

Portfolio Optimization of 60 Stocks Using Classical and Quantum Algorithms

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2008.08669-portfolio-optimization-60-stocks-classical-quantum
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.08669
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	5
2.4	Resource fingerprint	6
2.5	Assumptions and results	7
2.6	Portability flags	8
2.7	Caveats	8
3	Portability matrix	9

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

finance (primary). Secondary: optimisation. The application is Markowitz-style buy-and-hold portfolio selection over a universe of 60 U.S. listed equities; the computational primitive is a binary asset-selection QUBO solved by quantum annealing and by several classical/hybrid samplers, so the optimisation framing matters for any cross-vendor comparison.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantitative-finance practitioner who has personally cast portfolio selection as a QUBO and run it on D-Wave hardware. They should have calibrated intuition about minor-embedding overhead on the Chimera [16, 16, 8] topology, the trade-off between chain strength and chain breaks, annealing-time schedules in the [20, 200] μs range, and how the dynamic range of QUBO coefficients (large linear return terms versus shrinking quadratic covariance terms) interacts with D-Wave's H -range / J -range limits and on-device auto-scaling. Crucially, they must be able to separate genuine QPU runs (DW_2000Q_6) from the classical Ocean samplers also benchmarked here (simulated annealing, Tabu MST2, the Leap hybrid solver) and from the authors' bespoke scores, the Chicago Quantum Net Score $CQNS(R_w, \alpha) = \text{Var}(R_w) - \mathbb{E}[R_w]^{2+\alpha}$ and the Chicago Quantum Ratio.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- arXiv:2007.01430: Chicago Quantum's immediate predecessor study on 40 stocks; same formulation and hardware, smaller universe. The direct portability baseline.
- arXiv:2007.00017: Mugel et al., *Dynamic Portfolio Optimization with Real Datasets Using Quantum Processors and Quantum-Inspired Tensor Networks* (sibling dossier in this tree; same application, D-Wave plus tensor-network methods).
- arXiv:2007.03005: Grant, Humble & Stump, *Benchmarking Quantum Annealing Controls with Portfolio Optimization* (sibling dossier; same primitive, focused on annealing-control parameters). Cited by this paper.
- arXiv:1810.08584: Venturelli & Kondratyev, *Reverse Quantum Annealing Approach to Portfolio Optimization Problems* (same primitive, reverse-anneal variant on D-Wave). Cited by this paper.
- arXiv:1807.03890: Orús, Mugel & Lizaso, *Quantum computing for finance: overview and prospects*, *Reviews in Physics* 4 (2019). Context survey. Cited by this paper.
- arXiv:2201.02773: Herman et al., *A Survey of Quantum Computing for Finance* (later, broader survey situating annealing-based portfolio work against gate-model approaches).

1.4 Difficulty estimate

medium. The paper is fully accessible: it is a 19-page arXiv preprint and the folder already contains the complete LaTeX source (`paper-source/CQ60.tex`) and all figures, so there is no paywall, no fetch risk, and no missing SI. The hardware specifics Julien needs are stated explicitly in prose (DW_2000Q_6 lower-noise system, 2048 qubits, [16, 16, 8] Chimera, chain-strength range [0.2, 2.0], annealing times [20, 200] μs , 1,300 to 1,700 physical qubits used to embed 60 logical variables). The extraction work is medium rather than low because the genuine QPU fingerprint is interleaved with several classical and hybrid Ocean samplers and with the authors' non-standard scoring, so Julien must read carefully to attribute each result to the right solver rather than treating "D-Wave" as a single method.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

The authors (Chicago Quantum) select buy-and-hold equity portfolios from a universe of 60 U.S. listed liquid stocks. They cast asset selection as a binary optimisation: each stock is in or out of the portfolio, and the objective is a bespoke score, the Chicago Quantum Net Score $CQNS(R_w, \alpha) = \text{Var}(R_w) - \mathbb{E}[R_w]^{2+\alpha}$ (with the related Chicago Quantum Ratio), which trades expected return against variance and covariance with the market. The score is encoded as a $60 \times 60 \times 60$ “bigmatrix” (negative expected returns on linear terms, variance/covariance on quadratic terms), shifted by a graduated affine penalty so that the desired portfolio size sits at the energy minimum, then converted to a QUBO. Each QUBO is solved both by the D-Wave 2000Q quantum annealer and by five classical or hybrid samplers (a fat-tailed Monte Carlo sampler, a genetic algorithm, a custom and a D-Wave simulated annealer, the D-Wave Tabu sampler, and the D-Wave hybrid solver). The finding is that classical and quantum-annealing methods both recover attractive, efficient-frontier portfolios; this extends the authors’ prior 40-stock study.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** D-Wave Systems / DW_2000Q_6, the D-Wave 2000Q lower-noise system (quantum annealer, not gate-model).
- **Qubit count:** 2,048 physical qubits available; between 1,300 and 1,700 physical qubits used to embed the 60-variable problem (§1, §Scale-Up Potential).
- **Connectivity:** [16, 16, 8] Chimera topology (sparse, 8-qubit unit cells). The 60-variable covariance QUBO is dense (effectively all-to-all in the logical graph), so it must be minor-embedded into chains across the sparse hardware graph (§D-Wave Systems Quantum Annealer; Fig. “dwave topology”).
- **Gate set:** None. There is no circuit/gate model. The user programs an Ising Hamiltonian via per-qubit linear biases (h_i) and pairwise couplers (J_{ij}). Accepted ranges: H -range $[-2, 2]$ on linear terms and J -range $[-0.9, 0.9]$ on quadratic terms for Ising formulations; the authors pre-scale their matrix to $[-0.9, 0.9]$ before submission and D-Wave applies further auto-scaling (§D-Wave Systems Quantum Annealer).
- **Notable features leveraged:** minor-embedding with tunable chain strength (range $[0.2, 2.0]$, default 1.0; chain strengths > 2.0 gave no valid results); programmable annealing time ($[20, 200] \mu s$, default $20 \mu s$); chain-break handling by majority vote at readout; reduce-intersample-correlation and post-processing options; the D-Wave Inspector for embedding diagnostics; reliance on the “lower-noise” calibration of the DW_2000Q_6 system.

2.3 Computational primitive

Analog evolution: **quantum annealing** of a programmable Ising/QUBO problem. This is not VQE/QAOA/QPE/Trotterisation; there is no parametrised circuit and no classical-quantum variational loop on the QPU. The QPU is a heuristic low-energy sampler invoked

once per problem size, with classical accumulation of valid samples across runs.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	60 binary asset-selection variables (one per stock); each QUBO targets N of 60	§1 (abstract), §D-Wave Systems Quantum Annealer
Qubits (physical)	1,300 to 1,700 of 2,048 used to embed 60 variables	§Scale-Up Potential
Circuit depth	n/a (analog annealer, no circuit model). Anneal time used: $[20, 200] \mu s$ (default $20 \mu s$; hardware max $2,000 \mu s$, not exercised)	§D-Wave Systems Quantum Annealer
2Q-gate count (total)	n/a (analog annealer; couplings, not gates). Coupler/chain count not reported numerically	§D-Wave Systems Quantum Annealer
Measurement shots	200 to 500 samples (“reads”) per QPU run	§1 (Introduction)
Classical loop iter.	No variational loop. Runs swept across portfolio sizes (typically $[2, 59]$); valid QPU portfolios accumulated over many runs: 116 (calibration, 30-asset QUBO) building to a stated total of 3,725, sizes $[2, 47]$	§D-Wave Systems Quantum Annealer

Wall-clock runtime	$\sim 0.13\text{ s}$ ($\sim 130,000\ \mu\text{s}$) per QPU run; 21 s total accumulated QPU access time (primary account, vs a 60 s budget) across all runs	§1 (Introduction), §Comparative Analysis
--------------------	--	--

Notes on the QPU run counts: the paper quotes several accumulation snapshots (116 calibration portfolios, then 414, then 2,588, then a final total of 3,725 valid portfolios), reflecting different stages of the experiment rather than four independent experiments. The largest valid portfolio the QPU returned was 47 assets; sizes [48, 59] never yielded valid matches.

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claim.** Six methods, including the D-Wave annealer, found the “ideal” (lowest-CQNS) portfolio (§Comparative Analysis). The QPU, with relatively few samples ($< 1,000$), produces portfolios on or ahead of the efficient frontier found by random sampling: 414 quantum portfolios compared favourably against 40,000 Monte Carlo samples and outperformed at higher risk levels (§Quality of Solutions Found). For the top-10 portfolios the paper quotes CQNS values of “ -0.0146 vs. -0.0437 ” comparing quantum-selected against the Monte Carlo population.
- **Error bars / noise assumptions.** No statistical error bars are reported. Hardware error is handled operationally: chain breaks resolved by majority vote; pre-scaling to $[-0.9, 0.9]$ to keep D-Wave’s auto-scaling from distorting the relative weight of linear vs quadratic terms; reliance on the lower-noise DW_2000Q_6 calibration. The dominant reported failure mode is structural, not stochastic: at large portfolio sizes the quadratic (covariance) coefficients shrink to $[0.0037, 0.0045]$ at 59 assets while linear terms remain $[-1, 0.2]$, so covariance becomes too small for the device to resolve. This is the reason the QPU cannot reach valid portfolios above 47 assets.
- **Comparison to classical baseline.** All five classical/hybrid methods run on a 2013 iMac (3.4 GHz quad-core Intel Core i5, 16 GB DDR3-1600, macOS Catalina, Python 3.7.7) and each solves the 60-asset problem in under a minute: fat-tailed Monte Carlo found the best/2nd-best in 24 s over 221,660 samples; genetic algorithm 7 s (456 random seeds) or 48 s (2,588 D-Wave-seeded), 40 generations, 3:2 children-to-mutations; custom simulated annealer 15 s; D-Wave Ocean `neal` simulated annealer 11 s (β -range $[0.000001, 9]$, 200 samples/size, 200 sweeps, geometric schedule); D-Wave Tabu MST2 sampler 267 s (200 reads/QUBO, `scale_factor` 1, $20\ \mu\text{s}$ max, tenure 50) and produced the worst portfolios (off by $10\times$ or more); the D-Wave hybrid (Leap) solver returned no size-valid portfolios. The 21 s of accumulated QPU access is not a like-for-like wall-clock comparison against the single-shot classical timings; it is summed over the whole experiment campaign.
- **Market assumptions.** Risk-free rate 1%; market up 18.60% over the prior year; β range $[0.417, 2.12]$; S&P 500 variance 0.00045105; the 60-asset equally-weighted portfolio has CAPM expected return 22.09%, standard deviation 2.48%, Sharpe ratio 8.92 (§Market Context).

2.6 Portability flags

- **Requires a quantum annealer / Ising-QUBO sampler.** The primitive is analog annealing of an Ising Hamiltonian, with no gate-model circuit. Porting to gate-based hardware (IBM, Quantinuum, IonQ, neutral-atom digital) requires a full reformulation as QAOA or VQE, which is a different algorithm with its own depth/iteration costs, not a recompilation.
- **Dense, effectively all-to-all logical coupling at 60 variables.** The covariance matrix couples every stock to every other, so the logical interaction graph is dense. On the sparse [16, 16, 8] Chimera graph this forces heavy minor-embedding (1,300–1,700 physical qubits for 60 logical), and on gate-model lattices it would force deep SWAP networks or a fully connected trapped-ion register.
- **Depends on minor-embedding mechanics.** Chain-strength tuning ($[0.2, 2.0]$) and chain-break majority-vote are intrinsic to the embedded annealing workflow and have no direct equivalent on one-qubit-per-variable hardware.
- **Depends on D-Wave’s analog coefficient ranges and auto-scaling.** The workflow is built around H -range $[-2, 2]$, J -range $[-0.9, 0.9]$, manual pre-scaling to $[-0.9, 0.9]$, and the device’s internal auto-scaling. The dynamic-range failure (vanishing quadratic vs dominant linear terms at large portfolios) is specific to mapping continuous QUBO coefficients onto analog bias/coupler precision; a digital encoding would expose a different (qubit/depth) cost instead.
- **Analog annealing-time schedule, not circuit depth.** Performance is tuned via anneal time ($[20, 200] \mu s$) and schedule, not via gate count or depth, so the resource profile does not translate into the gate-model metrics Brillant’s portability analysis will use.
- **Heuristic sampler, not an exact solver.** Results are accumulated over many reads/runs; there is no certificate that a returned portfolio is the true optimum. Any portability claim must compare against the strong classical baselines that here matched or beat the QPU in seconds on commodity hardware.

2.7 Caveats

- The paper is fully accessible: a 19-page arXiv preprint (arXiv:2008.08669) with the complete LaTeX source (`paper-source/CQ60.tex`) and all figures present in the dossier. No paywall, no missing SI, no unreachable sections.
- Several resource numbers genuinely do not exist for this hardware class (circuit depth, 2Q-gate count) because the device is an analog annealer; these are marked “n/a” rather than “not reported” to avoid implying the authors omitted a measurable quantity.
- The QPU valid-portfolio counts (116 / 414 / 2,588 / 3,725) are reported as running accumulation snapshots across the campaign, not as four separate experiments; the 21 s QPU figure is total accumulated access time, not a single-problem solve time, so it is not directly comparable to the per-method classical wall-clock timings.
- Some figures (the comparative method tables) are embedded as raster images (`Table60asset.png`, `MethodAnalysis60asset.png`, `Details60asset.png`); the numbers cited above are those stated in the prose of the TeX source. Per-asset ticker-level details in those image tables were not transcribed.

3 Portability matrix