

Portfolio construction using a sampling-based variational quantum scheme

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2508.13557-portfolio-construction-sampling-based-variational-quantum
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.13557
Category	app
Triaged	2026-06-07 by codex
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

Primary: **finance** (bond-ETF portfolio construction). Secondary: **optimisation**. The application sits squarely in finance, but the computational core is a constrained binary (QUBO-style) optimisation, and the most useful portability comparisons live in the quantum-optimisation literature rather than in quantitative finance.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantum-optimisation specialist rather than a buy-side quant. Julien should be fluent in sampling-based variational algorithms (CVaR-VQA and the wider QAOA family), comfortable with QUBO and penalty-based constraint encodings, and able to read IBM Heron heavy-hex topology, transpilation settings, and the circuit-characteristics table (depth, two-qubit gate count, parameter count). Calibrated intuition about ansatz design (TwoLocal versus the counterdiabatic-inspired BFCD), gradient-free optimisers (NFT), shot budgets ($N_{\text{shots}} = 2^{13}$), and Matrix Product State simulability as a classical-hardness proxy matters more here than portfolio theory, since the finance model is reduced to a 109-variable binary problem (one qubit per bond).

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Barkoutsos et al., “Improving variational quantum optimization using CVaR”, *Quantum* 4, 256 (2020). DOI: 10.22331/q-2020-04-20-256. The CVaR aggregation primitive at the heart of this scheme.
- Sachdeva et al., “Quantum optimization using a 127-qubit gate-model IBM quantum computer can outperform quantum annealers for nontrivial binary optimization problems”, arXiv:2406.01743. The same sampling-plus-local-search recipe on an earlier IBM device, with a cross-paradigm annealer baseline.
- Cadavid et al., “Bias-field digitized counterdiabatic quantum optimization”, *Phys. Rev. Research* 7, L022010 (2025). DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevResearch.7.L022010. Source of the BFCD ansatz the authors adapt and parametrise.
- Montanez-Barrera et al., “Unbalanced penalization: a new approach to encode inequality constraints of combinatorial problems for quantum optimization algorithms”, *Quantum Sci. Technol.* 9, 025022 (2024). arXiv:2211.13914. Slack-free constraint encoding, directly comparable to the paper’s novel unconstrained reformulation.
- Sciorilli et al., “Towards large-scale quantum optimization solvers with few qubits”, *Nat. Commun.* 16, 476 (2025). arXiv:2401.09421. A qubit-frugal scaling path the authors cite as a future direction; useful contrast to the one-qubit-per-variable encoding used here.
- Mugel et al., “Dynamic portfolio optimization with real datasets using quantum processors and quantum-inspired tensor networks”, *Phys. Rev. Research* 4, 013006 (2022). arXiv:2007.00017. The same application (portfolio) run across different vendors and paradigms (D-Wave annealing, IBM-Q VQE, tensor networks), the key portability cross-check for Brilliant.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

low. The paper is a short IEEE-conference-format preprint with the full arXiv HTML and LaTeX source already in the folder (`paper.html`, `paper-source/main.tex`). No paywall. The hardware fingerprint is explicit in-text: 109 qubits on IBM Heron processors (`ibm_marrakesh`, `ibm_fez`), up to 4200 gates and 648 two-qubit gates, 2^{13} shots per iteration, NFT optimiser, dynamical decoupling with the default XX sequence, transpiler optimisation level 3. Table I gives per-ansatz depth and gate counts, so Julien does not need the (absent) figure images or external SI to extract the fingerprint. The only wrinkle keeping this above trivial is the slightly exotic BFCD ansatz, whose original construction lives in the SI of Cadavid et al.; the citation suffices and is included above.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

IBM Quantum and Vanguard test a quantum-classical workflow on a bond exchange-traded-fund (ETF) construction problem. The finance task is reduced to a 109-variable binary optimisation: one binary variable per candidate bond stating whether it enters the portfolio, with a quadratic objective (distance of portfolio metrics from targets) and linear budget/guardrail constraints. The authors fold the inequality constraints into the objective with a slack-free penalty term, giving an unconstrained problem that needs only one qubit per bond. They solve it with sampling-based CVaR-VQA: a parametrised circuit is sampled on hardware, the (classically computed) cost of each sampled bit-string is aggregated through Conditional Value at Risk, and a gradient-free optimiser updates the parameters; sampled solutions are then polished by classical local search. They run 109-qubit experiments on two IBM Heron processors, reaching a best relative optimality gap of 0.49% against the CPLEX optimum, and argue the combined workflow beats classical local search alone.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IBM / Heron processors `ibm_marrakesh` and `ibm_fez`.
- **Qubit count:** 109 qubits used (one qubit per bond). Device size not stated in the paper; `ibm_marrakesh` and `ibm_fez` are 156-qubit Heron r2 devices per IBM’s public specifications (cross-reference, not from this paper).
- **Connectivity:** Heavy-hex. The paper works with “the native heavy-hex connectivity on the IBM devices” and builds a 3-label colouring on it for one of its entanglement maps. If n is below the device qubit count, low-degree nodes are pruned from the topology graph until 109 remain.
- **Gate set:** Circuits transpiled to native gates (Qiskit Primitive V2 transpiler, optimisation level 3). The *TwoLocal* ansatz uses parametrised R_Y single-qubit rotations and controlled- Z two-qubit gates (CZ is native on Heron). The BFGD ansatz uses R_Y rotations plus two-qubit rotation gates $R_{YZ}R_{ZY}$ (a single shared parameter for each R_{YZ}/R_{ZY} pair), which are not native and must be decomposed.
- **Notable features leveraged:** Dynamical decoupling with the default XX sequence for error suppression; heavy-hex-aware 3-colouring for the “colored” entanglement layer; a parameter cut-off that drops gates whose angle is below 0.06 during hardware runs. Terminal computational-basis measurement only; no mid-circuit measurement and no dynamic circuits are used.

2.3 Computational primitive

Sampling-based variational quantum algorithm: **CVaR-VQA** (sampling/optimisation, in the QAOA/VQE family), with a gradient-free NFT classical optimiser and classical local-search post-processing. Only the sampling step runs on the QPU; cost evaluation and aggregation are classical.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Three ansatz configurations were run; the table reports each where the paper distinguishes them. Depth and gate counts are the transpiled values on `ibm_marrakesh` from Table I.

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	109 (no error correction; “logical” = bare qubits here)	Abstract; Sec. “109-qubit experiment”
Qubits (physical)	109	Abstract; Sec. “Experimental results”
Circuit depth	17 (TwoLocal bilinear) / 19 (TwoLocal color) / 57 (BFCD bilinear), transpiled	Table I
2Q-gate count (total)	216 (TwoLocal bilinear) / 246 (TwoLocal color) / 648 (BFCD bilinear)	Table I
Measurement shots	$N_{\text{shots}} = 2^{13} = 8192$ per iteration	Sec. “Experimental results”
Classical loop iter.	Not reported (numeric). NFT optimiser; per-run iteration counts appear only in figure labels, whose images are not in the dossier	Sec. “Classical optimizer: NFT”; Figs. 4 to 6 captions
Wall-clock runtime	Not reported for hardware. MPS simulator per-evaluation runtime (1k shots, Apple M1 Pro, 16 GB): 5 s (TwoLocal bilinear) / 3 min (TwoLocal color) / 16 min (BFCD bilinear)	Table I

Additional reported numbers: total gate count 1525 / 1555 / 4220 and parameter count 327 / 327 / 434 for the three configurations (Table I); abstract rounds these to “up to 4200 gates” and “109 qubits”. CVaR tail fraction $\alpha = 0.1$ and repetitions $r = 2$ for the hardware runs (Sec. “31-qubit MPS simulation”). Each NFT parameter step uses a 3-point estimate, so 3 circuit evaluations per parameter; one epoch updates all parameters once (Sec. “Classical optimizer: NFT”). All circuit parameters initialised to $\pi/3$ (Sec. “Experimental results”).

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claim.** On the simplified 109-bond ETF instance, the CVaR-VQA-plus-local-search workflow reaches a best relative optimality gap of 0.49% (TwoLocal bilinear on `ibm_marrakesh`), with TwoLocal color at 0.55% and BFCD at 0.91%; the noiseless MPS simulator reaches 0.39%. The combined quantum-classical workflow is argued to beat classical local search alone, and a 31-qubit simulator study suggests the harder-to-simulate BFCD ansatz can converge better than TwoLocal with increasing repetitions. The relative gap is $\gamma = \frac{|F(\theta_f)_{\text{low}} - F_0|}{|F_0|}$ against the CPLEX optimum F_0 .
- **Error bars / noise.** The 31-qubit tuning study uses 10 independent repetitions per configuration (90 experiments over $\alpha \in \{0.1, 0.15, 0.2\}$, $r \in \{1, 2, 3\}$); no explicit error bar is quoted for the headline 0.49% hardware figure. Hardware noise is present and addressed only by error suppression (dynamical decoupling, parameter cut-off), not error mitigation or correction. The CVaR values reported are over raw (un-post-processed) samples.
- **Classical baseline.** CPLEX solves the 109-bond instance to proven optimality in a few seconds, returning 33 feasible solutions (one proven optimal) while exploring more than 170,000 branch-and-bound nodes. The paper is explicit that this instance is classically easy and that genuine classical hardness only appears at the 1,000 to 10,000 bond scale; the quantum run is a feasibility demonstration, not a speed-up on this instance. A within-method baseline (classical local search alone, without CVaR-VQA samples) is reported to do worse than the combined workflow.

2.6 Portability flags

- **Heavy-hex-tailored entanglement.** The “colored” map is a 3-colouring of IBM’s heavy-hex graph chosen so equally coloured qubits are entangled in parallel; on a different topology this colouring must be recomputed, and on all-to-all hardware (trapped ions, neutral-atom global gates) it is unnecessary. The alternative “bilinear” map is a linear nearest-neighbour chain and ports cleanly to any device with at least a Hamiltonian path through 109 qubits.
- **BFCD native-gate dependence.** The BFCD ansatz leans on two-qubit $R_{YZ}R_{ZY}$ rotations. These are not native to Heron (decomposed to CZ plus single-qubit gates, inflating the BFCD circuit to depth 57 / 648 two-qubit gates versus 17 / 216 for TwoLocal). On ion-trap hardware with native Mølmer-Sørensen / $XX(\theta)$ interactions, R_{YZ} -type rotations may map more directly, so the relative cost of BFCD versus TwoLocal is hardware-dependent.
- **Controlled-Z assumption.** The TwoLocal two-qubit gate is CZ, native on Heron; on devices whose native two-qubit gate is XX , i SWAP, or echoed-cross-resonance-derived, it decomposes differently and the depth-17 figure will not carry over.
- **Sampler-only QPU role (portability-positive).** Only step 2 of the workflow uses the QPU, as a bit-string sampler; cost evaluation, CVaR aggregation, NFT updates, and local search are classical. The primitive is therefore relatively hardware-agnostic at the algorithmic level: any device that can prepare the ansatz and sample in the computational basis can run it. No mid-circuit measurement, dynamic circuits, or feed-forward are required.
- **One qubit per variable.** The slack-free penalty reformulation keeps the encoding at exactly n qubits for n binary variables (no slack-variable overhead). Portability cost scales as one physical qubit per bond with adequate two-qubit fidelity; the 109-variable

instance fits within a single Heron-class device.

- **Noise-robust classical layer.** Gradient-free NFT and CVaR aggregation are chosen for tolerance to hardware noise rather than for any device-specific feature, so they transfer across vendors without change.

2.7 Caveats

- **Full text available, figures not.** The arXiv TeX source (`paper-source/main.tex`) and rendered HTML are complete and were read in full; equations and Table I were taken verbatim from the source. The figure image files (`Figures/tuning.png`, `109-no-ls.png`, `109-ls1.png`, `109-ls2.png`, `coloring.png`) are referenced but the per-run iteration counts and convergence curves they carry are inside those images, so the exact number of NFT iterations per hardware run could not be extracted and is recorded as “not reported”.
- **Internal-estimate baseline.** The “5 to 10 minutes for 1,000 to 10,000 bonds” claim for classical solvers is footnoted as an internal empirical estimate, not an independently reproducible benchmark.
- **Entanglement-map labelling inconsistency.** Methods and Table I describe the BFCD hardware run as *bilinear* on `ibm_marrakesh`, but the results sentence reports it as “BFCD color (0.91%)”. The 0.91% gap value is reported consistently; only the entanglement-map label is ambiguous between the two passages, so the BFCD map used for the headline result is left flagged rather than asserted.
- **No Supplementary Information for this paper.** The BFCD construction it adapts lives in the SI of Cadavid et al. (Phys. Rev. Research 7, L022010, 2025), not in this paper; that reference was not fetched, so the BFCD details here are limited to what the paper states.

3 Portability matrix