

Dynamic Portfolio Optimization with Real Datasets Using Quantum Processors and Quantum-Inspired Tensor Networks

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2007.00017-dynamic-portfolio-optimization-real-datasets-quantum
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.00017
Category	app
Triaged	2026-06-07 by port_until_julien_parallel
Bootstrapped	2026-06-07

Contents

1	Source	3
1.1	Domain classification	3
1.2	Expert persona for Julien	3
1.3	Related prior work (brief bibliography)	3
1.4	Difficulty estimate	4
2	Extraction	5

2.1	What the paper does (one paragraph)	5
2.2	Quantum hardware used	5
2.3	Computational primitive	6
2.4	Resource fingerprint	6
2.5	Assumptions and results	8
2.6	Portability flags	9
2.7	Caveats	10
3	Portability matrix	11

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

finance (primary). Secondary: **optimisation**. The paper is squarely a dynamic portfolio optimisation study (Markowitz mean-variance over a trading horizon, with transaction costs and the 10 – 5 – 40 rule discussed as extensions), but its computational core is a Quadratic Unconstrained Binary Optimisation (QUBO) / Ising spin-glass problem, so the optimisation lens matters for anyone reading the hardware mapping rather than the financial framing.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantitative-finance-literate quantum engineer who is comfortable across several backends at once, rather than a single-platform specialist. They should read the QUBO encoding fluently (binary expansion of asset weights, N_q bits per weight, $N_{tot} = N \times N_t \times N_q$ qubit variables) and have calibrated intuition for what each platform’s stated size really means: D-Wave 2000Q hybrid annealing with chimera-embedding overhead (native limit ≈ 65 fully-connected qubits), NISQ VQE on IBM-Q (15-qubit system, a 12-qubit strongly-entangling ansatz of 82 CNOTs and 24 single-qubit y -rotations, built in PennyLane), and a Matrix Product State imaginary-time optimiser. Anti-hype discipline is essential here: the headline “1272 fully-connected qubits” is a classical tensor-network simulation on a laptop, not quantum hardware, and Julien must keep the genuine on-hardware fingerprints (D-Wave, IBM-Q) cleanly separated from the quantum-inspired classical runs.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Rosenberg et al., “Solving the Optimal Trading Trajectory Problem Using a Quantum Annealer,” *IEEE J. Sel. Top. Signal Process.* 10, 1053 (2016). DOI [10.1109/JSTSP.2016.2574703](https://doi.org/10.1109/JSTSP.2016.2574703). The direct D-Wave predecessor for the same dynamic trading-trajectory problem (the paper’s Ref. [11]); the explicit 24-qubit point of comparison.
- Mugel, Kuchkovsky, Sánchez, et al., peer-reviewed version of record of this same paper: *Phys. Rev. Research* 4, 013006 (2022). DOI [10.1103/PhysRevResearch.4.013006](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevResearch.4.013006). Julien should extract from this published version, not only the arXiv preprint.
- Egger et al., “Quantum computing for finance: state of the art and future prospects,” [arXiv:2006.14510](https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.14510) (2020). The IBM-side finance landscape review, contemporaneous and cross-vendor.
- Buonaiuto et al., “Best practices for portfolio optimization by quantum computing, experimented on real quantum devices,” *Sci. Rep.* 13, 19434 (2023). DOI [10.1038/s41598-023-45392-w](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-45392-w). Same application via VQE on real IBM devices, with ansatz and optimiser hyperparameter sweeps; a more recent on-hardware fingerprint to compare against.
- “Quantum Portfolio Optimization: An Extensive Benchmark,” [arXiv:2509.17876](https://arxiv.org/abs/2509.17876) (2025). A broad multi-method, multi-vendor benchmark of the same application; useful for placing this paper’s Sharpe-ratio and run-time claims in current context.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

medium. The paper is freely available (arXiv preprint plus full LaTeX source already in `paper-source/`), is 13 pages, peer-reviewed (PRR), and describes its methods fully in the body, so there is no paywall or supplementary-material dependency to chase. Data and code are “available on request” only, but the hardware specifics Julien needs are all in the text and tables. What pushes this above **low** is breadth, not depth: Julien must extract distinct fingerprints for four solver families (D-Wave hybrid annealing, IBM-Q VQE, IBM-Q VQE-Constrained, and the MPS tensor-network solver) and carefully separate genuine quantum-hardware runs from the quantum-inspired classical simulation. No exotic primitives are involved.

Cross-reference note for curation: the canonical `vendor-app/edges.json` already carries `dwave`, `ibm`, and `xanadu` (PennyLane) vendors plus `finance` and `optimization` app groups, so the major backends here map cleanly. Multiverse Computing, the authors’ affiliation and the origin of the tensor-network solver, is not currently a vendor in the graph; flagging in case the TN result warrants a vendor entry downstream.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

The paper tackles dynamic portfolio optimisation: choosing how to spread a fixed budget across 52 assets, rebalanced month by month over an 8-year price history, so as to maximise return for a given level of risk while paying transaction costs. It writes this Markowitz-style problem as a discrete optimisation (a QUBO / Ising spin-glass) and then runs the same problem through several solvers to compare them: two classical baselines (the Gekko solver and a brute-force exhaustive search), D-Wave hybrid quantum annealing, a Variational Quantum Eigensolver (VQE) on IBM-Q plus a new “VQE-Constrained” variant, and a classical, quantum-inspired tensor-network (Matrix Product State) optimiser. To fit small quantum hardware, assets are first clustered from 52 down to roughly 6 to 8 effective assets. The authors compare Sharpe ratios, profits, and run-times across solvers, reporting calculations up to 1272 binary variables for the two largest-capacity methods (D-Wave hybrid and the tensor network).

2.2 Quantum hardware used

This paper spans more than one platform. Two are genuine quantum hardware (D-Wave, IBM-Q); the headline-grabbing tensor-network solver is a classical laptop run and is flagged as such throughout.

Platform 1: D-Wave (quantum annealing).

- **Vendor / machine:** D-Wave / D-Wave 2000Q processor, accessed through the D-Wave Hybrid solver. (Sec. III.A, line 324.)
- **Qubit count:** 2048 physical qubits available on the chip. After minor-embedding, the device supports problems of “up to 65 fully-connected qubits” natively; larger problems are handled only by the hybrid solver, which classically decomposes the problem into pieces solved on the QPU and recombines them. (Sec. III.A.)
- **Connectivity:** Chimera graph (sparse, fixed-degree). Full all-to-all coupling is achieved only via embedding, which is what caps the native fully connected size at ≈ 65 . (Sec. III.A.)
- **Gate set:** None. This is an analog annealer; the user programs Ising couplings J_{ij} and local fields, not a gate circuit.
- **Notable features leveraged:** Quantum-annealing tunnelling out of local minima; the proprietary D-Wave Hybrid classical-quantum decomposition to reach problem sizes far beyond the bare QPU. The split of work between QPU and classical pre/post-processing is not reported.

Platform 2: IBM-Q (VQE and VQE-Constrained).

- **Vendor / machine:** IBM-Q superconducting processor. The specific backend is not named in the paper; it is described only as a 15-qubit system. (Fig. 2 caption, Sec. III.B.) A 15-qubit IBM-Q device of that era (2020) was `ibmq_16_melbourne`, but the paper does not state this, so it is left as an inference, not a fingerprint.
- **Qubit count:** 15 available, 12 used in the ansatz. Initial state $|0\rangle^{\otimes 12}$. (Fig. 2 caption.)

- **Connectivity:** Not reported. The substrate is fixed-coupling superconducting transmons; the paper does not state the coupling map or whether SWAP routing was required for the entangling layers.
- **Gate set:** Circuit expressed as single-qubit y -rotations plus CNOTs: 82 CNOTs and 24 variational one-qubit R_y rotations, arranged as strongly-entangling layers after the circuit-centric classifier design of Schuld et al. Built with Xanadu’s PennyLane and run on IBM’s backend. (Sec. III.B, line 330.)
- **Notable features leveraged:** Strongly-entangling CNOT layers; classical outer optimisation of the rotation angles. VQE-Constrained additionally samples the best 10 low-energy states per rebalancing step and recombines them classically. No mid-circuit measurement or dynamic circuits are used.

Not quantum hardware: Tensor Network (MPS) solver.

The tensor-network solver is a classical, quantum-inspired algorithm: an imaginary-time-evolution optimisation over a Matrix Product State, run on a MacBook Pro in Matlab (Sec. IV, line 430). Its “1272 qubits” are tensor indices in a classical simulation, not physical qubits. Multiverse Computing’s own work; included here only to keep it cleanly separated from the on-hardware runs.

2.3 Computational primitive

Multi-primitive paper; the single common task is finding the ground state of a QUBO / Ising Hamiltonian. The genuine quantum-hardware primitives are:

- **Quantum annealing** (analog adiabatic optimisation) on D-Wave 2000Q, wrapped in D-Wave Hybrid.
- **VQE** (variational quantum eigensolver) on IBM-Q, plus the authors’ **VQE-Constrained** low-energy-subspace variant.

The tensor-network MPS optimiser is a **classical** quantum-inspired baseline, not a quantum-hardware primitive.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Values are given per platform because the solvers differ sharply. The headline “1272” is N_{tot} , the number of binary spin variables in the QUBO ($N_{tot} = N \times N_t \times N_q$), not a physical-qubit count.

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	Up to $N_{tot} = 1272$ binary spin variables (XXL set) for D-Wave Hybrid and TN; 12 for VQE/VQE-Constrained (clustered problem)	Table I (tab:sets); Fig. 2 caption

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (physical)	D-Wave 2000Q: 2048 (chimera), ≤ 65 fully-connected after embedding. IBM-Q: 15 available, 12 used. TN: none (classical laptop run)	Sec. III.A (line 324); Fig. 2 caption; Sec. IV (line 430)
Circuit depth	Not reported (VQE ansatz specified by gate counts, not depth)	Fig. 2 / Sec. III.B
2Q-gate count (total)	82 CNOTs per VQE ansatz circuit; not applicable to annealing or TN	Sec. III.B (line 330)
Measurement shots	Not reported	n/a
Classical loop iter.	VQE: energy “converges after a number of iterations” (count not reported). VQE-Constrained: best 10 low-energy states per rebalancing step, then exhaustive classical recombination	Sec. III.B (lines 328, 339)
Wall-clock runtime	Per dataset, Table IV (tab:time). XXL (1272 vars): D-Wave Hybrid 171 s; TN 116833 s on a MacBook Pro	Table IV; Sec. IV (line 430)

Single-qubit gate count (VQE): 24 variational R_y rotations (Sec. III.B). MPS bond dimension D used in the TN runs is not reported. Measurement-shot count for VQE energy estimation is not reported.

Dataset specifics (Table I, tab:sets). N = assets, N_t = monthly rebalancing steps, N_q = bits per weight, $N_{tot} = N \times N_t \times N_q$, K = total investment, K' = per-asset cap. Risk aversion $\gamma = 1$ and transaction-cost coefficient $\lambda = 1$ throughout.

Param	XS	S	M	L	XL	XXL
N	3	4	4	8	8	8
N_t	2	5	7	17	29	53
N_q	1	1	1	2	2	3
N_{tot}	6	20	28	272	464	1272
$2^{N_{tot}}$	64	$O(10^6)$	$O(10^8)$	$O(10^{81})$	$O(10^{139})$	$O(10^{382})$
K	2	3	3	5	10	15
K'	1	1	1	3	3	7

Run-times in seconds (Table IV, tab:time). Blank where the dataset exceeds a solver’s capability.

Method	XS	S	M	L	XL	XXL
VQE	278	-	-	-	-	-
Exhaustive	0.005	34	-	-	-	-
VQE Constrained	123	412	490	-	-	-
Gekko	24	27	21	221	261	-
D-Wave Hybrid	8	39	19	52	74	171
Tensor Networks	0.838	51	120	26649	82698	116833

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claim.** The same dynamic-portfolio QUBO, on real 8-year / 52-asset data, can be solved by quantum annealing, VQE, and a classical tensor network; D-Wave Hybrid and the tensor network reach the largest sizes (1272 binary variables) without hitting their limit, “for demonstrative purposes”. No single solver is best on every figure of merit (Sharpe ratio, profit, time, cost). (Abstract; Secs. IV and VI.)
- **Encoding.** The objective minimised is the QUBO Hamiltonian (Eq. eq:returnsfinal):

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{t=t_i}^{t_f} \left[-\mu_t^T \omega_t + \frac{\gamma}{2} \omega_t^T \Sigma_t \omega_t + \lambda (\Delta \omega_t)^2 + \rho (u^T \omega_t - 1)^2 \right]$$

with binary encoding (Eq. eq:encoding) $\omega_{n,t} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{q=0}^{N_q-1} 2^q x_{n,t,q}$, $x_{n,t,q} \in \{0, 1\}$, giving $\mathcal{H} = x^T Q x$ over N_{tot} bits, equivalent to the Ising spin glass $\mathcal{H} = \sum_{i,j} J_{ij} s_i s_j$ (NP-hard in general, Barahona 1982).

- **Performance highlights (Tables II, III, IV).** XXL (1272 vars): D-Wave Hybrid 171 s, profit 67.6%, Sharpe 12.16; TN 116833 s, profit 39.7%, Sharpe 15.83. So annealing wins on speed and profit at XXL while the tensor network wins on Sharpe ratio. Gekko is competitive but “hits a memory wall around 500 qubits”. VQE alone reached only the XS set (Sharpe 3.59, profit 2.4%, 278 s); VQE-Constrained reached up to M.
- **Error bars / noise.** None reported. No statistical error bars, no shot-noise budget, no device-calibration or coherence figures are given for the VQE runs; run-times are described as “an estimation”. The annealer is described as “non-coherent qubits”. (Sec. III.A; Sec. IV intro, line 410.)
- **Classical baseline.** Gekko and an exhaustive brute-force search are the built-in baselines. Gekko is often as good as or better than the quantum and quantum-inspired solvers on small-to-mid sets, until its memory limit. The explicit historical comparison point is Rosenberg et al. 2016 on D-Wave (up to 24 fully-connected qubits, Table IV there; up to 72 qubits cited in the conclusion), versus this paper’s 1272 variables. (Sec. IV, line 424; Sec. VI.)

2.6 Portability flags

- **D-Wave 1272-variable result is not a single-QPU result.** The bare D-Wave 2000Q QPU handles only ≈ 65 fully-connected variables after chimera embedding; everything above that depends on D-Wave’s proprietary hybrid classical-quantum decomposition. Any portability claim about “1272 qubits on D-Wave” must carry this caveat.
- **Requires QUBO / Ising mapping native to an annealer.** The annealing path consumes the problem as Ising couplings J_{ij} ; there is no gate circuit to port. Moving it to gate-model hardware means re-expressing it as QAOA or VQE.
- **Embedding overhead for all-to-all coupling.** The QUBO is dense (fully connected in the worst case); on sparse-connectivity hardware (chimera, and equally any fixed-coupling superconducting transmon device) this needs minor-embedding or SWAP routing, with chain/qubit overhead that grows with problem size.
- **VQE only fits after aggressive dimensional reduction.** The raw problem does not fit IBM-Q; assets are clustered 52 to roughly 6 to 8 before a 12-qubit ansatz can run. The 82-CNOT strongly-entangling ansatz is deep for a NISQ device, and VQE alone reached only the smallest dataset.
- **VQE ansatz uses a hardware-agnostic gate set (Ry + CNOT)** so the circuit itself is portable to any gate-model backend, but the strongly-entangling CNOT pattern may require SWAP routing on limited-connectivity devices; the paper does not state the required connectivity.
- **Realistic constraints break the QUBO form.** The absolute-value transaction cost is non-polynomial and is approximated by a parabola to stay QUBO-friendly (Eq. `trons`). Exact linear costs need $N \times N_t$ ancillary qubits; the 10-5-40 rule makes the problem a HUBO (quartic and cubic terms) plus slack variables, needing higher-order solvers or extra ancilla/penalty overhead. This matters for any portability analysis that assumes a clean QUBO.
- **The tensor-network headline is classical.** The 1272-“qubit” TN run is a laptop Matlab simulation, not quantum hardware, and is not a portability target for any quantum backend. Treat it as a classical baseline.
- **No exotic primitives.** No mid-circuit measurement, no dynamic circuits, no Rydberg blockade, no native two-qubit rotation gate

beyond CNOT. The portability surface is the QUBO mapping plus the standard VQE ansatz, not a device-specific analog primitive.

2.7 Caveats

- **Access.** Full access. The source bundle is the Physical Review Research version-of-record TeX (`PortfolioPaperPRRv2.tex`); the arXiv preprint (2007.00017) matches. No paywall and no supplementary-material dependency: the hardware details are all in the body and Tables I to V. No section was unreachable.
- **Data and code.** “Available from the corresponding author on a reasonable request” only; not deposited. Numerical inputs (μ_t, Σ_t , the realised trajectories of Table V) are not reproducible from the paper alone.
- **Not reported by the authors (recorded as “not reported”, not inferred):** the specific IBM-Q backend name; VQE circuit depth; VQE measurement-shot count; VQE classical-optimiser iteration count and the optimiser used; the MPS bond dimension D ; the QPU-versus-classical work split inside D-Wave Hybrid; and any statistical error bars on Sharpe ratios, profits, or the “estimated” run-times.
- **Mixed hardware in one table.** Tables II to IV place genuine quantum-hardware runs (D-Wave, IBM-Q VQE) alongside classical runs (Gekko, exhaustive, TN) in the same columns. The run-times in particular are not like-for-like (different machines, the TN figure is a single laptop), so cross-method timing comparisons should be read with care.

3 Portability matrix