

# A Penalty-Free Pipeline for Direct Quantum-Annealer Portfolio Optimization

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2605.17628-dwave-portfolio-penalty-free
Source	arXiv
Link	<a href="https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.17628">https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.17628</a>
Category	app
Triaged	2026-05-21 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 . . . . .	6
2.4	Resource fingerprint . . . . .	6
2.5	Assumptions and results . . . . .	7
2.6	Portability flags . . . . .	8
2.7	Caveats . . . . .	8
<b>3</b>	<b>Portability matrix</b>	<b>10</b>

# 1 Source

## 1.1 Domain classification

Primary: **finance** (cardinality-constrained portfolio selection; Markowitz mean-variance with an exact- $K$  holding constraint, evaluated on Fama-French 49-industry equities and football 1X2 betting slates).

Secondary: **optimisation**. The substrate is combinatorial: the financial problem is encoded as a QUBO and submitted to a D-Wave quantum annealer. The paper’s actual contribution is an encoding/portability finding (the exact- $K$  penalty term  $A11^\top$  makes the logical interaction graph complete, driving minor-embedding chain breaks), so a reader chasing the QUBO-on-annealer methodology rather than the finance result will find the optimisation framing more useful. Finance is the stated application and the home for the canonical-graph edges, so it is primary.

## 1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A D-Wave quantum-annealing practitioner, not a gate-model person. The hardware fingerprint here is annealing-specific: minor embedding (minorminer, FixedEmbeddingComposite), chain strength, chain-break fraction, qubit-overhead ratio, and the Pegasus-versus-Zephyr working-graph differences. The ideal reviewer has calibrated intuition for how penalty-weight magnitude relative to chain coupling governs chain integrity, and can read the Ocean toolchain defaults (auto-scale, spin-reversal transforms, majority-vote unembedding) in Table 1 for what they imply about the run. Light familiarity with QUBO penalty formulations for cardinality constraints is enough on the finance side; deep portfolio-theory expertise is not required, since the financial metrics (Sharpe, ROI) are explicitly framed as directional rather than load-carrying for the central claim.

## 1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

Pointer set spanning the cross-vendor and same-application axes Brilliant and Julien will want:

- Pelofske (2025), *Comparing three generations of D-Wave quantum annealers for minor-embedded combinatorial optimization problems*, Quantum Sci. Technol. 10(2):025025. DOI [10.1088/2058-9565/ada1e7](https://doi.org/10.1088/2058-9565/ada1e7) - cross-generation annealer comparison on the same embedding-quality axis this paper measures (cited by the paper).
- Grant and Humble (2022), *Benchmarking embedded chain breaking in quantum annealing*, Quantum Sci. Technol. 7(2):025029. DOI [10.1088/2058-9565/ac26d2](https://doi.org/10.1088/2058-9565/ac26d2) - the chain-break mechanism that is the centre of this paper’s diagnosis (cited by the paper).
- *Quantum Portfolio Optimization: An Extensive Benchmark* (2025), [arXiv:2509.17876](https://arxiv.org/abs/2509.17876) - cross-method benchmark (QAOA and annealing versus classical heuristics) that attributes poor quantum performance to all-to-all connectivity, a close conceptual neighbour of the penalty-induced-density argument here.
- *End-to-End Portfolio Optimization with Quantum Annealing* (2025), [arXiv:2504.08843](https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.08843) - recent same-vendor (D-Wave) portfolio pipeline; useful contrast on constraint handling.

- *Constrained Portfolio Optimization via QAOA with XY-Mixers and Trotterized Initialization* (2026), [arXiv:2602.14827](#) - the gate-model route to enforcing cardinality without a penalty (Dicke-state plus XY-mixer feasible-subspace evolution), the circuit-side analogue of this paper’s penalty-free move.
- Hadfield et al. (2019), *From the Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm to a Quantum Alternating Operator Ansatz*, [arXiv:1709.03489](#) - foundational reference for handling a constraint through the mixer/structure rather than a quadratic penalty; the conceptual root of the separation the discussion conjectures generalises.

## 1.4 Difficulty estimate

**low.** The full arXiv LaTeX source is in `paper-source/` (no paywall), and the quantum-hardware fingerprint is unusually well consolidated: Table 1 (`tab:qpu_hygiene`) lays out both solver IDs (Advantage\_system4.1 / Pegasus, Advantage2\_system1.13 / Zephyr), active qubit and coupler counts, ideal-graph sizes, the three explicit sampler arguments (1{,}000 reads,  $t_a = 20 \mu\text{s}$  linear forward, chain strengths  $\{0.5, 1.0, 2.0\}$ ), the embedding tooling, and every inherited Ocean default. Scales ( $N \leq 49$  equities,  $N \leq 48$  betting, with  $K$  and  $\lambda$  grids) are in the Methods section. Two caveats, neither blocking: the work is annealing-only, so it will not fit a gate-model fingerprint template; and the Online Resources A-G (sweeps, perturbation analysis, validation grid) are referenced but not present in the source tarball. The headline fingerprint does not depend on the SI, so Julien can run without it.

## 2 Extraction

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

The paper studies cardinality-constrained portfolio selection (Markowitz mean-variance with a hard “hold exactly  $K$  assets” constraint) run directly on D-Wave quantum annealers. The standard recipe encodes the constraint as a quadratic penalty and submits the resulting QUBO to the hardware. The author shows that this penalty term is the binding problem: expanding the exact- $K$  penalty adds a dense rank-one contribution  $A\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top$  that makes the logical interaction graph complete regardless of the financial data, so minor-embedding onto the sparse Pegasus and Zephyr chips needs long chains that break (83–92% of chains broken; zero feasible raw samples). Two fixes are compared. Topology-aware sparsification removes the chain breaks but dilutes the constraint, and an ablation shows the surviving solution quality comes from the classical projector, not the QPU. The proposed remedy drops the penalty entirely: sample an objective-only QUBO on hardware and enforce cardinality with a deterministic classical projector. Chain breaks fall to at most 0.04% and post-processed regret to at most 0.03% versus greedy classical references. No quantum advantage is claimed.

### 2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** D-Wave, two machines run live.
  - Advantage\_system4.1 (Pegasus topology), `graph_id 01d07086e1`.
  - Advantage2\_system1.13 (Zephyr topology), `graph_id 01e1ea5685`. (Renamed to Advantage2\_system1 on 2026-04-10; see Assumptions.)
- **Qubit count:**
  - Pegasus: 5,627 active qubits / 40,279 active couplers (ideal  $m = 16$  graph has 5,760 nodes). [Table 1, `tab:qpu_hygiene`]
  - Zephyr: 4,579 active qubits / 41,549 active couplers (ideal  $m = 12$  graph has 5,400 nodes). [Table 1]
  - Logical problem variables actually used:  $N \leq 49$  (equities),  $N \leq 48$  (betting). Physical-qubit footprint per instance is small relative to the chip (e.g. 85 Pegasus / 62 Zephyr physical qubits for the  $N = 24$  dense equity instance). [§4.1; Table 3, `tab:sparse_embedding`]
- **Connectivity:** sparse, fixed-degree hardware graph (Pegasus on Advantage, the higher-degree Zephyr on Advantage2). The *logical* problem graph is the complete graph  $K_N$  (all-to-all) once the cardinality penalty is added; this mismatch against the sparse chip is the entire subject of the paper. The paper characterises the chip only as “bounded-degree”; it does not state the nominal per-qubit degree. (Substrate reference: Pegasus is the lower-degree, Zephyr the higher-degree D-Wave graph; `vendor-notes/annealing_flux_qubits.tex`.)
- **Gate set:** none. This is an analog quantum annealer (rf-SQUID flux qubits), not a gate-model device. The programmable object is a transverse-field Ising Hamiltonian: per-qubit flux biases  $h_i$  and tunable couplers  $J_{ij}$  annealed under a driver-plus-problem schedule. The schedule used is a linear forward anneal,  $t_a = 20 \mu\text{s}$ . [Table 1]
- **Notable features leveraged:** minor embedding via `minorminer` (offline) and fixed-embedding reuse via `FixedEmbedding-`

Composite (live); chain strength swept over  $\{0.5, 1.0, 2.0\}$ ; majority-vote chain unembedding; Ocean `auto_scale = True`; `flux_drift_compensation = True`. Gauge averaging is *off* (`num_spin_reversal_transforms = 0`), deliberately. [Table 1; §5]

## 2.3 Computational primitive

**Analog evolution** (quantum annealing): single-batch sampling of a QUBO/Ising energy landscape on the QPU, with no variational outer loop. Constraint satisfaction is handled by a separate deterministic classical projection step, not by the quantum hardware.

## 2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	$N \leq 49$ equities ( $N \in \{24, 32, 40, 49\}$ live); $N \leq 48$ betting	Abstract; §3.1 Methods; §4.1, §4.3
Qubits (physical)	( $N \in \{30, 39, 48\}$ live) $N = 24$ dense equity: 85 (Pegasus) / 62 (Zephyr). Sparsified $N = 24$ : 24–35 (Table 3). Per-instance physical count = logical $N \times$ mean chain length; total chip is 5,627 (Peg) / 4,579 (Zep)	§4.1; Table 3 ( <code>tab:sparse_embedding</code> ); Table 1
Circuit depth	Not applicable (analog annealer). Anneal time per read $t_a = 20 \mu\text{s}$ , linear forward schedule	Table 1 ( <code>tab:qpu_hygiene</code> )
2Q-gate count (total)	Not applicable (analog annealer). Logical edge counts: dense $\binom{N}{2}$ (up to 1,176 at $N = 49$ ); penalty-free betting only $N$ edges (30/39/48); penalty-free equity stays dense	§4.1 Table 2 ( <code>tab:scaling</code> ); §4.3 Table 5 ( <code>tab:penalty_free</code> )
Measurement shots	1,000 reads per submission	Table 1; §4.3

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Classical loop iter.	Not applicable (no variational outer loop). Single-shot QPU sampling plus one deterministic greedy feasibility projection per sample	§3.2 (post-processing); §4.3
Wall-clock runtime	Not reported (no end-to-end or total-QPU timing given; only per-read $t_a = 20 \mu\text{s}$ )	(not reported)

Supporting scales and counts (all from the paper): penalty weight  $A = 4.0$ ; risk aversion  $\lambda \in \{0.5, 1.0, 2.0\}$  (equity scaling at  $\lambda = 1.0$ ,  $K = 12$ ; betting at  $\lambda = 0.5$ ); 252-day estimation window, monthly rebalance (§3.1). Offline experimental grid: 918 preservation rows, 4,212 embedding rows, 1,620 domain-prior comparison rows, 405 validation rows (§3.1); the abstract cites 4,468 saved embedding records on live hardware. Exact brute-force references: enumeration for  $N \leq 16$ , plus  $\binom{24}{8} = 735,471$  at the  $N = 24$ ,  $K = 8$  frontier (§3.2).

## 2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claim.** The dense rank-one penalty term  $A \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top$ , not the sparse hardware topology, is the binding constraint for direct-QPU portfolio optimization at currently accessible scales ( $N \leq 49$ ). Removing the penalty and projecting classically cuts live chain-break fractions from 71–92% to at most 0.04% and yields post-processed regret of at most 0.03% on equities (lower-energy-than-greedy feasible portfolios on betting at  $N = 39, 48$ , reported as an energy comparison, not a proof of optimality). [Abstract; §4.3; §6]
- **Mechanism reported.** The fix works not because the chip becomes more permissive (chain lengths still grow with  $N$  in the penalty-free equity case) but because the largest off-diagonal coupling magnitude collapses from  $A \approx 4.0$  to  $\sim 10^{-3}$  (set by  $\lambda \Sigma$ ), pulling the objective couplings well below the chain coupling and stabilising chains. [§4.3]
- **Error bars / noise assumptions.** Equity Sharpe ratios reported with 95% bootstrap CIs (1,000 draws); Probabilistic Sharpe Ratio and minimum track record length computed per Bailey & López de Prado. Out-of-sample windows ( $T \approx 21$  trading days) are shorter than the MinTRL in most cases, so financial differences are treated as directional, not statistically significant. Chain-break fractions are mean fraction of broken chains per sample over 1,000 reads; the per-sample detection floor is  $10^{-3}$  ( $1/N_{\text{reads}}$ ). [§3.2; §4.2]
- **Classical baselines.** Greedy construction (128 random restarts), all-ones projection, random projection, and exact brute force where tractable. The paper explicitly declines to claim quantum advantage: greedy heuristics solve these instances in milliseconds and the QPU offers no computational advantage at  $N \leq 49$ . On the sparsify-and-project pipeline, output quality is dominated by the classical projector (on settlement-graph betting, all-ones + greedy projection matches QPU + projection at zero regret with

no QPU involvement). In the penalty-free pipeline the QPU makes a visible contribution, but the financial reading is not a win: realized Sharpe 0.035 (penalty-free) vs 0.209 (best sparse threshold equity); realized ROI 0.090 vs 0.200 (best sparse domain-prior betting). [§4.2; §4.3; §5; §6]

## 2.6 Portability flags

Hardware-specific features Brillant will need to weigh:

- **Analog quantum annealing, not gate model.** The entire fingerprint is D-Wave-annealer specific: minor embedding, chains, chain strength, chain-break fraction, majority-vote unembedding. There is no circuit, no gate set, and no depth or 2Q-gate count to carry across. A gate-model port would re-express the QUBO as a QAOA cost Hamiltonian (a  $ZZ$  term per logical edge).
- **Complete logical graph at every  $N$  under penalty encoding.** The penalty-encoded QUBO needs all-to-all coupling among  $N$  logical variables. On any sparse-connectivity substrate (D-Wave Pegasus/Zephyr here; equally superconducting gate-model heavy-hex) this forces embedding chains / SWAP overhead. The paper’s core result is that this density comes from the encoding, not the application, so it is a portable failure mode that any sparse-topology vendor inherits when using the standard penalty.
- **Chain integrity is governed by coupling dynamic range vs chain strength.** The result hinges on the largest objective coupling sitting below the chain coupling. Ports to other annealers, or to gate-model emulations that fix embeddings, must reproduce that scale separation; `auto_scale` behaviour and chain-strength choice are part of the fingerprint.
- **The portable idea is vendor-agnostic, the demonstrated speedup is not.** Separating objective (sampled on hardware) from constraint (enforced classically by a fast projector) is the transferable contribution and is explicitly conjectured to generalise to any penalty-encoded combinatorial problem on sparse-topology QPUs. But the demonstrated hardware win is purely an embedding/chain-break improvement on D-Wave; no cross-vendor or gate-model performance is shown.
- **Block-diagonal structure is the friendly case.** The betting case stays topology-friendly at any scale because settlement covariance is naturally block-diagonal (one 3-clique per match,  $3M$  edges), but the paper notes such problems are also classically decomposable, so the friendly-topology property does not by itself imply a quantum opportunity.

## 2.7 Caveats

- **Annealing-only paper.** It does not fit a gate-model fingerprint template; “circuit depth” and “2Q-gate count” rows above are marked not applicable rather than not reported, because the device has no circuit.
- **Supplement not available.** Online Resources A–G (sparsification sweeps over  $\tau$ ,  $k$ ,  $r$ ; the perturbation analysis; the full 918-row preservation grid; the 21-instance financial validation grid with PSR/Brier/log-loss) are referenced throughout but are **not present** in the arXiv source tarball (`paper-source/`). I could not read them. The headline hardware fingerprint (Table 1, the scaling table, the penalty-free table) is fully contained in the main text, so the fingerprint does not depend on the unreachable supplement; the secondary financial numbers (Sharpe/ROI) are quoted from the main text’s summary of Online Resource E and could not be independently checked against the resource itself.

- **No total runtime.** Per-read anneal time is given (20  $\mu$ s) but no aggregate QPU time or end-to-end wall-clock is reported, so the wall-clock row is “not reported”.
- **Solver-rename footnote.** On 2026-04-10 D-Wave renamed Advantage2\_system1.13 to Advantage2\_system1 and removed qubit 4374 from the working graph; the author confirms qubit 4374 was never selected for any chain on any reported instance, so the rename does not affect the results (§4.3).
- **Access.** Full main-text access via the arXiv LaTeX source; no paywall. Code is released MIT-licensed at the author’s GitHub.

### 3 Portability matrix