

# Option Pricing on Noisy Intermediate-Scale Quantum Computers: A Quantum Neural Network Approach

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

---

| Field        | Value   |
|--------------|---|
| Slug         | 2026-arxiv-2604.19832-cross-platform-option-pricing                             |
| Source       | arXiv   |
| Link         | <a href="https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.19832">https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.19832</a> |
| Category     | app   |
| Triaged      | 2026-05-16 by port_until_julien_parallel  |
| Bootstrapped | 2026-06-07  |

---

## Contents

|          |   |          |
|----------|---|----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Source</b>                                     | <b>3</b> |
| 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        |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Extraction</b>                                 | <b>5</b> |

|          |                                     |          |
|----------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| 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        |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Portability matrix</b>           | <b>9</b> |

# 1 Source

## 1.1 Domain classification

**Finance** (derivative / option pricing). Secondary: **machine learning**. The method is a variational quantum neural network (data-re-uploading regressor); finance is the benchmark domain and QML is the technique. The whole study lives in the Black-Scholes-Merton (BSM) European-call setting, used deliberately as a controlled benchmark with a known closed-form solution rather than as a target application in its own right.

## 1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantum machine learning practitioner with hands-on cross-platform VQC deployment experience. Should be fluent in data re-uploading / Fourier-feature QNNs, hardware-efficient ansätze,  $U3 + \text{CNOT}$  variational blocks, KAK / two-qubit  $U(4)$  unitary decomposition, and the transpilation plus readout-error-mitigation toolchains of both IBM Qiskit and AWS Braket (covering IonQ trapped-ion, IQM and Rigetti superconducting backends). Light quantitative-finance literacy (BSM, moneyness regimes, option convexity / Gamma) helps in reading the accuracy claims critically, but deep finance expertise is not required: the portability-relevant content is the circuit, the per-backend native gate sets, and the device-specific noise and bias signatures, not the pricing theory.

## 1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Schuld, Sweke, Meyer (2021), “The effect of data encoding on the expressive power of variational quantum machine learning models”, Phys. Rev. A 103, 32430. arXiv:2008.08605. The Fourier-series / data-re-uploading theory the finQbit encoding rests on.
- Pérez-Salinas, Cervera-Lierta, Gil-Fuster, Latorre (2020), “Data re-uploading for a universal quantum classifier”, Quantum 4, 226. arXiv:1907.02085. Origin of the re-uploading scheme and the permuted feature injection.
- Abbas, Sutter, Zoufal, Lucchi, Figalli, Woerner (2021), “The power of quantum neural networks”, Nature Computational Science 1, 403. arXiv:2011.00027. QNN expressivity / effective dimension; cited as the QNN capacity backbone.
- Stamatopoulos, Egger, Sun, Zoufal, Iten, Shen, Woerner (2020), “Option Pricing using Quantum Computers”, Quantum 4, 291. arXiv:1905.02666. Same application, a different primitive: amplitude-estimation pricing rather than a QNN surrogate. The natural portability contrast for Brillant later.
- Herman et al. (2023), “Quantum computing for finance”, Nature Reviews Physics 5, 450. arXiv:2201.02773. Domain survey; the Ezratty 2025 index treats it as the central finance reference.
- Mitarai, Negoro, Kitagawa, Fujii (2018), “Quantum circuit learning”, Phys. Rev. A 98, 032309. arXiv:1803.00745. Foundational VQC-as-regressor framework underpinning the function-approximation setup.

## 1.4 Difficulty estimate

**medium.** The arXiv LaTeX source is fully available under `paper-source/` (no paywall, no supplementary-material dependence), and the circuit itself is tiny: a 2-qubit, 36-parameter variational model with  $L = 3$  data-re-uploading layers and a  $\langle \hat{Z}_0 \rangle$  readout under a  $\max(0, \cdot)$  post-processing step. The core primitive is therefore simple. What lifts this above **low** is breadth rather than depth: Julien must extract four distinct hardware fingerprints, each in its own `04_*.tex` file plus a synthesis table in `05_results.tex`:

- **IBM Fez** (superconducting, Qiskit runtime; also the  $U(4)$ /KAK-compressed 3-CX ansatz variant),
- **IQM Garnet** (20-qubit superconducting, via AWS Braket; readout error mitigation applied),
- **IonQ Forte** (35-ion  $^{171}\text{Yb}^+$  trapped-ion, via AWS Braket),
- **Rigetti Ankaa-3** (superconducting square-lattice transmons, via AWS Braket;  $2 \times 2$  assignment-fidelity REM matrix).

Each backend carries its own native gate set, qubit count, shot / repetition budget ( $N_{\text{shots}} \in \{500, 2000, 5000\}$ ,  $R \in \{15, 20, 25, 50\}$ ), mitigation strategy, and device-specific bias signature (downward attenuation in the ITM region for superconducting devices, a persistent upward offset for the trapped-ion device). The primitives are all standard VQC building blocks with no exotic gates, which keeps the extraction out of **high**.

## 2 Extraction

### 2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

The paper uses the Black-Scholes-Merton European call option formula as a controlled benchmark for a small quantum neural network. It trains a two-qubit data-reuploading variational circuit to map moneyness, maturity, interest rate, and volatility to a normalised option price, then evaluates that model on IBM Fez, IQM Garnet, IonQ Forte, and Rigetti Ankaa-3. The financial problem is intentionally simple because the analytical price is known. The real experiment is a hardware comparison: whether the same compact QNN can reproduce a learned pricing curve under finite-shot sampling, backend transpilation, readout error, calibration drift, and device-specific noise. Source: PDF p. 1 abstract; PDF pp. 4, 7, 11, 17.

### 2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IBM / `ibm_fez`; IQM / Garnet; IonQ / Forte; Rigetti / Ankaa-3. Source: PDF p. 1 abstract; PDF pp. 11-17.
- **Qubit count:** 2 qubits used by the deployed `finQbit` model on all backends. Available hardware counts reported in the paper are IQM Garnet 20 qubits and IonQ Forte 35  $^{171}\text{Yb}^+$  ions. IBM Fez and Rigetti Ankaa-3 available qubit counts are not reported. Source: PDF p. 7, Fig. 2 and Table 5; PDF p. 11 for IQM; PDF p. 12 for IonQ.
- **Connectivity:** Rigetti Ankaa-3 is described as a square-lattice transmon QPU. IonQ Forte is described as a 35-ion linear Paul-trap system, but pairwise connectivity is not stated. IBM Fez and IQM Garnet connectivity are not reported. Source: PDF p. 14 for Rigetti; PDF p. 12 for IonQ.
- **Gate set:** Backend-native gate sets are not enumerated. The circuit-level model uses  $U3$  single-qubit rotations,  $R_x/R_y$  data-encoding rotations, and bidirectional CNOT entangling blocks. The IBM compressed variant uses a two-qubit  $U(4)$  block reported as a compressed 3-CX ansatz. Source: PDF p. 7, Eqs. (8)-(9); PDF p. 8, Sec. 4.7; PDF p. 16, Table 14.
- **Notable features leveraged:** finite-shot expectation-value sampling; AWS Braket and IBM Qiskit transpilation paths; readout error mitigation on IQM and Rigetti; a Rigetti 2 by 2 assignment-fidelity matrix; and an IBM-only  $U(4)$  ansatz compression. No mid-circuit measurement, feed-forward, dynamic-circuit feature, analogue evolution, or pulse-level primitive is reported. Source: PDF pp. 8-10, Sec. 5; PDF p. 11 for IQM mitigation; PDF p. 15, Eq. (10), for Rigetti mitigation; PDF p. 16 for IBM compression.

### 2.3 Computational primitive

Sampling (QML inference): a trained data-reuploading variational quantum neural-network regressor. The hardware executions estimate an expectation value of  $\hat{Z}_0$  and apply the non-negative post-processing map  $\max(0, \cdot)$  to obtain the option-price prediction. Source: PDF p. 7, Eqs. (7)-(9); PDF pp. 9-10, Sec. 5.

### 2.4 Resource fingerprint

| Metric                | Value   | Source (page / equation / SI)   |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| Qubits (logical)      | 2 for the deployed finQbit architecture. Earlier 4-qubit circuits are design baselines, not the cross-platform hardware run.  | PDF p. 7, Fig. 2 and Table 5; PDF p. 8, Tables 6-8  |
| Qubits (physical)     | 2 used on each QPU. Available device counts reported by the paper: IQM Garnet 20 qubits; IonQ Forte 35 ions. IBM Fez and Rigetti Ankaa-3 available counts: not reported.  | PDF p. 7, Fig. 2; PDF p. 11 for IQM; PDF p. 12 for IonQ   |
| Circuit depth         | not reported  | PDF p. 8, Sec. 4.7 says compression decreases depth, but gives no numeric depth.  |
| 2Q-gate count (total) | Standard deployed finQbit circuit: 8 CNOT gates per circuit. IBM compressed variant: 3 CX gates.  | PDF p. 8, Sec. 4.7; PDF p. 16, Table 14   |
| Measurement shots     | Simulation sweep: $N_{\text{shots}} \in \{500, 2000, 5000\}$ with $R \in \{20, 50\}$ . Physical runs reported: IQM $R = 25$ with 5,000 shots; IonQ $R = 15$ with 5,000 shots; IBM standard datasets at $R = 20, 2,000$ shots and $R = 50, 5,000$ shots; IBM compressed run 40 repetitions and 4,000 shots per point. Backend synthesis uses $N = 2,000$ shots. Rigetti's subsection reports $R = 20$ but does not state a separate shot count beyond the synthesis table. | PDF pp. 9-10, Tables 10-11; PDF p. 11 for IQM; PDF p. 13 for IonQ; PDF p. 15, Table 13, for IBM standard; PDF p. 16, Sec. 6.4.1 and Table 14, for IBM compressed; PDF p. 17, Table 15 |

| Metric               | Value   | Source (page / equation / SI)   |
|----------------------|---|---|
| Classical loop iter. | not reported  | The paper reports hardware repetition counts $R$ , but not optimiser iteration counts for QNN training or $U(4)$ fitting. See PDF pp. 9-17. |
| Wall-clock runtime   | IBM Fez only: 56 s for Dataset A, 100 total circuits, $R = 20$ , 2,000 shots; 322 s for Dataset B, 250 total circuits, $R = 50$ , 5,000 shots. Other backends and the IBM compressed run: not reported. | PDF p. 15, Table 13   |

## 2.5 Assumptions and results

- The paper claims that a two-qubit QNN can approximate the Black-Scholes-Merton call-price surface and retain usable predictive performance across heterogeneous QPUs. In the physical-hardware comparison, the best result is IBM Fez with the compressed 3-CX ansatz, reported at  $R^2 = 0.9300$ ; the global table reports IBM Fez standard  $R^2 = 0.9234$ , IonQ Forte  $R^2 = 0.6806$ , Rigetti Ankaa-3  $R^2 = 0.6720$ , and IQM Garnet  $R^2 = 0.6495$ . Source: PDF p. 16, Table 14; PDF p. 17, Table 15.
- The paper does not provide formal confidence intervals. It reports repeated-run standard deviations and backend bias signatures: IBM and Rigetti show downward in-the-money bias; IQM overestimates around  $M = 1.0$  with QPU  $\approx 0.173$  versus Black-Scholes  $\approx 0.104$ ; IonQ shows a persistent upward offset, with  $M = 1.0$  stabilising near  $\approx 0.1695$  versus  $\approx 0.1045$ . Source: PDF pp. 11-16; Rigetti readout mitigation is given in PDF p. 15, Eq. (10) and Table 12.
- The classical comparison is stronger than the physical-hardware comparison. On the  $N = 100$  out-of-sample test set, finQbit reports  $R^2 = 0.97958$ , XGBoost  $R^2 = 0.97854$ , and OLS  $R^2 = 0.93291$ ; the physical QPU study uses five benchmark moneyness points, so it is not a like-for-like replacement for the  $N = 100$  simulator/classical benchmark. Source: PDF p. 8, Table 6; PDF pp. 9, 17.

## 2.6 Portability flags

- The paper describes the portable circuit in an abstract gate basis, not in each backend’s native basis.  $U3$ ,  $R_x/R_y$ , and CNOT-level descriptions must be decomposed into the target backend’s actual native gates, which the paper does not list.
- The standard architecture uses bidirectional CNOT entanglement. Directionality, routing, and swap overhead matter on constrained superconducting topologies; the paper only explicitly reports Rigetti’s square lattice.
- The IBM compressed  $U(4)/3$ -CX ansatz is backend-aware and only reported on IBM Fez. Porting it requires re-synthesising the same two-qubit unitary into the target backend’s native entangler.

- Readout error mitigation materially affects interpretation. The Rigetti analysis depends on a calibrated 2 by 2 assignment-fidelity matrix, and IQM mitigation is reported to shift estimates further upward.
- The workload is measurement-heavy. The study explores 500 to 5,000 shots and repeated executions per moneyness point, so throughput, queueing, and calibration drift are part of the hardware fingerprint.
- The post-processing  $\max(x, 0)$  floor can mask negative noisy estimates. This matters for out-of-the-money options on superconducting devices, where the paper reports zero-price collapse or anchoring near the payoff boundary.
- No mid-circuit measurement, feed-forward, dynamic circuits, analogue evolution, or custom pulse primitive is reported.

## 2.7 Caveats

No paywall blocked access. The dossier contains `paper.html` and the arXiv TeX source bundle under `paper-source/`; it does not contain `paper.pdf`, `refs/`, or separate Supplementary Information. I fetched the arXiv PDF only to map the TeX source to page numbers. Local substrate notes and the Ezratty index were used only as sanity checks for hardware labels, not as sources for resource numbers. Native gate sets, full connectivity for IBM/IQM/IonQ, IBM/Rigetti available qubit counts, circuit depth, optimiser iterations, and most wall-clock runtimes are not reported in the paper.

### 3 Portability matrix