

Enhancing Blood Cells Classification using Hybrid Quantum Neural Networks

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2605.23324-blood-cell-hqnn
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.23324
Category	app
Triaged	2026-05-28 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	7
2.7	Caveats	8
3	Portability matrix	9

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

machine learning (quantum machine learning for medical image classification). Secondary: biology, since the application is haematology (microscopic white-blood-cell morphology on the BCCD/Blood Cell Images and PBC datasets). The computational primitive is the portable object here, so machine learning is primary; the cell-typing task is the domain it is exercised on.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantum machine learning practitioner who has built hybrid CNN-plus-VQC pipelines in PennyLane, where a variational circuit sits as a feature transformer after a classical bottleneck. Should have calibrated intuition about the design knobs that define this fingerprint: qubit count tied to latent dimension ($n_q = 10$ matching the 10-d bottleneck), R_Y angle encoding, a hardware-efficient ansatz with $L = 4$ trainable layers and ring-structured CNOT entanglement, and single-qubit Pauli- Z expectation readout. Equally important is grounded intuition about the gap between simulation (`lightning.gpu`) and real superconducting hardware inference (transpilation, noise, the modest hardware sample the paper runs) so the simulated-versus-IBM degradation is read correctly. Transfer-learning and ResNet-50 familiarity is useful but secondary.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Mari, Bromley, Izaac, Schuld & Killoran (2020), *Transfer learning in hybrid classical-quantum neural networks*, Quantum 4, 340. arXiv:1912.08278; DOI 10.22331/q-2020-10-09-340. The methodological template: pre-trained classical network plus a final VQC, image features embedded by angle encoding. This paper is essentially that pattern applied to blood cells.
- Acevedo, Alférez, Merino, Puigví & Rodellar (2019), *Recognition of peripheral blood cell images using convolutional neural networks*, Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine 180, 105020; DOI 10.1016/j.cmpb.2019.105020. The purely classical CNN baseline on the same PBC dataset, the natural classical comparator for the 8-class task.
- Bano & Liebovitch (2026), *Analyzing Images of Blood Cells with Quantum Machine Learning Methods: Equilibrium Propagation and Variational Quantum Circuits to Detect Acute Myeloid Leukemia*, arXiv:2601.18710. Same application (blood-cell images) reached with a different quantum primitive; a recent same-domain portability counterpoint.
- Senokosov, Sedykh, Sagingalieva, Kyriacou & Melnikov (2024), *Quantum machine learning for image classification*, Machine Learning: Science and Technology 5(1), 015040. Same primitive (VQC image classifier) under different encodings and datasets, useful for separating encoding choice from circuit choice.
- Kashif, Marchisio & Shafique (2025), *Computational advantage in hybrid quantum neural networks: Myth or reality?*, 2025 62nd ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference (DAC), pp. 1-7. Same lab’s anti-hype baseline on whether HQNN gains are genuine; frames the controlled “isolate the quantum contribution” design this paper adopts.

- Liu, Lim, Wood, Huang, Guo & Huang (2021), *Hybrid quantum-classical convolutional neural networks*, Science China Physics, Mechanics & Astronomy 64, 290311. arXiv:1911.02998. Canonical HQCNN primitive on a different image-classification task.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

low. The paper is an openly fetchable arXiv preprint (no paywall) and the folder already carries the full LaTeX source under `paper-source/`, including `conference_101719.tex` and the figure set. The fingerprint is stated plainly in the main text and Tables I-IV (10 qubits, 4 layers, R_Y angle encoding, ring CNOT entanglement, Pauli- Z readout, `lightning.gpu` simulation, IBM hardware run), with no reliance on a separate SI document. Primitives are standard hardware-efficient VQC building blocks, not exotic. The only mild extraction effort is pinning the exact IBM backend and shot budget used for the hardware-inference run, which sits in the results prose rather than a table.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

The paper builds a hybrid quantum-classical classifier for microscopic blood-cell images and asks whether a quantum layer adds anything a matched classical layer would not. A pre-trained ResNet-50 backbone extracts a 2048-dimensional feature vector, a fully connected layer compresses it to a 10-dimensional bounded latent vector, and that vector is fed to a 10-qubit variational quantum circuit (VQC) acting as a non-linear feature transformer before a small classifier head predicts the cell type. To isolate the quantum contribution, the authors hold the backbone, bottleneck, and head fixed and compare three variants: the HQNN, a capacity-matched classical block, and a no-intermediate-stage baseline. On a 4-class (Blood Cell Images / BCCD) and an 8-class (PBC) dataset the HQNN gives the best macro F1 (up to about 3.7% improvement on the 4-class task; 98.54% to 98.69% on the near-saturated 8-class task). A 40-sample inference run on IBM hardware shows a roughly 2.5-3% degradation versus simulation.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** Simulation on PennyLane `lightning.gpu` (NVIDIA GeForce RTX 5080, 16 GB VRAM); real-hardware inference on the IBM Quantum backend `ibm_fez`, accessed through Qiskit Runtime and bridged to PennyLane via the `qiskit.remote` device (§IV-A “Experimental Setup”; §IV-H “Hardware Results”). `ibm_fez` is an IBM Heron r2 superconducting (transmon) processor; the 156-qubit / heavy-hex characterisation is from IBM and the Ezratty 2025 index, **not** stated in the paper.
- **Qubit count:** 10 used (§III-E, Eq. 2; Table II). The backend’s available qubit count is not stated in the paper (156 on Heron r2 per IBM/Ezratty).
- **Connectivity:** Algorithm-level ring (each qubit entangles its neighbour, $q_i \rightarrow q_{i+1}$, with $q_9 \rightarrow q_0$ closing the ring; §III-E, Fig. 3, Table II). The physical backend is heavy-hex (IBM/Ezratty, not in the paper); the ring must therefore be routed onto heavy-hex, but the paper reports no transpilation detail.
- **Gate set:** Logical gates are single-qubit R_Y rotations (encoding and variational) and CNOT (entangling) (§III-E, Fig. 3). Heron’s native basis (CZ, RZ, SX, X) is not discussed; the R_Y /CNOT circuit is decomposed by the Qiskit transpiler, not reported.
- **Notable features leveraged:** None exotic. No mid-circuit measurement, no dynamic circuits, no analog/Rydberg physics. Pure gate-model: angle encoding, a hardware-efficient ansatz, and terminal single-qubit Z readout. Training in simulation uses adjoint differentiation (a simulator-only gradient method; §III-E); the hardware run is inference-only.

2.3 Computational primitive

Sampling (QML inference): a variational quantum circuit (hardware-efficient ansatz) used as a fixed-after-training non-linear feature transformer inside a hybrid CNN+VQC pipeline. It is not VQE/QAOA (no Hamiltonian/cost objective on the quantum state); the circuit’s Z -expectation outputs are features for a classical classifier, trained end-to-end by gradient descent.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	10	§III-E, Eq. (2) ($n_q = 10$); Table II
Qubits (physical)	not reported	§IV-H (backend <code>ibm_fez</code> ; mapped count not stated)
Circuit depth	not reported	§III-E, Fig. 3 (structure given; no depth number)
2Q-gate count (total)	not reported; 40 CNOTs implied (4 layers \times 10-qubit ring)	§III-E, Fig. 3 (derived, not stated as a total; pre-transpilation)
Measurement shots	not reported	§IV-H
Classical loop iter.	70 epochs max, early-stop patience 15 (training); hardware run is inference-only	Table III; §IV-H
Wall-clock runtime	not reported	(none)

Supporting counts the paper does report: 40 trainable quantum parameters ($q_layer.weights$, i.e. 10 qubits \times 4 layers of R_Y angles; Table I), versus 110 in the capacity-matched classical block; total model approx. 23.53 M parameters dominated by the ResNet-50 backbone (Table I). Quantum learning rate 1×10^{-4} , batch size 16 (Tables II-III). Hardware inference subset: 40 samples, 10 per class (§IV-H).

Verbatim circuit definition (copied from `paper-source/conference_101719.tex`):

$$\mathbf{z} = \tanh(\mathbf{W}_r \mathbf{f} + \mathbf{b}_r), \quad \mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^{2048}, \quad \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{10}.$$

$$U_{\text{enc}}(\mathbf{z}) = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{n_q} R_Y(z_i), \quad n_q = 10.$$

$$U(\mathbf{z}, \Theta) = \left(\prod_{\ell=1}^L U_{\text{var}}^{(\ell)}(\theta^{(\ell)}) \right) U_{\text{enc}}(\mathbf{z}), \quad L = 4.$$

$$q_i = \langle 0^{\otimes n_q} | U^\dagger(\mathbf{z}, \Theta) Z_i U(\mathbf{z}, \Theta) | 0^{\otimes n_q} \rangle, \quad i = 1, \dots, n_q.$$

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claimed:** Inserting the VQC improves class-balanced metrics over both a classical baseline and a capacity-matched classical block, with the largest gains on the harder, non-saturated task. Macro F1 on Blood Cell Images: 0.9153 (HQNN) vs 0.8862 (matched) vs 0.8784 (baseline), about +3.0-3.7% (Table IV, §IV-B). PBC 8-class macro F1: 0.9869 vs 0.9854 vs 0.9851 (Table VI, §IV-C). The authors argue the gain is from the quantum transformation, not extra parameters, since the matched classical block carries more trainable parameters (110) than the quantum layer (40).
- **Error bars / noise assumptions:** No confidence intervals, error bars, or multi-seed variance are reported; single fixed-seed runs (seeds fixed for Python/NumPy/PyTorch, §III-G). Hardware noise is treated empirically via the measured simulator-to-hardware gap, not modelled. On the 40-sample subset: simulator accuracy 0.9250 / macro F1 0.9246 vs hardware accuracy 0.9000 / macro F1 0.8963, attributed to NISQ noise, finite coherence, and sampling error (§IV-H).
- **Classical baseline:** Two in-house classical comparators (matched block and no-block baseline) under an identical pipeline, plus a prior-work table (Acevedo et al. 96.2% on PBC; several 4-class CNN works above 98-99% accuracy, Table VII). The authors note prior 4-class accuracies exceed theirs but caution that datasets, splits, and (accuracy-only) metrics differ, which is why they emphasise macro-averaged metrics for class balance.

2.6 Portability flags

- **Fully gate-model, no exotic primitives.** The circuit is angle encoding + hardware-efficient ansatz + terminal Pauli- Z readout. There is nothing here that ties it to superconducting hardware specifically; it maps to any digital gate-based platform (IBM, Rigetti, IonQ/Quantinuum trapped ions, digital neutral-atom). This is the high-portability case.
- **Ring entanglement assumes neighbour + wrap-around coupling.** The 10-qubit ring ($q_9 \rightarrow q_0$ closing the loop) maps natively onto all-to-all hardware (trapped ions) but needs SWAP/routing on heavy-hex (IBM) and on any limited-degree lattice; the paper runs exactly this case on `ibm_fez` but reports no routing or depth overhead.
- **Native-gate decomposition required.** R_Y and CNOT are not in Heron’s native basis (CZ, SX, RZ, X) and are not the native two-qubit primitive on ion traps (R_{XX} /MS) either; both decompose cheaply, but a portability analysis should account for the decomposition factor per target.
- **Shot-hungry readout, shot count unstated.** Ten single-qubit Z expectation values must be estimated per inference; the paper reports no shot budget, so the hardware cost (shots \times samples) cannot be bounded from the paper.
- **Training method is simulator-only.** Gradients in simulation come from adjoint differentiation, which is not available on hardware; porting *training* (not just inference) to hardware would require parameter-shift or similar and change the resource profile. The reported hardware experiment sidesteps this by being inference-only.
- **Small, shallow circuit.** 10 qubits, 4 layers, 40 parameters, approx. 40 logical CNOTs: comfortably within current NISQ reach on every gate-based vendor, so the binding portability constraint is routing/decomposition overhead and shot cost, not qubit count or depth.

2.7 Caveats

- The paper is an openly fetchable arXiv preprint with full LaTeX source under `paper-source/`; no paywall and no separate Supplementary Information. All reported numbers above are from the main text, equations, and Tables I-VIII.
- The backend hardware specification (qubit count, heavy-hex connectivity, native gate set of `ibm_fez` / Heron r2) is **not** stated in the paper. Those characterisations are supplied here from IBM and the Ezratty 2025 index for context only and are flagged as such; the fingerprint itself is drawn from the paper.
- Several hardware-execution numbers are genuinely absent and marked “not reported”: transpiled circuit depth, transpiled/total two-qubit gate count, measurement shots, and wall-clock runtime. The 40-CNOT figure is derived from the described 4-layer 10-qubit ring topology, not quoted as a total in the paper.

3 Portability matrix