

IAC–26–B2,5,8,x113206

Goal-Oriented Bundle Management and Flow Control for Deep-Space Communications via Reinforcement Learning

Sajjad Baghaee^{a*}, Aimin Li^{b*}, Shanmugarajan Balasubramanian^c, Elif Uysal^d

Communication Networks Research Group (CNG), Dept. of Electrical and Electronics Engineering, Middle East Technical University (METU), Ankara, Türkiye

^asajjad@baghaee.com, ^baimin@metu.edu.tr, ^ce279039@metu.edu.tr, ^duelif@metu.edu.tr

*Corresponding authors

Abstract

Deep-space communications operate under intermittent connectivity, long propagation delays, and relay storage constraints. To span vast distances, data are often forwarded through relay nodes, where incoming traffic can vary over time. In such networks, the Bundle Protocol encapsulates data into store-carry-forward units called bundles, which are stored at intermediate nodes and forwarded only when contact opportunities become available. Therefore, relay-side buffer and flow management become critical challenges, since limited storage and scarce contact windows force the relay to decide which bundles to transmit or discard. This decision process is inherently goal-oriented: the relay should not merely forward data, but should allocate limited transmission opportunities to the bundles that are most valuable to the downstream mission objective. Existing schedulers, such as FIFO, are heuristic and do not explicitly optimize task utility; moreover, they often lead to unfair service across heterogeneous planetary sources. This paper presents a closed-loop modeling and learning framework for relay-side bundle and flow management in a contact-driven deep-space network, where updates generated by lunar and Martian sources are forwarded via a relay to Earth. These bundles are stored in a shared relay buffer and carry metadata including source and destination identities, generation time, and time-to-live. On Earth, data utility depends on freshness, which we quantify via the excess age $\Delta_i^e(t) = [\Delta_i(t) - d_i(t)]^+$, where $\Delta_i(t)$ denotes the Age of Information (AoI) of source i , i.e., the time elapsed since the freshest update currently available on Earth was generated, and $d_i(t)$ is a source-dependent delay baseline. Based on this metric, we define a goal-oriented system loss that penalizes excess age in a source-dependent and nonlinear manner, allowing the relay to prioritize information according to mission relevance. We formulate relay control as a constrained semi-Markov decision process (CSMDP) and solve it using masked Lagrangian Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO), where feasibility-aware action masking restricts decisions to transmissions that can finish within the remaining contact window. Simulation results in DTNSim indicate that the proposed approach significantly improves age-based utility and achieves substantially better inter-flow fairness compared to baseline schedulers. By explicitly prioritizing information according to downstream task relevance and using this signal to guide transmission and dropping decisions, the proposed framework improves goal-oriented information delivery in deep-space networks and, to our knowledge, is among the first reinforcement learning frameworks to jointly optimize relay-side bundle scheduling and dropping, as well as flow control under contact-driven dynamics with explicit fairness considerations across heterogeneous sources.

1. Introduction

Deep-space networks rely on intermittent contacts and store-carry-forward relaying to communicate across long propagation delays. Delay/Disruption-Tolerant Networking (DTN) and the Bundle Protocol (BP) enable store-carry-forward communication in such environments [1, 2], but leave a fundamental relay-side allocation problem unresolved: when multiple buffered bundles compete for a short contact window, which should be transmitted, and which should be dropped under buffer pressure. This decision becomes challenging in heterogeneous deep-space networks, where lunar and Martian traffic share a finite relay buffer but differ significantly in contact frequency and propagation delay. Simple queueing policies such as FIFO,

LIFO, or fixed priority are therefore inadequate, as they may either waste scarce contact opportunities on outdated information or systematically disadvantage one source. To reason about this trade-off, we consider destination-side information freshness. Age of Information (AoI) captures the time elapsed since the most recently received update was generated [3, 4]. However, in deep-space settings, raw AoI conflates two effects: the relay's scheduling decisions and the underlying contact structure of each source. To separate these effects, we measure freshness relative to a contact-aware baseline $d_i(t)$ and define the excess age $\Delta_i^e(t) = [\Delta_i(t) - d_i(t)]^+$. This allows us to penalize only the staleness attributable to relay decisions, while avoiding bias toward inherently disadvantaged sources.

To address this problem, we develop a relay-side scheduling and dropping model for deep-space DTNs, where bundle decisions are driven by downstream information utility under finite storage and intermittent contacts. We consider an Earth–Relay–Moon–Mars network with a shared relay buffer. The relay operates in an event-driven manner: at each decision epoch, it may transmit a feasible bundle, resolve buffer overflow through rejection or eviction, or remain idle. Since freshness at the destination is only updated upon Earth delivery, pending deliveries are retained in the system state so that the delayed reception dynamics remain Markovian. These dynamics lead to a constrained semi-Markov decision process (CSMDP), which we solve using masked Lagrangian Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) with permutation-invariant encoding of the variable-size buffer state.

Our main **contribution** is a goal-oriented framework for deep-space DTNs that jointly controls relay scheduling and dropping based on downstream information utility rather than queue order. It combines: (i) a closed-loop model with finite relay storage, scheduled contacts, stochastic source traffic, heterogeneous bundle sizes, and delayed destination updates; (ii) a contact-aware excess-age objective with explicit inter-source fairness constraints; (iii) an event-driven CSMDP formulation for joint scheduling and dropping; and (iv) masked Lagrangian PPO with permutation-invariant encoding of the variable-size relay buffer. The framework is implemented in DTNSim.

2. Background and Related Work

2.1 Relay-Local DTN Resource Management

DTN and the Bundle Protocol (BP) enable persistent store-carry-forward communication across disrupted links while leaving relay-local bundle ordering and discard policies unspecified [1, 2, 5]. In scheduled space networks, Contact Graph Routing (CGR) and related methods exploit contact plans to construct time-dependent routes [6, 7], with extensions addressing heterogeneous traffic, contact capacity, and finite buffers [8, 9]. These mechanisms primarily determine where and when bundles can be forwarded across the network.

Our focus is complementary: once multiple bundles coexist at a finite-buffer relay, the node must decide which bundle should use the next outgoing contact and which bundle should be discarded when storage becomes scarce. Such relay-local decisions can influence end-to-end performance under limited contact capacity [10]. Conventional rules such as FIFO, LIFO, fixed-priority, and TTL-based policies are simple but do not account for the freshness already available at the destination, motivating freshness-aware joint scheduling and dropping based on the downstream value of each candidate transmission.

2.2 Freshness and Goal-Oriented Utility

Age of Information (AoI) provides a natural measure of destination-side information freshness, and AoI-aware scheduling can substantially affect information timeliness [11, 12]. Related work has also examined fairness in freshness-oriented systems, since minimizing an aggregate age metric can produce highly uneven service across heterogeneous sources [13, 14].

Deep-space networks introduce an additional *asymmetry*: sources may experience substantially different propagation delays and contact opportunities even under the same relay policy. We therefore evaluate freshness relative to a policy-independent reference induced by the known contact plan, and combine this relative freshness objective with explicit source-specific service constraints. This is consistent with goal-oriented communication, where resources are allocated according to downstream utility rather than delivered data volume alone [15, 16].

2.3 Learning-Based Control and Research Gap

Learning-based methods have been studied for communication scheduling, routing, and resource management, including constrained satellite routing and PPO-based congestion control in deep-space DTNs [17, 18]. The central difficulty in our setting is temporal: a relay must decide which bundle to transmit or discard using its current buffer state, while the value of that decision is realized only when the transmitted information reaches Earth. During this propagation interval, new bundles may arrive, others may expire, contact conditions may change, and subsequent buffer-management decisions may have been made. Relay actions are therefore coupled across irregular decision epochs through delayed destination-side freshness.

This structure calls for an event-driven control formulation that preserves the delayed effect of relay actions and the changing set of feasible decisions. We formulate the problem as a constrained SMDP, where event-driven transitions capture irregular decision times and delayed destination updates, feasibility-aware action masking removes transmissions that cannot be completed within the remaining contact window [19], and constrained policy optimization incorporates operational and source-specific service requirements [20, 21]. The formulation links relay-side scheduling and dropping decisions to the freshness realized at Earth under stochastic, heterogeneous traffic.

3. Deep-Space DTN System Model

3.1 Network and Contact Model

We consider a relay-side scheduling and dropping model for deep-space DTNs, where limited relay storage and intermittent contact opportunities require goal-oriented bundle management. As a representative scenario, we consider four nodes: Earth E , relay R , lunar source M , and




Fig. 1. Earth–Relay–Moon–Mars network.

Martian source S , with source set $\mathcal{I} \triangleq \{M, S\}$. Both sources generate time-stamped status-update bundles destined for Earth. Direct source–Earth delivery is excluded so that every bundle traverses the finite-buffer relay, the only node at which scheduling and dropping are controlled. Figure 1 shows this representative topology.

Connectivity is specified by contact plans

$$\mathcal{C}_{xy} \triangleq \left\{ \left(t_{xy,s}^{(q)}, t_{xy,e}^{(q)}, \sigma_{xy}^{(q)}, \tau_{xy}^{(q)} \right) \right\}_{q=1}^{K_{xy}}, \quad [1]$$

where x and y denote link endpoints, q indexes contact segments, and K_{xy} is the number of segments on $x \rightarrow y$; each segment specifies its start/end times, usable rate, and one-way propagation delay. We use the links $M \rightarrow R$, $S \rightarrow R$, and $R \rightarrow E$. During active relay–Earth segment q , $\sigma_{RE}(t) = \sigma_{RE}^{(q)}$, $\tau_{RE}(t) = \tau_{RE}^{(q)}$, and $t_{RE}^{end}(t) = t_{RE,e}^{(q)}$; otherwise $\sigma_{RE}(t) = \tau_{RE}(t) = 0$ and $t_{RE}^{end}(t) = t$. Thus, the downlink is available iff $\sigma_{RE}(t) > 0$.

3.2 Source Generation and Source–Relay Transport

Bundles are generated independently at the Moon and Mars according to Poisson processes with heterogeneous inter-generation times and randomly drawn sizes. Each source maintains a non-preemptive FIFO queue; bundles accumulate during contact gaps and are transmitted head-of-line when a source–relay contact is active. A bundle is admitted to service only if its full serialization fits within the remaining contact interval.

For source $i \in \mathcal{I}$, if bundle b begins transmission at $t_i^{tx,s}(b)$ over contact segment q , its source-link completion and relay arrival times are

$$t_i^{tx,e}(b) = t_i^{tx,s}(b) + \frac{L(b)}{\sigma_{iR}^{(q)}}, \quad t^{arr}(b) = t_i^{tx,e}(b) + \tau_{iR}^{(q)}, \quad [2]$$

with the feasibility condition

$$t_i^{tx,e}(b) \leq t_{iR,e}^{(q)}. \quad [3]$$

Thus, only transmission completion must occur before the contact closes; relay reception may occur later due to propagation delay.

3.3 Bundle and Buffer Model

Each bundle is represented as

$$b = (i(b), g(b), L(b), T^{ttl}(b), t^{arr}(b), \omega(b), id(b)), \quad [4]$$

where $i(b)$ is the source, $g(b)$ the update-generation time, $L(b)$ the size, $T^{ttl}(b)$ the lifetime, $t^{arr}(b)$ the relay-arrival time, $\omega(b)$ an optional importance weight, and $id(b)$ a unique identifier. Its expiry time is $t^{exp}(b) \triangleq g(b) + T^{ttl}(b)$, and it is valid at time t only if $t < t^{exp}(b)$.

Let $Q_i(t)$ be the multiset of buffered source- i bundles. The shared relay buffer is $\mathcal{B}(t) \triangleq \biguplus_{i \in \mathcal{I}} Q_i(t)$, with occupancy $B(t) \triangleq \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}(t)} L(b) \leq B_{\max}$. An arriving bundle is admitted when capacity permits; otherwise the controller must reject it or evict a bundle so that the post-decision occupancy does not exceed $B_{\max}$. We assume each bundle fits within the relay buffer, i.e., $L(b) \leq B_{\max}$.

3.4 Relay–Earth Service and Feasibility

The relay–Earth downlink is a non-preemptive single server. Let $busy(t) \in \{0, 1\}$ indicate whether a transmission is active, $b^{srv}(t)$ the in-service bundle, and $t^{cmp,srv}(t)$ its completion time, fixed when transmission begins. When the server is busy, $\tau_{RE}^{srv}(t)$ denotes the propagation delay of the relay–Earth contact segment used for the current transmission and remains fixed until completion. When the server is idle, $b^{srv}(t) = \emptyset$, $t^{cmp,srv}(t) = +\infty$, and $\tau_{RE}^{srv}(t) = 0$. For a bundle b selected at time t , its transmission, relay-completion, and Earth-delivery times are

$$\begin{aligned} t^{tx}(b, t) &= \frac{L(b)}{\sigma_{RE}(t)}, \\ t^{cmp}(b, t) &= t + t^{tx}(b, t), \\ t^{del}(b, t) &= t^{cmp}(b, t) + \tau_{RE}(t), \end{aligned} \quad [5]$$

with $t^{tx}(b, t) = +\infty$ when $\sigma_{RE}(t) = 0$. When bundle b starts service at time t , $t^{cmp,srv}(t^+) = t^{cmp}(b, t)$.

We use a non-preemptive, all-or-nothing service model: once transmission begins, the bundle must complete within the same active contact and cannot be resumed later. Accordingly, bundle b is schedulable at time t only if

$$t^{cmp}(b, t) \leq t_{RE}^{end}(t), \quad t^{del}(b, t) < t^{exp}(b). \quad [6]$$

The first condition ensures transmission completion before contact termination, while the second requires Earth reception before bundle expiry.

3.5 Pending Deliveries and Observability

Propagation separates relay transmission completion from Earth reception. We retain the pending-delivery

multiset $\mathcal{G}(t) \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathcal{I} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, where $(\hat{t}, \hat{i}, \hat{g})$ records an Earth-delivery time, source, and generation timestamp. Completion of bundle b inserts $(t^{\text{del}}(b, t), i(b), g(b))$ into $\mathcal{G}$; at $\hat{t}$, the record is removed and Earth-side freshness is updated as defined in Subsection 4.1. Retaining $\mathcal{G}(t)$ preserves the Markov state under propagation delay.

Under the deterministic contact plan and transmission/propagation dynamics, the relay can reconstruct pending deliveries and Earth-side timestamps from its prior actions and the known contact plan; instantaneous Earth feedback is therefore unnecessary. The policy observes only relay-available information and the known contact plan. The SMDP state is defined in Section 5, while the policy feature representation is defined in Subsection 8.2.

4. Closed-Loop Freshness and Excess-Age Objective

Relay-side transmission affects freshness only when the corresponding pending delivery reaches Earth. We therefore define destination-side Age of Information (AoI) and compare it with a source-dependent baseline derived from the known contact plan.

4.1 Earth-Side Freshness

For each source $i \in \mathcal{I}$, let $u_i(t)$ denote the generation timestamp of the freshest source- i update delivered to Earth by time t . When a pending delivery $(\hat{t}, \hat{i}, \hat{g}) \in \mathcal{G}(t^-)$ reaches Earth at $t = \hat{t}$, $u_i(t) \leftarrow \max\{u_i(t^-), \hat{g}\}$. The AoI is $\Delta_i(t) \triangleq t - u_i(t)$. The maximum prevents an out-of-order delivery from replacing fresher information at Earth. Relay transmission completion does not update $u_i(t)$; only Earth reception can advance this timestamp, while $\Delta_i(t)$ increases linearly between useful deliveries.

4.2 Contact-Plan Baseline

Raw AoI reflects both relay-controlled effects and source-dependent contact and propagation conditions. To account for this heterogeneity, we define a policy-independent baseline based on idealized, contention-free forwarding over the known contact plan.

For an L -bit bundle available at node x at time s , its earliest feasible arrival at node y is

$$A_{xy}(s; L) \triangleq \min_{1 \leq q \leq K_{xy}: \eta_{xy}^{(q)}(s) + L/\sigma_{xy}^{(q)} \leq t_{xy,e}^{(q)}} \left[\eta_{xy}^{(q)}(s) + \frac{L}{\sigma_{xy}^{(q)}} + \tau_{xy}^{(q)} \right], \quad [7]$$

where $\eta_{xy}^{(q)}(s) \triangleq \max\{s, t_{xy,s}^{(q)}\}$ and $A_{xy}(s; L) = +\infty$ if no contact can carry the complete bundle.

Let L^{ref} denote a fixed reference bundle size, common to all sources and policies. For a hypothetical reference update generated at time g , define

$$\begin{aligned} a_i(g) &\triangleq A_{RE}(A_{iR}(g; L^{\text{ref}}); L^{\text{ref}}), \\ \underline{u}_i(t) &\triangleq \sup\{g \leq t : a_i(g) \leq t\}, \\ d_i(t) &\triangleq t - \underline{u}_i(t). \end{aligned} \quad [8]$$

Here, $d_i(t)$ represents the freshness achievable by the reference update under idealized forwarding. Because it depends only on the contact plan and L^{ref} , it is independent of relay scheduling, queueing, contention, dropping, and the realized traffic process.

4.3 Excess-Age Objective

The excess age and instantaneous goal-oriented freshness cost are

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_i^e(t) &\triangleq [\Delta_i(t) - d_i(t)]^+, \\ G(t) &\triangleq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} w_i \phi_i(\Delta_i^e(t)), \end{aligned} \quad [9]$$

where $[x]^+ \triangleq \max\{x, 0\}$, $w_i > 0$ denotes the relative mission importance of source i , and $\phi_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is nonnegative and nondecreasing. Thus, $\Delta_i^e(t)$ measures Earth-side staleness relative to the corresponding source-dependent contact-plan baseline. Over an episode $[t_0, T]$, the relay minimizes the expected cumulative freshness cost $J_G \triangleq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t_0}^T G(t) dt \right]$, subject to the operational and source-specific constraints introduced later. Its event-wise decomposition defines the SMDP reward in Section 5.3.

5. Event-Driven SMDP Formulation

Relay-side scheduling and dropping occur at irregular times determined by contact changes, bundle arrivals, transmission completions, Earth deliveries, and expirations. We therefore model relay control as a semi-Markov decision process (SMDP) [22]. Let $\{t_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ denote the strictly increasing decision epochs and $\delta_k \triangleq t_{k+1} - t_k$ the holding time. Co-timed events are processed as one batch before control. If an arrival creates buffer overflow, the controller may take a finite sequence of rejection or eviction decisions at the same physical time until the overflow is resolved. A scheduling decision is then made when transmission is possible. These same-time control stages do not constitute separate SMDP transitions; physical time advances only after all applicable stages have been completed.

5.1 Events, State, and Action Sets

The physical event types are *contact boundary*, *transmission completion*, *Earth delivery*, *relay expiry*, and *relay arrival*. Co-timed events are processed in this fixed order. This convention first establishes the active contact state, then resolves transmission and destination updates, removes expired bundles, and finally processes new arrivals, yielding a unique post-event state. An additional controller wake-up may be scheduled after an elective wait, as described below; it changes no physical state by itself. After processing events at t_k , the relay-side control state is

$$s_k \triangleq \left(\mathcal{B}(t_k), B(t_k), busy(t_k), b^{srv}(t_k), t^{cmp, srv}(t_k), \right. \\ \left. t_k, \sigma_{RE}(t_k), \tau_{RE}^{srv}(t_k), \tau_{RE}(t_k), t_{RE}^{end}(t_k), \right. \\ \left. \{u_i(t_k)\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}, \mathcal{G}(t_k), \{D_i(k)\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}, b_k^{new} \right). \quad [10]$$

The physical, service, and freshness variables are defined in Sections 3–4. The variables $D_i(k)$ are the fairness deficits defined in Section 6, while b_k^{new} is nonempty only when a newly arrived bundle requires an overflow decision. Equation [10] collects the relay-side control state from which the policy observation is constructed. Let h_k denote the upstream simulator state, including source FIFO queues, active source–relay transmissions, and in-flight source–relay bundles. The environment state is $x_k \triangleq (s_k, h_k)$. The environment evolves Markovianly on x_k , whereas the relay policy acts only on information derived from s_k . The hidden upstream state h_k , together with source-generation and bundle-size draws, determines future relay arrivals but is not exposed to the controller.

For scheduling, define the currently feasible bundle set

$$\mathcal{F}(s_k) \triangleq \left\{ b \in \mathcal{B}(t_k) : t^{cmp}(b, t_k) \leq t_{RE}^{end}(t_k), \right. \\ \left. t^{del}(b, t_k) < t^{exp}(b) \right\}. \quad [11]$$

When the relay–Earth server is idle, the contact is active, and $\mathcal{F}(s_k) \neq \emptyset$, the scheduling action set is

$$\mathcal{A}^{sched}(s_k) \triangleq \mathcal{F}(s_k) \cup \{\text{wait}\}. \quad [12]$$

Here, wait is an elective action. If $\mathcal{F}(s_k) = \emptyset$, no scheduling decision is required.

Overflow is resolved through one or more same-time drop stages. Let $s_k^{d,0} \triangleq s_k$. Whenever a pending arrival $b_k^{new} \neq \emptyset$ would violate the shared relay capacity, the available drop actions at stage j are

$$\mathcal{A}^{drop}(s_k^{d,j}) \triangleq \{b_k^{new}\} \cup \mathcal{B}(s_k^{d,j}). \quad [13]$$

The drop stage is invoked only while admission of b_k^{new} would violate the shared relay-buffer capacity. Selecting b_k^{new} rejects the arriving bundle and terminates overflow resolution. Selecting $b \in \mathcal{B}(s_k^{d,j})$ evicts that buffered bundle. If the remaining capacity is still insufficient to admit b_k^{new} , another drop stage is performed at the same physical time using the updated buffer state. Otherwise, b_k^{new} is admitted and the overflow sequence terminates. For selected drop action $d_{k,j}$, define $s_k^{d,j+1} \triangleq \Psi^{drop}(s_k^{d,j}, d_{k,j})$. Let J_k denote the total number of rejection or eviction decisions executed during overflow resolution at physical epoch t_k . Each such decision discards one bundle, and $J_k = 0$ when no overflow action is required. The resulting post-overflow state is $s_k^d \triangleq s_k^{d,J_k}$, with $s_k^d = s_k$ when $J_k = 0$. The controller therefore executes state-dependent drop sequence $d_{k,0}, \dots, d_{k,J_k-1}$, where each action is selected from the intermediate state produced by the preceding stage. After overflow resolution, scheduling

is reconsidered. If the server is idle, $\sigma_{RE}(t_k) > 0$, and $\mathcal{F}(s_k^d) \neq \emptyset$, then $q_k \in \mathcal{A}^{sched}(s_k^d)$; otherwise $q_k = \emptyset$. The complete control applied at epoch t_k is $a_k \triangleq (\mathbf{d}_k, q_k)$, where $\mathbf{d}_k = (d_{k,0}, \dots, d_{k,J_k-1})$ is the drop sequence, empty when no overflow occurs.

5.2 Post-Decision State and Next Event

After the drop sequence has been completed, the scheduling component is applied: $\bar{s}_k \triangleq \Psi^{sched}(s_k^d, q_k)$, where $\Psi^{sched}(s, \emptyset) = \Psi^{sched}(s, \text{wait}) = s$. If $q_k = b \in \mathcal{F}(s_k^d)$, bundle b is removed from the relay buffer and the server state is set to $busy = 1$, $b^{srv} = b$, $t^{cmp, srv} = t_k + t^{tx}(b, t_k)$, and $\tau_{RE}^{srv} = \tau_{RE}(t_k)$. No holding time, reward interval, or discount factor is introduced between same-time drop stages or between overflow resolution and scheduling.

Let T_{exp} , T_{ct} , T_{tx} , T_{del} , and $T_{arr,k}$ denote, respectively, the next buffered-bundle expiry, relay–Earth contact boundary, transmission completion, pending Earth delivery, and relay arrival. The candidate times are

$$T_{exp}(\bar{s}_k) \triangleq \min \{t^{exp}(b) : b \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}_k, t^{exp}(b) > t_k\}, \\ T_{ct}(\bar{s}_k) \triangleq \inf \left\{ t > t_k : t \in \bigcup_{q=1}^{K_{RE}} \{t_{RE,s}^{(q)}, t_{RE,e}^{(q)}\} \right\}, \\ T_{tx}(\bar{s}_k) \triangleq \begin{cases} t^{cmp, srv}(\bar{s}_k), & busy(\bar{s}_k) = 1, \\ t^{cmp, srv}(\bar{s}_k) > t_k, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad [14] \\ T_{del}(\bar{s}_k) \triangleq \min \{ \hat{t} : (\hat{t}, \hat{i}, \hat{g}) \in \bar{\mathcal{G}}_k, \hat{t} > t_k \}.$$

Here, $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_k$ and $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_k$ denote the buffered-bundle and pending-delivery multisets in the post-decision state $\bar{s}_k$. A minimum or infimum over an empty candidate set is defined as $+\infty$. Let $\bar{x}_k \triangleq (\bar{s}_k, h_k)$ denote the complete post-decision state. The next relay-arrival time is a simulator-side random variable whose conditional law is generated by upstream evolution from $\bar{x}_k$, including subsequent source-generation and bundle-size draws. Neither hidden upstream information nor future random outcomes are exposed to the policy. Thus, $T_{arr,k} > t_k$ denotes the first unprocessed relay arrival strictly after the co-timed event batch, with $T_{arr,k} = +\infty$ if no further arrival occurs.

An elective scheduling wait introduces an additional decision timer

$$T_{wake}(\bar{s}_k, q_k) \triangleq \begin{cases} t_k + 30 \text{ s}, & q_k = \text{wait}, \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad [15]$$

A physical event occurring before this timer cancels the need to wait for the full 30 s because the earlier event itself creates the next decision opportunity. Forced idle periods, for which no feasible transmission exists, do not create this timer and remain purely event-driven. For every nonterminal epoch $t_k < T$, the next decision epoch is

$$t_{k+1} \triangleq \min \left\{ T_{\text{arr},k}, T_{\text{exp}}(\bar{s}_k), T_{\text{ct}}(\bar{s}_k), T_{\text{tx}}(\bar{s}_k), T_{\text{del}}(\bar{s}_k), T_{\text{wake}}(\bar{s}_k, q_k), T \right\}. \quad [16]$$

Because all events and control operations occurring at t_k are exhausted before this minimization, every nonterminal finite event candidate is strictly larger than t_k . Hence,

$$t_{k+1} > t_k, \quad \delta_k \triangleq t_{k+1} - t_k > 0. \quad [17]$$

If several future physical events attain the same minimum, they are processed as one batch according to Subsection 5.1. At the terminal time T , physical events occurring exactly at T are processed before the episode stops. The simulator then terminates without draining the system; unexpired bundles still queued, in service, or in transit are recorded as unresolved backlog rather than as drops or expirations.

5.3 Event Updates, Transition Kernel, and Reward

At t_{k+1} , only state components affected by the occurring physical events are updated. A relay arrival is admitted if capacity permits; otherwise the existing buffer is retained and the arrival becomes b_{k+1}^{new} , so that the first control stage at the resulting epoch is overflow resolution. If one eviction does not release sufficient capacity, additional drop stages are taken at the same timestamp until the arrival is either admitted or rejected. Scheduling is then reconsidered without advancing physical time.

When a relay-buffered bundle reaches its absolute expiry time, it is removed from the relay buffer. Expiry accounting is maintained according to the bundle's physical location in the simulator.

A queued bundle that can no longer be delivered before its expiry is excluded from the scheduling set through Equation [11], but it is not proactively removed; it remains in the relay buffer until it is explicitly dropped or reaches its absolute expiry time.

At transmission completion, the completed bundle is not yet treated as delivered because it must still propagate to Earth. Before clearing the server, the record $(t_{k+1} + \tau_{RE}^{srv}(t_{k+1}^-), i(b^{srv}(t_{k+1}^-)), g(b^{srv}(t_{k+1}^-)))$ is inserted into $\mathcal{G}$. Here, $\tau_{RE}^{srv}(t_{k+1}^-)$ is the propagation delay of the contact segment on which the completed transmission was initiated. The server is then cleared by setting $busy = 0$, $b^{srv} = \emptyset$, $t^{cmp,srv} = +\infty$, and $\tau_{RE}^{srv} = 0$.

An Earth-delivery event removes the corresponding pending record and updates the Earth-side timestamp according to Subsection 4.1. Thus, transmission completion and Earth-side freshness update remain distinct physical events. After all events at t_{k+1} are processed, the fairness deficits are updated using the holding time δ_k and the delivered freshness gains $y_{i,k}$ according to Section 6.

The post-decision map, event scheduler, source-generation processes, and transmission dynamics induce

the controlled transition kernel on the complete environment state $P(dx'|x_k, a_k) \triangleq \Pr\{x_{k+1} \in dx' \mid x_k, a_k\}$.

The relay policy selects actions using only the observation constructed from s_k and does not observe h_k or future random outcomes. Conditional on a fixed physical traffic trace, the environment transition is deterministic. Under stochastic traffic, randomness originates from the independent source-generation processes and bundle-size draws; source FIFO service, source-relay contacts, and propagation then determine the resulting relay-arrival sequence. Because physical time is included in x_k , the transition kernel also induces the holding time $\delta_k = t_{k+1} - t_k$.

The reward accumulated during transition k is the negative integrated freshness cost $r_k \triangleq - \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} G(t) dt$. Integration over physical time correctly weights intervals of different duration. Drop and expiry counts are retained as constraint costs rather than being penalized in the reward.

Because multiple overflow actions may occur at one physical epoch, define $N_k^{\text{drop}} \triangleq J_k$, where each rejected arriving bundle or evicted buffered bundle counts as one drop. Let N_k^{exp} denote the total number of bundles whose absolute lifetime expires during transition k ; the simulator additionally records the physical location at which each expiry occurs. Their constraints are defined in Section 7.

6. Fairness Modeling

Minimizing aggregate excess age does not guarantee balanced service across heterogeneous sources. We therefore measure fairness through *useful delivered freshness*: service is credited only when an Earth delivery advances the latest generation timestamp of that source.

6.1 Freshness-Service Deficit

Because $u_i(t)$ changes only when a useful source- i update reaches Earth, we define the delivered freshness gain during transition k as

$$y_{i,k} \triangleq u_i(t_{k+1}) - u_i(t_k) \geq 0. \quad [18]$$

The nonnegativity follows directly from Subsection 4.1, since the max-update rule makes $u_i(t)$ nondecreasing. This quantity equals the sum of the positive generation-timestamp advances produced by all source- i Earth deliveries during $(t_k, t_{k+1}]$; obsolete or out-of-order deliveries contribute zero through Subsection 4.1. Hence, $y_{i,k}$ measures useful freshness progress rather than the number or temporal regularity of delivered bundles.

Let $\rho_i > 0$ denote the required long-run freshness-service rate of source i , measured as delivered generation-time advance per unit physical time. Thus, ρ_i specifies a target rate of cumulative freshness progress, not a required bundle-delivery frequency or a bound on inter-delivery time. Because transition k lasts δ_k , its fairness cost is

$$c_k^{(\text{fair},i)} \triangleq \rho_i \delta_k - y_{i,k}, \quad [19]$$

where positive values indicate service shortfall. Accumulated under-service is tracked by the nonnegative deficit

$$D_i(k+1) \triangleq \left[D_i(k) + c_k^{(\text{fair},i)} \right]^+. \quad [20]$$

By including $D_i(k)$ in the relay-side control state s_k , the policy can condition scheduling and dropping decisions on accumulated source-specific freshness-service shortfall.

The targets ρ_i should be compatible with the achievable long-run freshness-service rates under the contact and traffic dynamics. Excess service can reduce an existing deficit, while the projection in Equation [20] prevents surplus service from accumulating as negative credit. Hence, $D_i(k)$ tracks uncompensated freshness-service shortfall rather than imposing a bound on inter-delivery gaps.

6.2 Long-Run Fairness Interpretation

Equation [20] is a virtual-queue recursion with demand $\rho_i \delta_k$ and service $y_{i,k}$.

Lemma 6.1 (Deficit rate stability implies freshness fairness). *Let $\tilde{t}_K \triangleq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \delta_k = t_K - t_0$. If $\tilde{t}_K \rightarrow \infty$ and $D_i(K)/\tilde{t}_K \rightarrow 0$, then*

$$\liminf_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\tilde{t}_K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} y_{i,k} \geq \rho_i.$$

Proof. Since $[x]^+ \geq x$, summing Equation [20] gives $\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} y_{i,k} \geq \rho_i \tilde{t}_K - D_i(K) + D_i(0)$; division by $\tilde{t}_K$ and deficit rate stability yield the result. $\square$

For finite-horizon learning, $D_i(k)$ serves as a state variable that exposes accumulated freshness-service shortfall to the policy. Separately, $c_k^{(\text{fair},i)}$ is used as the signed episodic constraint cost in Section 7. The lemma gives a conditional long-run guarantee on the average delivered freshness-progress rate, provided the deficit is rate stable. It does not guarantee bounded inter-delivery times, bounded AoI, or service within every finite time window. The mechanism targets long-run freshness-service balance rather than fairness over every finite time window.

7. Constrained SMDP Problem Formulation

Using the event-driven SMDP defined in Section 5, we optimize destination-side freshness subject to operational and source-specific fairness constraints.

7.1 Returns and Constraint Costs

Let π_θ denote the stochastic relay policy applied at each applicable control stage using the policy observation constructed from the relay-side control state. For physical transition k , the complete same-time control sequence is $a_k \triangleq (\mathbf{d}_k, q_k)$, with $\mathbf{d}_k = (d_{k,0}, \dots, d_{k,J_k-1})$, as defined in Section 5. The drop-stage decisions are taken sequentially on their intermediate states, followed by the optional scheduling decision q_k , while all such same-time stages belong to one physical SMDP transition.

The expected finite-horizon reward and constraint returns are

$$\begin{aligned} J_R(\theta) &\triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0, \pi_\theta, P} \left[\sum_{k:t_k < T} r_k \right], \\ J_{C_j}(\theta) &\triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0, \pi_\theta, P} \left[\sum_{k:t_k < T} c_k^{(j)} \right], \quad j \in \mathcal{J}, \end{aligned} \quad [21]$$

where μ_0 denotes the distribution of the initial complete environment state, and the reward r_k and transition kernel P are defined in Subsection 5.3.

For relay management, the constraint index set and operational costs are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J} &\triangleq \{\text{drop}, \text{exp}\} \cup \{(\text{fair}, i) : i \in \mathcal{I}\}, \\ c_k^{(\text{drop})} &\triangleq N_k^{\text{drop}}, \quad c_k^{(\text{exp})} \triangleq N_k^{\text{exp}}, \end{aligned} \quad [22]$$

The fairness cost $c_k^{(\text{fair},i)}$ is defined in Equation [19], while N_k^{drop} and N_k^{exp} are defined in Subsection 5.3. Each constraint $j \in \mathcal{J}$ has an episodic budget d_j .

Let K_T denote the number of SMDP transitions in an episode ending at T , so $t_{K_T} = T$. The undiscounted source- i fairness cost then satisfies

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K_T-1} c_k^{(\text{fair},i)} = \rho_i(T - t_0) - [u_i(T) - u_i(t_0)], \quad [23]$$

where the equality follows from $\sum_{k=0}^{K_T-1} \delta_k = T - t_0$ and the telescoping definition of $y_{i,k}$ in Equation [18].

Thus, the episodic source- i constraint regulates the total delivered freshness progress over the episode. Because $c_k^{(\text{fair},i)}$ is signed, excess freshness service during some transitions can compensate for shortfall during others in the episodic constraint return. This differs from the projected deficit recursion in Equation [20], which does not retain surplus service as negative credit. This finite-horizon constraint is distinct from the conditional long-run freshness-service guarantee in Lemma 6.1, which additionally requires deficit rate stability.

7.2 Constrained Objective and Lagrangian

The relay-control problem is

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\theta} \quad & J_R(\theta) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & J_{C_j}(\theta) \leq d_j, \quad j \in \mathcal{J}. \end{aligned} \quad [24]$$

Introducing a nonnegative multiplier $\lambda_j \geq 0$ for each constraint, we form the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) \triangleq J_R(\theta) - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \lambda_j (J_{C_j}(\theta) - d_j), \quad [25]$$

where $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \triangleq (\lambda_j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$ and the primal-dual problem is
$$\max_{\theta} \min_{\lambda \geq 0} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \boldsymbol{\lambda}). \quad [26]$$

Section 8 implements this formulation using masked Lagrangian PPO with projected multiplier updates.

8. Method: Masked Lagrangian PPO with Variable-Cardinality Set Pooling

We develop a masked Lagrangian PPO controller [23] for the constrained event-driven relay-control problem. The method combines stage-specific physical-feasibility masking, a causal observation adapter for variable-cardinality bundle candidates, permutation-invariant set pooling, holding-time-aware advantage estimation, and Lagrangian constraint updates. Overflow resolution may require multiple same-time drop-stage decisions followed by an optional scheduling decision, while PPO optimization is performed at the level of physical SMDP transitions. Fig. 2 summarizes the controller.

8.1 Stage-Specific Feasibility Masking

Let s denote the relay-side control state presented to an individual control stage. The nominal candidate sets are

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{sched}}(s) &\triangleq \mathcal{B}(s) \cup \{\text{wait}\}, \\ \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{drop}}(s) &\triangleq \mathcal{B}(s) \cup \{b^{\text{new}}(s)\}.\end{aligned}\quad [27]$$

The scheduling slate contains the currently buffered bundles together with the elective wait action, whereas the drop slate contains the currently buffered bundles together with the pending arrival. The drop stage is active only when the pending arrival requires overflow resolution. For stage $r \in \{\text{drop}, \text{sched}\}$, define

$$\chi^r(u; s) \triangleq \mathbf{1}\{u \in \mathcal{A}^r(s)\}, \quad u \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^r(s), \quad [28]$$

where $\mathcal{A}^r(s)$ is the corresponding feasible action set defined in Section 5.

During overflow resolution, every represented bundle in the current drop slate is eligible for rejection or eviction, while the special wait action is not available. After each selected rejection or eviction, the relay state, candidate set, observation, and mask are recomputed on the resulting intermediate state $s_k^{d,j}$. If the incoming bundle remains pending and the capacity violation persists, another masked drop decision is taken at the same physical time. Once the arrival is admitted or rejected, scheduling is reconsidered on the resulting state s_k^d . No physical time elapses between these same-time control stages. At a scheduling stage, the wait action is available and a bundle is enabled only if relay–Earth service is available, its complete serialization fits within the active contact, and its Earth reception occurs strictly before its absolute expiry, per Equation [11]. If no scheduling stage is enabled, the relay is forced idle and no scheduling action is sampled. The same physical masks are used during training and execution; deterministic evaluation selects the masked argmax.

8.2 Causal Observation & Set Pooling

The policy does not observe the hidden upstream state h_k introduced in Section 5. Instead, a deterministic adapter

constructs a causal numerical observation from the relay-side control state s . For a control stage with $n(s)$ represented bundle candidates,

$$o(s) \triangleq (X(s), x_g(s)), \quad X(s) \in \mathbb{R}^{n(s) \times 18}, x_g(s) \in \mathbb{R}^{50}, \quad [29]$$

where each row of $X(s)$ is the 18-dimensional representation of one represented bundle and $x_g(s)$ is the 50-dimensional raw global context. Stable bundle identifiers are retained for action decoding but are not part of these numerical feature tensors. The same feature definitions and fixed normalization rules are used during training, validation, and testing.

Each bundle is represented by 18 causal features grouped into four categories: source and size attributes, freshness relevance, expiry/contact feasibility, and buffer-management context. These features include bundle age and remaining lifetime, potential freshness gain, transmission and deadline slack, overflow pressure, and contact-opportunity indicators. The 50-dimensional global vector is naturally partitioned as

$$x_g(s) = [x_{\text{core}}(s), x_{\text{srv}}(s), x_{\text{pend}}(s), x_M^{\text{src}}(s), x_S^{\text{src}}(s)], \quad [30]$$

with dimensions $17 + 6 + 5 + 11 + 11 = 50$. The 50-dimensional global context summarizes five information groups: the current relay/contact state, active service, pending Earth delivery, and source-specific recent ingress/contact history for the Moon and Mars. All components are constructed from information available at the relay and the known contact plan. Thus, realized future source arrivals, hidden source queues, future random bundle-size realizations, RNG state, traffic seeds, and trace identifiers are not exposed to the policy.

To obtain a fixed-dimensional representation from the variable-cardinality bundle set, the network forms masked mean and elementwise-maximum summaries of the active bundle rows. Let

$$\mathcal{I}^r(s) \triangleq \{u \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^r(s) \setminus \{\text{wait}\} : \chi^r(u; s) = 1\} \quad [31]$$

denote the active bundle support for control stage r . Define

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{x}^r(s) &= \text{MeanPool}(\{x_u(s) : u \in \mathcal{I}^r(s)\}), \\ x_{\text{max}}^r(s) &= \text{MaxPool}(\{x_u(s) : u \in \mathcal{I}^r(s)\}).\end{aligned}\quad [32]$$

The raw 50-dimensional global context is then concatenated with the two 18-dimensional pooled summaries:

$$z^r(s) \triangleq [x_g(s)^\top, \bar{x}^r(s)^\top, x_{\text{max}}^r(s)^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{86}. \quad [33]$$

Hence, the 50-dimensional raw global observation $x_g(s)$ and the 86-dimensional pooled network context $z^r(s)$ are distinct quantities. For value estimation, we use the same mean–max pooling operation over all bundles represented in the relay-side control state, irrespective of their immediate action feasibility. Define




Fig. 2. Masked Lagrangian PPO architecture for event-driven relay control.

$$\mathcal{I}^V(s) \triangleq \mathcal{B}(s) \cup \{b^{\text{new}}(s) : b^{\text{new}}(s) \neq \emptyset\}, \quad [34]$$

and

$$z^V(s) \triangleq [x_g(s)]^\top, \quad [35]$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{MeanPool}\{x_u(s) : u \in \mathcal{I}^V(s)\}^\top, \\ & \text{MaxPool}\{x_u(s) : u \in \mathcal{I}^V(s)\}^\top \end{aligned} \in \mathbb{R}^{86}.$$

Empty bundle sets use zero pooled summaries. For a represented bundle action u , the corresponding bundle row is concatenated with the pooled context,

$$\tilde{x}_u^r(s) \triangleq [x_u(s)^\top, z^r(s)^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{104}. \quad [36]$$

Separate candidate-scoring networks are used for drop and scheduling stages. Thus, for a represented bundle,

$$\ell_\theta^r(u; o(s)) = f_\theta^r(\tilde{x}_u^r(s)), \quad r \in \{\text{drop}, \text{sched}\}, \quad [37]$$

whereas the elective wait score at a scheduling stage is obtained directly from the pooled context,

$$\ell_\theta^{\text{sched}}(\text{wait}; o(s)) = f_\theta^{\text{wait}}(z^{\text{sched}}(s)). \quad [38]$$

Feasibility masking is applied to the logits before normalization:

$$\pi_\theta^r(u|o(s)) = \frac{\exp(\ell_\theta^r(u; o(s))) \chi^r(u; s)}{\sum_{u' \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^r(s)} \exp(\ell_\theta^r(u'; o(s))) \chi^r(u'; s)}, \quad [39]$$

for $r \in \{\text{drop}, \text{sched}\}$. Consequently, infeasible nominal actions receive zero probability and contribute neither to action selection nor to the stage entropy.

8.3 Compound Transition Policy and Value Estimates

Let $o_k^{d,j} = o(s_k^{d,j})$ denote the observation at drop stage j , and let $o_k^q = o(s_k^q)$ denote the post-overflow scheduling observation. Define $\mathbb{I}_k^q = 1$ when a scheduling stage is active and $\mathbb{I}_k^q = 0$ otherwise.

The stage-wise policies induce the following probability for the complete physical-transition action $a_k = (d_k, q_k)$ conditional on the initial relay-side state s_k :

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_\theta(a_k|s_k) & \triangleq \prod_{j=0}^{J_k-1} \pi_\theta^{\text{drop}}(d_{k,j} | o_k^{d,j}) \\ & \times [\pi_\theta^{\text{sched}}(q_k | o_k^q)]^{\mathbb{I}_k^q}. \end{aligned} \quad [40]$$

An empty drop product equals one. Accordingly,

$$\begin{aligned} \log \pi_\theta(a_k|s_k) & = \sum_{j=0}^{J_k-1} \log \pi_\theta^{\text{drop}}(d_{k,j} | o_k^{d,j}) \\ & + \mathbb{I}_k^q \log \pi_\theta^{\text{sched}}(q_k | o_k^q). \end{aligned} \quad [41]$$

Equation [40] subsumes all control cases. If no overflow resolution is required, the empty drop product equals one. If scheduling is enabled, the scheduling probability is multiplied by the probabilities of all preceding same-time drop decisions; otherwise only the drop-stage probabilities contribute. If neither a drop nor a scheduling decision is required, the complete action probability equals one. Thus, all same-time control stages belong to one physical-transition policy probability.

The intermediate drop-stage states $s_k^{d,0}, \dots, s_k^{d,J_k}$ and their policy observations are used only for same-time conditional action selection; they do not constitute separate physical SMDP transitions, holding-time intervals, rewards, constraint costs, or critic time steps.

At physical transition boundary k , define $z_k^V \triangleq z^V(s_k)$. The critic therefore remains well defined whether the current epoch contains a drop stage, a scheduling stage, or no active control stage. It produces one reward value and one value for each constraint:

$$V_R(z_k^V), \quad V_{C_j}(z_k^V), \quad j \in \mathcal{J}. \quad [42]$$

Critic evaluation occurs only at physical SMDP transition boundaries, not at intermediate same-time drop stages.

8.4 Holding-Time-Aware Lagrangian PPO

To account separately for irregular holding times in temporal credit assignment, define

$$\lambda_k^{\text{time}} \triangleq \exp\left(-\frac{\delta_k}{\tau_{\text{GAE}}}\right), \quad [43]$$

where $\tau_{\text{GAE}} > 0$ is the physical-time scale used by the advantage estimator.

For numerical conditioning, rewards and constraint costs are rescaled as

$$\tilde{r}_k = \frac{r_k}{s_R}, \quad \tilde{c}_k^{(j)} = \frac{c_k^{(j)}}{s_j}, \quad [44]$$

where $s_R > 0$ and $s_j > 0$ are fixed optimization scales. These rescalings affect only numerical conditioning and not the physical objective or constraint definitions.

The reward and constraint TD residuals are

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_k^R &\triangleq \tilde{r}_k + V_R(z_{k+1}^V) - V_R(z_k^V), \\ \zeta_k^{C_j} &\triangleq \tilde{c}_k^{(j)} + V_{C_j}(z_{k+1}^V) - V_{C_j}(z_k^V). \end{aligned} \quad [45]$$

The holding-time-aware GAE recursions [24] are

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{A}_k^R &= \zeta_k^R + \lambda_k^{\text{time}} \hat{A}_{k+1}^R, \\ \hat{A}_k^{C_j} &= \zeta_k^{C_j} + \lambda_k^{\text{time}} \hat{A}_{k+1}^{C_j}. \end{aligned} \quad [46]$$

Terminal transitions use zero bootstrap values. If a rollout segment is truncated before termination, its final critic estimates may instead be used for bootstrap.

The episodic reward and constraint objectives remain undiscounted; λ_k^{time} affects only temporal credit assignment in GAE.

Let λ denote the current Lagrange multipliers. The Lagrangian advantage is

$$\hat{A}_k^L \triangleq \hat{A}_k^R - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \lambda_j \hat{A}_k^{C_j}. \quad [47]$$

Before the PPO actor update, $\hat{A}_k^L$ is standardized over transitions with an active control stage; the individual reward and constraint advantages are not separately standardized.

For notational simplicity, we retain $\hat{A}_k^L$ for the standardized quantity thereafter. Let θ_{old} denote the behavior policy that generated the rollout. The PPO importance ratio for physical transition k is

$$\xi_k(\theta) \triangleq \frac{\pi_\theta(a_k|s_k)}{\pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}(a_k|s_k)}. \quad [48]$$

In implementation, the behavior log-probability is stored when the transition is collected, and the numerator is reconstructed during optimization by summing the current log-probabilities of the same active control stages in Equation [41]. Stage observations, stable candidate identities, nominal action slates, and feasibility masks are stored with the rollout so that the behavior and current policies are evaluated on identical action supports.

The clipped PPO actor objective is

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\text{actor}}(\theta) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\min \left(\xi_k(\theta) \hat{A}_k^L, \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \text{clip}(\xi_k(\theta), 1 - \epsilon_{\text{ppo}}, 1 + \epsilon_{\text{ppo}}) \hat{A}_k^L \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \eta_H \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{H}_k], \right] \quad [49] \end{aligned}$$

where $\eta_H \geq 0$ is the entropy coefficient. For physical transition k , the entropy contribution is the sum of the entropies of all active same-time control stages:

$$\mathcal{H}_k = \sum_{j=0}^{J_k-1} \mathcal{H}^{\text{drop}}(o_k^{d,j}) + \mathbb{I}_k^q \mathcal{H}^{\text{sched}}(o_k^q), \quad [50]$$

with

$$\mathcal{H}^r(o(s)) = - \sum_{u \in \mathcal{A}^r(s)} \pi_\theta^r(u|o(s)) \log \pi_\theta^r(u|o(s)). \quad [51]$$

Thus, infeasible nominal actions contribute neither probability mass nor entropy.

Using critic targets

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{R}_k &= \hat{A}_k^R + V_R^{\text{old}}(z_k^V), \\ \hat{C}_{j,k} &= \hat{A}_k^{C_j} + V_{C_j}^{\text{old}}(z_k^V), \end{aligned} \quad [52]$$

the joint loss for the five critic outputs is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{critic}} &= \mathbb{E} \left[(V_R(z_k^V) - \hat{R}_k)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} (V_{C_j}(z_k^V) - \hat{C}_{j,k})^2 \right]. \quad [53] \end{aligned}$$

Actor and critic parameters are updated from the same physical-transition minibatches using their respective optimization losses and learning-rate schedules. Numerical optimizer settings are specified with the experimental training configuration rather than being part of the constrained SMDP definition.

8.5 Lagrange-Multiplier Update

Multiplier updates use completed episodic constraint returns. Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{comp}}$ denote the set of episodes completed since the previous multiplier update. The empirical return

of constraint j is

$$\hat{J}_{C_j} \triangleq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{E}_{\text{comp}}|} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{comp}}} \sum_{k=0}^{K_e-1} c_{e,k}^{(j)}, \quad [54]$$

The projected dual update is

$$\lambda_j \leftarrow \left[\lambda_j + \eta_\lambda \frac{\hat{J}_{C_j} - d_j}{s_j} \right]^+, \quad j \in \mathcal{J}, \quad [55]$$

where $\eta_\lambda > 0$ is the dual step size. Thus, an episodic return above its budget increases the corresponding multiplier, while a return below its budget permits the multiplier to decrease toward zero. The normalization by s_j affects only the numerical dual update and does not change the physical constraint $J_{C_j} \leq d_j$.

8.6 Training Procedure

Each rollout record corresponds to one physical SMDP transition and stores

$$(o_k, a_k, r_k, \{c_k^{(j)}\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}}, \delta_k, o_{k+1}, C_k, l_k^{\text{term}}), \quad [56]$$

where C_k contains the same-time control-stage observations, stable candidate identities, nominal action slates, feasibility masks, selected actions, and behavior log-probabilities required to reconstruct the compound action probability. The indicator $l_k^{\text{term}} \in \{0, 1\}$ identifies terminal physical transitions. The pooled contexts z_k^V and z_{k+1}^V are deterministic functions of the stored observations and masks and are reconstructed by the network when value estimates are evaluated.

After rollout collection, the holding-time factors, reward and constraint advantages, critic targets, and Lagrangian advantages are computed from the physical-transition sequence. The quantities used as PPO targets, together with the stored behavior log-probabilities, remain fixed during the PPO epochs for that rollout. Current policy probabilities, masked entropies, and value estimates are re-evaluated on each optimization minibatch.

The actor and critics are trained from random initialization using PPO. Stage-specific action masks are applied during both training and execution. Multiplier updates use completed episodic returns and are performed after the PPO updates for the corresponding rollout, so the updated multipliers affect subsequent data collection rather than changing advantages already computed for the current rollout. Algorithm 1 summarizes the procedure.

9. DTNSim Implementation and Simulator Interface

We extend DTNSim [25] to implement the event-driven relay environment of Section 5 and the masked control interface of Section 8. The implementation preserves the shared-buffer, non-preemptive service, delayed-reception, and co-timed event semantics defined by the model.

Algorithm 1 Masked Lagrangian PPO for Event-Driven Relay Control

Require: $T, \tau_{\text{GAE}}, \epsilon_{\text{ppo}}, \eta_H, \eta_\lambda, \{d_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}}, K_{\text{PPO}}$

- 1: Initialize actor, critics, and $\lambda_j \geq 0$
- 2: **while** training criterion not satisfied **do**
- 3: Initialize rollout buffer $\mathcal{R}$ and completed-episode set $\mathcal{E}_{\text{comp}}$
- 4: **while** rollout collection is incomplete **do**
- 5: Observe s_k and construct o_k ; initialize $\mathbf{d}_k \leftarrow ()$
- 6: **while** overflow resolution is required **do**
- 7: Construct masked drop policy at $s_k^{d,j}$ and sample $d_{k,j}$
- 8: Apply $d_{k,j}$ and append it to $\mathbf{d}_k$
- 9: **end while**
- 10: **if** scheduling is enabled **then**
- 11: Construct masked scheduling policy at s_k^d and sample q_k
- 12: **else**
- 13: $q_k \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 14: **end if**
- 15: Set $a_k \leftarrow (\mathbf{d}_k, q_k)$ and advance DTNSim to t_{k+1}
- 16: Observe $(r_k, \{c_k^{(j)}\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}}, \delta_k, o_{k+1})$ and store the transition and active stage records in $\mathcal{R}$
- 17: Accumulate completed episodic constraint returns
- 18: **end while**
- 19: Compute $\lambda_k^{\text{time}} = \exp(-\delta_k/\tau_{\text{GAE}})$, reward/constraint GAE, critic targets, and $\hat{A}_k^L$
- 20: **for** $p = 1, \dots, K_{\text{PPO}}$ **do**
- 21: **for** each shuffled minibatch $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{R}$ **do**
- 22: Re-evaluate masked stage probabilities and form PPO ratios
- 23: Update actor and critic parameters
- 24: **end for**
- 25: **end for**
- 26: **if** $\mathcal{E}_{\text{comp}} \neq \emptyset$ **then**
- 27: Estimate $\hat{J}_{C_j}$ and update λ_j
- 28: **end if**
- 29: **end while**

9.1 Runtime Architecture and Environment Contract

DTNSim owns the simulation clock, source generation and source queues, source–relay transmission and propagation, contact plan, bundle movement, and physical event calendar. A relay-control adapter exposes the relay-side state, constructs the causal observation and stage-specific masks, applies relay actions, and returns decision-to-decision SMDP transitions. The training driver updates the actor, critic parameters, and Lagrange multipliers without directly modifying simulator state.

Each decision epoch begins after all physical events at time t_k have been processed. If relay capacity is exceeded, the controller repeatedly selects same-time rejection or eviction actions $\mathbf{d}_k = (d_{k,0}, \dots, d_{k,J_k-1})$ until the overflow is resolved, recomputing the observation and mask after each decision. Scheduling is then reconsidered on the resulting state. The complete relay action is therefore $a_k = (\mathbf{d}_k, q_k)$, with no physical time elapsing between its internal drop and scheduling stages.

After the compound action is completed, DTNSim advances to the next decision epoch. Following an elective

wait while a feasible transmission exists, the controller is awakened after at most 30 s or earlier if a physical event occurs. The interface returns the next observation, reward r_k , constraint-cost vector, holding time δ_k , termination status, and the stage information required to reconstruct the compound policy probability during PPO optimization.

At the terminal time T , physical events scheduled exactly at T are processed before termination. The simulator stops without draining the network state; unexpired backlog is unresolved rather than counted as loss. Learned and heuristic controllers use the same physical simulator, contact plan, traffic realization, and relay-control interface.

9.2 DTNSim Extensions and Validation

Shared relay storage: Moon and Mars bundles share the finite relay-buffer budget $B_{\max}$. Bundles already in relay–Earth service or propagation are excluded from buffer occupancy. DTNSim applies no independent overflow rule; all capacity violations are resolved through the controller-defined rejection/eviction sequence.

Contact-aware service: Relay–Earth transmission is non-preemptive and single-server. A bundle may enter service only if its complete serialization fits within the active contact and its Earth reception occurs strictly before absolute expiry, i.e., $t_k + L(b)/R_{RE} \leq t_{\text{end}}$ and $t_k + L(b)/R_{RE} + \tau_{RE} < t_b^{\text{exp}}$. Thus, service admission requires timely Earth reception, not merely transmission completion before contact closure. A buffered bundle that can no longer satisfy the delivery deadline remains stored until overflow removal or absolute expiry, but is masked from relay–Earth scheduling.

Delayed reception and event ordering: Relay transmission completion releases the server but does not update destination freshness; the corresponding update occurs only at Earth reception. Co-timed events follow the deterministic ordering in Subsection 5.1, after which all applicable same-time control stages are completed before physical time advances.

The frozen DTNSim integration was validated against the Python reference implementation before policy evaluation. Source-ingress equivalence was verified over 67 traces and 8,085 bundles with zero timing deviation, and 134 automated tests covered observations, masks, event handling, and metric computation. Additional regression tests verified shared-buffer accounting, action feasibility, strict Earth-before-expiry delivery, delayed reception, co-timed event ordering, and reproducibility under fixed traces and frozen checkpoints. After validation, the held-out evaluation campaign compared five controllers on 64 common traffic traces, yielding 320 evaluation episodes under identical simulator conditions.

Table 1. Frozen evaluation and PPO training configuration.

Parameter	Setting
Episode interval	$t_0 = 1800$ s, $T = 16200$ s; $H = 14400$ s
Traffic generation	Independent Poisson; mean interarrival: Moon 180 s, Mars 360 s
Bundle sizes	20/100/300 Mbit with probabilities 0.5/0.3/0.2
Bundle TTL	5400 s from original generation
Relay capacity $B_{\max}$	1.2×10^9 bits
Contact cycle T_c	1800 s
Contact windows	$M \rightarrow R : [0, 1200)$; $S \rightarrow R : [900, 1500)$; $R \rightarrow E : [1200, 1800)$
Link rates	2 Mbit/s on all links
Propagation delays	$\tau_{MR} = 1.3$ s; $\tau_{SR} = 600$ s; $\tau_{RE} = 0.12$ s
Reference bundle size	$L^{\text{ref}} = 20$ Mbit
Freshness objective	$w_M = w_S = 1$; $\phi_M(x) = \phi_S(x) = x$
Initial Earth AoI	$\Delta_M(t_0) = 1190.0$ s; $\Delta_S(t_0) = 1179.88$ s
Fairness rates	$\rho_M = 0.8441$; $\rho_S = 0.8364$
GAE time scale	$\tau_{\text{GAE}} = 900$ s
PPO clipping	$\epsilon_{\text{ppo}} = 0.2$
Actor learning rate	$10^{-4} \rightarrow 10^{-5}$ (linear decay)
Critic learning rate	$10^{-3} \rightarrow 10^{-4}$ (linear decay)
Entropy coefficient	$0.01 \rightarrow 0.001$ (linear decay)
PPO batching	16 episodes/update; 4 PPO epochs; 512 physical transitions/minibatch
Training duration	2048 episodes; random initialization
Dual update	$\eta_\lambda = 0.05$; $\lambda_0 = (0.1, 0.1, 0, 0)$
Reward/cost scales	$s_R = HT_c$; $(s_{\text{drop}}, s_{\text{exp}}, s_{\text{fair},M}, s_{\text{fair},S}) = (17, 1, H, H)$
Optimization safeguards	max. gradient norm 0.5; KL threshold 0.03
Constraint budgets	$(d_{\text{drop}}, d_{\text{exp}}, d_{\text{fair},M}, d_{\text{fair},S}) = (17, 1, 0, 0)$
Held-out evaluation	5 controllers $\times$ 64 common traffic traces (320 evaluation episodes)

10. Evaluation Setup

All policies are evaluated through the common DTNSim execution path of Section 9. They use identical traffic realizations, contact opportunities, relay capacity, expiry semantics, and physical feasibility rules, and differ only in relay-side action selection. Table 1 summarizes the frozen simulation, training, and evaluation configuration.

10.1 Scenario and Training Configuration

The experiments use the Moon–Mars–relay–Earth topology of Section 3. Source generation, source-side FIFO service, propagation, shared-buffer admission, relay–Earth transmission, and delayed Earth reception follow the system model and are not repeated. The same contact-plan freshness reference is used for all policies.

10.2 Compared Policies

We compare the proposed **Masked Lagrangian PPO** controller with four deterministic baselines. **FIFO** schedules the feasible bundle with the earliest relay arrival,

Table 2. Excess-AoI performance over the 64 held-out traces. Values are means in seconds; lower is better.

Policy	Aggregate ↓	Moon ↓	Mars ↓
Masked Lag. PPO	887.63	216.64	670.98
FIFO	1747.87	686.89	1060.97
LIFO	993.57	232.83	760.74
EDF	1692.38	806.15	886.23
Freshest-first	1009.56	232.82	776.74

LIFO the latest relay arrival, **EDF** the earliest absolute expiry, and **Freshest-first** the largest generation timestamp. During overflow, each baseline discards its least-preferred bundle under the corresponding ordering: FIFO discards the latest arrival, LIFO the earliest arrival, EDF the latest expiry, and Freshest-first the smallest generation timestamp. Remaining ties are resolved using the stable bundle identifier. All policies use the same candidate sets and physical feasibility rules.

10.3 Evaluation Protocol and Metrics

Each policy is evaluated on the same 64 held-out stochastic traffic traces, ensuring identical exogenous conditions across policy comparisons. Reported performance values are arithmetic means over these common traces. All training hyperparameters and evaluation rules were fixed before the held-out evaluation.

The primary performance metric is the time-average aggregate excess-age cost $\bar{G} \triangleq \frac{1}{H} \int_{t_0}^T G(t) dt$, where lower values indicate less excess staleness relative to the contact-plan reference. With unit source weights and linear penalties, this equals the time-average aggregate excess AoI used for policy comparison.

Secondary diagnostics include source-specific excess, drop and expiry counts, delivered traffic, relay–Earth contact utilization, cumulative useful freshness progress $\sum_{k=0}^{K_T-1} y_{i,k}$, terminal deficits $D_i(K_T)$, and episodic constraint returns. Relay–Earth contact utilization is defined as transmitted bits divided by the total available relay–Earth contact capacity. Constraint compliance is assessed against the budgets in Table 1.

11. Results and Discussion

We compare Masked Lagrangian PPO with FIFO, LIFO, EDF, and Freshest-first under the common evaluation protocol of Section 10. All values are computed over the same 64 held-out stochastic traffic traces.

11.1 Freshness Performance

Table 2 reports the time-average aggregate and source-specific excess AoI. Masked Lagrangian PPO achieves the lowest aggregate excess AoI among the evaluated policies.

Relative to FIFO and EDF, the controller reduces mean aggregate excess AoI by 49.2% and 47.6%, respectively.




Fig. 3. Relay operation under the PPO policy.

Relative to the LIFO and Freshest-first baselines, the reductions are 10.7% and 12.1%. The improvement is present for both Moon and Mars, showing that the aggregate result is not obtained by sacrificing one source. Because all policies use common traffic traces, performance can be compared trace by trace. Masked Lagrangian PPO has lower aggregate excess AoI than FIFO and EDF on all 64 traces and lower excess AoI than both LIFO and Freshest-first on 59 of the 64 traces. Thus, the mean advantage is broadly distributed across the evaluation set rather than driven by a small number of favorable traces.

11.2 Operational Performance

Table 3 summarizes relay operation under the heterogeneous bundle-size distribution. The bundle-based and bit-based delivery metrics are both reported because they need not rank policies identically when bundle sizes differ.

The proposed controller produces substantially fewer overflow drops and delivers the largest number of bundles, giving the highest bundle delivery ratio. However, it delivers fewer total bits and uses less relay–Earth contact capacity than the baselines. Thus, its freshness improvement is not obtained by transmitting more data or occupying more downlink capacity. Instead, the results indicate more selective use of the available transmission opportunities according to information freshness.

The distinction between bundle and bit delivery is important in this setting: Masked Lagrangian PPO achieves a bundle delivery ratio of 0.860 while its bit delivery ratio is 0.686. This difference reflects the heterogeneous bundle sizes and prevents bundle-count delivery alone from being interpreted as a throughput metric.

Figure 3 provides an event-level view of the relay be-

Table 3. Mean operational performance over 64 traces. Expiries count relay-side events used in the constraint.

Policy	Drops ↓	Exp. ↓	Delivered	Delivered Gbit	Bundle DR	Bit DR	U_{contact}
Masked Lag. PPO	10.02	0.05	103.72	8.086	0.860	0.686	0.845
FIFO	16.20	0.00	96.28	8.578	0.801	0.727	0.897
LIFO	17.88	0.20	95.42	8.286	0.794	0.703	0.865
EDF	16.91	0.00	95.61	8.577	0.796	0.727	0.896
Freshest-first	16.78	0.17	96.56	8.262	0.803	0.701	0.863

havior underlying the aggregate results in Table 3. Over the representative three-hour interval, Moon and Mars bundles arrive asynchronously with heterogeneous sizes of 20, 100, and 300 Mbit, while their transmission opportunities are restricted by the scheduled contacts. The relay consequently selects different buffered bundles for transmission and invokes drop decisions when incoming traffic creates buffer pressure. As seen in Fig. 3(d), the offered pre-eviction occupancy can exceed the $B_{\text{max}} = 1.2$ Gbit capacity, whereas the post-decision occupancy is maintained within the buffer limit. The timeline therefore illustrates how scheduling and overflow-management decisions interact with intermittent connectivity, heterogeneous bundle sizes, and finite relay storage.

11.3 Fairness and Constraint Compliance

Table 4 reports the empirical mean episodic constraint returns. The corresponding budgets are (17, 1, 0, 0).

Masked Lagrangian PPO satisfies all four budgets on the empirical mean. LIFO is the only selected baseline that is not mean-feasible, because its mean drop return 17.88 exceeds the budget of 17. All five policies have negative mean source-specific fairness returns, indicating that their mean delivered freshness progress exceeds the required episodic service level for both sources.

For additional finite-horizon context, the proposed controller achieves cumulative useful freshness progress of 14162.9 s for Moon and 13737.8 s for Mars, with terminal reflected deficits of 484.0 s and 237.2 s, respectively. These reflected deficits are diagnostic state variables rather than constraint returns; positive terminal values therefore do not imply fairness-constraint violation and do not establish or refute the long-run rate-stability condition of Lemma 6.1.

11.4 Overall Discussion

The results show a consistent trade-off between freshness and transmitted volume. Masked Lagrangian PPO achieves the lowest aggregate and per-source excess AoI while satisfying the empirical mean operational and fairness budgets. Its advantage is observed on every trace against FIFO and EDF and on 59 of 64 traces against LIFO and Freshest-first. At the same time, the controller transmits fewer bits and uses less relay–Earth contact capacity than the deterministic baselines.

Accordingly, the observed freshness improvement should be interpreted as an improvement in relay-side information selection rather than increased throughput. The results are descriptive statistics over the fixed held-out policy evaluation and do not constitute a claim of statistical significance or robustness to independent retraining.

12. Conclusion

This paper developed a goal-oriented relay-control framework for deep-space DTNs with stochastic heterogeneous traffic, finite relay storage, intermittent contacts, and delayed Earth reception. Joint scheduling and dropping are formulated as a constrained event-driven SMDP and solved using Masked Lagrangian PPO with feasibility-aware action masking and variable-cardinality set encoding. The framework is implemented and evaluated in DTNSim.

Across 64 common held-out traffic traces, the proposed controller achieves the lowest mean aggregate excess AoI among the evaluated policies: 887.63 s, compared with 993.57 s for LIFO, 1009.56 s for Freshest-first, 1692.38 s for EDF, and 1747.87 s for FIFO. It also satisfies the empirical mean drop, expiry, and source-specific fairness budgets. These results show that relay decisions based on destination-side freshness and system context can outperform fixed queue-ordering heuristics under the considered deep-space DTN scenario.

The present study assumes a known contact plan, fixed routing, a single controlled relay, and non-preemptive no-resume bundle transmission. Future work will consider component-wise ablation, contact-plan uncertainty, partial-transfer service, multi-relay control, and validation with operational DTN implementations.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the ERC Advanced Grant GOSPACE (No. 101122990), TÜBİTAK Grant 123C572 (GOREV), and the 1515 Frontier R&D Laboratories Support Program for the Türk Telekom 6G R&D Lab (Project No. 5249902). The views expressed are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council Executive Agency, neither of which can be held responsible for them. The authors used AI for language refinement and figure polishing. All AI-assisted material was verified by the authors for consistency with the system architecture.

Table 4. Mean episodic constraint returns over the 64 held-out traces. A policy is mean-feasible when all four empirical means satisfy their corresponding budgets.

Policy	$\hat{J}_{C_{\text{drop}}}$	$\hat{J}_{C_{\text{exp}}}$	$\hat{J}_{C_{\text{fair},M}}$	$\hat{J}_{C_{\text{fair},S}}$	Mean-feasible
Budget	17	1	0	0	—
Masked Lag. PPO	10.02	0.05	−2007.89	−1693.17	Yes
FIFO	16.20	0.00	−1764.52	−1138.05	Yes
LIFO	17.88	0.20	−2010.25	−1659.19	No
EDF	16.91	0.00	−1592.67	−1452.85	Yes
Freshest-first	16.78	0.17	−2010.25	−1658.08	Yes

References

- [1] V. G. Cerf et al., *Delay-tolerant networking architecture*, RFC 4838, IRTF, Apr. 2007.
- [2] S. Burleigh et al., *Bundle protocol version 7*, RFC 9171, IETF, Jan. 2022.
- [3] R. D. Yates et al., “Age of information: An introduction and survey,” *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 39, 2021.
- [4] R. D. Yates et al., “The age of information: Real-time status updating by multiple sources,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 65, 2019.
- [5] C. Caines et al., “Delay- and disruption-tolerant networking: An alternative solution for future satellite networking applications,” *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 99, 2011.
- [6] G. Araniti et al., “Contact graph routing in DTN space networks: Overview, enhancements and performance,” *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 53, 2015.
- [7] J. A. Fraire et al., “Routing in the space internet: A contact graph routing tutorial,” *J. Netw. Comput. Appl.*, 2021.
- [8] P. G. Madoery et al., “Routing heterogeneous traffic in delay-tolerant satellite networks,” *IEEE J. Radio Freq. Identif.*, vol. 7, 2023.
- [9] T. Alhajj et al., *Improved contact graph routing in delay tolerant networks with capacity and buffer constraints*, 2024.
- [10] T. Le, “A unified utility-based framework for joint scheduling and buffer management in delay tolerant networks,” *Comput. Commun.*, vol. 249, 2026.
- [11] X. Xie et al., “Scheduling for minimizing the age of information in multisensor multiserver industrial internet of things systems,” *IEEE Trans. Ind. Informat.*, vol. 20, 2024.
- [12] V. Tripathi et al., “Fresh-CSMA: A distributed protocol for minimizing age of information,” *J. Commun. Netw.*, vol. 25, 2023.
- [13] N. Jones et al., “Achieving AoI fairness in spatially distributed wireless networks: From theory to implementation,” in *WiOpt*, IEEE, 2024.
- [14] Y. Zhu et al., “Fairness-aware age-of-information minimization in WPT-assisted short-packet data collection for mURLLC,” *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 25, 2026.
- [15] A. Li et al., “Toward goal-oriented semantic communications: New metrics, framework, and open challenges,” *IEEE Wireless Commun.*, 2024.
- [16] A. Li et al., “Goal-oriented tensor: Beyond age of information toward semantics-empowered goal-oriented communications,” *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, 2024.
- [17] Y. Lyu et al., “Dynamic routing for integrated satellite-terrestrial networks: A constrained multi-agent reinforcement learning approach,” *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 42, 2024.
- [18] L. Yang et al., “Optimizing deep-space DTN congestion control via deep reinforcement learning,” *Comput. Netw.*, vol. 255, 2024.
- [19] S. Huang et al., “A closer look at invalid action masking in policy gradient algorithms,” in *FLAIRS*, vol. 35, 2022.
- [20] J. Achiam et al., “Constrained policy optimization,” in *ICML*, vol. 70, 2017.
- [21] Z. Sun et al., “Constrained reinforcement learning under model mismatch,” in *ICML*, vol. 235, 2024.
- [22] R. S. Sutton et al., “Between MDPs and semi-MDPs: A framework for temporal abstraction in reinforcement learning,” *Artif. Intell.*, 1999.
- [23] J. Schulman et al., *Proximal policy optimization algorithms*, 2017.
- [24] J. Schulman et al., “High-dimensional continuous control using generalized advantage estimation,” in *ICLR*, San Juan, Puerto Rico, 2016.
- [25] M. S. Net, *DtnSim: A Python-based simulator for delay tolerant networking*, 2019.