

Quantum Financial Modeling on Noisy Intermediate-Scale Quantum Hardware: Random Walks using Approximate Quantum Counting

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2310.11394-quantum-financial-modeling-noisy-intermediate-scale
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.11394
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	3
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	5
2.5	Assumptions and results	7
2.6	Portability flags	7
2.7	Caveats	8
3	Portability matrix	9

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

finance (primary). The application target is asset-price modelling: simulating stock-index return distributions and tracking housing-market price dynamics. The secondary thread is quantum simulation, since the computational engine is a discrete-time quantum walk built from custom “approximate quantum counting” circuits, with mid-circuit measurement framed as a quantum Zeno effect. This maps cleanly onto the **finance** app group in `vendor-app/edges.json`.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantum-algorithms practitioner with a quantitative-finance footing: at home with quantum walks as price-process models and with the amplitude-estimation lineage of quantum finance, but equally able to read circuit diagrams and count 2-qubit entangling gates. Should carry calibrated NISQ intuition for trapped-ion execution (IonQ Aria-class 2-qubit fidelities around 99.9%, shot budgets, mid-circuit measurement) and should distinguish the paper’s bespoke primitives (arc counter, arc walk counter, random jump, cascading disjunction) from textbook binary quantum counting. Anti-hype discipline matters here: the persona must judge where a quantum walk is a genuine sampling primitive versus a qualitative market analogy.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Egger et al. (2020), “Quantum Computing for Finance: State of the Art and Future Prospects”, IEEE Trans. Quantum Eng. 1:1-24, arXiv:2006.14510. The field survey the authors position against (amplitude estimation, option pricing, risk).
- Stamatopoulos et al. (2020), “Option Pricing using Quantum Computers”, Quantum 4:291, arXiv:1905.02666, DOI 10.22331/q-2020-07-06-291. Same finance target on superconducting hardware, and the source of the gate-budget and noise figures the authors cite as motivation. Direct portability comparison.
- Qiang et al. (2016), “Efficient quantum walk on a quantum processor”, Nat. Commun. 7:11511, DOI 10.1038/ncomms11511. Same primitive (a quantum walk) run on a photonic processor; a cross-vendor baseline for the walk itself.
- Zhu et al. (2022), “Copula-based risk aggregation with trapped ion quantum computers”, arXiv:2206.11937. Same vendor family (trapped ion) on a finance distribution-modelling task.
- Iaconis, Johri and Zhu (2023), “Quantum state preparation of normal distributions using matrix product states”, arXiv:2303.01562. Adjacent distribution-loading primitive on the same hardware lineage, cited by the paper.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

medium. The source is open access (arXiv HTML plus the LaTeX source under `paper-source/`, CC BY 4.0), of moderate length, with no paywall and no reliance on separate SI material, so the material is fully in hand. What lifts it above **low** is the bespoke circuit family

(approximate counting, arc and arc-walk counters, random jump, cascading disjunction, plus mid-circuit measurement), which Julien must read carefully before mapping to a hardware fingerprint. The paper is exploratory rather than benchmark-driven: the gate-count and 2-qubit-gate framing is explicit, but the concrete QPU specifics (exact device, qubit count, shot counts) are scattered and lighter than a typical resource-table paper.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

The paper proposes NISQ-friendly circuits for the position-tracking step of a discrete-time quantum walk, and uses the walk as a model for asset-price dynamics. The headline contribution is a family of “approximate quantum counting” circuits, chiefly the *arc counter*, which encodes a count as single-qubit rotation angles (a rotation encoding) and so uses *no* 2-qubit entangling gates, in contrast to a binary positional counter whose adder circuits are saturated with Toffoli and CNOT gates. Variants add a Hadamard “quantum coin” (arc walk counter), weighted random target selection (random jump), and an OR-propagation step (cascading disjunction). The authors compare the resulting step distributions against heavy-tailed daily returns of the Dow Jones Industrial Average, and read mid-circuit measurement as a quantum Zeno effect, linking measurement frequency to housing-market volatility via Zillow data. The work is exploratory rather than benchmark-driven: most results are simulated, with a small trapped-ion QPU run used to contrast binary and arc counting.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IonQ (paper is authored at IonQ). The QPU is the 11-qubit trapped-ion device benchmarked by Wright et al. (2019), “Benchmarking an 11-qubit quantum computer” (deliberately an older machine).
- **Qubit count:** 11 trapped-ion qubits available on the QPU; the tabulated comparison uses a 6-qubit counting register (numbers 0 to 63). The exact number of the 11 qubits exercised in the QPU runs is not stated.
- **Connectivity:** Not stated in the paper. Substrate is trapped-ion ($^{171}\text{Yb}^+$ static linear chain), which is all-to-all within a chain via shared motional modes (vendor-notes / Ezratty cross-check, *not* the paper).
- **Gate set:** The *circuit designs* use H , X , $R_X(\theta)$, CNOT, Toffoli (CCX), controlled rotations, SWAP, and mid-circuit reset. The device’s *native* gate set is not reported in the paper (trapped-ion native set is arbitrary single-qubit rotations plus a native $R_{XX}(\theta)$ / Mølmer-Sørensen entangler, per the substrate note, *not* the paper).
- **Notable features leveraged:** Mid-circuit measurement and mid-circuit reset appear in the designs (Zeno-effect walks; cascading-disjunction ancilla reuse), but the paper explicitly runs these *in simulation only*, noting that mid-circuit measurement/reset support and accuracy are “not guaranteed today”. The headline arc-counter result deliberately leverages *no* entangling gate.

2.3 Computational primitive

Sampling, specifically a discrete-time quantum walk used as a sampling primitive (coin toss plus position increment, sampled over many shots to build a position distribution). This is **not** a variational algorithm: there is no classical optimiser, no parametrised ansatz being trained, and no amplitude estimation in the implemented circuits.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	6-qubit counting register (Tables 1–2); 8-qubit register in distribution figures; no QEC encoding	§“Preliminary Results...” (“simulations used 6-qubit counting registers... 0 to 63”); Fig. “Quantum walk results... 8-qubit register”; Fig. DJIA comparison (“8 qubits”)
Qubits (physical)	11 trapped-ion qubits available on the QPU (Wright 2019); number actually used not stated (≤ 11)	§“Preliminary Results...” (“run on a quantum computer with 11 trapped-ion qubits, described by [wright2019benchmarking]”)
Circuit depth	not reported (no explicit depth for the paper’s own QPU runs)	not reported
2Q-gate count (total)	Arc counter: 0 (single-qubit rotations only). Binary full adder: 2 Toffoli + 3 CNOT = at least 11 2Q gates; ~ 80 2Q gates to add two 8-bit numbers. Arc walk / random jump use controlled rotations (count not tabulated). No single total for the QPU experiment	§“Arc Counter Circuits” (“no 2-qubit entangling gates”); §“Quantum Counting...” + Fig. full-adder (“uses 2 Toffoli and 3 CNOT gates, which is at least 11 2-qubit gates”; “ ~ 80 2-qubit gates”)
Measurement shots	1000 shots per circuit for deterministic binary/arc circuits; random jump 30 shots \times 30 circuits (= 900 shots)	§“Preliminary Results...” (“1000 shots for a single circuit”; “30 shots on each of 30 randomly-generated circuits”); figure captions
Classical loop iter.	Not applicable (no classical optimisation loop). Walk “steps” run 0–10 in the tables and up to 20 for mid-measurement	Tables 1–2 (0–10 steps); §“Quantum Walks with Mid-Measurement” (20 steps)
Wall-clock runtime	not reported	not reported

For rows marked “not reported” the paper gives no number; “not applicable” marks quantities that do not exist for this (non-variational)

method.

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claim.** Rotation-encoded approximate counting (arc counter) tracks a walk’s position far more robustly under noise than a binary positional counter, because it removes 2-qubit entangling gates. On the 11-qubit QPU the binary counter is “useless after 2 steps”, quickly converging to a random value around 32 (the mean of a 6-bit register), whereas the arc counter QPU results stay close to the ideal monotonically increasing simulation (Tables 1–2; Fig. “Ideal and actual QPU results”). The arc-walk and random-jump step distributions are heavy-tailed, matching DJIA daily returns better than a best-fit normal; mid-measurement reduces the average distance travelled (20-step walk: 35.6 with no mid-measurement, 14.3 measuring every 7 steps, 5.7 measuring every step), read as a quantum Zeno effect.
- **Error bars / noise assumptions.** No explicit error bars on the paper’s own data; quantum results are averages over shots (and, for random jump, over sample circuits). Motivating fidelity figures are cited from other work, not measured here: Stamatopoulos et al. superconducting gates at 99.7% (1Q) and 97.8% (2Q), giving $0.997^{33} \times 0.978^{18} \approx 0.587$; IonQ Aria 2Q fidelity 99.9% quoted as a 2023 high-end. The Wright (2019) QPU is older and lower-fidelity; its specific fidelities/coherence are not restated in the paper.
- **Comparison to classical baseline.** The authors are explicit that the arc-counter design offers “no physical quantum advantage” and is easily classically simulable (no entanglement). The comparison is qualitative: circuit-generated distributions versus a classical normal-random-walk baseline and versus real DJIA / Zillow data. No quantum speedup is claimed or measured.

2.6 Portability flags

- **Arc counter is entanglement-free.** Single-qubit rotations only, so it ports trivially to any gate set and any connectivity, but by the authors’ own admission carries no quantum advantage and is classically simulable. Its value is robustness, not speedup.
- **Arc walk / random jump need controlled rotations.** These use a coin- controlled rotation (controlled- R_X family), i.e. a 2-qubit entangling operation that must be decomposed into the target platform’s native entangler.
- **Cascading disjunction needs Toffoli + SWAP + mid-circuit reset.** The OR-in- place block uses a Toffoli (5 CNOTs each) plus a SWAP, and reuses an ancilla via mid-circuit reset. The paper excludes it from the noisy/QPU comparison precisely because mid-circuit reset support “is not guaranteed today”.
- **Mid-measurement (Zeno) and housing-market modelling require mid-circuit measurement.** Run in simulation only; portability depends on a platform exposing accurate mid-circuit measurement and reset.
- **Binary-counter baseline is entanglement-heavy and connectivity-sensitive.** Full-adder counting needs many Toffoli/CNOT gates (~ 80 2Q gates per 8-bit addition), the regime where the trapped-ion all-to-all advantage and 2Q fidelity dominate the result. This is the foil the paper argues against, not a primitive it recommends porting.
- **QPU substrate is trapped-ion (all-to-all).** Any cross-vendor mapping of the binary-counter comparison should account for the QPU’s all-to-all coupling (substrate-inferred, not paper-stated); the arc-counter results are substrate-agnostic by construction.

2.7 Caveats

- Access is complete: the paper is open access (CC BY) and the full arXiv LaTeX source is in hand (`paper-source/quantum_finance_walks.tex`), plus the HTML rendering. There is no separate Supplementary Information and no paywall.
- The QPU is identified only by citation (Wright et al. 2019, the 11-qubit IonQ device). The paper does not give a commercial device name, the exact qubit subset used, native gate set, connectivity, coherence times, per-gate fidelities of that machine, transpiled depth/2Q-gate totals for the QPU runs, or any wall-clock figure. Connectivity and native-gate claims here are substrate-inferred from `vendor-notes/trapped_ion_qubits.tex` and Ezratty, and are flagged as such rather than taken as the paper's own evidence.
- Most results are simulated (ideal and noisy). Only the binary counter and arc counter were run on the QPU; arc walk, random jump, cascading disjunction, and all mid-measurement / Zeno results are simulation only.

3 Portability matrix