

The Quantum Abstract Machine

Liyi Li ✉ 

Iowa State University

Le Chang ✉

University of Maryland

Rance Cleaveland ✉

University of Maryland

Mingwei Zhu ✉

University of Maryland

Xiaodi Wu ✉ 

University of Maryland

Abstract

This paper develops a model of quantum behavior that is intended to support the abstract yet accurate design and functional verification of quantum communication protocols. The work is motivated by the need for conceptual tools for the development of quantum-communication systems that are usable by non-specialists in quantum physics while also correctly capturing at a useful abstraction the underlying quantum phenomena. Our approach involves defining a quantum abstract machine (QAM) whose operations correspond to well-known quantum circuits; these operations, however, are given direct abstract semantics in a style similar to that of Berry's and Boudol's Chemical Abstract Machine. This paper defines the QAM's semantics and shows via examples how it may be used to model and reason about existing quantum communication protocols.

2012 ACM Subject Classification

Keywords and phrases Quantum Computing, Process Calculi, Abstract Machine, Quantum Internet

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/LIPIcs..2024.

1 Introduction

Quantum computers offer unique capabilities that can be used to implement substantially faster algorithms than those classical computers are capable of. For example, Grover's search algorithm [20, 21] can query unstructured data in sub-linear time (compared to linear time on a classical computer), and Shor's algorithm [46] can factor integers in polynomial time (no existing classical algorithm for this problem is polynomial-time). Quantum computing, via mechanisms such as *quantum teleportation* [4, 42], also supports secure communication capabilities that can transmit information without the possibility of eavesdropping. These capabilities of quantum computation are motivating researchers to build hybrid classical-quantum communication networks (HCQNs), including so-called *quantum internets* [28], that integrate quantum computing and existing classical network facilities to provide secure information transmission, with several HCQN protocols being proposed [7, 14, 45, 48].

The growing interest in quantum communication systems has also spurred work on formal approaches to modeling and verifying quantum communication protocols. Frameworks [17, 26, 49] based on process algebra have been proposed to model HCQN systems particularly. These frameworks have generally focused on enhancing existing message-passing process algebras [35, 44] with notations for describing *quantum circuits* [37] and their physical behaviors based on precise linear-algebraic quantum-state interpretations. The virtue of these approaches is their fidelity to the semantics of quantum states, but with two major issues. The precise quantum interpretations require classical resources exponential in their



© Li et al.;

licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY 4.0



Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics


Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

quantum descriptions, so the automated verification procedures for such descriptions moreover must confront problems of combinatorial explosion. Additionally, the message passing model, which the process algebras are based on, can fall afoul of quantum physical realities, such as no relocations or remote controls of quantum qubit resources, so defining protocols in these frameworks requires a significant background in quantum physics to employ; otherwise, users might define semantically sound protocols that are physically impossible to construct. This fact limits their use to system modelers well-versed in quantum physics.

To address these issues, we introduce the *Quantum Abstract Machine* (QAM), inspired by the classical *Chemical Abstract Machine* [6] (CHAM) and Linda [1], as a basis for the abstract, yet accurate, modeling of quantum communication. Our approach involves identifying a set of action primitives for modeling HCQN behavior and then giving them direct operational semantics rather than interpreting them in the traditional framework as unitary matrices of complex numbers. In addition, HCQN behaviors show different functional behaviors from traditional network protocols, which direct the QAM's design. This yields semantics that abstracts away many low-level details while preserving essential functional HCQN behaviors and physical realities,

While channels in classical networks are identifiers, in HCQNs, quantum channels have a limited lifetime and act as the carriers for conveying quantum messages; thus, they must be properly created before a quantum message can be delivered, with new operations to connect them with quantum messages in the QAM. Secondly, the no-cloning theorem [37] indicates that the delivery of a quantum message cannot simply copy the message to the other party, i.e., once a quantum message is delivered, the sender no longer has the message, which contravenes classical message passing. Thirdly, as we mentioned above, the physical reality of quantum computing is that quantum qubit resources are localized, so they cannot be relocated to distinct locations, and there is very limited way, if it is no way, to remotely manipulate quantum resources. This indicates a regional concept for quantum resources, and we adopt the membrane concept from CHAM to model it. Finally, HCQNs permit the connections between quantum and classical messages, e.g., a classical message must be measured out from a quantum qubit in quantum teleportation [4], which involves the nondeterministic generation of values. However, the nondeterminism is not completely random. Instead, in quantum teleportation, the result of a quantum message measurement creates a pair of classical and quantum residues, and they perform like a key lock pair, so we can recover the original quantum message by combining the right two residues, as if we match the right key and lock. All these aspects and the QAM's design are discussed throughout the paper, and the following is our list of contributions.

- We develop the QAM, with its syntax and semantics (Section 3), suitable for defining HCQN protocols. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first abstract semantics for describing HCQN behaviors without the involvement of quantum circuits.
- We carefully employ HCQN properties and physical limitations in the QAM's design so the definable QAM protocols correctly respect these properties and limitations. The QAM helps explore many HCQN properties, such as Theorem 3 and Theorem 7.
- We extend the QAM to describe and evaluate real-world multi-location HCQN protocols (Section 4), demonstrating a certain probability of failure. To demonstrate the extendability and utility of the QAM, we utilize trace-refinement in the evaluation framework to reason about the similarity of two HCQN protocols, such as QPASS and QCAST [45].



■ **Figure 1** Quantum Channel Circuit

■ **Figure 2** Quantum Channel Task Block

■ **Figure 3** Multi Qubit Quantum Channel

2 Overview

Many previous quantum process calculi, based on the traditional message passing models, are incapable of describing HCQN behaviors precisely, e.g., some might be contrary to physical realities, so programmers might not know if the protocols defined in these systems are physically implementable. We provide an overview of the QAM designs to unveil these HCQN properties that are hard to capture by message-passing models and show the QAM's design that better represents these properties. We begin with an example (Section 2.1) showing the abstraction in the QAM. Essentially, QAM refers to programs as a QAM *configuration* (\bar{P}/\bar{Q} in Figure 5) ¹, a multiset of membranes; and a program transition in the QAM is a labeled transition system $\bar{P} \xrightarrow{\kappa} \bar{Q}$, with label κ introduced in Figure 4. (Background about quantum computing and HCQNs are in Appendix A.)

2.1 Motivating Example and the QAM Data Design

The primary QAM design goal is to provide a high-level description of HCQN behaviors by abstracting away many quantum circuit-level details based on unitary and density matrix semantics. To do so, we model the QAM operations based on the task-block diagram concept, which describes many quantum algorithms [37], to provide a high-level perspective of HCQN protocols. In the motivated bit-commitment protocol [17] (circuit diagram in Figure 1), Alice and Bob first collaboratively create a quantum channel (Bell pair) connecting them, and then Alice decodes the channel by measuring it. This results in a classical and quantum residue for Alice and Bob, respectively. The region for each party is distinguished by color: blue for Alice and red for Bob. Its task-block diagram (Figure 2) contains two tasks that form two task-blocks—it connects Alice and Bob through a channel creation followed by a decoding procedure, which results in the two residues above.

In the QAM, we try to find a succinct set of functional common patterns, such as the Bell pair for channel creation, and abstract away the circuit-level details by utilizing these common patterns, constantly appearing as task blocks in previous works, as our operations.

► **Example 1** (Bit-Commitment). The following shows the QAM's implementation of the bit-commitment protocol and one-step transition.

$$\{\nu c.c \triangleright (x).0, \circ\}, \{\nu c.c?(y).0, \circ\} \xrightarrow{c} \{c \triangleright (x).0, c.\circ\}, \{c?(y).0, c.\circ\}$$

On the left configuration, Alice and Bob hold the left and right membranes ², respectively. They collaboratively create a quantum channel, named c , through the quantum channel creation operation ($\nu c.$). During the process, a pair of blank qubit resources \circ are consumed and transferred to the ones marked with the channel name c as $c.\circ$ on the right configuration, meaning that a channel c , with blank content, is established between Alice and Bob. After that, Alice decodes the channel ($c \triangleright (x).$) and receives classical bits as her residue (x), while

¹ In this paper, if S is a set, then we use \bar{S} to denote the set of multisets over S .

² Membranes are from the CHAM, a group of molecules including processes and resources in $\{\} - \{\}$.

XX:4 The Quantum Abstract Machine

Syntactic Categories:

Variable	$x, y \in \mathbb{V}$	Message Names	$e \in \mathbb{E}$
Quantum Channel	$c, d \in \mathbb{L}$	Classical Channel	$a \in \mathbb{A}$
Projective Channel	$\hat{c}, \hat{d} \in \widehat{\mathbb{L}}$		

Message Definitions:

Quantum Message $q ::= \circ \mid e \mid c.\mu \mid \hat{c}.q \mid \dagger q$ Classical Message $\iota ::= \hat{q} \mid a.\iota \mid \hat{c}.\iota \mid \dagger \iota$

Syntactic Sugars:

Quantum Related Channels	$\alpha ::= c \mid \hat{c}$	All Channels	$\delta ::= \alpha \mid a$
All Messages	$\mu ::= q \mid \iota$	Channels & Messages	$\kappa ::= \mu \mid \delta$

■ **Figure 4** QAM Data. \mathbb{V} , \mathbb{E} , \mathbb{L} and \mathbb{A} are disjoint.

Bob waits ($c?(y).$) for Alice’s decoding and receives a quantum residue message. Note that the QAM abstracts away qubit sizes, e.g., the channel creations in Example 1 do not necessarily refer to a Bell pair involving only two qubits; they might refer to the multi-qubit channel in Figure 3 or a variation of multi-qubit Bell pair admitting circuit optimizations. This paper refers to the qubit resources as quantum resources, abstracting away qubit sizes.

The QAM’s data design is in Figure 4 based on the hybrid aspect of HCQNs, which connects two worlds: quantum and classical. HCQNs hybridize quantum and classical communications based on quantum (q) and classical (ι) messages, which are distinctly classified in the QAM (Figure 4). This two-world view is also extended to channels acting as intermediate stations for communications, i.e., we distinguish quantum ($c \in \mathbb{L}$) and classical Π -calculus [35] style ($a \in \mathbb{A}$) channels. Moreover, it is necessary to include *projective channels* ($\hat{c} \in \widehat{\mathbb{L}}$) as the third kind to transform information between the quantum and classical worlds, explained shortly in Section 2.3. The QAM includes a singleton quantum message abstraction e and allows Π -calculus style channeled message $\delta.\kappa$, i.e., the channel δ contains a content κ , such as the $c.\circ$ above. A channeled message is either quantum or classical depending on if it contains any quantum pieces as the classification in Figure 4. Getting information from a quantum channel c is a projection from the quantum to the classical world, e.g., Alice’s decoding above. The decoding results two different residue messages: classical \hat{q} and quantum residues $\dagger q$. They are associated with c ’s projective channel \hat{c} , as $\hat{c}.\hat{q}$ and $\hat{c}.\dagger q$. We’ll unveil the different QAM data step by step below.

2.2 Quantum Resources/Channels are Different from Classical Ones

As we mentioned in Section 1, quantum resources cannot be relocated; remote controls of distinct quantum resources are far from general and limited to a few patterns, e.g., The rate of building a quantum channel connecting three remote locations is low [11]. A Bell pair or a variation of Bell pair ³ that communicates two parties might be the only workable quantum channel to connect two parties. Since every quantum channel in the QAM is between two parties, we refer to one portion of a quantum channel c to be a *party* of c , e.g., Alice and Bob’s membranes in Example 1 both hold a party of c after the channel creation. Three unique features in quantum channels are different from classical channels.

First, the non-relocation property above indicates that we should enforce locality in the QAM, captured by our membrane concept inspired by CHAM. In Example 1, Alice and Bob are in different membranes. The quantum resources (\circ and $c.\circ$) cannot move out of membrane, even if the multiset structure in each membrane indicates commutativity and associativity. In addition, Bob’s membrane (the right one) cannot contain operations that

³ A multi-qubit Bell Pair or GHZ that communicates two parties.

directly manipulate Alice’s quantum resources.

Second, processes and quantum resources in a membrane are separated into different entities to liberate the process operations while guaranteeing the quantum no-cloning theorem. Many basic programming operations, such as substitutions, are too easily misused, so a no-cloning violation could easily happen if the process-resource separation is not provided. For example, classical substitutions in message-passing models can easily create multiple copies of a variable in a process. If such a variable represents a quantum resource, it would violate the no-cloning theorem. Previous quantum process algebras [17, 26, 49] employ additional type and dynamic checks for ensuring no violations.

Inspired by Linda [1], the QAM separates processes and quantum resources and utilizes quantum channels referring to the resources in processes. In the one-step transition in Example 1, after applying the quantum channel creation, we create a channel c connecting the two membranes, e.g., $c.\circ$ in both membranes. The processes in the two membranes could have other operations arbitrarily copying the quantum channel name c . Still, creating multiple copies of the channel name c does not create copies of the quantum resources separated from the processes; thus, we forbid the possibility of cloning the quantum resource labeled as c . In addition, the process resource separation mechanism helps the guarantee of the non-relocation property, e.g., Alice (Example 1) could missend her quantum channel name c in the process to a third party (Mike) through a classical message-sending operation; however, Mike’s membrane does not contain a quantum resource c , located in Alice and Bob’s membrane; the classical message exchange about c does not permit Mike’s reference to the quantum resource in Alice’s membrane.

Third, quantum channels have a lifetime, as they must be created and disappear after being used to communicate a message. In the QAM, we model the channel creation through a pair of actions $\nu c.$ in two different membranes, as the COHERE rule below.

$$\text{COHERE} \\ \{\nu c.R, \circ, \bar{M}\}, \{\nu c.T, \circ, \bar{N}\} \xrightarrow{c} \{R, c.\circ, \bar{M}\}, \{T, c.\circ, \bar{N}\}$$

Both membranes have a process starting with an action ($\nu c.$), as they intend to create a quantum channel c . In the creation, each of the two membranes must contain a blank quantum resource \circ for consumption because of the no-cloning theorem, as the reason given in Appendix A. The transition raises a label c and labels the two blank quantum resources with the quantum channel name c , indicating that a quantum channel is created. The created quantum channel can only be used to teleport one message. A process might indirectly manipulate a quantum resource in the other membrane through a procedure named quantum entanglement swaps, explained in Section 3.3, where a process teleports the information of a quantum resource to another membrane to create the illusion of prolonging a quantum channel to permit long-distance communications.

2.3 Projective Nondeterminism and Projective Channels

The decoding operation result of bit-commitment (Example 1) nondeterministically produces a pair of classical and quantum residues, selected from the two pairs: 0 and $|0\rangle$ as well as 1 and $|1\rangle$. The non-determinism is not truly random, in the sense that one can recover Alice’s qubit $|0\rangle$ by merging any of the two pairs. The same happens in quantum teleportation in Example 2, i.e., any nondeterministically generated pair after the decoding can be merged to recover Alice’s original quantum message. An analogy of the phenomenon is that a decoding operation nondeterministically creates a pair of keys and locks, so any pair is matched, but crossed pair keys and locks fail to match. We name this kind of nondeterminism to be *projective non-determinism* because the nondeterminism is caused by the fact that we

XX:6 The Quantum Abstract Machine

Resources	ϕ	$::= \alpha.\mu \mid \circ$
Action	A	$::= \nu c. \mid a!u. \mid \delta?(x). \mid \alpha \triangleleft \kappa. \mid c \triangleright (x).$
Process	R, T	$::= 0 \mid AR \mid R + T \mid !R$
Molecule	M, N	$::= R \mid \phi$
Membrane	P, Q	$::= \{\overline{M}\} \mid P \llbracket \phi \rrbracket Q$

■ **Figure 5** QAM syntax. \overline{S} to denote the set of multisets over S .

project the information in the quantum world to the classical world through the decoding operation. To model the phenomenon, the QAM includes the concept of projective channels (\hat{c} in Figure 4). After decoding a quantum channel, we label the two residues in a newly generated projective channel, indicating that they are strongly correlated and can be merged to recover the original information in the quantum channel. Details are in Section 3.1.3.

3 The QAM Semantics

In this section, we define the QAM semantics based on a succinct set of abstract operations to capture the behaviors of HCQN protocols. For highlighting the operations, we utilize quantum teleportation as an example, which is the standard HCQN protocol, serving as the basis of many other HCQN protocols [30, 45].

3.1 The QAM Operation Design for Quantum Communications

The QAM syntax is given in Figure 5. The CHAM’s membrane concept [6] is central in the QAM’s operation design, where processes and quantum resources coexist as molecules in a membrane, inspired by Linda [1]. In a membrane, we utilize the multiset adjacency mechanism from CHAM to marry a process and a quantum resource, permitting the manipulation of the resource. On the other hand, we only allow communications through channels between distinct membranes. We have two kinds of membranes: a molecule membrane ($\{\overline{M}\}$) indicates that all molecules \overline{M} , either processes or resources, can marry with each other; and an airlocked membrane $P \llbracket \phi \rrbracket Q$, i.e., the membranes P and Q are actively communicating through the shared resource ϕ , typically a quantum channel. Every process living inside membranes is one of the following actions: a unit 0, an action followed by a process AR , a choice operation $R + T$, or a process replication $!R$.

We model a concise set of operations — mainly inspired by quantum task blocks repeatedly appearing in quantum network algorithms — as actions, including similar operations from Π -calculus such as classical message sender ($a!\mu.$) and receiver ($\delta?(x).$), as well as new QAM operations for modeling HCQN protocols, such as quantum channel creators ($\nu c.$), quantum message encoders ($c \triangleleft \kappa.$) and decoders ($c \triangleright (x).$).

► **Example 2** (Quantum Teleportation). The QAM configuration for quantum teleportation.

$$\begin{aligned} & \{\nu c.c \triangleleft \hat{d}.c \triangleright (x).a!x.0, \hat{d}.e, \circ\}, \{\nu c.c?(u).a?(z).u \triangleleft z.0, \circ\} \\ \xrightarrow{\quad} & \{c \triangleleft \hat{d}.c \triangleright (x).a!x.0, c.\circ, \hat{d}.e\}, \{c?(u).a?(z).u \triangleleft z.0, c.\circ\} \end{aligned}$$

The configuration is similar to Example 2. Alice has an additional encoding that encodes a quantum message resource $\hat{d}.e$, in her membrane, waiting to send to Bob. Alice also sends the classical residue after her decoding to Bob via a classical channel a .

3.1.1 Equations for Membranes

The QAM’s multiset structures indicate implicit equational properties, i.e., identity, commutativity, and associativity equational properties. Another important equational property is the airlock property (AIREQ), an imitation of the airlock in CHAM⁴, where we airlock two distinct membranes sharing a quantum channel for activating their communication.

⁴ CHAM’s airlock happens inside a membrane, while ours happens across membranes.

$$\text{AIREQ} \\ \{c.\mu_1, \overline{M}\}, \{c.\mu_2, \overline{N}\} \equiv \{\overline{M}\} \llbracket c.(\mu_1 \odot \mu_2) \rrbracket \{\overline{N}\}$$

The equation AIREQ describes the above communication activation. On the right side, the two membranes hold the same channel c with different content. After the equational rewrite, the two membranes actively communicate through the channel c with the combination of the two content $\mu_1 \odot \mu_2$. The \odot operation describes an algebra for calculating the composition of two quantum messages (Section 3.2), which is extendable, inspired by the extendable features in the CHAM, i.e., We can extend the operation to include circuit gates for reasoning about complicated quantum configurations written in circuit gates as a future work of the QAM, e.g., the one in Appendix D. Equations are bidirectional so that an airlock mode can be dissolved to the original membrane as the left-hand side of the equation AIREQ.

3.1.2 Encoding Quantum Messages into Channels

Message encoding is the procedure of installing a message, either quantum or classical, to a quantum channel, which is one of the essential steps in HCQN communications, e.g., in Example 2, Alice encodes a quantum message into a channel between Alice and Bob. Different encoding schemes are modeled as rules below.

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{QLOCAL} \qquad \qquad \qquad \text{CLOCAL} \\ \{c \triangleleft \alpha.R, \alpha.q, \dots\} \longrightarrow \{c \triangleleft \alpha.q.R, \dots\} \qquad \{\hat{c}?(x).R, \hat{c}.l, \dots\} \longrightarrow \{R[l/x], \dots\} \\ \text{ENCODE} \\ \{\alpha \triangleleft \mu_1.R, \alpha.\mu_2, \dots\} \longrightarrow \{R, \alpha.(\mu_1 \odot \mu_2), \dots\} \end{array}$$

In rule ENCODE, process R is adjacent to a party of a quantum channel c with the content μ_2 . R applies an operation to encode the message μ_1 to c , turning c 's content to be $\mu_1 \odot \mu_2$ by summing μ_1 and μ_2 through the meet operation \odot ; explained shortly below.

The other two rules help the localization of quantum resources. In QAM, a quantum resource typically does not appear in a process due to the separation of resource and process. However, we need to localize a quantum resource in rule ENCODE. The localization is handled by rules QLOCAL and CLOCAL. The former localizes the quantum resource, while the latter handles the one with a classical message l having a projective channel \hat{c} . When a process encodes a quantum message $\alpha.q$, the encoding operation ($c \triangleleft \alpha$) in the process first refers the channel α to the resource location where the message resides. Then, the process localizes the message by calling the referenced name α , as in rule QLOCAL, where we replace the channel α in R with the message $\alpha.q$. Here, we only replace a single channel α with the single quantum message without violating the no-cloning theorem – a quantum message cannot be cloned. Rule CLOCAL does a similar task as QLOCAL, but we can replace every occurrence of x with l in R because l is classical without the no-cloning limitation. We will explain why a resource molecule can be a classical message with the form $\hat{d}.q$ in Section 3.1.3. We proved the property below that the QAM semantics does not violate the no-cloning theorem.

► **Theorem 3 (No-cloning Assurance).** For any membrane $\{\overline{R}, \overline{\phi}\}$ in a QAM configuration \overline{P} , for any quantum message q as a resource molecule in $\overline{\phi}$, any transition $\overline{P} \rightarrow \overline{Q}$ does not substitute and copy q more than once.

A proof outline for the above theorem is given in Appendix C.1.

► **Example 4 (The Quantum Teleportation Encoding Steps).**

$$\begin{array}{l} \{c \triangleleft \hat{d}.c \triangleright (x).a!x.0, c.o, \hat{d}.e\}, \{c?(u).a?(z).u \triangleleft z.0, c.o\} \\ \equiv \{c \triangleleft \hat{d}.c \triangleright (x).a!x.0, \hat{d}.e, c.o\}, \{c?(u).a?(z).u \triangleleft z.0, c.o\} \\ \longrightarrow \{c \triangleleft \hat{d}.e.c \triangleright (x).a!x.0, c.o\}, \{c?(u).a?(z).u \triangleleft z.0, c.o\} \quad (\text{QLOCAL}) \\ \longrightarrow \{c \triangleright (x).a!x.0, c.\hat{d}.e\}, \{c?(u).a?(z).u \triangleleft z.0, c.o\} \quad (\text{ENCODE}) \end{array}$$

Example 4 shows the encoding steps in Example 2 after creating a quantum channel. Here, the localization rule QLOCAL, after the equational rewrite, replaces the spot marked as \widehat{d} with the message $\widehat{d}.e$. Then, we apply rule ENCODE to push $\widehat{d}.e$ to the quantum channel c . Bob's party of the channel c is unaffected in the encoding transition. This non-affectation unveils that Bob might not observe Alice's encoding behavior, coinciding with quantum channels' physical behavior. A channel's content depends on the meet (\odot) of the two pieces of information in the channel's two parties, described in rule AIREQ above. The meet operation \odot describes the behavior of quantum message manipulations from two different membranes. In QAM, we first propose its basic algebraic property as:

► **Definition 5** (Message Encoding Properties). The \odot 's algebraic properties:

$$\mu \odot \mu' \equiv \mu' \odot \mu \quad \circ \odot q \equiv q \quad \widehat{c}.\widehat{q} \odot \widehat{c}.\dagger q \equiv q \quad \iota \odot \iota \equiv \circ \quad \widehat{c}.\widehat{c}.\iota \odot \mu \equiv \widehat{c}.\iota \odot \widehat{c}.\mu$$

The first two rules define \odot 's commutativity and identity. The third rule introduces the meet of classical and quantum residues. The next suggests that the effect is canceled if two parties encode the same classical message into a quantum channel. The last suggests that the meet of nested projective channels can be rearranged if they are the same; see Section 3.2.

3.1.3 Decoding a Quantum Channel

Once a party encodes a message in a quantum channel, he can apply the decoding operation to cut off his holding of the channel so that the quantum information stored in the quantum channel flows to another party. Regarding the channel's content type (classical or quantum), the decoding semantics are described below by the DECODE rule.

$$\text{DECODE} \\ \{c \triangleright (x).R, \overline{M}\} \llbracket c.\mu \rrbracket \{c?(y).T, \overline{N}\} \xrightarrow{c.\mu} \{R[\widehat{c}.\widehat{\mu}/x], \overline{M}\}, \{T[\widehat{c}/y], \widehat{c}.\dagger \mu, \overline{N}\}$$

Before a decoding transition, the left and right membranes need to be airlocked via a shared quantum channel $c.\mu$. Process R starts decoding the channel c , and it receives a classical residue $\widehat{c}.\widehat{\mu}$ with the projective channel \widehat{c} . Process T in the right membrane is waiting ($c?(y).$) on the decoding result via channel c , and it receives a projective channel \widehat{c} . In addition, the right membrane also contains a new residue resource $\widehat{c}.\dagger \mu$ with the projective channel \widehat{c} . If the channel content is quantum, i.e., μ is a quantum message q , $\dagger q$ is a quantum residue; if μ is classical (ι), $\dagger \iota$ is a classical residue. Essentially, a projective channel holding a classical message is a classical entity and should not be considered a quantum resource. One can utilize rule CLOCAL to localize the message to be owned by a process.

► **Example 6** (The Quantum Teleportation Decoding Steps).

$$\begin{aligned} & \{c \triangleright (x).a!x.0, c.\widehat{d}.e\}, \{c?(u).a?(z).u \triangleleft z.0, c.\circ\} \\ \equiv & \{c \triangleright (x).a!x.0\} \llbracket c.\widehat{d}.e \rrbracket \{c?(u).a?(z).u \triangleleft z.0\} \\ \xrightarrow{c.\widehat{d}.e} & \{a!\widehat{c}.\widehat{d}.e.0\}, \{a?(z).\widehat{c} \triangleleft z.0, \widehat{c}.\dagger \widehat{d}.e\} \end{aligned}$$

The above shows the decoding steps after Example 4, where we decode the channel c with quantum content $\widehat{d}.e$, by first airlocking the two membranes. Decoding c pushes the left membrane to receive a classical residue $\widehat{c}.\widehat{d}.e$ and the right membrane receives the projective channel \widehat{c} . The right membrane's resource is rearranged as the quantum residue $\widehat{c}.\dagger \widehat{d}.e$. The label $c.\widehat{d}.e$ refers to a quantum channel c with a quantum message e labeled with a projective channel \widehat{d} .

The following theorem explains the non-relocation property in Section 2.2, i.e., message decoding is the sole way of teleporting the information stored in a quantum resource c from one membrane P to the other one Q . We show that the QAM respects the property below:

► **Theorem 7** (Non-Relocation). For any $P = \{\overline{R}, \overline{\phi}\}$ in a QAM configuration \overline{P} , for a quantum resource labeled with c in $\overline{\phi}$, if it is transformed to another membrane Q in \overline{P} , then

- There must be a decoding operation to erase c in P first.
- After the decoding, there is an encoding in Q to reconstruct c in Q 's resource fields.

A proof outline for the above theorem is given in Appendix C.2. The key indication in Theorem 7 shows that classical message exchanging of a quantum channel name c does not permit the other party access to the resource c .

► **Example 8** (The Quantum Teleportation Reconstruction Steps).

$$\begin{array}{l} \{a!\widehat{c}.\widehat{d}.e.0\}, \{a?(z).\widehat{c}\triangleleft z.0, \widehat{c}.\dagger\widehat{d}.e\} \\ \xrightarrow{a.\widehat{c}.\widehat{d}.e} \{0\}, \{\widehat{c}\triangleleft\widehat{c}.\widehat{d}.e.0, \widehat{c}.\dagger\widehat{d}.e\} \\ \rightarrow \{0\}, \{0, \widehat{d}.e\} \end{array}$$

The above example shows the final two steps of quantum teleportation. Alice sends the classical residue through classical channel a , and Bob encodes the received message to the quantum resource with the projective channel \widehat{c} to retrieve $\widehat{d}.e$.

3.2 The QAM Semantic Framework and Other Semantic Rules

ID1 $\{\emptyset\} \equiv \emptyset$	ID2 $0 \equiv \emptyset$	SPLIT $\{\overline{M}, \overline{N}\} \rightarrow \{\overline{M}\}, \{\overline{N}\}$	CL $R + T \rightarrow R$	CR $R + T \rightarrow T$	MT $!R \rightarrow R, !R$
NT $!R \rightarrow 0$	DECOHERE $\phi \rightarrow \emptyset$	COM $\{a!\iota.R, \dots\}, \{a?(x).T, \dots\} \xrightarrow{a.\iota} \{R, \dots\}, \{T[\iota/x], \dots\}$			


■ **Figure 6** Additional QAM semantics.

Figure 6 provides additional equations and semantic rules. Rules ID1 and ID2 define the identity relations of membranes and processes. Rule SPLIT separates a membrane into two. In QAM, a membrane can be split into two, but two membranes cannot join into one. If a membrane wants to create a quantum channel with itself, it can first apply the SPLIT rule and then apply the channel creation rule.

Rules CL and CR define the semantics for choice operations, while rules MT and NT define the semantics for replications, both similar to the ones in Π -calculus. The behavior of replications is similar to a local quantum machine that can repeatedly generate the same quantum state, which does not violate the no-cloning theorem because the generation is local and only produces the same known quantum state. Rule DECOHERE defines the phenomenon that quantum resources decohere which can cause a quantum resource disappear nondeterminically. We also support Π -calculus style classical communication as the rule COM. In rule DECODE (Section 3.1.3) and COM, the receiver operation $a?(x).$ acts as synchronous waiting. In DECODE, it waits for the other party to decode a quantum channel while in COM, it waits to receive a classical message ; examples are in Examples 6 and 8.

3.3 Case Study: Quantum Entanglement Swaps

As mentioned in Section 2.1, communication through a two-party quantum channel might be the only available form of long-distance quantum communication. Essentially, long-distance quantum message transmissions are built through the compositions of multiple quantum teleportations; this is known as quantum entanglement swaps (QES in Appendix A). QES treats a party of a quantum channel c as a piece of quantum information that can be encoded into another channel d and conveyed through d . We show an example QES configuration below for modeling Figure 11,



■ **Figure 7** Alice to Bob via an Intermediate Router

XX:10 The Quantum Abstract Machine

with the left membrane being Alice, the middle one being an intermediate router, and the right one being Bob. Alice tries to send a message $\widehat{c}.e$ to Bob.

► **Example 9** (Quantum Entanglement Swap). The QES configuration and its first few steps of transitions. Here, $A = c \triangleright (x) . a!x.0$, $R = d \triangleright (y) . a_1!y.0$ and $B = c?(u) . a?(t) . u \triangleleft t.0$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \{ \nu c.c \triangleleft \widehat{c}_1 . A, \widehat{c}_1 . e, \circ \}, \{ \nu c.\nu d.d \triangleleft c.R, \circ, \circ \}, \{ \nu d.d?(w) . a_1?(z) . w \triangleleft z.B, \circ \} \\
\cdots & \xrightarrow{c} \cdots \xrightarrow{d} \{ A, c.\widehat{c}_1.e \}, \{ d \triangleleft c.R, d.\circ, c.\circ \}, \{ d?(w) . a_1?(z) . w \triangleleft z.B, d.\circ \} \\
\equiv & \{ A, c.\widehat{c}_1.e \}, \{ d \triangleleft c.R, c.\circ, d.\circ \}, \{ d?(w) . a_1?(z) . w \triangleleft z.B, d.\circ \} \\
\longrightarrow & \{ A, c.\widehat{c}_1.e \}, \{ d \triangleleft c.\circ . R, d.\circ \}, \{ d?(w) . a_1?(z) . w \triangleleft z.B, d.\circ \} \quad (\text{QLOCAL}) \\
\equiv & \{ A, c.\widehat{c}_1.e \}, \{ d \triangleleft c.\circ . R, d.\circ \}, \{ d?(w) . a_1?(z) . w \triangleleft z.B, d.\circ \} \\
\longrightarrow & \{ A, c.\widehat{c}_1.e \}, \{ R, d.c.\circ \}, \{ d?(w) . a_1?(z) . w \triangleleft z.B, d.\circ \} \quad (\text{ENCODE})
\end{aligned}$$

The example above shows several transition steps. The first step is an abbreviation of combining several steps to create two quantum channels, c and d . Rule QLOCAL replaces the channel name c in the encoding operation $d \triangleleft c.$, with $c.\circ$, to localize a party of the channel c , which will be viewed as a piece of quantum information encoded into the channel d . Realize that the other party of the channel c held by Alice does not change during the process, as Alice does not notice the change happening in the other part of the same channel. The final step encodes the channel party $c.\circ$ to the channel d by treating $c.\circ$ as a quantum message.

After the above transitions, the later ones in QES are similar to the last few steps of the quantum teleportation algorithm, where we decode the quantum channel d to hand over the quantum channel c to Bob. The transitions are described as follows.

► **Example 10** (QES Decoding for Long Distance Channel Building).

$$\begin{aligned}
& \{ A, c.\widehat{c}_1.e \}, \{ R, d.c.\circ \}, \{ d?(w) . a_1?(z) . w \triangleleft z.B, d.\circ \} \\
\equiv & \{ A, c.\widehat{c}_1.e \}, \{ d \triangleright (y) . a_1!y.0 \} \{ [d.c.\circ] \{ d?(w) . a_1?(z) . w \triangleleft z.B \} \\
\frac{d.c.\circ}{\longrightarrow} & \{ A, c.\widehat{c}_1.e \}, \{ a_1!\widehat{d}.\widehat{c}.\circ.0 \}, \{ a_1?(z) . \widehat{d} \triangleleft z.B, \widehat{d}.\dagger c.\circ \} \\
\frac{a_1.\widehat{d}.\widehat{c}.\circ}{\longrightarrow} & \{ A, c.\widehat{c}_1.e \}, \{ 0 \}, \{ \widehat{d} \triangleleft \widehat{d}.\widehat{c}.\circ.B, \widehat{d}.\dagger c.\circ \} \\
\longrightarrow & \{ A, c.\widehat{c}_1.e \}, \{ 0 \}, \{ B, c.\circ \}
\end{aligned}$$

In the above transitions, we aim to teleport $c.\circ$ from the router to Bob so that Bob can communicate with Alice via the channel c . As we can see, the procedures are the same as the second half of the quantum teleportation transitions in Example 6, except that the classical and quantum residues become $\widehat{d}.\widehat{c}.\circ$ and $\widehat{d}.\dagger c.\circ$, respectively. After the final recovery encoding step, the channel d disappears, and Bob holds the channel $c.\circ$. The step essentially transforms the quantum resource in d to be the quantum information of the channel $c.\circ$ by treating $c.\circ$ as a piece of quantum information. Then, Alice and Bob can communicate through channel c by executing the second half of the quantum teleportation transitions (Example 6) again. In the end, Bob receives the quantum message $\widehat{c}_1.e$.

QES is an important protocol for long-distance transmissions in HCQN communications. We will see an evaluation framework can be built on top of the QAM in Section 4.

4 Extending QAM to Remote Communication

We extend the QAM to an evaluation framework, permitting remote communications for analyzing real-world HCQN protocols; their key assumptions are in Appendix A. The extension's key includes location information in membranes, stabilizing channel's destinations, and computing probability success rates for a transmission path.

Locations	$g, h \in \mathbb{G}$	Intension ID	$n \in \mathbb{N}$
Success Rate	$p \in [0, 1]$	Relation Pair Multiset	$\theta ::= \overline{h \xleftrightarrow{p} g}$
Intension Map	$\xi ::= n \rightarrow (g, h)$	Predicates	$\varphi ::= \xi * \theta * g * h \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$

■ **Figure 8** Extended QAM Syntax. Membranes are now $\{\overline{M}\}_g$.

4.1 Extending QAM Membranes with Locations

As shown in Figure 8, membrane structures are extended to contain location information, as $\{\overline{M}\}_g$. Every channel is established to transfer a message between two fixed locations. We include the concept of intention ID $n \in \mathbb{N}$ for each channel and implement a channel c as $c(n)$. We also include an intention finite map ξ mapping from intention IDs (n) to two locations (g, h), indicating the target and the destination of the channel intended to establish. In the paper, we abbreviate the channel $c(n)$ as c and provide a function $\text{im}(c)$ to access c 's intention ID, e.g., $\text{im}(c) = n$. Every execution is associated with a graph θ , indicating the success rates of generating a quantum channel between two locations. For example, in Figure 7, Alice and the router can create a channel with a 0.5 success rate. Function $\theta(g, h)$ produces the success rate connecting g and h .

We now extend the QAM judgment to be $\overline{P} \xrightarrow{p(g,h)}_{\{\xi, \varphi, \theta\}} \overline{Q}$. Here, \overline{P} and \overline{Q} are configurations, with membranes extended with location information as in Figure 8. The predicate φ judges if a transition is valid by querying the transition labels. In the new system, we modify the label to $p(g, h)$, meaning that a channel connects g and h , and the success rate is p . The main utility of the extended QAM system is to evaluate the success rates of establishing long-distance channels. Notice that the system is *not* stochastic, e.g., Markov-chains [33, 34]. Success rates p in a label are viewed as a property of the transition edge instead of the edge's transition probability.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\text{TRANS} \quad \overline{P} \xrightarrow{\kappa} \overline{Q} \quad \neg \text{is_q}(\text{chan}(\kappa))}{\overline{P} \xrightarrow{\kappa}_{\{\xi, \varphi, \theta\}} \overline{Q}} \quad \frac{\text{CHAN} \quad \overline{P} \xrightarrow{c} \overline{Q} \quad \text{loc}(\overline{P}, c) = (g, h) \quad \varphi(\xi, \theta, g, h)}{\overline{P} \xrightarrow{(\theta(g,h))(g,h)}_{\{\xi, \varphi, \theta\}} \overline{Q}} \\
\frac{\text{MSG} \quad \overline{P} \xrightarrow{c, \mu} \overline{Q} \quad \text{loc}(\overline{P}, c, \text{chan}(\mu)) = (g, h) \quad \varphi(\xi, \theta, g, h)}{\overline{P} \xrightarrow{(1)(g,h)}_{\{\xi, \varphi, \theta\}} \overline{Q}}
\end{array}$$

Similar to the extendability in CHAM, we extend QAM to include the three rules. Rule TRANS turns a QAM transition, without quantum channel labels (checked by `is_q`), into a transition in the extended QAM. When creating a channel, Rule CHAN finds the rate in the intransitive set θ for the edge (g, h) , where g and h are found by the function $\text{loc}(\overline{P}, c)$ searching the two locations that c resides. Rule MSG deals with the case when a decoding happens. In QES (Section 3.3), the ownership of a quantum channel $\text{chan}(\mu)$ is transferred to a third party, so we need to access the location information of the two new parties through the function $\text{loc}(\overline{P}, c, \text{chan}(\mu))$, producing the two different locations that the two channels c and $\text{chan}(\mu)$ are connected to. In this process, the success rate of the transition is 1.

Consider Example 9, we extend the membranes from $\{-\}$ to $\{-\}_g$, where g can be A , R , and B , referring to the locations of Alice, the router, and Bob. We include intention IDs n and n' for channels c and d . In ξ , n maps to (A, B) and n' maps to (R, B) . We also need to implement the θ map as the diagram shown in Figure 7 as:

$$\theta \triangleq \{A \xleftrightarrow{0.5} R, R \xleftrightarrow{0.5} B\} \quad \xi \triangleq \{n \rightarrow (A, B), n' \rightarrow (R, B)\}$$

Here, we can set the predicate $\varphi(\xi, \theta, g, h)$ always to answer `true`, provided that (g, h) is a valid edge in θ . At the time when the channels c and d are being created (Example 9), we apply rule CHAN twice, and they raise labels $0.5(A, R)$ and $0.5(R, B)$. At the time when

we decode the channel d (Example 10), with the transition label being $d.c.o$, we apply rule `Msg` to prolong the channel d to connect the path between A and B , with the success rate 1. Along the chain of the successful creation of a long-distance channel from A to B , if we compute the total success rate along the above three steps, it is $0.5 * 0.5 * 1 = 0.25$.

4.2 Defining the QPass and QCast Protocols

The QPass and QCast protocols [45] define the routing behaviors of HCQN communications. In defining the two protocols, we utilize the above-extended QAM semantics by modifying the path graph θ for a specific routing table and defining the predicate φ for a specific protocol. Here, we model the simplified versions of the QPass and QCast protocols, where the simplified QPass protocol permits a creation (applying a rule `CHAN`) and extension (applying a rule `Msg`) of a quantum channel c , only if the edge that the channel connects, as (g, h) , are in the shortest path between the starting and the final destinations ($\xi(\text{im}(c))$). The simplified QCast protocol permits the creation or extension of a channel if the edge (g, h) is in the path between the starting and the final destinations, where the sum of the assumed success rates is maximized.




Figure 9 Example path graph.

$$\theta(\bar{p}) \triangleq \{ \text{Ann} \xrightarrow{p_1} \text{Cat}, \text{Ann} \xrightarrow{p_2} \text{Ra}, \text{Ann} \xrightarrow{p_3} \text{Rb}, \text{Cat} \xrightarrow{p_4} \text{Ra}, \text{Cat} \xrightarrow{p_5} \text{Ra}, \text{Ra} \xrightarrow{p_6} \text{Dan}, \text{Ra} \xrightarrow{p_7} \text{Bob}, \text{Dan} \xrightarrow{p_8} \text{Bob}, \text{Rb} \xrightarrow{p_9} \text{Rc}, \text{Rc} \xrightarrow{p_{10}} \text{Bob} \}$$

As an example, we define an example routing map (Figure 9) as $\theta(\bar{p})$ above, with \bar{p} being a list of assumed success rates for creating the channel between two parties in an edge. In the example map, for simplicity, we define the destination to be **Bob** for every quantum channel. We discuss the predicate definition for the QPass and QCast protocols below.

The QPass Protocol. In defining the QPass protocol, the predicate φ_p is defined as:

$$\varphi_p(\xi, \theta(\bar{p}), g, h) \triangleq (g, h) \in \text{shortest}(\theta(\bar{p}), \xi(\text{im}(c)))$$

A valid quantum channel creation or extension is validated if the edge generated from a transition is in the shortest path from the left node of the channel to the destination. An example of transmitting a message from **Ann** to **Bob** in Figure 9 is shown below.

► **Example 11** (QPass Example Code). Below, we reuse the code in Example 9 to define the behaviors of the membranes **Ann**, **Ra**, and **Bob** for transmitting a message $\widehat{c}_1.e$ from **Ann** to **Bob** via the intermediate router **Ra**. Here, $A = c \triangleright (x).a!x.0$, $R = d \triangleright (y).a_1!y.0$, and $B = c?(u).a?(t).u \triangleleft t.0$.

$$\{ \nu c.c \triangleleft \widehat{c}_1.A, \widehat{c}_1.e, \circ \}_{\text{Ann}}, \{ \nu c.\nu d.d \triangleleft c.R, \circ, \circ \}_{\text{Ra}}, \{ \nu d.d?(w).a_1?(z).w \triangleleft z.B, \circ \}_{\text{Bob}}$$

The above example defines a small portion of the system in Figure 9, where we send a message from **Ann** to **Bob** via the router **Ra**, as we use the same ξ map above. The transitions of Example 11 are listed as follows.

► **Example 12** (QPass Example Transitions).

$$\begin{aligned} \dots & \xrightarrow{p_2(\text{Ann,Ra})} \{ A, c.\widehat{c}_1.e \}_{\text{Ann}}, \{ \nu d.d \triangleleft c.R, \circ, c.o \}_{\text{Ra}}, \{ \nu d.d?(w).a_1?(z).w \triangleleft z.B, \circ \}_{\text{Bob}} \\ \dots & \xrightarrow{p_7(\text{Ra,Bob})} \{ A, c.\widehat{c}_1.e \}_{\text{Ann}}, \{ d \triangleleft c.R, d.o, c.o \}_{\text{Ra}}, \{ d?(w).a_1?(z).w \triangleleft z.B, d.o \}_{\text{Bob}} \\ \dots & \xrightarrow{1(\text{Ann,Bob})} \{ A, c.\widehat{c}_1.e \}_{\text{Ann}}, \{ a_1!\widehat{d}.\widehat{c}.\widehat{o}.0 \}_{\text{Ann}}, \{ a_1?(z).\widehat{d} \triangleleft z.B, \widehat{d}.\dagger.c.o \}_{\text{Ann}} \\ \dots & \end{aligned}$$

In the above example, the creation of the channels c and d are validated in QPass, because the locations where the channels are connecting belong to the shortest path from **Ann** to **Bob** and **Ra** to **Bob** in Figure 9. The last step performs a decoding, as in Example 10, and it is

essentially a step to convey a party of the channel c from Ra to Bob, stated in Theorem 7. This procedure is validated in QPass by applying rule Msg with the predicate definition φ_p above, because the edge (Ann, Bob) is also in the shortest path from Ann to Bob.

The QCast Protocol. In defining the QCast protocol, the predicate φ_c is defined as:

$$\varphi_c(\xi, \theta(\bar{p}), g, h) \triangleq (g, h) \in \max(\theta(\bar{p}), \xi(\text{im}(c)))$$

In the case of QCast, we validate a quantum channel creation or relocation, if the edge generated from a transition is in the path that maximizes the possibility of sending a message from the source to the target. We examine the QCast behavior by reusing the example in Example 11 as the following.

► **Example 13** (QCast Example Transitions).

$$\begin{aligned} \dots & \xrightarrow{p_2(\text{Ann, Ra})} \left\{ A, c.\widehat{c_1}.e \right\}_{\text{Ann}}, \left\{ \nu d.d \triangleleft c.R, \circ, c.\circ \right\}_{\text{Ra}}, \left\{ \nu d.d?(w).a_1?(z).w \triangleleft z.B, \circ \right\}_{\text{Bob}} \quad ? \\ \dots & \xrightarrow{p_7(\text{Ra, Bob})} \left\{ A, c.\widehat{c_1}.e \right\}_{\text{Ann}}, \left\{ d \triangleleft c.R, d.\circ, c.\circ \right\}_{\text{Ra}}, \left\{ d?(w).a_1?(z).w \triangleleft z.B, d.\circ \right\}_{\text{Bob}} \quad ? \\ \dots & \xrightarrow{1(\text{Ann, Bob})} \left\{ A, c.\widehat{c_1}.e \right\}_{\text{Ann}}, \left\{ a_1!d.\widehat{c_1}.0 \right\}_{\text{Ann}}, \left\{ a_1?(z).d \triangleleft z.B, \widehat{d}.\dagger c.\circ \right\}_{\text{Ann}} \quad ? \\ & \dots \end{aligned}$$

In the above example, the three transitions are marked with question marks because their validity depends on the success rate values (\bar{p}) given in $\theta(\bar{p})$. For example, if we set p_2, p_9 and p_{10} to be 0.5, and the other success rates to be 0.3, the maximized success rate path is the path: Ann \rightarrow Rb \rightarrow Rc \rightarrow Bob. Thus, the transitions in Example 13 are all invalidated because the edges are not in the maximized success rate path. One thing worth noting is that the success rates (\bar{p}) are fixed before the program execution, and they represent the guesses of success rates to construct channels between two distinct locations. The original QCast paper has an algorithm to adjust the success rates when network transmissions are evolving, which will be a future study of the QAM.

5 Behavioral Refinement and Equivalence

To illustrate the QAM, we use the traditional trace refinement. Here, we define trace-refinement relations on labeled transition systems (LTS) for the QAM and the extended QAM, following traditional notions in process algebra. We view the QAM system as LTS $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A}, \rightarrow)$, with \mathcal{C} being the set of configurations and \mathcal{A} containing transition labels (κ), while the Extended QAM is another LTS $(\mathcal{C}_d, \mathcal{A}_d, \rightarrow_{\{\xi, \varphi, \theta\}})$, with \mathcal{C}_d being the set of configurations extended with location information, and \mathcal{A}_d containing transition labels, having the form $p(g, h)$ in the extended QAM. We also use $::$ as a label sequence concatenation operation and ϵ as the empty sequence. We first define QAM finite traces and trace refinement based on Back and von Wright's definition [2], which provides an abstraction of transitions.

► **Definition 14** (QAM Finite Trace Set). Given the QAM LTS $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A}, \rightarrow)$, the trace set $\mathcal{T}(C)$ for configuration $C \in \mathcal{C}$ is defined inductively as:

- $\epsilon \in \mathcal{T}(C)$.
- $t \in \mathcal{T}(C)$, given $C \rightarrow C'$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}(C')$.
- $\kappa :: t \in \mathcal{T}(C)$, given $C \xrightarrow{\kappa} C'$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}(C')$.

► **Definition 15** (QAM Trace Refinement). Given $\mathbb{Q} = (\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A}, \rightarrow)$, and $C, C' \in \mathcal{C}$, we say that C trace refines C' , written as $C \sqsubseteq_{\mathbb{Q}} C'$, iff $\mathcal{T}(C) \subseteq \mathcal{T}(C')$.

The above trace-refinement definition is suitable for QAM programs. For an extended QAM execution, success rates can be attached to a transition label. We need to extend the above trace-refinement relation to include probability success rates, treated as a special property of the labels. We first define a likeliness finite trace set.

XX:14 The Quantum Abstract Machine

► **Definition 16** (Likeliness Finite Trace Set). Given ξ , θ , and an extended QAM system $\mathbb{Q} = (\mathcal{C}_d, \mathcal{A}_d, \rightarrow_{\{\xi, \varphi, \theta\}})$, the trace set $\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{Q}, C)$ over $C \in \mathcal{C}_d$ is defined inductively as:

- $\epsilon \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{Q}, C)$.
- $t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{Q}, C)$, given $C \rightarrow_{\{\xi, \varphi, \theta\}} C'$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{Q}, C')$.
- $p(g, h) :: t \in \mathcal{T}(C)$, given $C \xrightarrow{(p)(g, h)}_{\{\xi, \varphi, \theta\}} C'$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}(C')$.

The likeliness trace ordering relation and QAM trace refinement can now be defined as:

► **Definition 17** (Likeliness Trace Order). Two QAM finite traces, σ_1 and σ_2 , are likely ordered, written as $\sigma_1 \preceq \sigma_2$, iff the following holds:

- $\sigma_1 = \epsilon$ and $\sigma_2 = \epsilon$.
- If $\sigma_1 = p(g, h) :: \sigma'_1$, then $\sigma_2 = p'(g, h) :: \sigma'_2$ for some p' , and $p \leq p'$ and $\sigma'_1 \preceq \sigma'_2$.

► **Definition 18** (Likeliness Trace Subset). Given two likeliness trace sets S and S' , $S \subseteq_r S'$ iff, for every $\sigma \in S$, there is $\sigma' \in S'$, such that $\sigma \preceq \sigma'$.

► **Definition 19** (Likeliness QAM Trace Refinement (LQTR)). Given ξ , θ , and two extended QAM systems $\mathbb{Q}_1 = (\mathcal{C}_d, \mathcal{A}_d, \rightarrow_{\{\xi, \varphi_1, \theta\}}^1)$ and $\mathbb{Q}_2 = (\mathcal{C}_d, \mathcal{A}_d, \rightarrow_{\{\xi, \varphi_2, \theta\}}^2)$, and configurations $C_1, C_2 \in \mathcal{C}$, we say that (\mathbb{Q}_1, C_1) likely trace refines (\mathbb{Q}_2, C_2) , written as $(\mathbb{Q}_1, C_1) \sqsubseteq_r (\mathbb{Q}_2, C_2)$, iff $\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{Q}_1, C_1) \subseteq_r \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{Q}_2, C_2)$.

The LQTR relation is defined based the QAM trace refinement relation, with the modification of labels, i.e., the extended QAM transition definition in Section 4.1 extends the transition rules in the QAM. Notice above that the configuration and label sets \mathcal{C}_d and \mathcal{A}_d as well as maps θ and ξ are the same in the two systems.

The LQTR definition is useful in relating two different HCQN protocols. For example, we can relate the above QPass and QCast protocols to the theorem below:

► **Theorem 20** (QPass and QCast Trace Refinement). Given ξ , $\theta(\bar{p})$, and an initial configuration $C \in \mathcal{C}_d$ and the QPass and QCast systems as stated in Section 4.2, there is an assignment \bar{p} , such that $(\text{QPass}, C) \sqsubseteq_r (\text{QCast}, C)$.

6 Related Work

Quantum Process Algebra. The QAM's design was inspired by several existing quantum process calculi: qCCS [49, 15, 41], Communicating Quantum Processes (CQP) [17], quantum model checker (MQC) [10, 16], QPAlg [26], and eQPAlg [22]. These process calculi enhance existing message-passing models, such as CSP [25] and Π -calculus [35], to define HCQN protocols. They do not intend to provide abstract semantics and a new communication model for specifically describing HCQNs. First, they did not define the unique properties of quantum resources. For example, qCCS allows the message passing of variables referring to quantum resources and permits their remote controls; thus, HCQN protocols that do not meet the physical realities can be defined in qCCS. Second, their message-passing views did not capture the lifetime properties of quantum channels, as we describe in Section 2.2. Third, all of the previous quantum process calculi are not based on abstract semantics, which is the mathematical characterization of program behaviors. They mainly admit concrete operational semantics instead of abstract ones by integrating quantum circuits and states in the syntax of some process algebra, e.g., CQP and qCCS extend CSP [25] and Π -calculus [35] with operations describing quantum circuits and semantic states that do not appear in their language operation syntax. The key to process calculi is to provide insight into HCQN communications. Although quantum circuit semantics provides a thorough story of

HCQN protocols, many subtleties in these protocols might be glossed over, e.g., the projective nondeterminism. It would be unfortunate for protocol designers to examine the projective nondeterminism behavior through a heavy study of quantum circuit states, especially considering the fact that projective nondeterminism is essential in HCQN communications, and a system should show the behavior directly in front of users.

Traditional Process Algebra. Communicating Sequential Processes (CSP) [25] and Π -calculus [35] are process calculi suitable for defining concurrent systems based on the message-passing model. Several bisimulation and trace-refinement protocol verification methodologies exist for CSP and the Π -calculus [32, 18, 44]. As noted earlier, the Chemical Abstract Machine [6] and Linda [1] are the inspiration of the QAM. Membrane computing [40], Modulo structural operational semantics [36], and the K framework [43] are three general language definition frameworks for defining language semantics formally.

Quantum Network Protocols. Quantum teleportation [4, 42] serves as the basis for quantum communication between two parties. Julia-Diaz *et al.* [27] provides a two-qubit quantum teleportation protocol. Superdense coding [5] encodes a classical message into a quantum channel. Quantum routing investigates long-distance quantum message transmission, with QES being one of the promising protocols for the task [38, 47, 30]. QPass and QCast are protocols based on the quantum-swap algorithm [45] to maximize the transmission chances, through static and semi-dynamic analyses. Researchers developed their circuit implementations [13, 9] and new protocols for enhancing the reliability [39]. Chakraborty *et al.* [8] provided an alternative routing protocol to permit distributed routing. Li *et al.* [31] and Caleffi [7] provide systems to improve transmission chances and message delivery rates. The refinement of HCQN network protocols strongly motivates the QAM's development.

7 Conclusion and Future Work

We propose the Quantum Abstract Machine (QAM), admitting an abstract semantics, as a communication model for HCQN communications, which captures the important aspects of HCQNs and permits the definition and analysis of HCQN protocols; they are different from the behaviors of classical network communications based on message-passing models. Many HCQN properties, such as Theorems 3 and 7, are surfaced in the QAM due to our abstract semantics. We also show the QAM semantics can be extended to an evaluation framework suitable for quantum resource analyses for real-world HCQN protocols, such as QPass and QCast, and utilize classical trace refinement relations, as an example of the QAM's extendability for analytical tools, to analyze real-world protocols.

As one of the future work, we plan to establish a temporal logic model-checking environment on top of the QAM to verify HCQN protocols. Supporting HCQN security protocol analyses will also be a future direction for the QAM. The encoding and meet operations (\odot) in the QAM are extensible for the task of defining different quantum operations for enforcing cryptographic methodologies. One example extension is given in Appendix D. In addition, we plan to develop a concurrent quantum circuit language that inherits the properties and restrictions from the QAM so that every defined physical level protocol in the language is an implementable one following physical laws. A small example is given in Appendix E.

References

- 1 Ahuja, Carriero, and Gelernter. Linda and friends. *Computer*, 19(8):26–34, 1986. doi: 10.1109/MC.1986.1663305.

- 2 R. J. R. Back and J. von Wright. Trace refinement of action systems. In Bengt Jonsson and Joachim Parrow, editors, *CONCUR '94: Concurrency Theory*, pages 367–384, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1994. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- 3 Charles H. Bennett and Gilles Brassard. Quantum cryptography: Public key distribution and coin tossing. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 560:7–11, 2014. Theoretical Aspects of Quantum Cryptography – celebrating 30 years of BB84. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304397514004241>, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2014.05.025>.
- 4 Charles H. Bennett, Gilles Brassard, Claude Crépeau, Richard Jozsa, Asher Peres, and William K. Wootters. Teleporting an unknown quantum state via dual classical and einstein-podolsky-rosen channels. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 70:1895–1899, Mar 1993. URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.70.1895>, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.70.1895.
- 5 Charles H. Bennett and Stephen J. Wiesner. Communication via one- and two-particle operators on einstein-podolsky-rosen states. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 69:2881–2884, Nov 1992. URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.69.2881>, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.69.2881.
- 6 Gérard Berry and Gérard Boudol. The chemical abstract machine. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 96(1):217–248, 1992. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/030439759290185I>, doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975\(92\)90185-I](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(92)90185-I).
- 7 Marcello Caleffi. Optimal Routing for Quantum Networks. *IEEE Access*, 5:22299–22312, 2017. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2017.2763325.
- 8 Kaushik Chakraborty, Filip Rozpedek, Axel Dahlberg, and Stephanie Wehner. Distributed Routing in a Quantum Internet, 2019. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.11630>, doi:10.48550/ARXIV.1907.11630.
- 9 Axel Dahlberg, Matthew Skrzypczyk, Tim Coopmans, Leon Wubben, Filip Rozpundefineddek, Matteo Pompili, Arian Stolk, Przemysław Pawełczak, Robert Knegjens, Julio de Oliveira Filho, Ronald Hanson, and Stephanie Wehner. A Link Layer Protocol for Quantum Networks. In *Proceedings of the ACM Special Interest Group on Data Communication, SIGCOMM '19*, page 159–173, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery. doi:10.1145/3341302.3342070.
- 10 Tim Davidson, Simon Gay, H. Mlnářík, Rajagopal Nagarajan, and Nick Papanikolaou. Model checking for communicating quantum processes. *International Journal of Unconventional Computing*, 8:73–98, 01 2012.
- 11 Jarn de Jong, Frederik Hahn, Jens Eisert, Nathan Walk, and Anna Pappa. Anonymous conference key agreement in linear quantum networks. *Quantum*, 7:1117, September 2023. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22331/q-2023-09-21-1117>, doi:10.22331/q-2023-09-21-1117.
- 12 Haowei Deng and Connor Clayton. Quantum network SDN programming language, 2022. URL: <https://github.com/cbclayton/quantum-network-pl>.
- 13 Stephen DiAdamo, Bing Qi, Glen Miller, Ramana Kompella, and Alireza Shabani. Packet switching in quantum networks: A path to the quantum Internet. *Phys. Rev. Res.*, 4:043064, Oct 2022. URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevResearch.4.043064>, doi:10.1103/PhysRevResearch.4.043064.
- 14 Ali Farahbakhsh and Chen Feng. Opportunistic routing in quantum networks, 2022. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.08479>, doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2205.08479.
- 15 Yuan Feng, Runyao Duan, and Mingsheng Ying. Bisimulation for quantum processes. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 34(4), dec 2012. doi:10.1145/2400676.2400680.
- 16 Simon Gay, Rajagopal Nagarajan, and Nikolaos Papanikolaou. Specification and verification of quantum protocols. *Semantic Techniques in Quantum Computation*, 01 2013. doi:10.1017/CB09781139193313.012.
- 17 Simon J. Gay and Rajagopal Nagarajan. Communicating Quantum Processes. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, POPL '05*, page 145–157, New York, NY, USA, 2005. Association for Computing Machinery. doi:10.1145/1040305.1040318.

- 18 Thomas Gibson-Robinson, Alexandre Boulgakov Philip Armstrong, and A.W. Roscoe. Fdr3 - a modern refinement checker for csp. In *TACAS*, 2014. In Press.
- 19 Fabrizio Granelli, Riccardo Bassoli, Janis Nötzel, Frank Fitzek, Holger Boche, and Nelson Fonseca. A Novel Architecture for Future Classical-Quantum Communication Networks. *Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing*, 2022:1–18, 04 2022. doi:10.1155/2022/3770994.
- 20 Lov K. Grover. A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '96, page 212–219, New York, NY, USA, 1996. Association for Computing Machinery. arXiv:quant-ph/9605043, doi:10.1145/237814.237866.
- 21 Lov K. Grover. Quantum mechanics helps in searching for a needle in a haystack. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 79:325–328, July 1997. arXiv:quant-ph/9706033, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.79.325.
- 22 Salman Haider and Dr. Syed Asad Raza Kazmi. An extended quantum process algebra (eqpalg) approach for distributed quantum systems, 2020. arXiv:2001.04249.
- 23 Kesha Hietala. Python voqc, 2021. URL: <https://github.com/inQWIRE/pyvoqc>.
- 24 Kesha Hietala, Robert Rand, Shih-Han Hung, Xiaodi Wu, and Michael Hicks. A verified optimizer for quantum circuits. In *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL)*, January 2021.
- 25 C. A. R. Hoare. *Communicating sequential processes*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA, 1985.
- 26 Philippe Jorrand and Marie Lalire. Toward a Quantum Process Algebra. In *Proceedings of the 1st Conference on Computing Frontiers*, CF '04, page 111–119, New York, NY, USA, 2004. Association for Computing Machinery. doi:10.1145/977091.977108.
- 27 B. Juliá-Díaz, Joseph Burdis, and Frank Tabakin. Qdensit—a mathematica quantum computer simulation. *Computer Physics Communications*, 180:914–934, 08 2005. doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2005.12.021.
- 28 H. J. Kimble. The Quantum Internet. *Nature*, 453(7198):1023–1030, Jun 2008. doi:10.1038/nature07127.
- 29 Emmanuel Knill. Conventions for quantum pseudocode. Technical report, Los Alamos National Lab., NM (United States), 1996.
- 30 Wojciech Kozłowski, Axel Dahlberg, and Stephanie Wehner. Designing a Quantum Network Protocol. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Emerging Networking Experiments and Technologies*, CoNEXT '20, page 1–16, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery. doi:10.1145/3386367.3431293.
- 31 Jian Li, Mingjun Wang, Qidong Jia, Kaiping Xue, Nenghai Yu, Qibin Sun, and Jun Lu. Fidelity-Guarantee Entanglement Routing in Quantum Networks, 2021. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.07764>, doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2111.07764.
- 32 Formal Systems (Europe) Ltd. Failures-divergence refinement. FDR2 user manual. In *FDR2 User Manual*, 2010.
- 33 Andrey Markov. Rasprostranenie zakona bol'shikh chisel na velichiny, zavisyaschie drug ot druga. *Izvestiya Fiziko-matematicheskogo obschestva pri Kazanskom universitete*, 15:135–156, 1906.
- 34 Andrey Markov. Extension of the Limit Theorems of Probability Theory to a Sum of Variables Connected in a chain. *The Notes of the Imperial Academy of Sciences of St. Petersburg VIII Series, Physio-Mathematical College*, XXII/9, 1907.
- 35 Robin Milner, Joachim Parrow, and David Walker. A calculus of mobile processes, I. *Information and Computation*, 100(1):1–40, 1992. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0890540192900084>, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401(92)90008-4.
- 36 Peter D Mosses. Modular structural operational semantics. *The Journal of Logic and Algebraic Programming*, 60:195 – 228, 2004. Structural Operational Semantics. URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S156783260400027X>, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jlap.2004.03.008.

- 37 Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L. Chuang. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press, USA, 10th anniversary edition, 2011.
- 38 Stefano Pirandola, Riccardo Laurenza, Carlo Ottaviani, and Leonardo Banchi. Fundamental limits of repeaterless quantum communications. *Nature Communications*, 8:15043, 04 2017. doi:10.1038/ncomms15043.
- 39 A Pirker and W Dür. A quantum network stack and protocols for reliable entanglement-based networks. *New Journal of Physics*, 21(3):033003, mar 2019. URL: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/ab05f7>, doi:10.1088/1367-2630/ab05f7.
- 40 Gheorghe Păun. Computing with membranes. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 61(1):108–143, 2000. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022000099916938>, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1006/jcss.1999.1693>.
- 41 Xudong Qin, Yuxin Deng, and Wenjie Du. Verifying quantum communication protocols with ground bisimulation. In Armin Biere and David Parker, editors, *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*, pages 21–38, Cham, 2020. Springer International Publishing.
- 42 Gustavo Rigolin. Quantum teleportation of an arbitrary two-qubit state and its relation to multipartite entanglement. *Physical Review A*, 71(3), mar 2005. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.71.032303>, doi:10.1103/physreva.71.032303.
- 43 Grigore Roşu and Traian Florin Şerbănuţă. An Overview of the K Semantic Framework. *Journal of Logic and Algebraic Programming*, 79(6):397–434, 2010. doi:10.1016/j.jlap.2010.03.012.
- 44 Davide Sangiorgi. A Theory of Bisimulation for the pi-Calculus. In Eike Best, editor, *CONCUR*, volume 715 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 127–142. Springer, 1993.
- 45 Shouqian Shi and Chen Qian. Concurrent Entanglement Routing for Quantum Networks: Model and Designs. In *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the ACM Special Interest Group on Data Communication on the Applications, Technologies, Architectures, and Protocols for Computer Communication*, SIGCOMM '20, page 62–75, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery. doi:10.1145/3387514.3405853.
- 46 P.W. Shor. Algorithms for quantum computation: discrete logarithms and factoring. In *Proceedings 35th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 124–134, 1994. doi:10.1109/SFCS.1994.365700.
- 47 Stephanie Wehner, David Elkouss, and Ronald Hanson. Quantum internet: A vision for the road ahead. *Science*, 362(6412):eaam9288, 2018. URL: <https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.aam9288>, arXiv:<https://www.science.org/doi/pdf/10.1126/science.aam9288>, doi:10.1126/science.aam9288.
- 48 Peng Yan and Nengkun Yu. The QQUIC Transport Protocol: Quantum-Assisted UDP Internet Connections. *Entropy*, 24(10), 2022. URL: <https://www.mdpi.com/1099-4300/24/10/1488>, doi:10.3390/e24101488.
- 49 Mingsheng Ying, Yuan Feng, Runyao Duan, and Zhengfeng Ji. An Algebra of Quantum Processes. *ACM Trans. Comput. Logic*, 10(3), apr 2009. doi:10.1145/1507244.1507249.


A Background: Quantum Computing and HCQNs

Quantum States. A quantum state consists of one or more quantum bits (*qubits*). A qubit can be expressed as a two-dimensional vector $\begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{pmatrix}$; α, β are complex numbers such that $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$. The α and β are called *amplitudes*. We frequently write the qubit vector as $\alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$, with $|0\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $|1\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$. When both α and β are non-zero, we can think of the qubit as being “both 0 and 1 at once,” a.k.a. a *superposition*. For example, $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$ is an equal superposition of $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$. We can join multiple qubits together to form a larger quantum state using the *tensor product* (\otimes) from linear algebra. For example, the two-qubit state $|0\rangle \otimes |1\rangle$ (also written as $|01\rangle$) corresponds to vector $[0\ 1\ 0\ 0]^T$. If a multi-qubit state cannot be expressed as the tensor of individual states; such states are called *entangled*. One example is the *Bell pair* $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)$, which is frequently used as a quantum channel in HCQN protocols as the two qubit elements in the pair are used by two parties to synchronize information. Entangled states lead to exponential blowup: a general n -qubit state must be described with a 2^n -length vector rather than n vectors of length two.

Quantum Computation: From Circuits to Task Blocks. Quantum computation is essentially hybrid, containing both quantum and classical components so that they can collaboratively finish a task (the *QRAM model* [29]). Computation on a large quantum state consists of a series of *quantum operations*, each of which acts on a subset of qubits in the state. In the standard presentation, quantum computations are expressed as *circuits*, e.g., Figure 1, in which each horizontal wire represents a qubit, boxes on the wires indicate quantum operations, or *gates*, and **bold** lines represent classical hardware. Applying a gate to a state *evolves* the state. The traditional semantics is expressed by multiplying the state vector by the gate’s corresponding matrix representation; n -qubit gate are 2^n -by- 2^n matrices. Except for measurement gates, a gate’s matrix must be *unitary*, preserving the unitarity invariant of quantum states’ amplitudes. A *measurement* operation extracts classical information from a quantum state. Measurement collapses the quantum state to a basis state with a probability related to the state’s amplitudes. For example, measuring $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$ collapses the state to $|0\rangle$ with probability $\frac{1}{2}$ and likewise for $|1\rangle$, returning classical value 0 or 1, respectively. In a Bell pair $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)$, measuring one qubit results in having the same bit appearing in the other, e.g., if the first bit is measured as 0, the second-bit results in 0; such property enables Bell pairs being quantum channels.

While circuit expressions are common, researchers utilized *task blocks*, consisting of groups of gates, to describe algorithms. Such blocks appear repetitively in quantum circuits, such as the **Be11** block appearing in Figures 1 and 2 for preparing a Bell pair by applying the block on a two-qubit state $|0\rangle \otimes |0\rangle$, and the **De11** block decodes a quantum channel to send a quantum message from one party to the other. We model these repetitive task blocks, appearing in many HCQN protocols, as operations in the QAM, regardless of their circuit details, such as qubit size.

No Cloning Theorem. The *no-cloning theorem* suggests no general way of copying a quantum value. In quantum circuits, this is related to ensuring the reversible property of unitary gate applications. For example, the control-not gate in the Bell pair circuit (Figure 1) cannot have two ends to refer to the same qubit. There is also no general way of copying a quantum qubit if its state is arbitrarily defined. In the classical substitution, one can substitute a value for all occurrence of a variable in a term, which results in creating possible multiple copies of quantum qubits, violating the no-cloning law. However, if the quantum qubit state is known, there can be ways to create its copies. For example, our replications in Section 3.2 reflect the procedure of locally copying a known quantum state. Quantum



■ Figure 10 Teleportation Circuit

channel creation is also linked to no-cloning, as the discussion below.

HCQNs. The essence of HCQNs is to hybridize the existing classical network infrastructure to construct the next generation of communication networks, a.k.a. quantum internet, featured with quantum mechanics [19]. HCQN can provide more secure message communications than the existing infrastructure due to the *no-cloning* theorem, i.e., quantum messages cannot be cloned, so hackers have no way to eavesdrop without being realized by users.

Essentially, HCQN communications view quantum entanglement behaviors as quantum channels. Encoding messages in a party of a quantum channel leads to a change in the quantum state of the whole channel due to quantum entanglement. If the two parties of a quantum channel are located in different places, then the change in one party affects the other. This phenomenon is utilized to construct the quantum teleportation protocol [4, 42], whose circuit representation is in Figure 10. In the protocol, a message is encoded in a party of a quantum channel; such behavior affects the whole channel. Then, the protocol decodes the other party to access the message. In this process, the information and quantum resources in the first party disappear, so the no-cloning theorem is preserved. In quantum teleportation, the message being encoded is a quantum one, and people utilize protocols such as superdense coding [5], to generate a quantum message that encodes classical information.

HCQN communications have certain physical limitations. First, quantum qubits cannot be relocated, i.e., one cannot send out a qubit directly. Instead, it is the information in the qubit being sent out. In addition, there is a few patterns for permitting the remote controls of quantum qubits, i.e., there is a serious restriction to apply a quantum operation to a qubit in a distinct location. For example, the rate of building a quantum channel connecting three remote locations is very low and has only lab experiment significance [11]. In addition, the no-cloning restriction can be violated very easily in the setting of many classical operations, such as the classical substitution in Section 2.2. Finally, it is worth noting that projective nondeterminism is caused by the mapping from the quantum world to the classical world. When a quantum channel c is decoded, it generates a pair of classical and quantum residues. Assume that we decode two quantum channels c_1 and c_2 with the same content $q = \widehat{d.e.}$, which results in two pairs $\widehat{c}_1.\widehat{q}$ and $\widehat{c}_1.\dagger q$ as well as $\widehat{c}_2.\widehat{q}$ and $\widehat{c}_2.\dagger q$. One cannot recover q through the composition of wrong pairs, i.e., both $(\widehat{c}_1.\widehat{q} \odot \dagger c_2.\dagger q)$ and $(\widehat{c}_2.\widehat{q} \odot \dagger c_1.\dagger q)$ are not likely to be equal to q i.e., if q is n qubit, then the probability for $(\widehat{c}_1.\widehat{q} \odot \dagger c_2.\dagger q)$ to be equal to q is $\frac{1}{2^n}$.

The above summarizes the reasons why many HCQN protocols is originated from the quantum teleportation and superdense coding protocols and have similar structures as the two. The two algorithms describe network communication within a limited distance. To permit long-distance communication, the quantum entanglement swap protocol plays a key role in prolonging a quantum channel to permit reaching distinct locations, which is elaborated in Section 3.3.

Real-world HCQN Protocols. When constructing the HCQNs in real-world networks, more issues are coming out, and researchers investigated different aspects of the real-world HCQNs and came up with different real-world HCQN protocols to overcome the difficulties in certain aspects, such as proposing QPass and QCast [45], to permit long-distance remote quantum communications. There are three important assumptions about real-world routing networks. First, locations in an HCQN can be far away, so a direct channel cannot be established between two locations that are far away. There is usually a routing graph structure to guide the possible quantum channel establishment between two locations. Far away locations must use QES (Section 3.3) to prolong a quantum channel so that the two locations are possibly connected. Second, a quantum message communication between two locations can have many different message transmission paths, but one path might be the best choice among these paths, based on a choice property, such as the shortest path or maximizing the success probability rate to transmit the message. The success rate of message transmission can be below 1 because quantum computers are noisy, so the quantum channel has a certain chance of failure for conveying a quantum message. Finally, quantum channels have a short lifetime, so it is unlikely that an established quantum channel can be stalled for a long time to wait to transmit a message. Thus, many real-world protocols assume a set of quantum messages are waiting to be sent, and a quantum channel is established to send a pre-defined quantum message; our Intention IDs and Intention ID maps capture such behavior.




Figure 11 Routing Swaps

B Superdense Coding Example




Figure 12 Superdense Coding Circuit

Superdense coding is the protocol to encode a classical message into a quantum channel, which can then be used as a quantum message. It is the example usage of rules COM and CLOCAL is the circuit implementation of the superdense coding protocol, shown in Figure 12⁵, which shows how a piece of classical information can be encoded into a quantum channel and decodes the channel to extract the classical information content.

⁵ Superdense coding assumes to have an extra step of physically sending a qubit from Alice to Bob in the middle of the circuit. In the circuit implementation, we remove the step and let Alice send a classical message to Bob in the end.

► **Example 21** (Superdense Coding Transitions).

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \{ \nu c. c \triangleleft \iota. c \triangleright (x). a!x.0, \circ \}, \{ \nu c. c?(y). a?(z). y \triangleleft z. y?(w).0, \circ \} \\
 \xrightarrow{c} & \{ c \triangleleft \iota. c \triangleright (x). a!x.0, c. \circ \}, \{ c?(y). a?(z). y \triangleleft z. y?(w).0, c. \circ \} \\
 \longrightarrow & \{ c \triangleright (x). a!x.0, c.\iota \}, \{ c?(y). a?(z). y \triangleleft z. y?(w).0, c. \circ \} \\
 \equiv & \{ c \triangleright (x). a!x.0 \} [c.\iota] \{ c?(y). a?(z). y \triangleleft z. y?(w).0 \} \\
 \xrightarrow{c.\iota} & \{ a!\hat{c}.\hat{\iota}.0 \}, \{ a?(z). \hat{c} \triangleleft z. \hat{c}?(w).0, \hat{c}. \dagger \iota \} \\
 \xrightarrow{a.\hat{c}.\hat{\iota}} & \{ 0 \}, \{ \hat{c} \triangleleft \hat{c}.\hat{\iota}. \hat{c}?(w).0, \hat{c}. \dagger \iota \} \\
 \longrightarrow & \{ 0 \}, \{ \hat{c}?(w).0, \hat{c}.\hat{c}.\hat{\iota} \odot \dagger \iota \} \\
 \equiv & \{ 0 \}, \{ \hat{c}?(w).0, \hat{c}.\iota \} \\
 \longrightarrow & \{ 0 \}, \{ 0 \}
 \end{aligned}$$

We show the QAM configuration and transitions above. In the final step, Alice and Bob both receive classical residues $\hat{c}.\hat{\iota}$ and $\hat{c}. \dagger \iota$, meaning that the classical information is split into two messages. After that, two extra steps are marked red in Example 21 but not shown in Figure 12. The first extra step merges the two classical residues with the original classical information by applying an encoding operation. After that, the encoded classical information exists as a resource molecule in the system. Since its content is classical, we can apply rule CLOCAL to localize the classical information, being used as data in the local processes.

In the marked black part of the superdense coding transitions, the first few rule applications are similar to the ones in the quantum teleportation transitions above. After the decoding rule, we have the classical residue $\hat{c}.\hat{\iota}$ for Alice (the left membrane), and another classical residue $\hat{c}. \dagger \iota$, living as a molecule, for Bob (the right membrane). Alice then sends $\hat{c}.\hat{\iota}$ to Bob, and Bob encodes it to the molecule $\hat{c}. \dagger \iota$. The encoding step is a classical one. It combines the two classical residues and recovers the message ι . Finally, Bob applies rule CLOCAL to localize the result classical message ι .

C Theorem Proof Outlines

Here, we provide an outline of theorems in the paper.

C.1 No-cloning Theorem Proof

The first theorem is Theorem 3, restated below.

► **Theorem 22** (No-cloning Assurance). For any membrane $\{\bar{R}, \bar{\phi}\}$ in a QAM configuration \bar{P} , for any quantum message q located as a resource molecule in $\bar{\phi}$, any transition $\bar{P} \rightarrow \bar{Q}$ does not substitute and copy q in \bar{P} more than once.

Proof. The proof is done by rule induction on the QAM semantic rules. There are five cases involving substitution that might copy a quantum message q more than once and we analyze them one by one as follows:

- The application of rule QLOCAL substitutes a specific channel α with a quantum message $\alpha.q$ labeled with the same channel α . Clearly, it does not create a copy of the message q .
- The application of rule CLOCAL substitutes variable x with a classical message ι , so it does not involve quantum messages.

- The application of rule ENCODE computes a meet operation between the existing channel content μ_1 in the channel α and a new message μ_2 that might be a quantum message. However, the meet operation does not involve substitution, so it does not create a copy of the message μ_2 .
- The application of rule COM performs the communication of a classical message ι , so it does not involve quantum messages.
- The application of rule MT duplicates a process R , but R is a process, and all quantum messages are assumed to be as a resource module, so the duplication does not create a copy of a quantum message as a resource molecule.

◀

C.2 Non-Relocation Theorem Proof

Next, we show the outline for proving Theorem 7. The proof of the theorem relies on several lemmas as well as a well-formedness assumption on all channels. We first state the well-formedness assumption. In QAM, the label of every quantum or projective channel to be created is uniquely named, as described by the following well-formedness definition.

► **Definition 23** (Channel Well-formedness). A QAM configuration \bar{P} is well-formed if the following two conditions are satisfied:

- A quantum/projective channel in membrane resource molecules appears no more than twice.
- Every pair of channel creation operations creates a unique quantum channel name than other channels appearing in other pairs and membrane resources.

Given a QAM configuration \bar{P} , if it satisfies the well-formedness definition, the evaluation of the configuration does not result in an ill-formed state. We now show a lemma below, stating that only a decoder in a QAM configuration can erase a quantum resource from a membrane:

► **Lemma 24** (Decoding Uniqueness Property). For or any membrane $P = \{\bar{R}, \bar{\phi}\}$ in a QAM configuration \bar{P} , for a quantum resource labeled with c in $\bar{\phi}$, only a decoding operation can erase c from the membrane P .

Proof. The proof is done by rule induction on the QAM semantic rules. There are five cases involving a quantum channel c and we analyze them one by one as follows:

- The application of rule QLOCAL substitutes a specific channel α with a quantum message $\alpha.q$ labeled with the same channel α in the process R . After the rule application, the quantum resource labeled with the channel c is still in the membrane P , since the process R applying rule QLOCAL is in P .
- The application of rule CLOCAL substitutes variable x with a classical message ι , so it does not involve quantum channels.
- The application of rule ENCODE might push a quantum resource labeled with channel c to another quantum resource α , but α is located in P , so the channel c is still in P .
- The application of rule COM performs the communication of a classical message ι , so it does not involve quantum messages.
- The application of rule DECODE can erase a channel c , but it is valid in our lemma.

◀

XX:24 The Quantum Abstract Machine

We then need to show that an encoding operation can turn a pair of correlated classical and quantum residues into a quantum resource labeled with a proper channel.

► **Lemma 25** (Quantum Channel Generation). For any membrane $P = \{\overline{R}, \overline{\phi}\}$ in a QAM configuration \overline{P} , to generate a quantum channel c in the membrane P , we can either perform a quantum channel creation operation; or an encoder where it is performed by a process $R = \alpha \triangleleft \alpha.c.\overline{p}.R'$ and the resource being encoded is $\phi = \alpha.\dagger c.\mu$ with α being projective channels.

Proof. The proof is done by rule induction on the QAM semantic rules with case analyses. ◀

We are now ready to prove the whole theorem below.

► **Theorem 26** (Non-Relocation). For any $P = \{\overline{R}, \overline{\phi}\}$ in a QAM configuration \overline{P} , for a quantum resource labeled with c in $\overline{\phi}$, if it is transformed to another membrane Q in \overline{P} , then

- There must be a decoding operation to erase c in P first.
- After the decoding, there is an encoding in Q to reconstruct c in Q 's resource fields.

Proof. By Lemma 24, we can see that only a decoder can allow erasing the channel c . The other rule applications do not erase the channel so it is enough to only discuss the case when a decoding operation is applied. In this case, we can analyze the result of applying a decoder and see that for any quantum channel c or $\alpha.c$, after applying a decoder, it creates projective channels \hat{c} or \overline{alpha} , as well as two residues, are produced.

With the above assumption, we can prove the theorem by rule step induction on the number of steps for applying a QAM semantic rule on a QAM configuration \overline{P} . To create a channel c in Q , by Lemma 25, there are only two possible operations: a channel creation or an encoder.

- The operation cannot be a channel creation operation because of the well-formedness assumption. We have already had the channel c existed in the system, any newly created channel cannot have the same name.
- If the operation is an encoder, by Lemma 25, it then reconstructs a quantum resource labeled with the channel c .

◀

C.3 Refinement Theorem Proof

We now show the theorem that connects QPass and QCast below.

► **Theorem 27** (QPass and QCast Trace Refinement). Given $\xi, \theta(\overline{p})$, and an initial configuration $C \in \mathcal{C}_d$ and the QPass and QCast systems as stated in Section 4.2, there is an assignment \overline{p} , such that $(\text{QPass}, C) \sqsubseteq_r (\text{QCast}, C)$.

Proof. The proof of Theorem 20 is done by rule induction (QPass) on the configuration of C , for any QPass transition on C , we can uniformly set the probabilistic success rate \overline{p} to be all 0.5, in this case, the maximized success rate path and the shortest path for any path between two locations (defined in ξ) are the same. Thus, the predicates φ_p and φ_c are the same, so that $(\text{QPass}, C) \sqsubseteq_r (\text{QCast}, C)$.

◀

D Extend the QAM for Security Protocols

Many quantum security protocols, such as BB84 [3], have built in the concept of encrypting the quantum state by using some additional quantum gates, such as Pauli gates below:

$$X_i = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y_i = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Z_i = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

Here, The index i in the gates refers to the index position of applying the gate on a qubit. In the QAM, we can extend the encoding operation $\alpha \triangleleft \mu_1$. to support the security encryption concept by permitting an operation as $\alpha \triangleleft G_i$. where $G \in \{X, Y, Z\}$. This operation means that we apply gate G_i on the i 's position of the quantum resource state labeled as α . The semantics of the encoding operation will remain the same, but we need to modify the operation in the meet operation \odot , so that we can apply a gate G_i as follows:

$$\text{ENCODE} \\ \{\alpha \triangleleft G_i.R, \alpha.\mu_2, \dots\} \longrightarrow \{R, \alpha.(G_i(\mu_2)), \dots\}$$

The modified \odot operation is responsible for applying G_i on the quantum state μ_2 as $\alpha.(G_i(\mu_2))$. With the modification, we will be able to define the security encryption such as the encryption in BB84. We will also need to extend the decoding to support the measurement in different bases. The support of analysis for different quantum security protocols will be a future study of the QAM, and we show the possibility here by showing how quantum gates can be merged in the meet operation in the QAM.

E The QAM and Quantum Circuits

We intend to define the QAM to capture the HCQN behaviors; thus, we can expect that the QAM is instantiated to a quantum programming language⁶. Here, we show an instance of the QAM can be compiled to a concurrent quantum circuit language, Concurrent SQIR [24, 23, 12], which is largely built on top of qCCS [49] and CQP [17]. The compilation essentially translates an instance of the QAM to a multi-threaded language with the SQIR as a quantum circuit library. Essentially, Concurrent SQIR can be viewed as a multiset of concurrent processes arranged as:

$$S_1 \mid S_2 \mid S_3 \mid \dots \mid S_n.$$

Each process S_i is a sequential circuit program, each operation of which can be either a quantum circuit operation written in SQIR [24] or a classical operation, such as a classical C-like synchronizer. Each process also contains a location name indicating the membrane it belongs to.

We compile a specific instance of the QAM to Concurrent SQIR by instantiating abstract syntactic entities in the QAM. We first instantiate the QAM membranes and quantum resources mentioned in a QAM program with fixed names (identifiers) that distinguish these entities with each other, such as $\{\bar{M}\}_g$ (Figure 8). Additionally, Quantum channels (c) are instantiated as objects with two location names g and h (we use $\text{lft}(c)$ for the first location

⁶ We do not intend to design the QAM as a programming language, but a process algebra for defining HCQN behaviors with programming language features.

and $\text{rht}(c)$ for the second location.), identifying the two membranes that a quantum channel is connecting. Essentially, locations refer to quantum qubit array regions. For example, in quantum teleportation in Example 2, the total number of qubits is 3 so the qubit array in the system is a length-3 qubit array. Alice's two qubits are in the region $[0, 1]$, while Bob's qubit is in the region of $[2, 3)$. Then, The membrane location for Alice refers to the index 0, the starting position of Alice's qubit region, and the membrane location for Bob refers to the index 2.

Since the QAM molecules can be either processes or quantum resources, the QAM compiler generates not only a concurrent program but also quantum states. We simplify the compilation by assuming only one compiled target quantum state φ , and every quantum operation in the compiled concurrent program is applied on some qubit locations in φ . In the compilation, we translate the QAM operations that manipulate quantum resources, such as quantum channel creations, encoding quantum messages, and quantum channel decoding, to quantum circuits written in SQIR, classical operations that manipulate classical resources to classical functions, and quantum resources to a quantum state. Each named quantum resource is translated to a qubit array that resides as a section in the state, where we ensure any two different quantum resources are disjoint. The QAM compiler is expressed as the following two judgments:

$$\Omega; \Sigma; g \vdash R \gg S \quad \Omega; \Sigma \vdash \bar{P} \gg (\bar{S}, \varphi)$$

The first judgment translates a QAM process to a Concurrent SQIR process, and the second translates a QAM program to a multiset of Concurrent SQIR processes and a quantum state. Here, Ω is a type environment mapping from the QAM element parameters, including message names, different channel names, and program variables, to C or Q representing if a parameter is classical or quantum; Σ maps parameters to a pair of two numbers i and n (the first element, fst , in the pair is i and the second element, snd , in the pair is n). If g and h are the two locations of a channel c , then $\Sigma(c.g)$ and $\Sigma(c.h)$ produce the i and n values for the two-qubit location indices of c in φ , respectively. \bar{P} is a QAM configuration, \bar{S} is a concurrent multiset of QSDN processes, either a SQIR quantum circuit or a classical function f .

We assume that a given global number, N , acts as the bandwidth number for a piece of quantum information. In Example 2, we teleport a unit piece of quantum message $\widehat{d.e}$, which is not necessarily a single qubit quantum message. In the compilation, we allow users to specify N representing the number of qubits in a unit piece of quantum message, such as $\widehat{d.e}$. A composed quantum message, such as $c.e$, is proportional to the fixed bandwidth number. The type environment Ω determines if a parameter is classical or quantum. The compilation procedure fails if a parameter in R and \bar{P} violates the type given in Ω . Σ is an environment recording the qubit bandwidth for a parameter, mapping from parameters to two numbers i and n . The first number defines the starting qubit array position for the parameter, and the second number defines the length of the qubit array, proportional to N . Here, we write $\Sigma(x)$ to mean that the starting position i for the qubit array of x , and $|\Sigma(x)|$ to refer to the length n of the array.

To see why Σ is needed, recall that in the teleportation example (Example 2), we encode a message $\widehat{d.e}$ to a quantum channel c . Assume that the message $\widehat{d.e}$ (more specifically, parameter e) is translated to a quantum array having length N . This means that the channel c must be at least translated to a qubit array of length $2N$ to be able to hold the message; otherwise, the quantum teleportation execution would fail. In addition, assume that we instead would like to encode a portion of a channel $d.e$ into the quantum channel c . If e is a

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{C-COHEREL} \\
\frac{\text{lft}(c) = g \quad \Sigma(c.g) = i \quad \Sigma(c.\text{rht}(c)) = j \quad \Omega; \Sigma; g \vdash R \gg S}{\Omega; \Sigma; g \vdash \nu c.R \gg (\forall x \in [0, n] \Rightarrow H(i+x); CX(i+x)(j+x)); S} \quad \text{C-COHERER} \\
\frac{\text{rht}(c) = g \quad \Omega; \Sigma; g \vdash R \gg S}{\Omega; \Sigma; g \vdash \nu c.R \gg S} \\
\\
\text{C-ENCODEC} \\
\frac{\Omega(\mu) = C \quad \Sigma(c.g) = i \quad |\Sigma(c.g)| = n \quad \Omega; \Sigma; g \vdash R \gg S}{\Omega; \Sigma; g \vdash c \triangleleft \mu.R \gg (\forall x \in [0, n] \Rightarrow CX \mu[x](i+x); CZ \mu[x](i+x)); S} \\
\\
\text{C-ENCODEQ} \\
\frac{\Omega(\mu) = Q \quad \Sigma(c.g) = i \quad |\Sigma(c.g)| = n \quad \Omega; \Sigma; g \vdash R \gg S}{\Omega; \Sigma; g \vdash c \triangleleft \mu.R \gg (\forall x \in [0, n] \Rightarrow H(i+x); CNOT \mu[x](i+x)); S} \\
\\
\text{C-DECODEQ} \\
\frac{\Omega(\mu) = Q \quad \Sigma(c.\text{lft}(c)) = i \quad \Sigma(c.\text{rht}(c)) = j \quad \Omega; \Sigma; g \vdash R \gg S}{\Omega; \Sigma; g \vdash c \triangleright (x).R \gg (\forall x \in [0, n] \Rightarrow Meas(i+x)); \text{send}(c, \hat{c}); S} \\
\\
\text{C-REV} \quad \frac{\Omega; \Sigma; g \vdash R \gg S}{\Omega; \Sigma; g \vdash \delta?(x).R \gg \text{wait}(\delta, x); S} \quad \text{C-MEMP} \\
\frac{\Omega; \Sigma; g \vdash R \gg S' \quad \Omega; \Sigma \vdash \{\overline{M}\}_g \gg (\overline{S}, \varphi)}{\Omega; \Sigma \vdash \{R, \overline{M}\}_g \gg (S' \mid \overline{S}, \varphi)}
\end{array}$$

■ **Figure 13** QAM compilation rules. $\Sigma(x) = \text{fst}(\Sigma(x))$ and $|\Sigma(x)| = \text{snd}(\Sigma(x))$.

length N array, a portion of the quantum channel $d.e$ has a length $2N$, so the channel c is estimated to have length $4N$, which results in a different situation.

In the compilation, Σ is given as an input of the compilation. Since the QAM describes nondeterminism in HCQN protocols, when executing the compiled code, it is possible that a channel c holds a quantum message q that surpasses the defined bandwidth for c . We classify such a case to be a failure state. The QAM compilation correctness is defined by the assumption that no failure states can be reached.

The compilation rules are given in Figure 13. Rules C-COHEREL and C-COHERER describe the compilation procedure for quantum channel creation, respectively representing the behaviors of the two processes living in the two membranes holding the two ends of the channel. In the compilation procedure, we assume that all the channel creation task is handled by one end (the `lft` end) of the channel, and the `rht` end does nothing. The channel creation procedure does not require a synchronizer because there are no operations in the QAM that need to surely happen before a quantum channel creation.

Rules C-ENCODEC and C-ENCODEQ describe the encoding procedure when the message being encoded is classical and quantum, respectively. The two kinds of encoding have different implementations at the quantum circuit level, even though they can both be viewed as encoding. Here, we also utilize Σ to learn about the number of qubits in the target quantum channel to produce the correct circuit with respect to the correct qubit number. Rule C-DECODEQ describes the compilation procedure of decoding a quantum channel with a quantum message content. There is another similar rule describing the decoding of a quantum channel with classical message content. In the rule, we first look at the qubit positions of the `lft` end of the quantum channel c , then place a list of measurement operations on these positions. The operation `send`(c, \hat{c}) is a classical synchronizer. It sends a message to the other end of the channel c and notifies the other side that the decoding is finished and the other side can move forward.

Rule C-REV is a classical receiver operation acting as the receiver synchronizer. It waits to receive a classical message, either a projective channel name or a classical message, from the

channel δ . For example, once a C-DECODEQ rule is applied on a membrane g , it sends out a projective channel \mathcal{C} via the quantum channel name c . The other end of the channel waits to receive the projective channel. The compiled code synchronizes the `send` and `wait` operations to ensure they happen simultaneously. Finally, rule C-MEMP describes the compilation of a QAM program based on the compilation procedures of sub-processes.

The QAM compilation correctness is based on a version of the simulation relation with the exclusion of the failure state listed below. We implement the QAM compilation in Coq and output the code to Ocaml. Then, we test the correctness proposition by running programs in a QAM simulator against the execution of the compiled SQIR program.

► **Theorem 28.** [QAM translation correctness] Suppose $\bar{P} \xrightarrow{\kappa} \bar{Q}$, $\Omega; \Sigma \vdash \bar{P} \gg (\bar{S}, \varphi)$ and $\Omega; \Sigma \vdash \bar{Q} \gg (\bar{S}', \varphi')$. then there is a non-failure SQIR execution, such that $(\varphi, \bar{S}) \longrightarrow^* (\varphi', \bar{S}')$.

E.1 A Proof Outline of Theorem Theorem 28

The theorem is proved by rule induction on the semantic rules of QAM. We assume that the translated circuit allows an n qubit width channel to convey quantum messages.

E.1.0.1 Channel Creation.

For the COHERE rule, assuming that processes \bar{M} , \bar{N} , R and T , as well as the other membranes not mentioned in the system are properly translated, the rule application is valid only if we have the following conditions:

1. The pair of channel names c (the two ends of channel c) is uniquely defined in the system, and the two ends of channels are classified as `lft` and `rht`.
2. There are two pieces of available quantum resources \circ , which are empty at the beginning.

The translated circuit has a generalized Bell pair circuit (possibly n qubit width) connecting the pair `lft`(c) and `rht`(c). With the availability, the system properly creates a generalized Bell pair as a quantum channel.

E.1.0.2 Quantum State Equations.

Every equation appearing in the AIREQ defines an equivalence property appearing in a quantum state; thus, they are automatically valid in a quantum state.

E.1.0.3 Quantum Encoding Operations.

For any QAM program P , rules QLOCAL and CLOCAL are substitution rules. Their correctness depends on the inductive step of proving the substituted variables in P with the given subterm. Rule ENCODE installs a quantum message into a channel, which has two different cases:

1. If the message encoded is a classical message, which is verified by the predicate $\Omega(\mu) = C$ in rule C-ENCODEC, the generated circuit properly installs the classical message μ into a quantum channel.
2. If the message encoded is a quantum message, which is verified by the predicate $\Omega(\mu) = Q$ in rule C-ENCODEQ, the generated circuit properly installs the message μ into a quantum channel c , provided that the width of the quantum channel c is large enough to hold the message.

The final result of the encoding is defined by the operation \odot , whose equational rules are validated by quantum state properties in Concurrent SQIR.

E.1.0.4 Quantum Decode Operations.

Assuming that processes \overline{M} , \overline{N} , R and T , as well as the other membranes not mentioned in the system are properly translated, the application of the `DECODE` rule can be divided into two cases:

1. If the message decoded is a classical message, which is verified by the predicate $\Omega(\mu) = C$ in rule `C-DECODEC`, the generated circuit applies a series of CX and CZ gates, with a measurement operation in the end. It extracts a classical message out of a quantum channel.
2. If the message encoded is a quantum message, which is verified by the predicate $\Omega(\mu) = Q$ in rule `C-DECODEQ`, we then apply two series of measurement operations on the two ends of a channel c . The result is the same as the measurement result of a quantum teleportation circuit, which creates a pair of a classical residue $\hat{c}.\hat{q}$ and a quantum residue $\hat{c}.\dagger q$, such that the combination of the two residues recovers the message q .

E.1.0.5 Other Operations.

The classical message communication is translated to a classical message communication, similar to the Π -calculus communication operation that we define on top of Concurrent SQIR, the choice operation is also a classical Π -calculus style choice operation that we define on top of Concurrent SQIR, and the Concurrent SQIR semantics of the replication operations are also from Π -calculus. The other operations are syntactic rules appearing in the QAM level and they are properly translated to equivalent processes in Concurrent SQIR.