

KANQAS: Kolmogorov Arnold Network for Quantum Architecture Search

Akash Kundu^{a,1,2,3,†}, Aritra Sarkar^{4,‡} and Abhishek Sadhu^{5,6,§}

¹*QTF Centre of Excellence, Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Finland*

²*Joint Doctoral School, Silesian University of Technology, Gliwice, Poland*

³*Institute of Theoretical and Applied Informatics, Polish Academy of Sciences, Gliwice, Poland*

⁴*QuTech, Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands*

⁵*Raman Research Institute, Bengaluru, India*

⁶*Centre for Quantum Science and Technology (CQST),*

International Institute of Information Technology, Hyderabad, Telangana, India

(Dated: June 26, 2024)

Quantum architecture search (QAS) is a promising direction for optimization and automated design of quantum circuits towards quantum advantage. Recent techniques in QAS focus on machine learning-based approaches from reinforcement learning, like deep Q-network. While multi-layer perceptron-based deep Q-networks have been applied for QAS, their interpretability remains challenging due to the high number of parameters. In this work, we evaluate the practicality of KANs in quantum architecture search problems, analyzing their efficiency in terms of the probability of success, frequency of optimal solutions and their dependencies on various degrees of freedom of the network. In a noiseless scenario, the probability of success and the number of optimal quantum circuit configurations to generate the multi-qubit maximally entangled states are significantly higher than MLPs. Moreover in noisy scenarios, KAN can achieve a better fidelity in approximating maximally entangled state than MLPs, where the performance of the MLP significantly depends on the choice of activation function. Further investigation reveals that KAN requires a very small number of learnable parameters compared to MLPs, however, the average time of executing each episode for KAN is much higher.

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent research has advanced quantum computing concepts and software development, yet significant challenges remain before real-world applications are feasible. Automating quantum algorithm design via Machine Learning (ML) and optimization algorithms offers promising solutions to enhance quantum hardware and programming capabilities for complex problems. Strongly inspired by Neural Architecture Search (NAS) [1], which is the process of automated engineering of neural network architectures for a given task Quantum Architecture Search (QAS) [2] is introduced. QAS encompasses techniques to automate the optimization of quantum circuits and it typically consists of two parts. In the first part, a template of the circuits is built where the circuit can have parametric quantum gates, e.g., rotation angles. Then, these parameters are determined via the variational principle using a classical optimizer in a feedback loop. Algorithms constructed via this technique are called Variational Quantum Algorithms (VQA) [3, 4]. The parametric circuit design in VQAs is critical, as it directly influences the expressivity and efficiency of the quantum solution. Recently QAS has been utilized to automate the search for optimal parametric circuits for VQAs. QAS also finds application in determining non-parametric circuits as an approach for quantum program synthesis [5] and multi-qubit maximally entangled state preparation [6].

One of the most prominent methods to tackle QAS problems is to use Reinforcement Learning (RL), namely RLQAS [6–10]. In this approach, quantum circuits are defined as a sequence of actions generated by a trainable policy. The cost function’s value, optimized independently by a classical optimizer, serves as a signal for the reward function. This reward function guides the policy updates to maximize expected returns and select optimal actions for subsequent steps. RLQAS has several applications and can overcome the trainability issues of VQAs and has demonstrated promising outcomes in NISQ hardware [9, 10].

In a recent work [11], the researchers introduce the Kolmogorov-Arnold Networks (KANs) as a novel neural network architecture typically poised to replace traditional Multi-Layer Perceptrons (MLPs). Contrary to the universal approximation theorem-based MLPs, KAN utilizes the Kolmogorov-Arnold representation theorem to approximate complicated functions. KAN has linear weights replaced by spline-based univariate functions along the network edges and is structured as learnable activation functions. Such a design enhances the accuracy and interpretability of

^a Corresponding author

[†] akash.kundu@helsinki.fi

[‡] a.sarkar-3@tudelft.nl

[§] abhisheks@rri.res.in

the networks, enabling them to achieve comparable or superior results with smaller network sizes across a range of tasks, including data fitting and solving partial differential equations. Recently, different variants of KAN have been introduced [12–17]. KAN has to have applications in time series analysis [18–20], satellite image calcification [21], and improving the robustness of neural network architectures [22]. To understand the full potential and limitations of KANs there is a need for further investigation towards robustness and compatibility with other deep learning architectures.

In this article, we evaluate the practicality of KANs in quantum circuit construction, analyzing their efficiency in terms of the probability of success, frequency of optimal solutions and their dependencies on various degrees of freedom of the network. To the best of our knowledge, the application of Kolmogorov-Arnold Networks in Quantum




FIG. 1: The schematic for KANQAS where Kolmogorov Arnold network replaces the multi-layer perceptron structure in RL agent. The environment which is the quantum circuit interacts with the RL agent (containing the KAN) and gets updates after each step after the agent decides on an action following a policy.

Architecture Search is still lacking in standard literature. *We propose the application of KAN in QAS by replacing the MLP of Double Deep Q-Network (DDQN) in RLQAS with KAN to generate the desired quantum state, introducing KANQAS¹.* As shown in Figure 1, the proposed framework of KANQAS features an RL agent, which contains the KAN, interacting with a quantum simulator. The agent sequentially generates output actions, which are candidates for quantum gates on the circuit. The fidelity of the state from the constructed circuit is compared to the quantum state fidelity of the circuit and is evaluated to determine how far it is from the desired goal. The reward, based on fidelity, is sent back to the RL agent. This process is repeated iteratively to train the RL agent. We show that in a noiseless scenario constructing Bell and GHZ state the probability of success and the number of optimal quantum circuit configurations to generate the states is significantly higher than MLPs. In a noisy scenario, we show that KAN can achieve a better fidelity in approximating GHZ state than MLPs, where the performance of the MLP significantly depends on the depth of the network and choice of activation function.

The structure of the paper is as follows. We present the problem statement in Sec. II. In Sec. III, we provide the methods used in this work. Specifically, we introduce the Kolmogorov-Arnold Q Network in Sec. III A and discuss the RL state, action and reward function in Sec. III B. We present our results in Sec. IV. Specifically we discuss the results of our noiseless simulations in Sec. IV A, noisy simulations in Sec. IV B and the resource requirements for the simulations in Sec. IV C. We provide concluding remarks and discuss open problems in Sec. V.

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT

To evaluate the efficiency of RL-assisted KANQAS in quantum circuit construction we check if, in a noiseless and noisy scenario, multi-qubit entanglement can be generated as expected. To this end, we target the generation of two

¹ [Link to KANQAS code repository](#)

kinds of quantum states: Bell and Greenberger–Horne–Zeilinger (GHZ) states. A Bell state is a maximal 2-qubit entangled state and is given by

$$|\Phi^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|00\rangle + |11\rangle). \quad (1)$$

The optimal circuit to produce a Bell state is given by



Meanwhile, a GHZ state is a 3-qubit maximally entangled state given by

$$|GHZ\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|000\rangle + |111\rangle) \quad (3)$$

and the optimal circuit produces a GHZ state given by



As a measure of the efficiency of the network, we define the probability of success and the probability of optimal success. The probability of success is given by

$$\frac{\text{Number of times the network finds an admissible circuit}}{\text{Total number of admissible circuits}}, \quad (5)$$

As the problem statement clarifies, any circuit that generates a Bell state and a GHZ state is considered an admissible circuit. Meanwhile, Figure 2 and 4 are optimal admissible circuits to generate 2- and 3-qubit maximally entangled state.

III. METHODS

A. Kolmogorov-Arnold Q Networks (KAQN)

In a recent work [11], Kolmogorov-Arnold Networks (KAN) was proposed as a promising alternative to the Multi-Layer Perceptrons (MLP). KAN is based on the Kolmogorov-Arnold representation theorem [23] instead of the Universal Approximation Theorem [24] used in MLP. The Kolmogorov-Arnold representation theorem states that a real-valued, smooth and continuous multivariate function $g(\mathbf{t}) : [0, 1]^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ can be represented by a superposition of univariate functions [23]

$$g(\mathbf{t}) = \sum_{j=1}^{2n+1} \Psi_i \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \psi_{jk} \right), \quad (6)$$

where $\Psi_j : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\psi_{ij} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. In other words, any multivariate continuous function on a bounded domain can be expressed as a composition of continuous functions of one variable. This reduces the task of learning complex multi-variable functions to learning a polynomial number of single-variable functions. It was noted by the authors of [11] that the representation of the function in Eq. (6) has two layers of nonlinearity with $2n + 1$ terms in the middle layer, and we need to find functions Ψ_i and ψ_{ij} to approximate $g(\mathbf{t})$. The function ψ_{ij} may be approximated using B-splines [25].

A spline is a piecewise smooth polynomial function defined by a set of control points. It is defined by the order l of the polynomial used to interpolate the curve between the control points. We denote the number of segments between adjacent control points as G . The data points are connected by the segments to form a smooth curve having $G + 1$ grid points. It is observed that Eq. (6) can be represented as a two-layer network having activation functions at the

edges and nodes performing the summation operation. However, such a network is too restrictive to approximate any arbitrary function. A way to overcome this was proposed in [11], where the authors propose a general architecture with wider and deeper KANs.

The authors of [11] define a KAN layer by a matrix Ψ of trainable univariate spline functions $\{\psi_{jk}(\cdot)\}$ with $j = 1, \dots, n_i$ and $k = 1, \dots, n_o$, where n_i and n_o denotes the number of inputs and outputs respectively. The Kolmogorov-Arnold representation theorem can be expressed as a two-layer KAN. The inner functions constitute a KAN layer with $n_i = n$, $n_o = 2n + 1$ while the outer function is another KAN with $n_i = 2n + 1$, $n_o = n$. We define the shape of a KAN by $[n_1, \dots, n_k]$ with k denoting the number of layers of the KAN. The Kolmogorov-Arnold representation theorem can be expressed as a KAN of shape $[n, 2n + 1, 1]$. A deeper KAN can be expressed by the composition k layers:

$$\mathbf{z} = \text{KAN}(\mathbf{t}) = (\Psi_k \circ \Psi_{k-1} \circ \dots \circ \Psi_1)\mathbf{t}. \quad (7)$$

Since all functions are differentiable, KAN can be trained using backpropagation [26]. For the sake of simplicity, we describe a 2-depth KAN as $[n_i, n, n_o]$, where the input layer is not included in the depth count. The output and input layers will be comprised of n_o , and n_i nodes corresponding to the total amount of time steps while n describes the number of the hidden layers.

KAN can learn features and compositional structure due to their outer structure resembling MLPs and optimize the learnt features by approximating the univariate functions with high accuracy due to their internal spline structure. It should be noted that increasing the number of layers of the dimension of the grid increases the number of parameters and, hence, the complexity of the network.

Motivated by the developments in [27], we replace the Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP) component of Deep Q-Networks (DQN) with the KAN. Furthermore, we employ the Double Deep Q-Network (DDQN) update rule to enhance stability and learning efficiency. DDQN [28] is a Q-learning algorithm based on standard DQN [29], which features two neural networks to increase the stability of the prediction of Q-values for each state and action pair. For more details, see Appendix A.

B. RL state, action and reward function

The RL environment in KANQAS is encoded as per the one hot encoding introduced in [10], which translates a quantum circuit into a tensor of size $D \times N \times (N + 5)$, where D is a hyperparameter and is defined as the maximum depth of the circuit and N is the number of qubits. In the initial step, the quantum circuit is empty (i.e. without any gates). Depending on a fidelity-based reward function of the form

$$R = \begin{cases} \mathcal{R}, & \text{if } F(s_t) \geq 0.98 \\ F(s_t), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

and by following an ϵ -greedy policy the RL agent sets the probability of selecting a random action. Where $F(s_t)$ is the fidelity of a state at step t generated by KANQAS and $\mathcal{R} \gg F(s_t)$, is a hyperparameter.

The random action is chosen from a predefined action space (\mathbb{A}) which contains non-parametrized 1- and 2-qubit gates [6]

$$\mathbb{A} = \{CX, X, Y, Z, H, T\}. \quad (9)$$

Depending on the action the RL state is modified in the next step.

IV. RESULTS

A. Noiseless simulation

In the noiseless case, we consider the structure of the KAN and the MLP as presented in Table I. In the case of MLP, the activation function is a hyperparameter and is fixed throughout the training but in KAN it is learnable. For the construction of Bell state we run a total of 10000 episodes where each episode is divided into 6 steps. For a better intuition, we divide the total number of episodes into 4 intervals where each interval contains 2500 episodes.

Network	Problem	Configuration	Spline and grid	Activation func.
KAN	Bell state prep.	[84, 2, 12]	B-spline, $k = 3, G = 5$	learnable
	GHZ state prep. (KAN ₂)	[288, 3, 21]	B-spline, $k = 4, G = 5$	learnable
MLP	Bell state prep.	[84, 30, 30, 30, 12]	NA	LeakyReLU
	GHZ state prep. (MLP ₂)	[288, 3, 21]		
	GHZ state prep. (MLP ₄)	[288, 30, 30, 30, 21]		

TABLE I: Configuration for noiseless GHZ and Bell state preparation.




FIG. 2: In (a) the probability of successful circuits and in (b) the probability of optimal successful circuits in finding a 2-qubit maximally entangled state is slightly higher with KAN than DDQN. A total of 10000 episodes are divided into 4 separate intervals where each interval contains 2500 episodes. In (a) each point in an interval corresponds to the probability of occurrence of a successful episode (see Eq. 5). Similarly, (b) corresponds to the number of occurrences of an optimal successful episode. The results are averaged over 20 random seeds (i.e. initialization) of the networks.

In Figure 2(a) investigate the probability of success in each interval which is calculated as per Eq. 5. Meanwhile, in Figure 2(b) we see the variation in the number of the optimal admissible circuits in each interval. In each interval, the probability is averaged over 20 random seeds, where each seed corresponds to the random initialization of the network. The probability of success with an MLP and KAN is comparable in the first 3 intervals but in the 4th interval i.e. in the episodes falls in the range of 7500 – 10000, the probability of success achieved by KAN is higher. With MLP the best probability of success achievable in the 4th interval is 35.36% whereas with KAN we can achieve a success probability 36.31% but the number of optimal admissible ansatz achievable by both the networks is the same. This indicates KANs potential to generate more diverse solutions in solving the same problem compared to MLPs.

Meanwhile, the difference in performance between KAN and MLP becomes significant in the task of constructing the GHZ state. Here we consider the depth 2 MLP (MLP₂) with 3 neurons and depth 4 MLP (MLP₄) with 30 neurons and compare its performance with a depth 2 KAN (KAN₂) of 3 neurons. We run a total of 8000 episodes where each episode is divided into 12 steps. Just like the previous 2-qubit experiment, we divide the total number of episodes into 4 intervals where each interval contains 2000 episodes.

In Figure 3(a) we observe that the average probability of success with KAN₂ is higher than both MLP₂ and MLP₄ over 15 random initialization of the networks. This difference becomes truly significant when we consider the best performance at the 4th interval. *With KAN₂ we can achieve a probability of success in the final interval 48.41% whereas with MLP₂ and MLP₄ we get 38.23% and 38.61% respectively, indicating a 10.18 – 9.8% performance enhancement with KAN.*

In Figure 3(b) we observe that on average (over 15 random initialization of the networks) one can achieve a higher number of optimal admissible ansatz using KAN₂ than the MLPs. Meanwhile, when we consider the best performance in the 4th interval *the number of optimal admissible ansatz achievable by KAN is 1.84× to 5.16× higher than MLP₂ and MLP₄ respectively.*




FIG. 3: In (a) the probability of successful circuits and in (b) the total number of optimal successful circuits in finding 3-qubit maximally entangled state is noticeably higher with KAN than MPL. A total of 8000 episodes are divided into 4 separate intervals where each interval contains 200 episodes. In (a) each point in an interval corresponds to the probability of occurrence of a successful episode (see Eq. 5). The results are averaged over 15 random seeds (i.e. initialization) of the networks. The *range* defines the best performance of each interval for both networks. The *range* defines the region between the best and the worst performance in each interval for both networks.

B. Noisy simulation

For the noisy simulation of Bell state preparation, we consider two forms of gate errors depending on the number of qubits. The gate error refers to the imperfection in any quantum operation we perform. For the 1-qubit gate error, we consider random X noise where with probability p_x an X gate is applied to the circuit and with $1 - p_x$ it applies an I . Meanwhile, for 2-qubit gate error we apply depolarizing noise which replaces the state of any qubit with a random state of probability p_{dep} . The configuration of MLP and KAN utilized are summarized in Table IV B.

Network	Configuration	Spline and grid	Activation func.	Fidelity
KAN	[84, 10, 10, 12]	B-spline, $k = 4, G = 5$	learnable	0.7328
MLP _{4,30}	[84, 30, 30, 30, 12]	NA	ReLU	0.5005
		NA	LeakyReLU	0.7300
MLP _{4,100}	[84, 100, 100, 100, 12]	NA	ELU	0.6830
			ReLU	0.7300
			LeakyReLU	0.8500

TABLE II: KAN outperforms most of the configurations of MLPs except when MLP_{4,100} is operated with LeakyReLU activation function for noisy Bell state preparation with $p_x = 0.3$ and $p_{\text{dep}} = 0.2$.

At the first stage, we consider noise levels $p_x = 0.1$ and $p_{\text{dep}} = 0.01$, where the MLP_{4,30} (i.e. an MLP of depth 4 and 30 neurons) we can achieve a fidelity 99.25% whereas the same fidelity can be achieved with KAN with just depth 2 and 2 neurons.

To elevate the hardness of the problem, in the second experiment, we consider the following noise levels: $p_x = 0.3$ and $p_{\text{dep}} = 0.2$. With KAN configuration presented in Table IV B we can achieve a fidelity of 73.28% which MLP_{4,30} with ReLU and LeakyReLU activation functions cannot achieve. Even when the number of neurons is increased tenfold compared to KAN, MLP_{4,100} (i.e., MLP with depth 4 and 100 neurons) still fails to surpass KAN's fidelity using ELU and ReLU activation functions. However, with LeakyReLU activation, it achieves a higher fidelity of 85%.

To achieve competitive/better performance with an MLP, it is necessary to fine-tune not just the network's depth and width but also the activation function. However, with KAN, this process becomes much simpler, as the activation functions are learnable.

One can argue that KAN has two additional parameters: splines (k) and grid (G) and tuning these hyperparameters




FIG. 4: The number of splines (k) has more impact in improving and stabilizing the performance of the KAN than the grid size (G). Here we measure the improvement of the KAN while constructing GHZ state by calculating the average number of gates and depth in each setting. Each point is marked as (a, b) where a is the total number of successful episodes and b total optimal successful episodes.

can heavily affect the performance of the KAN. In Fig. 4, for constructing GHZ state, we show that *to achieve better performance in terms of depth and number of gates variation in the number of splines (i.e. k) is more effective and stable for the network than variation in G* . Whence, in ref. [20] the authors show that achieving a better minimization of the loss function grid size within the splines of KANs has a notable impact. Meanwhile, loss function minimization is crucial for Variational Quantum Algorithms (VQAs), so it is much needed to fine-tune the grid size while optimizing parameterized gates within parametric quantum circuits of VQAs.

C. Resource details

Here we quantify the resources required by KAN and MLP for the simulations presented in the previous section. In this quantification, we consider (1) the total number of learnable parameters and (2) the time of execution of each episode with the two networks.

a. Parameter count

Problem	Network	Configuration	Spline and grid	Parameter count
Bell state prep. (noiseless)	KAN	[84, 2, 12]	B-spline, $k = 3, G = 5$	64
	MLP	[84, 30, 30, 30, 12]	NA	480
GHZ state prep. (noiseless)	KAN	[288, 3, 21]	B-spline, $k = 4, G = 5$	108
	MLP	[288, 30, 30, 30, 21]	NA	480
Bell state prep. (noisy)	KAN	[84, 10, 10, 12]	B-spline, $k = 4, G = 5$	810
	MLP	[84, 100, 100, 100, 12]	NA	1600

TABLE III: The required number of learnable parameters for KANs and MLPs.

With depth L and width N MLP only needs $O(N^2L)$ parameters whereas KAN requires $O(N^2L(G+k))$ parameters. In Table IV, we calculate the total number of learnable parameters required for KANs and MLPs in noisy and noiseless scenarios. *We observe that in all cases KAN requires a lesser number of parameters than MLP.*

b. Time of executing each episode Although KAN requires a very small number of learnable parameters compared to MLPs the average time of executing each episode for KAN is $120\times$ higher.

Problem	Network	Configuration	Avg. time per episode	Avg time per successful episode
GHZ state prep.	KAN	[288, 3, 21]	7.094	4.097
	MLP	[288, 30, 30, 30, 21]	0.0592	0.0383

TABLE IV: Albeit the advantages, KAN is approximately $120\times$ slower in executing an episode compared to MLP.

V. DISCUSSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this work, we analyse the practicality of using the recently introduced Kolmogorov-Arnold Networks in constructing quantum circuits in terms of probability of success, frequency of optimal solutions and the degrees of freedom of the network. To this end, we propose KANQAS which replaces the Multi-Layer Perception (MLP) in reinforcement learning-assisted quantum architecture search in the double deep Q-network with the Kolmogorov Arnold network (KAN).

Our experiments *with KANQAS reveal that in constructing multi-qubit maximally entangled states with non-parameterised gates KAN can increase the probability of success of the RL agent in finding optimal quantum circuits as compared to MLPs. Moreover, when noise is present in the quantum device, achieving similar or better outcomes with an MLP necessitates a deeper and wider network compared to KAN, as well as a careful selection of the appropriate activation function. Since finding the optimal activation function for deep learning remains an ongoing challenge [30, 31], KAN has an advantage, as its activation functions are inherently learnable.*

Although the number of learnable parameters in KAN is much lesser than in MLPs, one of the biggest disadvantages of KAN is that it requires a much higher execution time per episode as compared to MLPs. However, due to their effectiveness and efficiency in finding solutions in noiseless and noisy quantum devices, KAN thus appears to be a reasonable alternative to traditional MLPs in solving quantum architecture search problems. In the following, we discuss the *future research directions* as a follow-up to our research.

- **KAN for VQAs** A primary direction for future research is addressing the quantum architecture search problem within variational quantum algorithms, where the action space is parameterized. These algorithms have significant applications in quantum chemistry and combinatorial optimization problems.
- **Optimizing computational time of KAN** Another important goal is to explore the use of specialized accelerators, such as tensor processing units or digital signal processors, to reduce the computation time of KAN.
- **Interpretability of KAN** Focusing on the interpretability of KAN, future research should investigate its applicability to similar but scalable problems to enhance understanding. This can, for example, include the investigation of subclasses of families of the activation function after training KAN.

Appendix A: Double Deep Q-Network (DDQN)

Deep Reinforcement Learning (RL) techniques utilize Neural Networks (NNs) to adapt the agent’s policy to optimize the return:

$$G_t = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma^k r_{t+k+1}, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ is the discount factor. For each state-action pair (s, a) , an action-value is assigned, quantifying the expected return from state s at step t when taking action a under policy π :

$$q_{\pi}(s, a) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[G_t | s_t = s, a_t = a]. \quad (\text{A2})$$

The goal is to determine the optimal policy that maximizes the expected return, which can be derived from the optimal action-value function q_* , defined by the Bellman optimality equation:

$$q_*(s, a) = \mathbb{E} \left[r_{t+1} + \max_{a'} q_*(s_{t+1}, a') | s_t = s, a_t = a \right]. \quad (\text{A3})$$

Instead of solving the Bellman optimality equation directly, value-based RL aims to learn the optimal action-value function from data samples. Q-learning is a prominent value-based RL algorithm, where each state-action pair (s, a) is assigned a Q-value $Q(s, a)$, which is updated to approximate q_* . Starting from randomly initialized values, the Q-values are updated according to the rule:

$$Q(s_t, a_t) \leftarrow Q(s_t, a_t) + \alpha \left(r_{t+1} + \gamma \max_{a'} Q(s_{t+1}, a') - Q(s_t, a_t) \right), \quad (\text{A4})$$

where α is the learning rate, r_{t+1} is the reward at time $t + 1$, and s_{t+1} is the state encountered after taking action a_t in state s_t . This update rule is proven to converge to the optimal Q-values in the tabular case if all (s, a) pairs are visited infinitely often [32]. To ensure sufficient exploration in a Q-learning setting, an ϵ -greedy policy is used. Formally, the policy is defined as:

$$\pi(a|s) := \begin{cases} 1 - \epsilon_t & \text{if } a = \max_{a'} Q(s, a'), \\ \epsilon_t & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{A5})$$

The ϵ -greedy policy introduces randomness to the actions during training, but after training, a deterministic policy is used.

We employ NN ad function approximations to extend Q-learning to large state and action spaces. NN training typically requires independently and identically distributed data. This problem is circumvented by experience replay. This method divides past experiences into single-episode updates and creates batches which are randomly sampled from memory. For stabilizing training, two NNs are used: a policy network, which is continuously updated, and a target network, that is an earlier copy of the policy network. The current value is estimated by the policy network, while the target network provides a more stable target value Y given by :

$$Y_{\text{DQN}} = r_{t+1} + \gamma \max_a Q_{\text{target}}(s_{t+1}, a'). \quad (\text{A6})$$

In the DDQN algorithm, we sample the action for the target value from the policy network to reduce the overestimation bias present in standard DQN. The corresponding target is defined as:

$$Y_{\text{DDQN}} = r_{t+1} + \gamma Q_{\text{target}} \left(s_{t+1}, \arg \max_{a'} Q_{\text{policy}}(s_{t+1}, a') \right). \quad (\text{A7})$$

This target value is approximated via a loss function. In this work, we consider the loss function as the smooth L1-norm.

-
- [1] Pengzhen Ren, Yun Xiao, Xiaojun Chang, Po-Yao Huang, Zhihui Li, Xiaojiang Chen, and Xin Wang. A comprehensive survey of neural architecture search: Challenges and solutions. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 54(4):1–34, 2021.
 - [2] Shi-Xin Zhang, Chang-Yu Hsieh, Shengyu Zhang, and Hong Yao. Differentiable quantum architecture search. *Quantum Science and Technology*, 7(4):045023, 2022.
 - [3] Jarrod R McClean, Jonathan Romero, Ryan Babbush, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik. The theory of variational hybrid quantum-classical algorithms. *New Journal of Physics*, 18(2):023023, 2016.
 - [4] Marco Cerezo, Andrew Arrasmith, Ryan Babbush, Simon C Benjamin, Suguru Endo, Keisuke Fujii, Jarrod R McClean, Kosuke Mitarai, Xiao Yuan, Lukasz Cincio, et al. Variational quantum algorithms. *Nature Reviews Physics*, 3(9):625–644, 2021.
 - [5] Aritra Sarkar. Automated quantum software engineering. *Automated Software Engineering*, 31(1):1–17, 2024.
 - [6] En-Jui Kuo, Yao-Lung L Fang, and Samuel Yen-Chi Chen. Quantum architecture search via deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.07715*, 2021.
 - [7] Mateusz Ostaszewski, Lea M Trenkwalder, Wojciech Masarczyk, Eleanor Scerri, and Vedran Dunjko. Reinforcement learning for optimization of variational quantum circuit architectures. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:18182–18194, 2021.
 - [8] Akash Kundu, Przemysław Bedelek, Mateusz Ostaszewski, Onur Danaci, Yash J Patel, Vedran Dunjko, and Jarosław A Miszczak. Enhancing variational quantum state diagonalization using reinforcement learning techniques. *New Journal of Physics*, 26(1):013034, 2024.
 - [9] Yuxuan Du, Tao Huang, Shan You, Min-Hsiu Hsieh, and Dacheng Tao. Quantum circuit architecture search for variational quantum algorithms. *npj Quantum Information*, 8(1):62, 2022.
 - [10] Yash J Patel, Akash Kundu, Mateusz Ostaszewski, Xavier Bonet-Monroig, Vedran Dunjko, and Onur Danaci. Curriculum reinforcement learning for quantum architecture search under hardware errors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03500*, 2024.
 - [11] Ziming Liu, Yixuan Wang, Sachin Vaidya, Fabian Ruehle, James Halverson, Marin Soljačić, Thomas Y Hou, and Max Tegmark. Kan: Kolmogorov-arnold networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.19756*, 2024.
 - [12] Alireza Afzal Aghaei. fkan: Fractional kolmogorov-arnold networks with trainable jacobi basis functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.07456*, 2024.
 - [13] Remi Genet and Hugo Inzirillo. Tkan: Temporal kolmogorov-arnold networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.07344*, 2024.
 - [14] Zavareh Bozorgasl and Hao Chen. Wav-kan: Wavelet kolmogorov-arnold networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.12832*, 2024.
 - [15] Diab W Abueidha, Panos Pantidis, and Mostafa E Mobasher. Deepokan: Deep operator network based on kolmogorov arnold networks for mechanics problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.19143*, 2024.

- [16] Mehrdad Kiamari, Mohammad Kiamari, and Bhaskar Krishnamachari. Gkan: Graph kolmogorov-arnold networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.06470*, 2024.
- [17] Jinfeng Xu, Zheyu Chen, Jinze Li, Shuo Yang, Wei Wang, Xiping Hu, and Edith C-H Ngai. Fourierkan-gcf: Fourier kolmogorov-arnold network—an effective and efficient feature transformation for graph collaborative filtering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01034*, 2024.
- [18] Remi Genet and Hugo Inzirillo. A temporal kolmogorov-arnold transformer for time series forecasting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.02486*, 2024.
- [19] Kunpeng Xu, Lifei Chen, and Shengrui Wang. Kolmogorov-arnold networks for time series: Bridging predictive power and interpretability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.02496*, 2024.
- [20] Cristian J Vaca-Rubio, Luis Blanco, Roberto Pereira, and Màrius Caus. Kolmogorov-arnold networks (kans) for time series analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.08790*, 2024.
- [21] Minjong Cheon. Kolmogorov-arnold network for satellite image classification in remote sensing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.00600*, 2024.
- [22] Yizheng Wang, Jia Sun, Jinshuai Bai, Cosmin Anitescu, Mohammad Sadegh Eshaghi, Xiaoying Zhuang, Timon Rabczuk, and Yinghua Liu. Kolmogorov arnold informed neural network: A physics-informed deep learning framework for solving pdes based on kolmogorov arnold networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.11045*, 2024.
- [23] Andrei Nikolaevich Kolmogorov. On the representation of continuous functions of many variables by superposition of continuous functions of one variable and addition. In *Doklady Akademii Nauk*, volume 114, pages 953–956. Russian Academy of Sciences, 1957.
- [24] Kurt Hornik, Maxwell Stinchcombe, and Halbert White. Multilayer feedforward networks are universal approximators. *Neural networks*, 2(5):359–366, 1989.
- [25] Gary D Knott. *Interpolating cubic splines*, volume 18. Springer Science & Business Media, 1999.
- [26] David E Rumelhart, Richard Durbin, Richard Golden, and Yves Chauvin. Backpropagation: The basic theory. In *Backpropagation*, pages 1–34. Psychology Press, 2013.
- [27] Radji Waris and Corentin. Kolmogorov-Arnold Q-Network (KAQN)-KAN applied to Reinforcement learning, initial experiments. <https://github.com/riiswa/kanrl/tree/main?tab=readme-ov-file#kolmogorov-arnold-q-network-kaqn---kan-applied-to-reinforcement-learning-initial-experiments>, 2024.
- [28] Hado Van Hasselt, Arthur Guez, and David Silver. Deep reinforcement learning with double q-learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 30, 2016.
- [29] Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Andrei A Rusu, Joel Veness, Marc G Bellemare, Alex Graves, Martin Riedmiller, Andreas K Fidjeland, Georg Ostrovski, et al. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *nature*, 518(7540):529–533, 2015.
- [30] Soufiane Hayou, Arnaud Doucet, and Judith Rousseau. On the selection of initialization and activation function for deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.08266*, 2018.
- [31] Prajit Ramachandran, Barret Zoph, and Quoc V Le. Searching for activation functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.05941*, 2017.
- [32] Francisco S Melo. Convergence of q-learning: A simple proof. *Institute Of Systems and Robotics, Tech. Rep*, pages 1–4, 2001.