

Quantum Networks: from Multipartite Entanglement to Hypergraph Immersion

Yu Tian,¹ Yuefei Liu,² and Xiangyi Meng^{3,*}

¹*Nordita, Stockholm University and KTH Royal Institute of Technology, SE-10691 Stockholm, Sweden*

²*Department of Applied Physics, School of Engineering Sciences,*

KTH Royal Institute of Technology, AlbaNova University Center, SE-10691 Stockholm, Sweden

³*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois 60208, USA*

(Dated: June 21, 2024)

Multipartite entanglement, a higher-order interaction unique to quantum information, offers various advantages over bipartite entanglement in quantum network (QN) applications. Establishing multipartite entanglement across remote parties in QN requires entanglement routing, which irreversibly transforms the QN topology at the cost of existing entanglement links. Here, we address the question of whether a QN can be topologically transformed into another via entanglement routing. Our key result is an exact mapping from multipartite entanglement routing to Nash-Williams's graph immersion problem, extended to hypergraphs. This generalized hypergraph immersion problem introduces a partial order between QN topologies, permitting certain topological transformations while precluding others, offering discerning insights into the design and manipulation of higher-order network topologies in QNs.

Quantum entanglement, a pivotal quantum resource [1], allows for the simultaneous correlation of *multiple* qubits. Multipartite entanglement offers notable benefits, in terms of both efficiency and scalability, over bipartite entanglement in a variety of quantum information applications such as sharing secret among multiple parties [2] and reducing the memory requirements for entangling qubits [3]. These benefits make multipartite entanglement a necessary building block for future quantum networks (QN) [4–6]. In a QN, each *vertex (node)* typically represents a local assembly of qubits entangled with qubits from other vertices, and each *edge (link)* signifies an entangled state between qubits that belong to different vertices [7]. In this setting, multipartite entanglement is most effectively represented as a higher-order interaction, or in the language of hypergraph theory, as a *hyperedge* [8]. Contrasting with ordinary edges that connect just two vertices, hyperedges can connect several vertices at once—a feature that has wider applications in not only physics but also chemistry [9], biology [10], and social sciences [11].

In ordinary QNs (without hyperedges), vertices not directly connected by an edge can still be entangled through a fundamental operation known as entanglement routing [12, 13], provided that there is a path of edges connecting the vertices. This operation, however, utilizes all the edges along the path, subsequently deleting them from the QN, leading to a dynamic process called path percolation [14]. As a result, each entanglement routing operation uniquely modifies the QN's topology in an irreversible manner, permitting certain types of topological transformations while precluding others, raising the question: *can a QN's topology be transformed from one to another through a series of entanglement routing operations?* It is also unknown how this question extends to hypergraph QNs due to the ambiguous definition of paths involving multipartite entanglement [13]. Under-

standing this question is key to grasping the complexity of many-body entanglement structures (e.g., matrix product states [15], which are derivable from QNs [6, 16]). Moreover, the insights can be applied to evaluate the effectiveness of qubit layouts (e.g., the hex lattices used by IBM [17]). This is especially relevant as small-scale multipartite-entanglement QNs have been implemented on superconducting [18] and optical [19] platforms.

Here, we address this question of entanglement routing, involving both edges and hyperedges, by establishing an exact mapping to a topological problem on hypergraphs. We first identify and simplify entanglement routing into two hypergraph rules by extending the routing operation to multipartite entanglement. Then, we show that the corresponding topological problem can be viewed as a generalization of the well-established *graph immersion* problem [20], which, to our best knowledge, has not been generalized to hypergraphs. This aptly allows us to formalize our problem as *hypergraph immersion*, which establishes a partial order [21] between hypergraph topologies. Following graph immersion [22], we also prove in an accompanying work that the algorithmic complexity of solving hypergraph immersion is polynomial [23]. This unique bridge between quantum information and graph theory may provide some useful insights into the efficient design of multipartite QNs.

Hypergraph QN.—We start by considering a hypergraph QN model where each hyperedge e of size r (i.e., e joins r vertices together) is represented as a generalized GHZ state between r qubits:

$$|\text{GHZ}\rangle_r = \frac{|\overbrace{00\dots 0}^r\rangle + |\overbrace{11\dots 1}^r\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}. \quad (1)$$

These states, albeit varying in size ($r \geq 2$), always have the lowest nontrivial *generalized Schmidt rank* [24] to exhibit entanglement (rank = 2). GHZ states are prevalent




FIG. 1: **Hypergraph immersion.** (a) The “coalescence” operation merges two hyperedges that share at least one vertex, resulting in a new hyperedge that joins all vertices from the original two. (b) The “evaporation” operation disconnects a vertex from a hyperedge, reducing the hyperedge’s size by one. (c) Transformation of QN from an initial topology to a final one, achieved through a series of operations. The final topology is effectively immersed within the original.

in quantum systems, such as the random transverse-field quantum Ising model, where the critical ground state consists exclusively of GHZ-state magnetic domains [25]. The Ising configuration naturally facilitates a QN interpretation using complex network theory [26].

How do we entangle multiple vertices by *routing* via several hyperedges? Given, for example, two GHZ states of r_1, r_2 qubits respectively and at least one common vertex that shares two qubits separately from the two states, a simple projector on the two qubits,

$$M \propto |0\rangle\langle 00| + |1\rangle\langle 11|, \quad (2)$$

suffices to “merge” the two states into a larger GHZ state of $r_1 + r_2 - 1$ qubits, which are all simultaneously entangled. Conversely, one has the freedom to disentangle a vertex from a GHZ state of size r by applying

$$M' \propto |0\rangle\langle 0| + |0\rangle\langle 1| \quad (3)$$

on the vertex, yielding a smaller GHZ state with $r - 1$ qubits. With appropriate rotations of $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, these two operations are also extensible to general Schmidt-rank-2 states of the form $|\alpha_1 \otimes \alpha_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_n\rangle + z|\beta_1 \otimes \beta_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \beta_n\rangle$ [27]. An example of such is the cat state, commonly used in continuous-variable optical communications [28].

The projectors M and M' do not represent optimal routing protocols. However, a combination of M and M' is sufficient to reproduce, with a consistently nonzero success probability, any *topological* change to QN through entanglement routing tasks. Therefore, entanglement routing, or simply the inclusion of M and M' , creates a partial order between different QN topologies made up

of general Schmidt-rank-2 states. This is akin to, but inherently different from how stochastic local operations and classical communication (SLOCC) sets an *algebraic* partial order for generic multipartite entanglement [29].

Coalescence and evaporation operations.—The topological emphasis of Eqs. (2) and (3) suggests that they can be simplified as hypergraph operations. Consider two hypergraphs H and G , each comprising sets of vertices $V(H)$ and $V(G)$, and sets of hyperedges $E(H)$ and $E(G)$, respectively. Both H and G are loopless and undirected, but may include multi-hyperedges. The feasibility of deriving H from G through entanglement routing is equivalent to asserting that H can be derived from G through the following hypergraph operations:

- *Coalescence*: merging two connected hyperedges to create a new one including all the incident vertices.
- *Evaporation*: disconnecting an hyperedge from one vertex that it is incident on.

One can visualize vertices in the hypergraph as spatially distributed objects (pink) that are “hydrophilic” (Fig. 1). Correspondingly, each hyperedge e can be visualized as a water droplet, touching those hydrophilic objects (vertices) that are incident with e . In this physical analogy, the coalescence operation results in the merging of two droplets that share contact with a common vertex v , forming a larger droplet [Fig. 1(a)]; the evaporation operation simulates the reduction in volume of a droplet and the loss of its connections to the vertices it was previously in contact with [Fig. 1(b)]. This physical analogy motivates our naming of the two operations.

Note that both operations are irreversible: the coalescence reduces the number of hyperedges by one; the evaporation reduces the number of vertices incident with the hyperedge by one. Hence, for H to be derived from G through these operations, a necessary condition is $|V(H)| \leq |V(G)|$ and $|E(H)| \leq |E(G)|$, i.e., H must not possess more vertices or hyperedges than G . In general, determining whether H can be derived from G poses a nontrivial problem. In the following, we present an alternative definition in parallel to these operations.

Hypergraph immersion.—We consider a general function, α , with domain $V(H) \cup E(H)$, such that:

1. $\alpha(v) \in V(G)$ for all $v \in V(H)$, and $\alpha(v_1) \neq \alpha(v_2)$ for all distinct $v_1, v_2 \in V(H)$;
2. for each hyperedge $e \in E(H)$, if e has distinct ends v_1, v_2, \dots , then $\alpha(e)$ is a connected subgraph in G that includes $\alpha(v_1), \alpha(v_2), \dots$.
3. for all distinct $e_1, e_2 \in E(H)$, $E(\alpha(e_1) \cap \alpha(e_2)) = \emptyset$;

In other words, α is an injective mapping from vertices in H to vertices in G , and from hyperedges in H to *edge-disjoint* connected subgraphs in G . The formulation of

α mirrors the *graph immersion* as outlined in Ref. [20], which has a similar definition that maps edges in H to edge-disjoint paths in G , but with H and G being ordinary graphs. For ordinary edges, the function α reduces to the definition of graph immersion.

Theorem 1. *An immersion α of hypergraph H in hypergraph G exists if and only if H can be obtained from a subgraph of G by a sequence of coalescence and evaporation operations.*

Proof. If an immersion α exists, we can show that H is isomorphic to a graph H' obtained by applying the coalescence and evaporation operations on a subgraph of G , where the bijection corresponding to the isomorphism $f : V(H) \rightarrow V(H')$ takes the same value as α , i.e., $\forall v \in V(H)$, $f(v) = \alpha(v)$.

We obtain H' as follows. We focus on the subgraph of G , $G' \subseteq G$ s.t. $G' = \bigcup_{e \in E(H)} \alpha(e)$. By the definition of immersion α , G' is necessarily connected. For each $e \in E(H)$ with distinct ends $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{|e|}$, we then apply the coalescence operation to pairs of (hyper)edges in $\alpha(e) \subseteq G$ until we obtain one single hyperedge with all vertices in $\{\alpha(v_1), \alpha(v_2), \dots, \alpha(v_{|e|})\}$ included. Finally, we apply the evaporation operation to disconnect the hyperedge from vertex u , $\forall u \in V(\alpha(e)) \setminus \{\alpha(v_1), \alpha(v_2), \dots, \alpha(v_{|e|})\}$. The resulting connected component of vertices $\{\alpha(v)\}_{v \in V(H)}$ is H' , and it is straightforward to show that H is isomorphic to H' with the bijection f .











Now, if H can be obtained by applying the two operations to a subgraph of G , we can immediately construct α which maps $v \in V(H)$ to $\alpha(v) \in V(G)$, the one it comes from. Then $\alpha(v_1) \neq \alpha(v_2)$ for all distinct $v_1, v_2 \in V(H)$. Also, for each edge $e \in E(H)$, we can retrieve the set of edges $\alpha(e) \in E(G)$ where we apply the operations to obtain e . Then $\alpha(e)$ is connected since the two operations can only be applied to connected edges. Also, for all distinct $e_1, e_2 \in E(H)$, $E(\alpha(e_1) \cap \alpha(e_2)) = \emptyset$, since each edge in G can be used at most once in the operations. Hence, H is immersed in G by definition. \square

Intuitively, the three conditions in the definition of hypergraph immersion find explanations in parallel to quantum information:

The first condition, concerning vertices—or *locality*, requires that two vertices in H are distinct if and only if they correspond to different vertices in G . As a result, H cannot introduce or merge vertices. This constraint underscores the role of SLOCC, restricting that only qubits associated with different vertices in QN are constrained by (S)LOCC—the free operation that establishes entanglement as a resource [1]. This locality constraint in QN must uphold throughout entanglement routing.

The second condition, concerning hyperedges—or *connectivity*, requires that to establish entanglement between distinct vertices, the vertices must be “connected.” This

TABLE I: **Conditions for immersion of a complete r -uniform hypergraph K_n^r in G .**

$H = K_n^r$	H can be immersed in G if and only if...
	K_1^1 $ V(G) \geq 1$.
	K_2^1 $ V(G) \geq 2$.
	K_2^2 $ E(G) \geq 1$.
	K_3^1 $ V(G) \geq 3$.
	K_3^2 \exists a cycle of length ≥ 3 , or two length-2 cycles that are edge-disjoint and share exactly one common vertex.
	K_3^3 \exists a connected component of size ≥ 3 in G .
	K_4^1 $ V(G) \geq 4$.
	K_4^2 \exists an (ordinary) graph, derived through evaporations on hyperedges in G , that is either non-series-parallel [34] or falls into the special cases given in Ref. [35] (see SM).
	K_4^3 \exists an immersion of one of the 18 hypergraph variants of K_4^3 in G (see SM).
	K_4^4 \exists a connected component of size ≥ 4 in G .
\vdots	\vdots

emphasis loosely resonates with the Reeh–Schlieder theorem [30], suggesting that localized regions in quantum field theory (QFT) must also be “connected” [31]. Indeed, we can view a QN as a partition of spatially distributed qubits (quantum fields), such that qubits are affiliated with the same vertex in QN if and only if they are encompassed within the same local region. This view translates QN to the language of QFT [32], emphasizing the topological aspects of entanglement overall.

The third condition requires that each hyperedge in G can be utilized only once to derive a hyperedge in H . This rule is a direct reflection of the *no-cloning theorem* [33], asserting that a quantum state cannot be replicated. In other words, once a hyperedge is utilized for entanglement routing, it cannot be reused.

Examples.—Let the resulted multipartite QN after entanglement routing be a complete r -uniform hypergraph, $H = K_n^r$, where $n \equiv |V(K_n^r)|$, and the edge set $E(K_n^r)$ is equal to the set of all size- r subsets in $V(K_n^r)$. In other words, K_n^r includes all possible hyperedges of size r . We present a few necessary and sufficient conditions for $H = K_n^r$ to be immersed in G in Table I. We observe that the conditions are straightforward for most small n and r , except for K_4^2 and K_4^3 , which represent the first nontrivial examples. Indeed, while both K_4^2 and K_4^3 are




FIG. 2: K_4^2 versus K_4^3 . (a) Three-edge-connectedness. Both K_4^2 and K_4^3 are three-edge-connected, i.e., every pair of vertices (such as A and B) are linked by at least three edge-disjoint paths (red, blue, orange). But K_4^2 and K_4^3 cannot be immersed into each other. (b) In an infinite honeycomb lattice, there exists an immersion of K_4^2 , (c) but not K_4^3 . Conversely, in a cycle graph made up of ≥ 4 vertices and double-edges, while (d) there cannot be an immersion of K_4^2 , (e) an immersion of K_4^3 exists.

three-edge-connected, it can be shown that neither one can be immersed in the other [Fig. 2(a)]. This is an explicit example showing that immersion is a partial order, not a total order.

We discuss the criteria for immersion of K_4^2 and K_4^3 further in the SI. These criteria lead to more compelling examples, involving infinite network topologies:

Theorem 2. *There is an immersion of K_4^2 but not K_4^3 in an infinite honeycomb lattice (6^3).*

Proof. The proof of the existence of an immersion α of $H = K_4^2$ in an infinite honeycomb lattice G is straightforward. According to Table I, since G is not series-parallel, α must exist. An illustration of such an immersion is presented in Fig. 2(b).

For $H = K_4^3$, assume there exists an immersion α of H in G , with the four vertices in H mapped to A, B, C , and D in G . The presence of a hyperedge of size 3 implies connectivity among the three vertices $\{A, B, C\}$ in G . Essentially, there are three possible minimal configurations: $A-B-C$, $B-A-C$, or $A-C-B$, where, for instance, $A-B-C$

indicates a path from A to B and then from B to C . Similarly, for vertex sets $\{A, B, D\}$ and $\{A, C, D\}$, they must be similarly connected through paths in G . All the paths must be edge-disjoint. However, in a honeycomb lattice, each vertex is contained in at most three edge-disjoint paths. Consequently, there are only two possible path configurations for three hyperedges, depicted in Fig. 2(c) (another one being its mirror symmetry). Subsequently, vertices B, C , and D have exhausted all available edge-disjoint paths originating from them. Therefore, there is no space in G for the immersion of a fourth hyperedge connecting $\{B, C, D\}$, contradicting α 's existence. \square

Theorem 3. *There is an immersion of K_4^3 but not K_4^2 in a cycle graph consisting of only double-edges and no less than 4 vertices.*

Proof. The proof of the existence of an immersion α of $H = K_4^3$ in a cycle graph consisting of double edges and no less than 4 vertices (G) can be shown by construction. See Fig. 2(e) for an example in G of size 7, where the four vertices in H are mapped to A, B, C, D in G . The generalisation to G of an arbitrary size n is straightforward.

For $H = K_4^2$, assume by contradiction that such immersion exists, denoted by α . Assume w.l.o.g. the four vertices A', B', C', D' in H are mapped to A, B, C, D , respectively, that are consecutive anti-clockwise in G . The presence of edges $A'B', A'C', A'D'$ implies three edge-disjoint paths between A, B , A, C , and A, D , respectively. Since node C can only reach node A through nodes B or D , assume w.l.o.g. that $B \in \alpha(A'C')$. Hence, there are two edges that are incident on node B in $\alpha(A'C')$, and there is also one edge that is incident on node B in $\alpha(A'B')$. Then, there is only one edge in G that is incident on node B but is not in $\alpha(A'B')$ or $\alpha(A'C')$. However, $\alpha(B'C')$ and $\alpha(B'D')$ imply that there are two edges that are incident on node B but are not in $\alpha(A'B')$ or $\alpha(A'C')$, which leads to contradiction. \square

These examples have profound implications for QN designs. For instance, now we know that the 2D lattice in Fig. 2(b) is impossible for simultaneous secret sharing among every three parties in any four-party group through entanglement routing, unless additional quantum channels [36] or memories [37] are introduced to the QN to create more links. Similarly, the quasi-1D structure in Fig. 2(e) also has inherent topological limitations. To conclude, the hypergraph immersion problem we introduce captures the topological landscape of entanglement routing in QNs, which could allow for analyzing very large scales (due to its polynomial complexity [23]).

Discussion.—In classical communication, information transmission is fundamentally directional [38], reflecting the causality between the sender and receiver. Hence, a classical broadcast can only disseminate information from one-to-many, not many-to-one. In contrast, quantum entanglement lacks a causal structure, as suggested

by the no-communication theorem [39], which can be used to transmit classical information. This absence of causality underscores the unique interpretation of multipartite entangled states as undirected multiedges, a pure quantum analog. Also, note that a variant of immersion involves *labeled* vertices in both hypergraphs G and H , corresponding to the establishment of multipartite entanglement between specified vertices. In this labeled scenario, identifying an immersion of H in G is simpler than in the unlabeled case. We leave this direction for future exploration.

* xm@northwestern.edu

- [1] E. Chitambar and G. Gour, Quantum resource theories, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **91**, 025001 (2019).
- [2] O. Farràs, J. Martí-Farré, and C. Padró, Ideal Multipartite Secret Sharing Schemes, in *Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT 2007*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, edited by M. Naor (Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2007) pp. 448–465.
- [3] J. Miguel-Ramiro, A. Pirker, and W. Dür, Optimized quantum networks, *Quantum* **7**, 919 (2023).
- [4] F. Hahn, A. Pappa, and J. Eisert, Quantum network routing and local complementation, *npj Quantum Information* **5**, 1 (2019).
- [5] M. Wang, Y. Xiang, H. Kang, D. Han, Y. Liu, Q. He, Q. Gong, X. Su, and K. Peng, Deterministic Distribution of Multipartite Entanglement and Steering in a Quantum Network by Separable States, *Physical Review Letters* **125**, 260506 (2020); P. Contreras-Tejada, C. Palazuelos, and J. I. de Vicente, Genuine Multipartite Nonlocality Is Intrinsic to Quantum Networks, *Physical Review Letters* **126**, 040501 (2021).
- [6] C. Meignant, *Multipartite Communications over Quantum Networks*, Ph.D. thesis, Sorbonne Université (2021).
- [7] A. Acín, J. I. Cirac, and M. Lewenstein, Entanglement percolation in quantum networks, *Nature Physics* **3**, 256 (2007); X. Meng, J. Gao, and S. Havlin, Concurrence Percolation in Quantum Networks, *Physical Review Letters* **126**, 170501 (2021).
- [8] A. Bretto, *Hypergraph Theory: An Introduction*, 1st ed. (Springer, Cham, Switzerland, 2013).
- [9] J. Jost and R. Mulas, Hypergraph laplace operators for chemical reaction networks, *Adv. Math.* **351**, 870 (2019).
- [10] S. Klamt, U. Haus, and F. Theis, Hypergraphs and cellular networks, *PLOS Computat. Biol.* **5**, 1 (2009).
- [11] C. Taramasco, C. J., and C. Roth, Academic team formation as evolving hypergraphs, *Scientometrics* **85**, 721 (2010); L. Krumov, C. Fretter, M. Müller-Hannemann, K. Weihe, and M. Hütt, Motifs in co-authorship networks and their relation to the impact of scientific publications, *Eur. Phys. J. B* **84**, 535 (2011); G. Bianconi, *Higher-Order Networks*, Elements in the Structure and Dynamics of Complex Networks (Cambridge University Press, 2021); J. Lee, K. I. Goh, D. S. Lee, and B. Kahng, (k, q) -core decomposition of hypergraphs, *Chaos Solitons Fractals* **173**, 113645. (2023).
- [12] S. Pirandola, End-to-end capacities of a quantum communication network, *Communications Physics* **2**, 1 (2019); M. Pant, H. Krovi, D. Towsley, L. Tassioulas, L. Jiang, P. Basu, D. Englund, and S. Guha, Routing entanglement in the quantum internet, *npj Quantum Information* **5**, 25 (2019); N. Lo Piparo, M. Hanks, K. Nemoto, and W. J. Munro, Aggregating quantum networks, *Physical Review A* **102**, 052613 (2020).
- [13] E. Sutcliffe and A. Beghelli, Multiuser Entanglement Distribution in Quantum Networks Using Multipath Routing, *IEEE Transactions on Quantum Engineering* **4**, 1 (2023).
- [14] X. Meng, B. Hao, B. Ráth, and I. A. Kovács, Path Percolation in Quantum Communication Networks, arXiv:2406.12228 [10.48550/arXiv.2406.12228](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.12228) (2024).
- [15] W. W. Ho, S. Choi, H. Pichler, and M. D. Lukin, Periodic orbits, entanglement, and quantum many-body scars in constrained models: Matrix product state approach, *Physical review letters* **122**, 040603 (2019).
- [16] X. Meng, X. Hu, Y. Tian, G. Dong, R. Lambiotte, J. Gao, and S. Havlin, Percolation Theories for Quantum Networks, *Entropy* **25**, 1564 (2023).
- [17] J. Chow, O. Dial, and J. Gambetta, Ibm quantum breaks the 100-qubit processor barrier, IBM Research Blog **2** (2021).
- [18] G. Huber, F. Roy, L. Koch, I. Tsitsilin, J. Schirck, N. Glaser, N. Bruckmoser, C. Schweizer, J. Romeiro, G. Krylov, *et al.*, Parametric multi-element coupling architecture for coherent and dissipative control of superconducting qubits, arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.02203 (2024); Y. Chen, C. Neill, P. Roushan, N. Leung, M. Fang, R. Barends, J. Kelly, B. Campbell, Z. Chen, B. Chiaro, *et al.*, Qubit architecture with high coherence and fast tunable coupling, *Physical review letters* **113**, 220502 (2014).
- [19] X. Su, C. Tian, X. Deng, Q. Li, C. Xie, and K. Peng, Quantum entanglement swapping between two multipartite entangled states, *Physical Review Letters* **117**, 240503 (2016); P. Kok, W. J. Munro, K. Nemoto, T. C. Ralph, J. P. Dowling, and G. J. Milburn, Linear optical quantum computing with photonic qubits, *Reviews of modern physics* **79**, 135 (2007).
- [20] N. Robertson and P. Seymour, Graph minors XXIII. nash-williams’ immersion conjecture, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* **100**, 181 (2010).
- [21] C. Godsil and G. Royle, *Algebraic Graph Theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 207 (Springer, New York, NY, 2001).
- [22] M. Grohe, K.-i. Kawarabayashi, D. Marx, and P. Wollan, Finding topological subgraphs is fixed-parameter tractable, in *Proceedings of the Forty-Third Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC ’11 (Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2011) pp. 479–488.
- [23] In preparation.
- [24] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum computation and quantum information* (Cambridge university press, 2010); J. Eisert and H. J. Briegel, Schmidt measure as a tool for quantifying multiparticle entanglement, *Physical Review A* **64**, 022306 (2001).
- [25] R. T. C. Chepuri and I. A. Kovács, Complex quantum network models from spin clusters, *Communications Physics* **6**, 1 (2023).
- [26] S. Perseguers, D. Cavalcanti, G. J. Lapeyre Jr., M. Lewenstein, and A. Acín, Multipartite entanglement percolation, *Physical Review A* **81**, 032327 (2010).

- [27] S. Turgut, Y. Gül, and N. K. Pak, Deterministic transformations of multipartite entangled states with tensor rank 2, *Physical Review A* **81**, 012317 (2010).
- [28] S. Deleglise, I. Dotsenko, C. Sayrin, J. Bernu, M. Brune, J.-M. Raimond, and S. Haroche, Reconstruction of non-classical cavity field states with snapshots of their decoherence, *Nature* **455**, 510 (2008).
- [29] S. Szalay, Multipartite entanglement measures, *Physical Review A* **92**, 042329 (2015).
- [30] H. Reeh and S. Schlieder, Bemerkungen zur unitäräquivalenz von lorentzinvarianten feldern, *II Nuovo Cimento (1955-1965)* **22**, 1051 (1961).
- [31] E. Witten, APS Medal for Exceptional Achievement in Research: Invited article on entanglement properties of quantum field theory, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **90**, 045003 (2018).
- [32] R. Clifton, D. V. Feldman, H. Halvorson, M. L. G. Redhead, and A. Wilce, Superentangled states, *Physical Review A* **58**, 135 (1998).
- [33] J. L. Park, The concept of transition in quantum mechanics, *Foundations of Physics* **1**, 23 (1970); W. K. Wootters and W. H. Zurek, A single quantum cannot be cloned, *Nature* **299**, 802 (1982).
- [34] R. J. Duffin, Topology of series-parallel networks, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **10**, 303 (1965).
- [35] H. D. Booth, R. Govindan, M. A. Langston, and S. Ramachandramurthi, Fast Algorithms for K_4 Immersion Testing, *Journal of Algorithms* **30**, 344 (1999).
- [36] H.-J. Kim and S. Lee, One-shot static entanglement cost of bipartite quantum channels, *Physical Review A* **103**, 062415 (2021).
- [37] M. Afzelius, N. Gisin, and H. de Riedmatten, Quantum memory for photons, *Physics Today* **68**, 42; X. Meng, N. L. Piparo, K. Nemoto, and I. A. Kovács, Quantum Networks Enhanced by Distributed Quantum Memories, arXiv.2403.16367 [10.48550/arXiv.2403.16367](https://arxiv.org/abs/10.48550/arXiv.2403.16367) (2024).
- [38] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*, 2nd ed. (Wiley-Interscience, Hoboken, 2006).
- [39] M. R. Douglas and N. A. Nekrasov, Noncommutative field theory, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **73**, 977 (2001).
- [40] C. Berge, *Graphs and hypergraphs* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, Netherlands, 1973).
- [41] J. Valdes, R. E. Tarjan, and E. L. Lawler, The recognition of series parallel digraphs, *SIAM Journal on Computing* **11**, 298 (1982).

Supplemental Materials

1. Terminology

A *graph* G consists of vertices and edges, where we denote by $V(G)$, $E(G)$ for the set of vertices and edges, respectively. We consider undirected graphs in this paper, where multiple edges may be present among the same set of nodes, but loops are ignored. In an ordinary graph, an edge can only connect two vertices, thus $\forall e \in E(G)$, $e = uv$ with $u, v \in V(G)$.

Connections between vertices are important in a graph. Specifically, a *cut point* in a connected graph G is a vertex whose removal disconnects G . Two vertices in G are said to be *biconnected* if they cannot be disconnected by the removal of any cut point. A *biconnected component* of G is the subgraph induced by a maximal set of pairwise biconnected vertices.

Two vertices are said to be *three-edge-connected* if there are at least three edge-disjoint paths between them. A *three-edge-connected component* of $G = (V, E)$ is a graph $G' = (V', E')$ where $V' \subseteq V$ is a maximal set of vertices that are pairwise three-edge-connected in G . E' contains all edges induced by V' plus a (possibly empty) set of *virtual edges* defined as follows: for $\{u, v\} \subseteq V'$, a virtual edge uv is added to E' for each distinct $\{x, y\} \subseteq V - V'$ such that ux and vy form a cut edge pair in G . Note that, due to the possible preference of virtual edges, a three-edge-connected component will not necessarily be a subgraph.

Another important definition is based on the series and parallel operations. Specifically, an edge is said to be in *series-parallel connection* if the joint resistor (of the whole graph) through this edge can be evaluated by Ohm's two rules (resistors either in series or in parallel) [34]. A graph is *series-parallel* if every edge is in series-parallel connection.

We consider the important notion of *immersion* in this paper. Specifically, for ordinary graphs, an immersion of H in G is a function α with domain $V(H) \cup E(H)$ such that: (i) $\alpha(v) \in V(G)$ for all $v \in V(H)$, and $\alpha(u) \neq \alpha(v)$ for all distinct $u, v \in V(H)$; (ii) for each edge $e \in E(H)$, if e has distinct ends u, v then $\alpha(e)$ is a path of G with ends $\alpha(u), \alpha(v)$; (iii) for all distinct $e, f \in E(H)$, $E(\alpha(e) \cap \alpha(f)) = \emptyset$.

The notion of *embedding* (a.k.a. topological minor) is closely related to immersion. Specifically, an embedding of H in G is a function β that is defined the same as an immersion α , except that in rule (iii), $E(\beta(e_1) \cap \beta(e_2)) = \emptyset$ is replaced by $V(\beta(e_1) \cap \beta(e_2)) = \beta(V(e_1 \cap e_2))$ where $V(e_1 \cap e_2)$ denotes the common endpoints of e_1 and e_2 . In other words, β is an injective mapping from edges in H to vertex-disjoint paths, instead of edge-disjoint paths as in immersion. As a special example, it is well known that an embedding of the complete graph of size 4 exists

if and on if the graph is not series-parallel. We note that an embedding is an immersion, but not vice versa.

A *hypergraph* relaxes the constraints on the number of vertices in each edge, where a hyperedge e can connect an arbitrary number of vertices, and we denote the size of a hyperedge by the number of vertices in this edge. An r -uniform hypergraph is then a hypergraph where each hyperedge has size r , and a complete r -uniform hypergraph is the one with all possible edges of size r , denoted by K_n^r where n encodes the size of the hypergraph, i.e., $|V(K_n^r)| = n$.

The connection in hypergraphs can be considered through the generalisation of a path in an ordinary graph to hypergraphs, the *Berge path* [40]. A *Berge path* of length t is an alternating sequence of distinct $t + 1$ vertices and distinct t hyperedges of the hypergraph G , $v_1, e_1, v_2, e_2, v_3, \dots, e_t, v_{t+1}$, such that $v_i, v_{i+1} \in e_i$, for $i = 1, \dots, t$. A *Berge cycle* is the same as a Berge path except that the last vertex v_{t+1} is replaced by v_0 , making the sequence cyclic. A *connected subgraph* of a hypergraph is then a set of vertices which are pairwise connected by some Berge path(s). The size of the subgraph is the size of its vertex set.

2. Criteria on Immersion of K_4^2 and K_4^3

In this section, we discuss in more detail how to determine whether there is an immersion of K_4^2 and K_4^3 .

K_4^2

To determine the immersion of K_4^2 , we utilise the fact that K_4^2 is an ordinary graph. Specifically, we consider the strategy to apply a series of evaporation operations to the edges of size greater than 2 in the hypergraph of interest, G , until it becomes an ordinary graph (where every edges have size 2), \bar{G} . We denote the set of all such ordinary graphs obtained from hypergraph G by $\mathcal{S} = \{\bar{G}_i\}_{i=1}^k$. It is straightforward to show that an immersion of K_4^2 exists in G (as defined in hypergraphs) exists if and only if an immersion of K_4^2 exists in \bar{G}_i for some i (as defined in ordinary graphs). Therefore, if there is some i such that \bar{G}_i is non-series-parallel (see [41] for an efficient algorithm), then an embedding of K_4^2 exists, thus an immersion of K_4^2 exists; Else, for every three-

edge-connected components of each \bar{G}_i , run Algorithm 1 to check whether any of them fall into the special cases where an immersion of K_4^2 exists (see [35] for more details on constructing three-edge-connected components). Specifically, we will apply the *pruning* operation: in a three-edge-connected series-parallel multigraph, suppose v is a vertex with exactly two neighbours u and w , and suppose there is only one copy of edge uw (then at least two copies of uw by three-edge-connectivity); we say that v is *pruned* if the multiplicity of uw is set to 2, and we say that a graph is pruned if each vertex fitting the profile of v is pruned.

Algorithm 1 test(\bar{G}).

- 1: Input: a three-edge-connected series parallel multigraph \bar{G} .
 - 2: Output: YES, if \bar{G} contains an immersed K_4 , NO otherwise.
 - 3: **for** each vertex v in \bar{G} with exactly one neighbour **do**
 - 4: delete all but three copies of edges incident on v
 - 5: **end for**
 - 6: **if** any cut point in \bar{G} has degree 7 or more **then**
 - 7: output YES and halt
 - 8: **end if**
 - 9: **for** each biconnected component B with four or more vertices **do**
 - 10: prune B
 - 11: **if** there is a vertex in B with degree 5 or more **then**
 - 12: output YES and halt
 - 13: **end if**
 - 14: **end for**
 - 15: output NO and halt
-

K_4^3

We first note that any edges of higher orders, i.e., consisting of more than 3 nodes, contain redundant information for the immersion of K_4^3 where all edges have size 3. Hence, in the following, we focus on hypergraphs where hyperedges have at most 3 nodes. In particular, we take a first step to list all possible variants of hypergraphs of size 4 with an immersion of K_4^3 , that are minimal, in the sense that no edges in the variants remain unused for defining the immersion; see Fig. 3. A hypergraph of interest, G , has an immersion of K_4^3 if and only if G has an immersion of any of the 18 variants in Fig. 3.




FIG. 3: **The minimum subset $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}(H)$.** For $H = K_4^3$, the minimum subset $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}(K_4^3)$ includes 18 variants of different topologies. Including all variants ensures that, for every G in which H has an immersion, there is at least one $\tilde{H} \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(H)$ such that \tilde{H} has an immersion in G .