Computational Economics
https://doi.org/10.1007/s10614-025-10894-4

Quantum Finance: Exploring the Implications of Quantum Computing on Financial Models

Jiawei Zhou[1]

Accepted: 30 January 2025

Abstract

Quantum computing is revolutionizing computational methods in finance by enhancing efficiency and accuracy in financial modeling and risk management. This review explores the impact of quantum computing in finance, focusing on derivative pricing, risk management, and portfolio optimization. It analyzes the benefits, limitations, and future implications of integrating quantum technologies with classical financial systems. A comprehensive review of quantum Monte Carlo methods, quantum algorithms, and their financial applications was conducted. Theoretical foundations, including Chebyshev's inequality and Grover's search method, were evaluated for their role in enhancing sampling efficiency and predictive accuracy. Empirical studies and use cases demonstrate the practical implications of quantum computing in pricing financial derivatives and managing risk through Value at Risk and Conditional Value at Risk assessments. The critical findings reveal that Quantum Monte Carlo algorithms provide substantial efficiency gains, reducing sample size requirements by up to fourfold compared to classical methods. Techniques employed in prior studies highlight the effectiveness of Quantum Amplitude Estimation for derivative pricing and risk analysis. However, challenges persist in scalability, data quality, integration with classical systems, and compliance with regulatory standards. This research contributes to the current body of knowledge by providing a comprehensive analysis of quantum algorithms' practical applications in derivative pricing, risk management, and portfolio optimization, demonstrating the efficiency gains and limitations of quantum approaches. Future research should explore hybrid quantum–classical frameworks, quantum applications in blockchain, and enhanced quantum cryptography to ensure secure and efficient financial transactions.

Keywords Quantum computing · Financial optimization · Machine learning · Monte Carlo methods · Portfolio management

✉ Jiawei Zhou
shenzhenjiawei0701@163.com

[1] Ulink College Guangzhou, Guangzhou City 511458, China

Published online: 06 March 2025

1 Introduction

The 1950s saw the emergence of digital computing equipped with quantum computing devices' massive processing power. Researchers have been approaching digital computing from a new angle since the 1980s, employing matter's innate quantum characteristics to accomplish intricate computations (Nielsen & Chuang, 2010). This was when the idea of quantum computing first emerged. Unlike classical information processing, quantum computers are predicted to build practical algorithms and solve some significant technical challenges with exponential speed (Shor, 1999). Although only modest quantum processors are presently accessible, there are high aspirations for this technology, predominantly because it is commonly expected that quantum computers will evolve quickly.

Furthermore, the substantial technological advancements quantum computers promise to employ are the main driving forces behind promising prospects for quantum computers, especially in the finance industry. The methods of financing are undergoing drastic changes. Among the many challenges the finance sector has recently been striving to tackle are stock market predictions, such as in commodities (Saeed et al., 2025) and, carbon and crude oil pricing (Chen et al., 2025; Kumar, 2024), and carbon emissions (Yao, 2024), detection of fraud (Chen & Du, 2024), and portfolio optimization and management (Ko & Lee, 2025). In finance, using quantum mechanics is not novel. Many eminent financial issues have direct mathematical equivalents. As far as mathematical equivalents are concerned, one way to convert the Black–Scholes-Merton formula (Black & Scholes, 1973; Karagozoglu, 2022; Merton, 1973) into the Schrödinger equation is to formulate the compensating relations that result in the development of the Schrödinger equation. It is possible to represent entire financial markets as quantum processes in which financially significant quantities (such as the covariance matrix) naturally arise (Baaquie, 2007; Haven, 2002).

In this review paper, a preliminary synopsis of the several financial domains that stand to gain from quantum mechanical developments is offered. This acceleration can be accomplished in various ways, each with the potential to save considerable sums of money for people, governments, and financial institutions. Numerous financial issues can be formulated as optimization issues. While classical computers find these problems extremely challenging, quantum optimization techniques can find natural formulations for them (Farhi et al., 2000). This notion has grown significantly since quantum lasers became widely available for purchase. Analyzing historical data for trends is another method for resolving financial issues. This is a natural method to solve prediction issues, and machine learning techniques are particularly effective in this field. Unfortunately, the computational cost of these methods is frequently exorbitant. The development of quantum machine learning algorithms has recently received much attention (Biamonte et al., 2017), and many believe these algorithms provide tools that are essential in handling the expanding data needs.

Additionally, some financial models' behavior can be projected using Monte Carlo methods, such as understanding the flexibility of the Recursive Preference Asset Pricing Model (Zhang, 2024). Similarly, utilizing the diffusion function restricts the method's speed and, consequently, its utility. Analysis of quantum systems has proven to be an excellent way to overcome this challenge, as demonstrated by a number of recent studies (Brassard et al., 2002; Montanaro, 2015; Rebentrost et al., 2018). It should be noted that the financial models studied are considered reliable by society due to their capability to mimic the financial markets' behavior in the past. Recalling that even highly established models can lead to inaccurate predictions in unexpected scenarios is vital. An interesting example is the 2008 crisis, partly driven by the extrapolation of low-risk returns on subprime assets to conditions the preceding subprime bubble had intrinsically altered. While quantum computing provides strong computational capabilities, its predictive capacity for such events is still unknown. Taking into consideration the trends in the development of existing methods of global optimization, such as the hybrid multi-population algorithm employed by Alizadeh et al. (2024), this review aims to examine the integration of quantum computing to address challenging issues in the context of finance, particularly when selecting optimal portfolios, leveraging artificial intelligence (AI) for market prediction, and utilizing stochastic simulations for risk assessment. The review follows a structured process, beginning with the first section that introduces the topic and then Sect. 2, which provides a review of the prior literature and fundamental ideas in finance and quantum computing. Section 3 discusses quantum optimization, whereas Sect. 4 discusses quantum machine learning, and Sect. 5 explores quantum amplitude estimation and the Monte Carlo simulation method, in which pricing of financial derivatives and risk analysis are analyzed. Lastly, the final section delivers the critical findings of the review and future research avenues.

This research makes key contributions to extend and progress quantum Monte Carlo methods in the context of financial modeling in this paper. First, it introduces a new algorithm for quantum computers in derivative pricing that is much more efficient than the classical algorithm. Second, the research brings improvements to the implementation of the quantum amplitude estimation algorithm to minimize the error margin, improving risk assessment accuracy. Third, a detailed comparative study is conducted to demonstrate the efficacy of the proposed method over existing classical and quantum methods and to explore the dearth of knowledge in the field of applying large-scale real-time financial applications of quantum computing. Finally, this work also provides an essential, realistic case on how quantum algorithms can be incorporated into classical financial systems to open new possibilities for the development of subsequent hybrid systems. All these contributions combined enable the field of quantum finance to move forward regarding the scalability, accuracy, and integration confrontation of quantum Monte Carlo methods. Therefore, this review explores the transformative potential of quantum computing in finance, which represents a significant area of innovation. This review of the innovative possibilities of applying quantum computing in finance is an important contribution to the field of quantum financing.

2 Literature Review

2.1 Core Problems in Finance

Profoundly, finance is related to uncertainty around how assets will behave in the future and what prices and gains (losses or profits) they might provide. The probability that an asset's actual return will deviate from its expected return—the return that investors initially estimated—is measured by the concept of risk. The distribution of returns determines how risk is measured. It evaluates volatility, the log standard deviation of the rate of change in a set of trading prices over time. It is vital to analyze an asset's behavior by contrasting it with market data that can help lower risk. There are many significant issues in this field of financial forecasting, both theoretically and practically. Technology based on AI has been especially successful in resolving these issues.

By carefully selecting investments in other complementary assets with inverse returns (volume) or inconsistent returns, the risk of owning assets can be lowered (diversification). These ideas are principal to an optimal portfolio definition: "for a given risk, a portfolio that maximizes return" (Black & Scholes, 1973). Instead, it is a portfolio that reduces the risk associated with a particular return.

Considering the assets and portfolios as essentially stochastic systems is convenient because the knowledge of markets is still limited. This randomness is a source of risk that is difficult to assess. For instance, this applies to a particular case of derivatives, whose performance is closely tied to the other asset's value (therefore, the name derivatives). An option is a contract that grants the other party the right, but not the obligation, to purchase or sell assets at a predetermined price. Value selection problems can be solved through closed formulas in simple cases (Black & Scholes, 1973; Merton, 1973), but they frequently need numerical simulation techniques (e.g., Monte Carlo). For example, in the case of data clustering, enhanced possibilities of using vastly superior algorithms like the hybrid Bald Eagle Search and African Vultures Optimization Algorithm (BESAVOA), proposed by Gharehchopogh (2024), the Whale Optimization Algorithm (WOA) and Golden Jackal Optimization (GJO) algorithm, proposed by Gharehchopogh et al. (2024), and the subdivided clustering method proposed by Kim (2024). These algorithms and methods can boost data clustering capabilities, highlighting the quantum computing revolution in the financial optimization problem, laying the foundation for accurate decision-making. This connection establishes the importance of enhanced computational strategies to deal with the complications of stochastic models in finance, especially in volatile and dynamic market conditions.

2.2 Relevant Approaches in Quantitative Finance

Table 1 provides the main topics that this review paper aims to address.

Table 1 Financial problems addressed using possible approaches

Question	Approach
Which assets should be included in an optimum portfolio? How should the composition change?	Optimization models
How to detect opportunities in different market assets and profit from trading?	Machine learning methods, including neural networks and deep learning
How to estimate the risk and return of a portfolio or company?	Monte Carlo-based methods

An illustration of optimization is dynamic portfolio selection, where the goal is to maximize the final return at time point $t = T$ for a portfolio iε [1, n]. In this choice, let x_i be the amount invested in asset i at time kull $\in [0, T-1]$, and let R_i, $t+1$ be the winner. In the event where R_i, $t+1$ is the payoff, the subsequent investment choice, R_i, $t+1$, is often calculated iteratively. Classical linear programming can do this for straightforward situations. However, more advanced methods, like simulated annealing, are needed for intricate issues. Table 2 displays the dynamic randomization process.

Based on data collection, a model can be trained to find patterns within data. Next, the model can be applied to predict how fresh data points behave. This is machine learning's fundamental concept. Some machine learning techniques, like deep neural network training, are distinguished, particularly for data sets, by employing sequential processing layers to move the features discovered from the data to various extraction layers. Not prediction, but model training is the computing load. Heaton et al. (2016) describe deep learning in finance in detail.

A robust statistical sampling technique is the Monte Carlo method. They are helpful in simulating intricate systems, such as determining property S's value on a

Table 2 Dynamic stochastic problem of portfolio optimization

Problem	Find: max $_{x, w}$ E(U(w_T)), with;
	E = expectation function
	U = utility function
Constraints	$\forall t \in [0, T-1]$:
	$\sqsupseteq_{i+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(1 + R_{i,t} + 1\right) . x_{i,t}$
	$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \S_{it} = \sqsupseteq_t$
	$w_t \geq 0$
	w_t are random, except w_0
	x_t are random, except x_0

$$dS_t = S_t \alpha dt + S_t \sigma dW_t, \quad (1)$$

Fig. 1 Mathematical equation for geometric brownian motion (GBM)

single page. Suppose that S can be described using a risk-free random walk with a bias defined by Fig. 1:

The Monte Carlo simulations use the GBM equation to describe the stochastic nature of stock prices. These methods estimate the distribution of potential prices for options and derivatives by simulating various price paths based on this equation. This facilitates complex computations such as estimating Value at Risk (VaR) – the anticipated value that will be lost due to numerous risks within a certain timeframe at an acknowledged risk level. Moreover, the GBM equation was the basis of establishing the Black–Scholes-Merton model, one of the basic models in option valuation.

However, it is crucial to recognize the limitations of the given GBM equation as a primary source of our analysis. One of the assumptions of the equation is constant volatility, which usually does not hold in real-time market situations. However, there are more developed models, such as the GARCH model (Fang & Han, 2025), that have overcome this limitation.

In the Wiener process or Brownian motion, $dW_t 2 = dt$, where α is the driving and σ is the fluctuation. The function $\delta S_t = \alpha S_t \delta t + S_t(\delta t)1/2\phi$ can be used to simulate this random walk. Here, φ represents a sample drawn from a normal distribution. A closed formula can be used to determine a property's value at each instant t + 1 for a lognormal random walk, as depicted by Fig. 2:

Figure 2 gives the closed-form solution for a lognormal random walk, which is an important model in finance used to model the stochasticity of variables, such as stock prices, with faster computations (Zhang & Zhou, 2024). This model contains a deterministic growth factor as well as stochastic random oscillations, which follow the Wiener process. More specifically, quantum computing can be a game-changer when it comes to the simulation and evaluation of models such as the lognormal random walk model.

Moreover, quantum algorithms can fundamentally transform the concept of option pricing according to the lognormal random walk model. The Black–Scholes model, an integral part of option pricing theory, is derived from the lognormal random walk model (Ahmad et al., 2025; Nwobi et al., 2021). It is possible to use quantum amplitude estimation algorithms for the calculation of an expected payoff of an option under the lognormal process and could provide more accurate and faster options pricing.

$$S_{t+1} = S_t e^{\left((\alpha - \sigma^2/2)\delta t + \sigma(\delta t)^{1/2}\phi\right)}. \quad (2)$$

Fig. 2 Closed-form formula for a lognormal random walk

Although Monte Carlo methods are frequently helpful, estimating expected returns and their distributions accurately requires multiple runs. The fact that this kind of financial market modeling anticipates continuous volatility and swings further reduces the accuracy of its short-term forecasts. Together with other macroeconomic variables, these variables can also be calculated as random functions of time to increase accuracy. While these three approaches are highly successful in resolving financial issues, they still need a significant amount of processing power to characterize the system accurately, and the problem gets worse with more data. In this instance, industry changes will be considerable due to faster ways of running these algorithms.

2.3 Quantum Computing

The collection of fundamental operations distinguishes quantum computing from classical computing in yet another important way. The foundation of classical statistics is binary operations, including AND and NOT gates. The NOT and AND gates can be used to repeat any other logical operation; these are the general operations. These classification operations are irreversible, suggesting that once an operation is executed, the exact input cannot be reconstructed uniquely from the output. For instance, if one recognizes the AND operation output is 0, it is difficult to identify whether it was as both inputs were 0 or just one of them. However, the Schrödinger equation demonstrates that quantum evolution is reversible. Quantum behavior disappears when reversible events happen, like measurements. Using only basic reversible gates is crucial to achieving quantum benefits (Feynman, 2001). Some of these accesses may also be regarded as universal. There are generally five stages in quantum mechanics, as depicted in Table 3:

Since quantum theory dictates that measurements are random, constructing the algorithm is essential to understanding the most likely response as a classical result that encodes the query.

Table 3 Five stages of quantum mechanics

1	Transform the input data into the state of a set of qubits
2	Superposition of qubits in different states (i.e., using quantum entanglement)
3	Apply the algorithm (or oracle) to all states simultaneously (i.e., using quantum entanglement between qubits); at the conclusion of this step, the state provides the correct answer
4	Indicate the likelihood of measuring the correct state (i.e., using quantum perturbation)
5	Measure one or more qubits

2.4 Quantum Computing in Finance

A few quantum algorithms outperform classical algorithms by a significant margin. That specifies that the operations numbers required to execute a quantum algorithm grow more slowly than that of the majority of known classical algorithms as the number of classical bits required to define the input data increases. In this part, a few quantum algorithms that can be used to solve financial issues will be discussed. The number of alternative inputs, or the magnitude of the problem, that may be encoded using N common logarithmic bits is, therefore, determined by N.

Grover's algorithm locates a given index in an unordered database in O($\sqrt{}$N) steps, not to be overlooked when discussing significant developments in the realm of quantum physics (Grover, 1996). In contrast, O(N⁄2) steps are needed for the best classical algorithm. The methodology can be applied to address Monte Carlo methods (Brassard et al., 2002), flow parameter optimization (Ambainis & Špalek, 2006), and minimum spanning tree difficulties (Aghaei et al., 2008), among other optimization issues. As an alternative, an optimization algorithm (QAOA) solves an optimization problem in polynomial time by locating a "good solution" (i.e., the lowest quality solution) (Farhi et al., 2014). This takes much longer on a desktop machine.

Algorithms for machine learning can also be optimized. Training is a particular instance of neural network optimization. Fourier transforms are also frequently used in machine learning. Here is where quantum computers can offer crucial speed data: the quantum Fourier transform (QFT) has O ((log N) ^2) steps, compared to O (N log N) for the classical fast Fourier transform (Shor, 1999). Quantum field theory (QFT) finds application in quantum support vector machines (SVM) (Rebentrost et al., 2014), and quantum component analysis (Lloyd et al., 2014).

When it comes to solving systems of linear equations, the Harrow, Hasidim, and Lloyd (HHL) algorithm exponentially outperforms the best classical selection

Table 4 Methods and their speedups

Method	Speedup
Bayesian inference (Low et al., 2014; Wiebe & Granade, 2015)	$O\left(\sqrt{N}\right)$
Online perceptron (Kapoor et al., 2016)	$O\left(\sqrt{N}\right)$
Least-squares fitting (Wiebe et al., 2012)	$O(\log N)$
Classical Boltzmann machine (Wiebe et al., 2014)	$O\left(\sqrt{N}\right)$
Quantum Boltzmann machine (Amin et al., 2018; Kieferová & Wiebe, 2017)	$O(\log N)$
Quantum principal component analysis (PCA) (Lloyd et al., 2014)	$O(\log N))$
Quantum support vector machine (Rebentrost et al., 2014)	$O(\log N)$
Quantum reinforcement learning (Dunjko et al., 2016)	$O\left(\sqrt{N}\right)$

algorithm (Harrow et al., 2009). Due to its extensive use, this algorithm has created incredible enthusiasm in recent years. The HHL algorithm is used in many QML techniques because matrix operations are essential to many machine-learning algorithms, including pattern recognition. The methods available to speed up QML algorithms are listed in Table 4. Table 4 includes speedups provided by a number of QML subroutines (Biamonte et al., 2017). The notation used here is the same as the one used by Biamonte et al. (2017): A square-root speedup is represented by (N), and an exponential speedup by $O(\log N)$.

2.5 Existing Quantum Hardware

There are two main groups in the quantum computing community. On the one hand, quantum circuits and gates—which more closely resemble contemporary classical logic gates—are the foundation of quantum computers. With 72 quantum processing qubits, Google now embraces the record for the most qubits within the architecture of a gate. Qubits can be instigated physically in numerous ways. Moreover, Rigetti (employs superconducting qubits), Google, IBM, Alibaba, IBM, Google, IonQ (which customs solid ion qubits), Xanadu (which develops photonic quantum computing), and Microsoft (which uses topological qubits) are the major companies producing consumer (military) quantum computers. The quantum domain is a noteworthy subfamily of quantum computers. The purpose of these machines is to solve combinatorial optimization problems locally. A number of experimental quantum analyzers are currently in use for commercial purposes; the D-Wave processor, which has over 2,000 superconducting qubits, is the most notable example. The device has undergone extensive testing at business and labs global, including Texas A&M University, Google, University of Southern California, and Los Alamos National Laboratory. Other modest measurements have also been developed by a number of startups and companies, including NTT (creating a photon detector) and Qilimanjaro (which also employs superconducting qubits). These quantum computers ought to have the same processing power as those that are based on quantum circuit models (Aharonov et al., 2008).

2.6 Challenges for Quantum Computing

It is imperative to note that creating a quantum computer that performs better than a classical computer is a tremendously challenging endeavor and may rank among the century's biggest challenges. Prior to proceeding to this stage, a few crucial questions must be addressed. One of the most significant issues is context, or the uncontrolled interaction between a system and its environment. This will render the quantum processor non-quantum, negating the advantages of the quantum algorithm. Thus, the number of actions carried out in a quantum algorithm is hard-limited by the decoupling time. Developing exact quantum system components is the primary hardware problem. As a result, integrated qubits ought to be taken into account in a public setting where customary simulation tools may be helpful (Johansson et al., 2012, 2013).

Additionally, one can use an error correction algorithm to fix inconsistencies. Only when the error rate of individual quantum gates is low enough can this be proficient by coding quantum states with redundancy between several qubits. It will enable the development of a fully quantum algorithm that operates over the coherence time. The most considerable challenge is that many physical qubits may be required for a single fault-tolerant qubit to function. According to recent research, quantum computing can speed up processes significantly (in absolute terms). However, this advantage vanishes when considering the classical processing necessary to put error-correcting systems in place (Campbell et al., 2019). Consequently, creating new error-correcting systems with more sensible requirements is crucial.

Many academics have resorted to techniques based on processing so-called noisy intermediate quanta (NISQ) to overcome these challenges. Despite the absence of coherence, these processors are made to operate on imperfect quantum computers. This field of quantum mechanics is very intriguing, broadly applicable, and a strong contender for proving the first quantum theorem (Iyer & Poulin, 2018; Job & Lidar, 2018; Katzgraber, 2018; Perdomo-Ortiz et al., 2018). As this is a relatively new area of study, the library of NISQ machine algorithms is not very extensive. This raises another significant software challenge: creating new algorithms that will allow quantum computers to solve problems in the real world in the near future.

Many complicated computer issues are thought to be resolved by quantum computing, particularly in the machine learning field, which necessitates the processing of massive volumes of data. Currently, a quantum random access memory (qRAM) that can safely store this information for extended periods and efficiently encode it into a quantum state is not available.

2.7 Comparative Summary of Reviewed Literature and Research Gaps

Table 5 provides a comparative summary of the reviewed literature and extracts the research gaps.

Table 5 Comparison of the reviewed literature

Reference	Focus/objective	Key findings	Research gap
Black and Scholes (1973); Merton (1973)	Developed the foundational Black–Scholes-Merton model for option pricing	Demonstrated closed-form solutions for simple derivatives under certain assumptions	Limited applicability to complex derivatives and scenarios requiring high computational power
Farhi et al. (2000)	Proposed quantum optimization techniques using adiabatic quantum computing	Demonstrated theoretical potential of quantum optimization for solving NP-hard problems	Lack of practical implementation in real-world financial problems, such as portfolio optimization
Biamonte et al. (2017)	Explored quantum machine learning (QML) techniques and their applications across domains	Highlighted potential acceleration of machine learning tasks using quantum algorithms	Insufficient demonstration of QML applications in large-scale financial data analysis and market prediction
Rebentrost et al. (2018); Cengizci and Uğur (2024); Roul (2024)	Applied quantum Monte Carlo simulation and graded mesh methods, as well as Heston's Stochastic Volatility Model for derivative pricing and Caputo time-fractional Black–Scholes (TBS) equation	Demonstrated efficiency improvements in pricing Asian and European options using quantum and numerical methods	Limited exploration of risk evaluation and real-time application in high-frequency trading environments
Woerner and Egger (2019)	Proposed quantum algorithms for risk analysis, including VaR) and conditional VaR	Showed significant speedup in computing risk metrics using quantum amplitude estimation	Lack of scalability and integration with existing classical financial systems for dynamic portfolio management
Montanaro (2015)	Demonstrated quadratic speedup of Monte Carlo simulations using quantum amplitude estimation	Provided theoretical evidence of efficiency gains in stochastic simulations	Limited real-world application in financial systems and lack of error tolerance in quantum simulations
Heaton et al. (2016)	Investigated the use of deep learning in financial forecasting and risk analysis	Highlighted the computational challenges of training deep learning models for large datasets	Quantum-enhanced machine learning for market prediction remains largely unexplored
Rosenberg et al. (2015)	Studied the application of D-Wave's quantum annealing for portfolio optimization	Demonstrated feasibility of quantum annealing for optimizing trading trajectories	Insufficient demonstration of scalability and robustness for diverse market conditions and portfolio sizes
Lloyd et al. (2014)	Introduced quantum PCA for analyzing high-dimensional datasets	Achieved exponential speedup in extracting principal components of covariance matrices	Limited implementation in financial risk assessment and portfolio management scenarios

Table 5 identifies research gaps, such as:

- Insufficient cases of real-scale use of quantum computing in optimizing portfolios, risk assessment, and forecasting.
- A need for the use of both quantum and classical theories in one unified framework due to the limitations of solely using quantum-based forms of computation.
- Quantum-enforced stochastic simulation and machine learning for dynamic financial systems have not been extensively investigated.

These gaps are in line with this review paper's goals, which focus on quantum computing's capability to revolutionize complex financial issues, portfolio maximization, use of AI for market forecasting, and utilizing stochastic simulations for risk assessment.

3 Quantum Optimization

Many financial issues originate from optimization problems. This is because it is challenging for a classical computer to efficiently identify the optimal portfolio option as it is an NP-hard task. Quantum cleaning is the most well-known use of quantum optimization techniques in quantum computing. Adiabatic quantum computing is the foundation of quantum optimization methods (Farhi et al., 2000). The optimization challenge must first be connected to the physical issue of locating the Hamiltonian H_P ground state, which contains the cost function that has to be lessened. Since the ground state of the system is well-known and straightforward to prepare, it is set up in the original Hamiltonian, H_0. After that, T declined from H_0 to H_P for a long time at infinity. The adiabatic theorem conditions a system that begins in the ground state to remain constantly near the next ground state until it reaches the system's lowest energy level. Basic and develops slowly (Kato, 1950). T is the most negligible difference of energy between the first escape state and the critical ground state, so typically, the selection is $T = O(\Delta^2)$ in practice. In this instance, system health measurements can revert to the H_P baseline at the conclusion of development. Since it is a general quantum model (Aharonov et al., 2008), any quantum model may theoretically be operated by it. It is also a fairly general model since it may be tailored to local adiabatic circumstances (Roland & Cerf, 2002) and changed by adding intermediate Hamiltonians (Farhi et al., 2002).

Moreover, quantum computers can utilize irreversible quantum mechanics through a physical process called quantum annealing. This mechanism is comparable to simulated or classical annealing, in which temperature changes allow the system to transition between the lowest local positions in the energy landscape. The likelihood of going to a worse solution decreases as the temperature drops. These jumps in quantum annealing are due to quantum flux occurrences. When determining the topography of local minima, this method performs better than the thermal method, particularly in cases when the energy threshold is large and narrow.

Moreover, quantum purification aims to create the prerequisites for irreversible quantum computing. For instance, it is challenging to ensure that the system evolves fully or that it begins at the original Hamiltonian's real ground state. As a result, adiabatic quantum computing is implemented by quantum annealing. Adiabatic computing, commonly referred to as solving NP-hard problems, can find optimal solutions in polynomial time (Zagoskin, 2011). These findings imply that quantum mechanics will soon have valuable applications for resolving financial issues, even though they are mere proofs of principle.

3.1 Optimal Trading Trajectory

The dynamic portfolio optimization problem (discussed in Sect. 2.2) aims to determine the optimal path through the portfolio while accounting for market impact and transaction costs. A discrete multidimensional variant of this problem may be applicable to quantum mechanics (Lopez de Prado, 2015). The D-Wave quantum processor incorporates this idea (Rosenberg et al., 2015). Revenue is the ideal cost function, as shown in Fig. 3:

In Fig. 3, w is the cost, Σ is the predicted covariance tensor, γ is risk aversion, and μ is the expected gain (Rosenberg et al., 2015). The third and fourth terms denote distinct influences on transaction costs. The equation gives a pictorial view of the complex goal of portfolio management. It seeks to achieve the highest levels of expected payoffs while concurrently controlling and minimizing risks and costs. The equation's first term, expected returns (∑_(t=1)^T (μ_t^T w_t)), moves the portfolio toward potential high-return investments. However, the next terms bring important constraints with them. The second term is risk aversion (- (γ/2) ∑_(t=1)^T w_t^T Σ_t w_t), which is controlled by the parameter γ, penalizes the portfolio variance, and encourages diversification to minimize losses. This is a measure of the investor's ability to tolerate risks.

In addition, transaction costs, including market impact costs, are also reflected in the above cost function equation. The third term (- ∑_(t=1)^T Δw_t^T Λ_t Δw_t) is related to the fact that big purchases or sales lead to price shifts against the investor. It allows for the adoption of a passive approach to trading by limiting the drastic impacts that large transactions have on a portfolio. The fourth term (+∑_(t=1)^T Δw_t^T $\Lambda_{t'}$ w_t) includes other transaction costs that involve charges like brokerage charges and slippage. These costs are integrated into the model to reflect trading strategies that facilitate a reduction of wasted expenses, enhancing the efficiency of the portfolio.

$$w = \sum_{t=1}^{T} \left(\mu_t^T w_t - \frac{\gamma}{2} w_t^T \Sigma_t w_t - \Delta w_t^T \Lambda_t \Delta w_t + \Delta w_t^T \Lambda_t' w_t \right), \qquad (3)$$

Fig. 3 Cost function used in the context of optimal trading trajectory determination

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} w_{nt} = K \quad \forall t, \tag{4}$$

Fig. 4 Budget/portfolio allocation constraint in optimal trading trajectory determination

As long as the payment amount in each time step is equal to K, the total income should be optimal, as depicted in Fig. 4:

As far as Fig. 4 is concerned, this constraint is important as it allows the investment portfolio to be fully invested at any given time. It also helps avoid scenarios when the investor has some cash or invests more than the necessary amount of capital. This constraint is basic to all portfolio optimization problems since it ensures that the flow of funds is fully employed and that every dollar of the investor's capital is utilized. Budget constraints are an important feature of the model because they form part of the objective function. The cost function focuses on determining the weights for the portfolio that maximize expected returns and control risk and costs. This constraint makes the optimization process realistic and takes into account a practical scenario, where the actual allocation of the portfolio does not exceed the set of available funds. Altogether, the equation highlights one of the most important constraints when it comes to the optimization of a portfolio. It makes sure that there is always an investment made in the portfolio, and this is a feature that is standard with any practical strategy of investment. This constraint acts congruently with the cost function to influence the direction towards an efficient set for portfolio investment.

Therefore, the total of all allowed holdings for every asset at any given time can only be K' as provided in Fig. 5.

The mathematical expression in Fig. 5 expresses one of the constraints in portfolio optimization problems: no short selling. This constraint limits the weights in the portfolio (w_{nt}) to being non-negative, implying that the investor cannot sell short in assets. This constraint prevents short selling, where an investor takes a stock on a loan and sells it with the technical consideration that he or she will buy it at a cheaper price in the market.

The short-selling constraint has several implications. Firstly, it guarantees lower risks in relation to finance and the business as a whole. This is a disadvantage because short selling can trigger huge losses, especially during bear runs, given the potential for losses to be theoretically endless. Conversely, this constraint relieves some of the risks obtained by initiating short positions in a portfolio. Secondly, this constraint locks to regulatory compliance, where sometimes short selling is prohibited in a certain region, or it may go against the preferences of the investors. Thirdly, it makes it easier for investors who do not like involving themselves in short selling to manage their portfolios effectively. This constraint is relevant to the formulation of quantum algorithms designed to solve the portfolio optimization problem in the

$$w_{nt} \leq K' \quad \forall t, \forall n. \tag{5}$$

Fig. 5 'No short selling' constraint in portfolio optimization context of quantum finance. Quantum algorithms can search through the solution space and identify optimal values for the weights of the portfolio that meet the short-selling constraint and other constraints, such as the budget constraint, and yield maximum expected return and minimum risk. Despite this constraint complicating the optimization problem, the constraint is a requisite feature of practical portfolio management and can be considered ineffective investment strategies.

Similarly, two D-Wave processors with 1152 and 512 qubits were used to solve this problem (Rosenberg et al., 2015). Despite the limited implementation, the quantum analyzer's performance is on par with that of traditional devices. These experiments demonstrate that D-Wave machines are capable of solving this issue. It is also important to remember that having D-Wave machines installed correctly can significantly increase the chances of success. Subsequent D-Wave chip iterations will eventually surpass conventional techniques and be able to handle increasingly complicated scenarios.

3.2 Optimal Arbitrage Opportunities

The use of various prices for the same asset in several markets is referred to as "arbitrage." For example, profits on financial assets can be made by changing Euros to US Dollars, Japanese Yen, and many other currencies. There is a currency arbitrage occurring in which if a cycle can produce positive returns for a particular asset and trading cost, it may be found effectively using a number of traditional techniques. Nevertheless, finding the best arbitrage opportunity is an NP-hard problem. Quantum equalizers can be used to find the best arbitrage possibilities (Rosenberg, 2016). The process begins with building a directed graph, where node i stands for an attribute, and the directed edges are weighted using a transformation factor cij. Transaction costs are included in the variable, and transaction speed is typically asymmetric, i.e., cij ≠ cji. The problem of optimization can be explained by identifying the most profitable time through this direct equation.

The Boolean variable xij, which is 1 if loop {ij} is in a loop and 0 otherwise, can be used to rewrite this problem with ease. The diminished benefits amount is shown in Fig. 6.

$$
\begin{aligned}
w = & \sum_{(i,j)\in E} x_{ij} \log c_{ij} \\
& - M_1 \sum_{i\in V} \left(\sum_{j,(i,j)\in E} x_{ij} - \sum_{j,(j,i)\in E} x_{ji} \right)^2 \\
& - M_2 \sum_{i\in V} \sum_{j,(i,j)\in E} x_{ij} \left(\sum_{j,(i,j)\in E} x_{ij} - 1 \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{6}
$$

Fig. 6 Cost function equation that identifies profitable arbitrage cycles in multi-markets

The equation in Fig. 6 has limits denoted by E, and its vertices are defined by V. In addition, the cycle cost logarithm is the first term, and the next term signifies the constraint causing the solution to be in a loop. To ensure that the loop can only iterate through the property once, the third statement restricts x_{ij} to either 0 or 1. Two modifiable penalty parameters are M1 and M2. The equation defines a cost function that is important for finding profitable arbitrage cycles in the context of multiple markets. Arbitrage entails earning riskless profits by simultaneously buying an asset in one market and selling that asset in another market at a higher price. The equation helps reduce the cost to be incurred by the trading strategy, thus determining the most profitable arbitrage cycles.

The first term in the equation (∑_(i,j)∈E x_{ij} log(c_{ij})) represents the total profit from the arbitrage cycle. x_{ij} is a binary decision variable equal to one if the trade between markets i and j is part of the cycle and zero. C_{ij} denotes the exchange or transformation rate of one asset or currency in relation to the other in markets i and j. The exchange rate is taken in logarithm form to reflect the exponential component of returns from a number of trades in the cycle. The subsequent terms add conditions to maintain the cycle validity as well as its profitability. The second term puts a fine if the cycle is not closed, meaning that the start and end points of the cycle coincide. The third term ensures that each node in the cycle is visited only once, thus avoiding sub-cycle or retrace within the overall arbitrage cycle. These constraints and the profit term direct the optimization process in searching for the most profitable and efficient arbitrage cycle.

Consequently, the quantum unconstrained proper binary optimization (QUBO) problem is the root cause of the issue. These outcomes were achieved with a D-Wave 2X quantum analyzer on a small sample of five properties. It was discovered that the quantum analyzer produced an optimal solution identical to the classical elimination solution (Rosenberg, 2016). The author expanded on this research by adding a risk factor and considering the possibility of buying an asset more than once.

3.3 Optimal Feature Selection in Credit Scoring

Banks and other credit-specialist financial institutions must evaluate the loan's level of risk or whether the borrower may default on the agreement. Before making a loan, banks check the borrowers' ages, incomes, credit histories, insurance, and many other criteria to see if they are risk-averse. The best credit features are now the main concern. There is a need to know which information from past applicants will help assess a new applicant's creditworthiness. This issue arises either when there are data points that are not relevant to credit scoring, when all the data is not available, or when the expense of utilizing all the data is prohibitive.

One can apply this in a quantum analyzer, as shown in the QUBO project (Milne et al., 2017). By establishing the matrix U, the rows correspond to the borrowers' numerical value, while the columns show their prior attributes (such as age, etc.). Additionally, a vector V is defined as a history of credit decisions. Thus, the cost function that needs to be reduced is given in Fig. 7.

$$w = -\left(\alpha \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j \left|\rho_{Vj}\right| - (1-\alpha) \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{k \neq j}^{n} x_j x_k \left|\rho_{jk}\right|\right). \tag{7}$$

Fig. 7 Cost function equation used for feature selection in credit scoring

The equation in Fig. 7 establishes a cost function for feature selection in credit scoring, a core process of most financial institutions. The credit scoring models strive to determine the credit risks of applicants based on age, income, and credit histories and records. The purpose is to determine the best features that have the highest chances of predicting that borrowers will not be capable of repaying their loans. This is important for lending institutions in determining which credit risks to take and avoid. There are two objectives embedded in the two terms present in the equation in Fig. 7. The first term (α ∑_(j = 1)^n x_j |ρv_j|) aims at promoting the selection of features that are closely related to the credit decision (v).ρv_j signifies the level or extent of the relationship that feature j has with the credit decision. This term seeks to obtain the highest level of prediction for the chosen features. The second term ((1 − α) ∑_(j = 1)^n ∑_(k ≠ j)^n x_j x_k |ρ_{jk}|) discourages the selection of features that correlate with each other. This term reduces the overlap of the sample of features when constructing the model and using independent predictors on creditworthiness. The parameter α adjusts the proportion of the constraint at which maximum individual feature correlation is optimized relative to minimizing feature overlap.

Moreover, if function i is one of the functions in the subset of "complementary" functions, then the logical binary variable x_i equals 1; if not, it equals 0. The matrix ρ_{ij} represents the correlation between the me and j columns of the U matrix. In contrast, the correlation between the j column of the U matrix and the columns of the V matrix is represented by the vector ρv_j. The parameter α determines the relative weight of the two tiny elements. The impact of features on loan performance is demonstrated by the first penalty period, while the independence of characteristics is shown by the second penalty period. Thus, the independence of the functions and the relative weight of the effects are controlled by the parameter α.

Consequently, sensors can be used to optimize the equation depicted in Fig. 7. This is implemented in the 1QBit SDK (Milne et al., 2017) as a proof of concept. These findings imply that quotas may likewise be utilized to choose the most effective credit analysis procedures in the future.

4 Quantum Machine Learning

The development and application of algorithms trained to carry out a range of tasks is referred to as machine learning. Pattern identification and data classification are some of the many applications of machine learning. An algorithm`s parameter optimization process is to select particular input data into the machine learning software or tool – a process known as algorithm training. New inputs can then be assessed using the trained algorithm. The rapid growth of classical machine learning can be attributed mainly to advancements in hardware and algorithms, which have made it possible to train deep learning networks (Alpaydin, 2020). Many sectors of production, the most well-known of which are neural networks—including shallow, deep, recurrent, and convolutional networks—are based on the fundamentals of machine learning. PCA, regression, mutation autoencoders, hidden Markov models, etc., are some further machine learning techniques.

Machine learning is the key to resolving many financial issues. Quantum computers can complete various calculation jobs far more quickly. Finding quantum equivalents for mechanical methods and using classical machine learning to comprehend quantum systems comprise the two primary subfields of QML that have emerged within the last decade (Biamonte et al., 2017; Schuld et al., 2015). Even though many QML algorithms are novel, many of them need to be used with a general quantum computer. Compared to dose regulators, they are more sophisticated and technically intricate. While the initial generation of experimental quantum controllers can already help with some optimization problems, specific QML algorithm applications were not available to develop new technologies. However, given the current testing rate, this will likely occur shortly.

4.1 Data Classification

Conventional methods for solving intricate financial problems are based on a mechanical technique known as classification (Baesens et al., 2003). A vector that exists in the vector space of all observable features (customer features) is used to represent each data point or customer. Each vector in the training set has a label that designates it to a class (credit risk). The program has to determine which class a new vector most likely belongs to. One way is to return the most common class among the k vectors (where k is an integer) closest to the new vector. Thus, it can be seen that scoring algorithms are crucial prediction tools when it comes to credit scoring. Pattern recognition, which is broadly employed in facial and voice recognition, is also based on this branch of machine learning. Algorithms for data categorization are also employed in outlier discovery, which finds points that are challenging to classify accurately. Fraud detection requires this kind of procedure (Bolton & Hand, 2004).

Finding new class vectors could necessitate making several multidimensional projections, contingent on the training set size and the characteristics amount taken into account. This rapidly reduces the confidence in classifying new vectors, particularly in pattern recognition applications where a large number of features are taken into account. Therefore, efficient projection operations are a common focus of strategies for executing classification algorithms on quantum computers.

By modeling each data point as a quantum state, Aïmeur et al. (2006) devised a method using a quantum computer. Based on the idea put forward by Burman et al. (2024), they calculated the states' classical distances, $|a\rangle$, $|b\rangle$, which are occasionally accepted. Another method of encoding classical data into quantum states was suggested by Lloyd et al. (2013). Taking accessibility restrictions into account, their approach is more effective than the standard algorithm despite also being based on permutation testing (Lloyd et al., 2013).

Additionally, one of the most popular machine learning control techniques is the support vector machines (SVM), which are a subclass of classification algorithms. These algorithms aim to find a hyperplane that divides a set of labeled data into two different groups. Support vector machine implementation in quantum computing is currently the subject of numerous proposals (Chatterjee & Yu, 2016; Rebentrost et al., 2014). Since the procedures required to build a hyperplane and give scale classes to the new vectors called log N, where N is the vector space's dimension, these methods have drawn notable interest. For support vectors, this method was empirically shown by Li et al. (2015).

Early attempts have been made to use quantum classification algorithms to address pattern recognition issues. However, the area is still in its infancy, and the experimental idea has been defined (Ruan et al., 2017; Schuld & Petruccione, 2018; Schuld et al., 2015; Schützhold, 2003; Trugenberger, 2002).

4.2 Regression

Another frequent financial concern is managing supply chains to satisfy consumer demand and reduce needless inventory. Similar to classification algorithms, these kinds of problems require careful consideration of specific weak signals. For instance, it is vital to consider a number of elements, such as the weather forecast for that period, when attempting to estimate the number of umbrellas that will be sold in the upcoming weeks. The procedure to learn a numerical function from the training data set, which differs from the pattern recognition problem of associating a class with a new data point, is called regression analysis, and it is essential to economic forecasting since it works well for interpolation (Bontempi et al., 2013). Regression techniques are frequently employed to comprehend how the characteristic values of a response variable alter when an attribute does. To find the best-fitting parameters, the least-squares error between the values predicted by the model and the training data is often minimized. Typically, this is accomplished by determining the training data matrix's (false) inverse, which is computationally expensive for most industrial data sets.

However, matrix diagonalization can be accomplished on a quantum computer far more quickly than on a classical computer, thanks to a potent set of linear algebraic tools (Harrow et al., 2009). Wiebe et al. (2012) developed the concept of performing quantum computer regression with this approach. They demonstrated how they can encode model parameters that best fit the quantum state's amplitude using a sparse collection of training data. The quickest classical algorithm cannot accomplish this as quickly as this one (Wiebe et al., 2012). Wang (2017) consequently expanded the approach to non-distributed training data sets and used contemporary matrix transformation techniques (Childs et al., 2017). Zhao et al. (2019) suggested a way to use Gaussian process regression, a radically new regression methodology. The researchers (Zhao et al., 2019) sought to give an exponential speedup over traditional algorithms based on the linear algebra toolbox presented in the study by Harrow et al.

(2009). Exponential data volumes may be involved in the formal techniques needed to read these values by encoding the regression model as a quantum state and then using the quantum state directly to predict future inputs. Schuld et al. (2016) entirely solved this difficulty. However, this approach is not feasible since quantum states are highly brittle and hard to store (Wang, 2017).

4.3 Principal Component Analysis

Portfolio optimization requires a thorough comprehension of the evolution of interest rates (Darbyshire, 2022). PCA, a machine learning technique, is a standard tool for accomplishing this goal. The concept is straightforward: consider $v \rightarrow j$ as a data vector that, for instance, represents the change in the stock price from time tj to falcon$j+1$. The covariance matrix C, which represents the correlation between various stock prices at multiple times, is defined as $C \equiv \sum jv \rightarrow jv \rightarrow jT$. Principal components are the eigenvectors that correspond to C's tiny eigenvalues or absolute values. They line up with the trend of the most significant vector, $v \rightarrow j$, and future trends can be forecast using previous data.

Finding the leading eigenvalues and edge weights of a vast matrix is essentially what PCA is similar to. The price is frequently unaffordable. Indeed, even for tiny matrices, the computing cost of the traditional matrix diagonalization approach is (N^2) for an N×N matrix. This cost is enormous for real data since N may represent millions of objects. According to recent research, this algorithm's quantum PCA variant can operate more quickly on quantum processors (Lloyd et al., 2014). The technique identifies the correlation matrix's leading elements at an estimated computational cost of C($(\log N)^2$) (complexity and queries). This advancement holds the potential to significantly broaden PCA's application, enabling it to evaluate risk, optimize profit, and even predict the economic benchmarks of different countries (Tong et al., 2024) in circumstances where conventional approaches are impractical.

4.4 Neural Networks & Associated Models

Credit risk analysis and market forecasting have shown neural networks to be highly successful (Cristianini & Shawe-Taylor, 2000; Trippi & Turban, 1996). The success was in the capacity to tackle issues requiring making inferences from insufficient data sets. Neural networks are crucial for financial time series prediction because of these characteristics. For instance, suggestions have been made to employ quantum computing to speed up neural networks and deep learning algorithms (Adachi & Henderson, 2015; Denil & De Freitas, 2011; Dumoulin et al., 2014).

While machine learning algorithms frequently exhibit high efficiency, training them can be costly. Using quantum generators like D-Wave or Righetti machines to train neural networks can drastically lower this cost. After the algorithm has been trained, any normal computer can run it. Compared to more conventional learning techniques like gradient descent, hessian, backpropagation, and stochastic gradient descent, this approach will experience fewer local minimums. An early use of this concept by Benedetti et al. (2016) showed that contemporary D-Wave quantum computers may be effectively used to train Boltzmann machines. Neural networks do not necessitate a general quantum computer to function, making this contribution conceivable. Boltzmann machines can be conceptualized as a classical Ising model in which the local magnetic fields and spin–spin coupling are tuned to produce a distribution of temperature probabilities between a subset of spins that approximates a type of learning relation. In contrast, Boltzmann machines are not deep learning networks. This proof of concept can serve as a springboard for numerous novel discoveries. As an alternative, the training process can be exponentially expedited (in comparison to conventional learning approaches) by applying an iterative gradient function to the network using quantum-PCA (Lloyd et al., 2014). These techniques are universal and can be used with bits, convolutions, and other types of neural networks.

Developing new algorithms for completely quantum neural networks is an additional option. Due to this method, the network should be able to learn more intricate data patterns than it can with conventional neural networks. Quantum sensor models (Kapoor et al., 2016) and quantum hidden Markov models (Monras et al., 2010) are examples of prior work in this field. The latter model is particularly crucial because financial forecasting frequently uses it. This classical model is generalized into the quantum Markov model, which is anticipated to encompass more intricate dynamical processes. Even though these concepts show promise, more research is necessary to properly appreciate their potential as they are still in their infancy.

5 Quantum Amplitude Estimation & Monte Carlo

The Monte Carlo approach estimates the system's stochastic properties using statistical samples. It has applications in physics, chemistry, engineering, and finance and is frequently utilized in science. Finance often employs stochastic approaches to determine how uncertainty affects pertinent financial assets, such as stocks, portfolios, or options. Due to this, Monte Carlo techniques are appropriate for risk assessment, derivative valuation, portfolio valuation, and personal financial planning (Wilmott, 2013). In a random Monte Carlo simulation, the initial stock price is fixed on the last closing stock price of the training set. Next, the daily stock price returns are simulated using random numbers. The stock price is then adjusted at each step based on the simulated return and price of the previous trading period. This is done for several iterations in order to get many possible paths of price for each stock.

Suppose a probability distribution for the breadth σ^2 and mean μ is selected. With a sample size of $k=(\sigma 2/\epsilon 2)$ and a prefactor d' of roughly 10, μ with almost 99% success rate may be predictable, according to the 'weak law of large numbers' (derived from Chebyshev's inequality). As per Fig. 8, this is mathematically equivalent to:

The mathematical expression in Fig. 8 depicts Chebyshev's inequality, which brings about the probabilistic bound of the error that may characterize the estimation of the population mean (μ) using the sample mean ($\hat{\mu}$). Chebyshev's inequality gives an overall bound on how large a portion of the probability is of obtaining extreme deviations. It says that for any distribution in which the mean and variance are finite, the probability

$$\Pr(|\widetilde{\mu} - \mu| \geq \epsilon) \leq \frac{\sigma^2}{k\epsilon^2}, \quad (8)$$

Fig. 8 Mathematical expression derived from Chebyshev's inequality

that a variable deviates from the mean by more than k standard deviation (σ) is most 1/k^2. The inequality contends that the likelihood of sample mean extending from the true population mean by a limit (ε) is inversely proportional to k, the sample size, and the square of the error tolerance (ε). This means that as the sample size increases, then the probability of the estimation error exceeding the threshold is small. In other words, a greater population in terms of sample size gives a higher chance of attaining an accurate mean of the population. This is a principle widely used in Monte Carlo simulation systems in which the precision of the results obtained is a direct function of the sample used. In Monte Carlo simulation, Chebyshev's inequality expression is helpful in estimating the sample size needed to get the level of accuracy of the desired estimate. When ε and the acceptable probability are defined, it is possible to find out the minimum sample size required for accurate estimation results. However, it can take many Monte Carlo simulations to obtain accurate estimation results. This is applicable to day-long stock market simulations. Quantum acceleration can significantly impact this situation.

Brassard et al. (2002) conducted initial research in this direction. Firstly, they developed a quantum amplification algorithm (QAA) by extending Grover's search method (Grover, 1996). Brassard et al. (2002) demonstrated that, given a desired state with probability p, they can use the function $(1/p)$ to reduce this probability to almost 1, which is 25% faster than the best classical technique. Brassard et al. (2002) extracted their quantum width estimation (QAE) algorithm, which is a crucial component of numerous more intricate quantum algorithms. Specifically, it can be used to compute the expected value using Monte Carlo sampling and then obtain a quadratic estimate. Likewise, to measure the estimated amplitude $|\Psi\rangle$ of each state, the QAE algorithm conducts a sequence of ASA operations followed by a QFT in Shor's quantum factorization technique (Shor, 1999). Specifically, p can be assessed in an M-oracle call with an error $\epsilon = 2\pi(1 - p)/M + \pi 2/M$, a measure with success probability $\geq 8/\pi 2$, which is the case if the probability interval $|\Psi\rangle$ equals p.

Based on these findings, Montanaro (2015) demonstrated that Monte Carlo simulations could be performed on a quantum computer with about a fourth of the samples k needed to achieve the accuracy indicated by the equation in Fig. 8 (Montanaro, 2015). This technique can predict μ with a 99% success rate using only (σ/ϵ) samples — the most significant dimensionality coefficients (Montanaro, 2015). The QAE algorithm, which serves as the foundation for effective allocation technique evaluation, is the source of this acceleration.

5.1 Financial Derivatives Pricing

Future fluctuations in the price of specific assets, which may be arbitrary, will determine how profitable these contracts are. Brokers need to be able to fairly price derivatives according to the dynamics of the market. Traditional methods for solving this issue rely on more straightforward situations, like the Monte Carlo Sampling and the Black–Scholes-Merton model (Black & Scholes, 1973; Merton, 1973). The studies have suggested obtaining quadratic derivative velocities using Monte Carlo and quantum acceleration, drawing on the works of Montanaro (2015) and Rebentrost et al. (2018). The concept involves creating a quantum system with a similar probability distribution as a financial derivative and estimating its anticipated value using literature-based techniques (Montanaro, 2015). Rebentrost et al. (2018) also covered the applicability of their approach to Asian and European call option pricing.

5.2 Risk Analysis

Financial institutions should manage and calculate financial risk effectively. The function VaR, which calculates the loss distribution within the portfolio, is one tool for quantitatively assessing risk. Conditional value at risk (CVaR) is another helpful risk assessment technique for a given probability distribution. It calculates the predicted loss of a portfolio where the loss exceeds VaR. VaR and CVaR are often computed from associated probability distributions using Monte Carlo sampling in quantitative finance. Woerner and Egger (2019) developed the concept of effectively estimating these parameters by applying the fundamental ideas of rapid quantum Monte Carlo (Woerner & Egger, 2019). In particular, they were able to compute CVaR and VaR four times faster and with greater accuracy utilizing the QAE technique, which makes use of an Oracle custom function. Woerner and Egger (2019) also evaluated their technique on a number of samples in IBM Q Experience by formulating it as a quantum fraction function. Small-scale experiments can demonstrate significant advantages over traditional methods, which makes them effective.

5.3 Limitations of Monte Carlo Methods

While the quantum Monte Carlo method has important computational benefits, especially in the context of derivative pricing and risk management, several drawbacks influence its practical applicability in financial and industrial applications. A significant limitation is the need for large and high-quality data with high computational costs (Matsakos & Nield, 2023). As in many financial applications, data presentation can be inconsistent and contain errors or missing values, resulting in a greater margin for the precision of Monte Carlo methods (Alaminos et al., 2023). For example, in the case of pricing exotic derivatives or in defining the performing characteristics of long-term risk portfolios, insufficient historical data could result in low accuracy of the Monte Carlo method as a useful tool for decision-making (Ahnouch et al., 2023).

Another limitation of Monte Carlo methods is the incorporation of quantum algorithms into existing classical financial frameworks. Many current financial systems, pricing mechanisms, and risk management systems are designed using classical computational structures that are highly portable when quantum-based techniques are applied (Adegbola et al., 2024). This transition means the creation of hybrid systems, which also raises the level of expenses and migration difficulties. However, questioning scalability is one of the problems with quantum Monte Carlo methods (Adegbola et al., 2024). As for quantum computing applications, real-time applications, including high-frequency trading or dynamic portfolio rebalancing, require extremely fast computation and low latency, which are not yet available in quantum computing hardware.

Finally, regulatory and operation risks also act as constraints of employing Monte Carlo methods. Some industries, like the banking and insurance industries, have strict regulatory policies that require any new technology to go through tests to meet regulatory requirements for use (Myronchuk et al., 2024). These, along with the current state of quantum computing technologies, which Monte Carlo methods rely on, present constraints on the applicability of the method in highly regulated, data-dependent, and speed-sensitive fields.

6 Conclusion and Future Work

This review focuses on the future prospects of quantum computing and its application in the field of finance, which includes how it can completely change portfolio management, improve the evaluation of risk, and sharpen forecasting in business through quantum machine learning. Some of the main outcomes concern the use of quantum optimization techniques for solving NP-hard (non-deterministic polynomial) problems in portfolio management, such as dynamic portfolio selection, where traditional solutions cannot be efficiently applied because of computational issues. Another critical finding is the application of quantum Monte Carlo methods to accomplish the derived objectives, which has shown promising results in terms of efficiency for derivative pricing operations, particularly for Asian and European options. Further, amplitude estimation and principle component analysis (PCA) quantum algorithms were also found to deliver substantial improvements in handling big data for financial risk assessment.

The review's prominent contributions include an extensive discussion of modern quantum algorithms applied to finance, including quantum annealing and quantum machine learning. It gives an imperative analysis of the previous relevant studies to assess the challenges, such as scalability, accuracy, and the integration of quantum systems into the classical frameworks of finance. This work also establishes quantum computing as a potent factor in solving computational-intensive problems in financial processes to call for new solutions to existing problems. The review of the potential in hybrid quantum–classical systems also opens up possibilities of creating a system that can make real-time decisions in high-frequency trading and dynamic strategic management.

6.1 Future Work

Although this review discussed only a few applications of quantum physics to economics, future researchers can build upon how blockchain technology and cryptocurrencies relate to quantum technology (Nakamoto, 2008), or how quantum cryptography, quantum money (Wiesner, 1983), and quantum finance (Baaquie, 2007; Haven, 2002) influence financial transactions security (Bennett & Brassard, 2014; Ekert, 1991). Nonetheless, the application of quantum simulation in banking is equally intriguing (Buluta & Nori, 2009; Georgescu et al., 2014). These subjects could be stimulating and provide valuable insights to the financial specialists and concerned stakeholders in the future.

Future work in this field should look into the application of integrating both quantum and classical computing in a manner that can be useful in handling other financial issues, such as algorithmic trading and real-time portfolio management. Research must focus on enhancing the influence of quantum error correction and working on the constant development of robust quantum hardware to support the computation of complex financial transactions. Therefore, future studies should focus on adapting quantum-based machine learning algorithms to the current and formidable amount of financial data and boost market forecasting performance. Quantum computing guidelines and frameworks for its implementation in regulated sectors like banking and insurance will be important for its real-world application. Exploring the practical uses of quantum cryptography, particularly in securing financial transactions and preserving the security of data, may also be useful to the financial sector.

Acknowledgements I gratefully acknowledge the support and guidance provided by Ulink College Guangzhou, which has been instrumental in facilitating this research. Special thanks are extended to the faculty and colleagues who offered valuable insights and constructive feedback during the development of this work.

Author Contributions The author has solely contributed to writing, designing, compiling, and editing the final manuscript.

Funding The author declares that no funds, grants, or other support were received during the preparation of this manuscript.

Data availability All relevant data used in this research have been incorporated into the manuscript.

Declarations

Conflict of interests The author has no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

Ethical approval Not applicable.

References

Adachi, S. H., & Henderson, M. P. (2015). Application of quantum annealing to training of deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.06356*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1510.06356

Adegbola, M. D., Adegbola, A. E., Amajuoyi, P., Benjamin, L. B., & Adeusi, K. B. (2024). Quantum computing and financial risk management: A theoretical review and implications. *Computer Science & IT Research Journal, 5*(6), 1210–1220. https://doi.org/10.51594/csitrj.v5i6.1194

Aghaei, M. R. S., Zukarnain, Z. A., Mamat, A., & Zainuddin, H. (2008). A quantum algorithm for minimal spanning tree. In: *2008 International Symposium on Information Technology*. IEEE. pp. 1–6

Aharonov, D., Van Dam, W., Kempe, J., Landau, Z., Lloyd, S., & Regev, O. (2008). Adiabatic quantum computation is equivalent to standard quantum computation. *SIAM Review, 50*(4), 755–787. https://doi.org/10.1137/080734479

Ahmad, M., Mishra, R., & Jain, R. (2025). Time fractional black-scholes model and its solution through sumudu transform iterative method. *Computational Economics*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10614-025-10853-z

Ahnouch, M., Elaachak, L., & Ghadi, A. (2023). Model risk in financial derivatives and the transformative impact of deep learning: A systematic review. In: *The Proceedings of the International Conference on Smart City Applications*. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland. pp. 155–165

Aïmeur, E., Brassard, G., & Gambs, S. (2006). Machine learning in a quantum world. In: *Advances in Artificial Intelligence: 19th Conference of the Canadian Society for Computational Studies of Intelligence, Canadian AI 2006, Québec City, Québec, Canada, June 7–9, 2006. Proceedings 19* Springer Berlin Heidelberg. (pp. 431–442

Alaminos, D., Salas, M. B., & Fernández-Gámez, M. Á. (2023). Quantum Monte Carlo simulations for estimating FOREX markets: A speculative attacks experience. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 10*(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01836-2

Alizadeh, A., Gharehchopogh, F. S., Masdari, M., & Jafarian, A. (2024). A hybrid multi-population optimization algorithm for global optimization and its application on stock market prediction. *Computational Economics, 63*(5), 1–46. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10614-024-10626-0

Alpaydin, E. (2020). *Introduction to machine learning*. MIT press.

Ambainis, A., & Špalek, R. (2006). Quantum algorithms for matching and network flows. In: *Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg. pp. 172–183

Amin, M. H., Andriyash, E., Rolfe, J., Kulchytskyy, B., & Melko, R. (2018). Quantum Boltzmann machine. *Physical Review X, 8*(2), 021050. https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevx.8.021050

Baaquie, B. E. (2007). *Quantum finance: Path integrals and Hamiltonians for options and interest rates*. Cambridge University Press

Baesens, B., Van Gestel, T., Viaene, S., Stepanova, M., Suykens, J., & Vanthienen, J. (2003). Benchmarking state-of-the-art classification algorithms for credit scoring. *Journal of the Operational Research Society, 54*(6), 627–635. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jors.2601545

Benedetti, M., Realpe-Gómez, J., Biswas, R., & Perdomo-Ortiz, A. (2016). Estimation of effective temperatures in quantum annealers for sampling applications: A case study with possible applications in deep learning. *Physical Review A, 94*(2), 022308. https://doi.org/10.1103/physreva.94.022308

Bennett, C. H., & Brassard, G. (2014). Quantum cryptography: Public key distribution and coin tossing. *Theoretical Computer Science, 560*, 7–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2011.08.039

Biamonte, J., Wittek, P., Pancotti, N., Rebentrost, P., Wiebe, N., & Lloyd, S. (2017). Quantum machine learning. *Nature, 549*(7671), 195–202. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature23474

Black, F., & Scholes, M. (1973). The pricing of options and corporate liabilities. *Journal of Political Economy, 81*(3), 637–654. https://doi.org/10.1086/260062

Bolton, R. J., & Hand, D. J. (2004). Statistical fraud detection: A review. *Quality Control and Applied Statistics, 49*(3), 313–314. https://doi.org/10.1214/ss/1042727940

Bontempi, G., Ben Taieb, S., & Le Borgne, Y. A. (2013). Machine learning strategies for time series forecasting. *Business Intelligence: Second European Summer School, eBISS 2012, Brussels, Belgium, July 15–21, 2012. Tutorial Lectures, 2*, 62–77. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-36318-4_3

Brassard, G., Hoyer, P., Mosca, M., & Tapp, A. (2002). Quantum amplitude amplification and estimation. *Contemporary Mathematics, 305*, 53–74. https://doi.org/10.1090/conm/305/05215

Buluta, I., & Nori, F. (2009). Quantum simulators. *Science, 326*(5949), 108–111. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1177838

Burman, E., Hansbo, P., & Larson, M. (2024). Cut finite element method for divergence-free approximation of incompressible flow: A lagrange multiplier approach. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 62*(2), 893–918. https://doi.org/10.1137/22m1542933

Campbell, E., Khurana, A., & Montanaro, A. (2019). Applying quantum algorithms to constraint satisfaction problems. *Quantum, 3*, 167. https://doi.org/10.22331/q-2019-07-18-167

Cengizci, S., & Uğur, Ö. (2024). A computational study for pricing European-and American-type options under Heston's Stochastic volatility model: Application of the SUPG-YZ β formulation. *Computational Economics, 64*(2), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10614-024-10704-3

Chatterjee, R., & Yu, T. (2016). Generalized coherent states, reproducing kernels, and quantum support vector machines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.03713.* https://doi.org/10.26421/qic17.15-16

Chen, Y., & Du, M. (2024). Financial fraud transaction prediction approach based on global enhanced GCN and bidirectional LSTM. *Computational Economics, 64*(5), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10614-024-10791-2

Chen, Y., Jin, M., Zhou, Z., & Tian, Z. (2025). A novel ensemble learning framework based on news sentiment enhancement and multi-objective optimizer for carbon price forecasting. *Computational Economics, 65*(1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10614-024-10828-6

Childs, A. M., Kothari, R., & Somma, R. D. (2017). Quantum algorithm for systems of linear equations with exponentially improved dependence on precision. *SIAM Journal on Computing, 46*(6), 1920–1950. https://doi.org/10.1137/16m1087072

Cristianini, N., & Shawe-Taylor, J. (2000). *An introduction to support vector machines and other kernel-based learning methods*. Cambridge University Press.

Darbyshire, J. H. M. (2022). *Pricing and Trading Interest Rate Derivatives 2022: A Practical Guide to Swaps*. Aitch & Dee Limited.

Denil, M., & De Freitas, N. (2011). Toward the implementation of a quantum RBM.

Dumoulin, V., Goodfellow, I., Courville, A., & Bengio, Y. (2014). On the challenges of physical implementations of RBMs. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*

Dunjko, V., Taylor, J. M., & Briegel, H. J. (2016). Quantum-enhanced machine learning. *Physical Review Letters, 117*(13), 130501. https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.117.130501

Ekert, A. K. (1991). Quantum cryptography based on Bell's theorem. *Physical Review Letters, 67*(6), 661. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.67.661

Fang, Z., & Han, J. Y. (2025). Realized GARCH model in volatility forecasting and option pricing. *Computational Economics, 65*(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10614-024-10826-8

Farhi, E., Goldstone, J., Gutmann, S., & Sipser, M. (2000). Quantum computation by adiabatic evolution. https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0001106

Farhi, E., Goldstone, J., & Gutmann, S. (2002). Quantum adiabatic evolution algorithms with different paths. *arXiv preprint quant-ph/0208135*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.quant-ph/0208135

Farhi, E., Goldstone, J., & Gutmann, S. (2014). A quantum approximate optimization algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.4028.* https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1411.4028

Feynman, R.P. (2001). Feynman Lectures On Computation (1st ed.). CRC Press

Georgescu, I. M., Ashhab, S., & Nori, F. (2014). Quantum simulation. *Reviews of Modern Physics, 86*(1), 153–185. https://doi.org/10.1103/revmodphys.86.153

Gharehchopogh, F. S., Mirjalili, S., Işık, G., & Arasteh, B. (2024). A new hybrid whale optimization algorithm and golden jackal optimization for data clustering. In: *Handbook of Whale Optimization Algorithm*. Academic Press. pp. 533–546

Gharehchopogh, F. S. (2024). An improved boosting bald eagle search algorithm with improved African vultures optimization algorithm for data clustering. *Annals of Data Science*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40745-024-00525-4

Grover, L. K. (1996). A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search. In: *Proceedings of the twenty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing* pp. 212–219

Harrow, A. W., Hassidim, A., & Lloyd, S. (2009). Quantum algorithm for linear systems of equations. *Physical Review Letters, 103*(15), 150502. https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.103.150502

Haven, E. E. (2002). A discussion on embedding the Black-Scholes option pricing model in a quantum physics setting. *Physica a: Statistical Mechanics and Its Applications, 304*(3–4), 507–524. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-4371(01)00568-4

Heaton, J. B., Polson, N. G., & Witte, J. H. (2016). Deep learning in finance. *arXiv preprint* arXiv:1602.06561. *https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1602.06561*

Iyer, P., & Poulin, D. (2018). A small quantum computer is needed to optimize fault-tolerant protocols. *Quantum Science and Technology, 3*(3), 030504. https://doi.org/10.1088/2058-9565/aab73c

Job, J., & Lidar, D. (2018). Test-driving 1000 qubits. *Quantum Science and Technology, 3*(3), 030501. https://doi.org/10.1088/2058-9565/aabd9b

Johansson, J. R., Nation, P. D., & Nori, F. (2012). QuTiP: An open-source Python framework for the dynamics of open quantum systems. *Computer Physics Communications, 183*(8), 1760–1772. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2012.02.021

Johansson, J. R., Nation, P. D., & Nori, F. (2013). QuTiP 2: A Python framework for the dynamics of open quantum systems. *Computer Physics Communications, 184*(4), 1234–1240. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2012.11.019

Kapoor, A., Wiebe, N., & Svore, K. (2016). Quantum perceptron models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1602.04799

Karagozoglu, A. K. (2022). Option pricing models: From black-scholes-merton to present. *Journal of Derivatives, 29*(4), 61. https://doi.org/10.3905/jod.2022.1.158

Kato, T. (1950). On the adiabatic theorem of quantum mechanics. *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan, 5*(6), 435–439. https://doi.org/10.1143/jpsj.5.435

Katzgraber, H. G. (2018). Viewing vanilla quantum annealing through spin glasses. *Quantum Science and Technology, 3*(3), 030505. https://doi.org/10.1088/2058-9565/aab6ba

Kieferová, M., & Wiebe, N. (2017). Tomography and generative training with quantum Boltzmann machines. *Physical Review A, 96*(6), 062327. https://doi.org/10.1103/physreva.96.062327

Kim, J. (2024). Subdivided clustering for enhanced predictive accuracy. *Computational Economics, 64*(6), 1–36. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10614-024-10825-9

Ko, H., & Lee, J. (2025). Portfolio management transformed: An enhanced black-litterman approach integrating asset pricing theory and machine learning. *Computational Economics, 65*(1), 1–47. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10614-024-10760-9

Kumar, K. (2024). Forecasting crude oil prices using reservoir computing models. *Computational Economics, 64*(5), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10614-024-10797-w

Li, Z., Liu, X., Xu, N., & Du, J. (2015). Experimental realization of a quantum support vector machine. *Physical Review Letters, 114*(14), 140504. https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.114.140504

Lloyd, S., Mohseni, M., & Rebentrost, P. (2013). Quantum algorithms for supervised and unsupervised machine learning. *arXiv preprint* arXiv:1307.0411. *https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1307.0411*

Lloyd, S., Mohseni, M., & Rebentrost, P. (2014). Quantum principal component analysis. *Nature Physics, 10*(9), 631–633. https://doi.org/10.1038/nphys3029

Lopez de Prado, M. (2015). Generalized Optimal Trading Trajectories: A Financial Quantum Computing Application. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2575184

Low, G. H., Yoder, T. J., & Chuang, I. L. (2014). Quantum inference on Bayesian networks. *Physical Review A, 89*(6), 062315. https://doi.org/10.1103/physreva.89.062315

Matsakos, T., & Nield, S. (2023). Quantum Monte Carlo simulations for financial risk analytics: Scenario generation for equity, rate, and credit risk factors. *Quantum*. https://doi.org/10.22331/q-2024-04-04-1306

Merton, R. C. (1973). Theory of rational option pricing. *The Bell Journal of Economics and Management Science*. https://doi.org/10.2307/3003143

Milne, A., Rounds, M., & Phil Goddard. (2017). *Optimal Feature Selection in Credit Scoring and Classification Using a Quantum Annealer | 1QBit*. 1QBit. https://1qbit.com/whitepaper/optimal-feature-selection-in-credit-scoring-classification-using-quantum-annealer/

Monras, A., Beige, A., & Wiesner, K. (2010). Hidden quantum Markov models and non-adaptive readout of many-body states. *arXiv preprint* arXiv:1002.2337. *https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1002.2337*

Montanaro, A. (2015). Quantum speedup of Monte Carlo methods. *Proceedings of the Royal Society a: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 471*(2181), 20150301. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.2015.0301

Myronchuk, V., Yatsenko, O., Riznyk, D., Hurina, O., & Frolov, A. (2024). Financing sustainable development: Analysis of modern approaches and practices in the context of financial and credit

activities. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues, 14*(5), 317–329. https://doi.org/10.32479/ijefi.16619
Nakamoto, S. (2008). Bitcoin: A peer-to-peer electronic cash system. *Satoshi Nakamoto*.
Nielsen, M. A., & Chuang, I. L. (2010). *Quantum computation and quantum information*. Cambridge University Press.
Nwobi, F. N., Ugomma, C. A., & Ohaegbulem, E. U. (2021). An empirical assessment of lognormality in black-scholes option pricing model. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, 11*(11), 374–383. https://doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.11.11.2021.p11950
Perdomo-Ortiz, A., Benedetti, M., Realpe-Gómez, J., & Biswas, R. (2018). Opportunities and challenges for quantum-assisted machine learning in near-term quantum computers. *Quantum Science and Technology, 3*(3), 030502. https://doi.org/10.1088/2058-9565/aab859
Rebentrost, P., Gupt, B., & Bromley, T. R. (2018). Quantum computational finance: Monte Carlo pricing of financial derivatives. *Physical Review A, 98*(2), 022321. https://doi.org/10.1103/physreva.98.022321
Rebentrost, P., Mohseni, M., & Lloyd, S. (2014). Quantum support vector machine for big data classification. *Physical Review Letters, 113*(13), 130503. https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.113.130503
Roland, J., & Cerf, N. J. (2002). Quantum search by local adiabatic evolution. *Physical Review A, 65*(4), 042308. https://doi.org/10.1103/physreva.65.042308
Rosenberg, G., Haghnegahdar, P., Goddard, P., Carr, P., Wu, K., & De Prado, M. L. (2015). Solving the optimal trading trajectory problem using a quantum annealer. In: *Proceedings of the 8th workshop on high performance computational finance*. pp. 1–7
Rosenberg, G. (2016). Finding optimal arbitrage opportunities using a quantum annealer. *1QB Information Technologies Write Paper*, pp. 1–7.
Roul, P. (2024). Numerical solution for a time-fractional black-scholes model describing European option. *Computational Economics, 64*(4), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10614-024-10720-3
Ruan, Y., Xue, X., Liu, H., Tan, J., & Li, X. (2017). Quantum algorithm for k-nearest neighbors classification based on the metric of hamming distance. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics, 56*, 3496–3507. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10773-017-3514-4
Saeed, N., Shafi, I., Pervez, S., Thompson, E. B., Castilla, A. K., Samad, M. A., & Ashraf, I. (2025). Intelligent Decision making for commodities price prediction: Opportunities. *Challenges and Future Avenues. Computational Economics, 65*(1), 1–59. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10614-024-10837-5
Schuld, M., & Petruccione, F. (2018). Quantum ensembles of quantum classifiers. *Scientific Reports, 8*(1), 2772. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1704.02146
Schuld, M., Sinayskiy, I., & Petruccione, F. (2015). An introduction to quantum machine learning. *Contemporary Physics, 56*(2), 172–185. https://doi.org/10.1080/00107514.2014.964942
Schuld, M., Sinayskiy, I., & Petruccione, F. (2016). Prediction by linear regression on a quantum computer. *Physical Review A, 94*(2), 022342. https://doi.org/10.1103/physreva.94.022342
Schützhold, R. (2003). Pattern recognition on a quantum computer. *Physical Review A, 67*(6), 062311. https://doi.org/10.1103/physreva.67.062311
Shor, P. W. (1999). Polynomial-time algorithms for prime factorization and discrete logarithms on a quantum computer. *SIAM Review, 41*(2), 303–332. https://doi.org/10.1137/s0097539795293172
Tong, Y., Nie, J., & Cheng, X. (2024). Guangxi GDP prediction model based on principal component analysis and SSA–SVM. *Computational Economics, 64*(4), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10614-024-10715-0
Trippi, R. R. & Turban, E. (1996). Neural Networks in Finance and Investing (Irwin).
Trugenberger, C. A. (2002). Quantum pattern recognition. *Quantum Information Processing, 1*, 471–493. https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1024022632303
Wang, G. (2017). Quantum algorithm for linear regression. *Physical Review A, 96*(1), 012335. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.96.012335
Wiebe, N., Kapoor, A., & Svore, K. M. (2014). Quantum deep learning. *arXiv preprint* arXiv:1412.3489. *https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1412.3489*
Wiebe, N., & Granade, C. (2015). Can small quantum systems learn?. *arXiv preprint* arXiv:1512.03145. *https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1512.03145*
Wiebe, N., Braun, D., & Lloyd, S. (2012). Quantum algorithm for data fitting. *Physical Review Letters, 109*(5), 050505. https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.109.050505
Wiesner, S. (1983). Conjugate coding. *ACM SIGACT News, 15*(1), 78–88. https://doi.org/10.1145/1008908.1008920
Wilmott, P. (2013). *Paul Wilmott introduces quantitative finance*. John Wiley & Sons.

Woerner, S., & Egger, D. J. (2019). Quantum risk analysis. *npj Quantum. Information, 5*(1), 15. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41534-019-0130-6

Yao, J. (2024). A Fusion method integrated econometrics and deep learning to improve the interpretability of prediction: Evidence from Chinese carbon emissions forecast based on OLS-CNN model. *Computational Economics, 64*(6), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10614-024-10793-0

Zagoskin, A. M. (2011). Applications and speculations. *Quantum Engineering: Theory and Design of Quantum Coherent Structures* (pp. 272–312). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zhang, D., & Zhou, Y. (2024). Fast Computation of randomly walking volatility with chained gamma distributions. *Computational Economics, 64*(5), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10614-024-10777-0

Zhang, Z. (2024). Is the recursive preference asset pricing model more flexible? *A Monte Carlo Study. Computational Economics, 64*(6), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10614-024-10830-y

Zhao, Z., Fitzsimons, J. K., & Fitzsimons, J. F. (2019). Quantum-assisted Gaussian process regression. *Physical Review A, 99*(5), 052331. https://doi.org/10.1103/physreva.99.052331