EARLY-STAGE DETECTION OF COGNITIVE IMPAIRMENT BY HYBRID QUANTUM-CLASSICAL ALGORITHM USING RESTING-STATE FUNCTIONAL MRI TIME-SERIES

A PREPRINT

Junggu Choi Yonsei Graduate program in Cognitive science Yonsei University Seoul, Republic of Korea junggu.choi@yonsei.ac.kr

Daniel K. Park Department of Applied Statistics Department of Statistics and Data Science Yonsei University Seoul, Republic of Korea dkd.park@yonsei.ac.kr

Seung-Koo Lee Department of Radiology College of Medicine, Yonsei University Seoul, Republic of Korea

slee@yuhs.ac

Tak Hur Department of Statistics and Data Science Yonsei University Seoul, Republic of Korea takh0404@yonsei.ac.kr

Na-Young Shin Department of Radiology College of Medicine, Yonsei University Seoul, Republic of Korea nyshin@yuhs.ac

Hakbae Lee

Department of Applied Statistics Department of Statistics and Data Science Yonsei University Seoul, Republic of Korea hblee@yonsei.ac.kr

Sanghoon Han * Department of Psychology Yonsei Graduate program in Cognitive science Yonsei University Seoul, Republic of Korea sanghoon.han@yonsei.ac.kr

May 6, 2024

ABSTRACT

Following the recent development of quantum machine learning techniques, the literature has reported several quantum machine learning algorithms for disease detection. This study explores the application of a hybrid quantum-classical algorithm for classifying region-of-interest time-series data obtained from resting-state functional magnetic resonance imaging in patients with early-stage cognitive impairment based on the importance of cognitive decline for dementia or aging. Classical one-dimensional convolutional layers are used together with quantum convolutional neural networks in our hybrid algorithm. In the classical simulation, the proposed hybrid algorithms showed higher balanced accuracies than classical convolutional neural networks under the similar training conditions. Moreover, a total of nine brain regions (left precentral gyrus, right superior temporal gyrus, left rolandic operculum, right rolandic operculum, left parahippocampus, right hippocampus, left medial frontal gyrus, right cerebellum crus, and cerebellar vermis) among 116 brain regions were found

^{*}Corresponding author

to be relatively effective brain regions for the classification based on the model performances. The associations of the selected nine regions with cognitive decline, as found in previous studies, were additionally validated through seed-based functional connectivity analysis. We confirmed both the improvement of model performance with the quantum convolutional neural network and neuroscientific validities of brain regions from our hybrid quantum-classical model.

Keywords Resting-state functional magnetic resonance imaging · Early mild cognitive impairment · Quantum machine learning

1 Introduction

Diagnosis of early-stage cognitive impairment is critical for the tracking of patient-candidate groups that can progress to severe dementia. Previous studies have proposed methodologies for cognitive impairment diagnosis [1, 2, 3]. Related studies and medical practices have mainly used questionnaire-based methods to detect cognitive decline [4, 5]. In Startin *et al.*, the authors suggested modified questionnaires for the scaling of Down syndrome (DS) [6]. Although several methods using questionnaires have been proposed in previous studies, some authors have pointed out their shortcomings. The response bias of self-report questionnaires in diagnosing Alzheimer's disease (AD) was shown by Hill *et al.* [7]. In their experimental results based on self-reported assessments, the authors found incorrect responses as well as inconsistencies therein. In addition, Brooks *et al.* investigated the potential for the misclassification of mild cognitive impairment (MCI) based on the Wechsler memory scale test and a questionnaire [8]. Furthermore, to minimize the misdiagnosis of MCI, Nikolai *et al.* used computational tools to compare traditional criteria for MCI [9].

To address several limitations in methods utilizing the self-report questionnaire, other modalities, including neuroimaging, have been used in combination. Among various applicable modalities, a brain resting-state functional MRI (rs-fMRI) that collected to neural dynamics without any cognitive tasks have been applied for cognitive impairment detection. Wang *et al.* validated the utility of the brain rs-fMRI for detecting vascular cognitive impairment [10]. In addition, the authors compared fMRI responses from MCI-patient groups with those from healthy control groups in a picture-word pair paradigm to find differences in brain activation between the two groups [11]. Zhang *et al.* attempted to distinguish between early-MCI (EMCI) and late MCI groups using a functional brain network from the rs-fMRI [12]. They found clear differences in the frequency bands from selected brain regions based on the MCI stage. Alterations of the default mode network and the quantification of these network changes were used as a biomarker for cognitive decline in Parkinson's disease (PD) in their meta-analysis. Sun *et al.* reviewed several previous studies on the analysis of single-channel time-series using electroencephalogram (EEG), magnetoencephalogram (MEG), and fMRI for AD patients [13]. The authors suggested that a high spatial resolution of fMRI could provide more in-depth information for AD brain dysfunction than both EEG and MEG.

For multivariable analysis of the collected brain fMRI data, various data-analysis methods, including statistical modeling or machine learning (ML) algorithms, have been widely utilized. In particular, deep learning (DL) algorithms that show remarkable performance with many parameters have been widely used for classification or prediction tasks [14, 15]. Recent studies have also mainly utilized DL algorithms to classify brain fMRI data. Sarraf *et al.* introduced convolutional neural network (CNN) based DL models to detect MCI and AD groups [16]. The authors used preprocessed two-dimensional images from structural and functional MRI to train their model. Furthermore, Abdulaziz and Khan proposed a DL model-based pipeline for the multi-label classification of rs-fMRI data [17]. In their study, a total of six labels of brain functional connectivities from each stage of AD patient (i.e., normal, significant memory concern, EMCI, MCI, late MCI, and AD) were classified. Moreover, high-order functional connectivity, which is calculated from the post-processing of the brain functional connectivity, is applied to classify the EMCI stage [18]. The authors demonstrated the effectiveness of post-processed functional connectivity such as high-order and time-varying connectivity in EMCI diagnosis.

Studies have reported several drawbacks of the DL algorithm. For example, Thompson *et al.* discussed possible constraints related to the computational burden of DL models [19]. They pointed out that the scale of model architecture such as the number of parameters could negatively impact a range of applications. In response to these challenges, recently, quantum machine learning (QML) has emerged as a novel approach for data analysis, motivated by the computational advantages of quantum computing. It aims to overcome the limitations inherent in its classical counterparts [20]. In particular, QML algorithms have made significant strides in classification tasks, showcasing their potential to outperform classical methods in terms of runtime efficiency, trainability, model capacity, and prediction accuracy [21, 22, 23, 24]. QML algorithms are also widely utilized for disease detection. Maheshwari *et al.* applied optimized quantum support vector machine (OQSVM) and hybrid quantum multi-layer perceptron (HQMLP) to electronic health-care records (EHR), which is one of the well-known structured datasets in the medical domain for ischemic heart-disease classification [25]. They achieved higher classification accuracy compared with that achieved using classical SVM

and MLP. Furthermore, the authors focused on the advantage of QML algorithms in terms of the efficiency of the computation time. In addition, Garg *et al.* used quantum support vector machine (QSVM) models to recognize emotions from EEG signals [26]. Several features including power spectral density (PSD) features were calculated from EEG signals. The authors found that QSVM models trained using EEG features showed improved classification performance compared with conventional SVM models. Furthermore, Felefly *et al.* proposed a quantum neural network-based detection framework for solitary large-brain metastases and high-grade gliomas, which are difficult to differentiate on MRI [27]. Among a total of 1,813 features extracted from two-dimensional MRI images, 10 were selected as the most associated features using the D-Wave quantum annealer. The authors confirmed that a 2-qubit quantum neural network had algorithm performance comparable to those of dense neural network and extreme gradient boosting as the classical counterparts. Although various types of data such as EHR, EEG, and structural MRI are being analyzed using QML algorithms, studies on rs-fMRI datasets pertaining to neurodegenerative patients have been rare. Furthermore, previous QML studies for time-series analysis have only used extracted features and not the raw time-series data[28, 29].

In this study, we classified rs-fMRI datasets collected from healthy control and EMCI patient groups using the quantum-classical hybrid ML algorithm. The rs-fMRI dataset for the two groups was preprocessed to ROI time-series to apply it to our algorithms as a one-dimensional time-series, as opposed to the widely used two-dimensional image. Time-series data on 116 ROIs were compared to examine their relative importance for the detection of EMCI based on the classification performance. The hybrid algorithm utilized a quantum convolutional neural network (QCNN) on a segment of the time-series data, while employing a classical convolutional neural network (CNN) without pooling layers on the remaining portion for local feature extraction and dimensionality reduction. Subsequently, the output features of these neural networks were combined and fed into a classical neural network to produce the final output. The QCNN was applied only to a portion of the data to ensure compatibility with Noisy Intermediate-Scale Quantum (NISQ) computers, which are becoming increasingly accessible [30]. In NISQ computers, the size of quantum circuits that can be reliably manipulated is limited due to noise and imperfections. This circumstance motivated the development of quantum-classical hybrid algorithms that rely on compact quantum models. The utilization of QCNN is motivated by the strengths outlined in the following: First, variational quantum algorithm (VQA) structures of the QCNN are relatively easy to implement in NISQ devices. Their shallow circuit depths and the utilizing of only nearest neighboring two qubit gates can offer advantages to the implementation in real quantum hardware with limited connectivity. Second, the QCNN have small generalization error upper bound by their small number of parameters. Caro et al showed that the upper bound of the generalization error scales with number of parameters in QML algorithms [31]. Since the QCNN has small number of parameters (the number of parameters grows as O(loq(n)) for n input qubits), it will have small generalization error upper bound. Third, it is known that the QCNN avoids the barren plateau problem, which is a vanishing gradient problem that hinders the optimization in QML. [32]. Finally, the QCNN has shown good performances in classical and quantum tasks in previous studies [33, 34, 35]. Model performances were evaluated in simulations with several experimental conditions regarding the number of quantum replacements and 116 brain regions. The proposed model's performance was validated through comparisons with classical baseline models. Our study has following strengths:

- We proposed a hybrid quantum-classical ML algorithm with QCNNs and classical CNN to classify ROI time-series signals from rs-fMRI datasets for healthy and EMCI groups.
- The hybrid algorithm outperformed its classical baseline-model in our simulation results.
- Brain regions that showed larger improvements of the classification performance in the hybrid model have been validated by previous studies and additional seed-based functional connectivity (SBFC) analysis.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces the research scheme with descriptions of the rs-fMRI dataset, hybrid quantum-classical algorithm, baseline model, and evaluation methods for the classification performance of the algorithms. Section 3 describes the experimental results, including the classification performances of the algorithms and validation analysis regarding the brain-region selection based on the classification performance. Section 4 discusses the performance of the proposed hybrid algorithm for EMCI classification and brain regions related to the highest classification performance in previous studies. The conclusions, strengths, and limitations of this study are presented in Section 5.

2 Methods

An overview of this study is depicted in Figure 1. The study comprises six main steps: 1) the collection of the rs-fMRI datasets measured from healthy and EMCI groups; 2) preprocessing the collected rs-fMRI datasets; 3) extracting the rs-fMRI region-of-interest (ROI) time-series from the preprocessed dataset; 4) training the hybrid quantum-classical and baseline models using the extracted time-series data; 5) evaluating the classification performances of the trained hybrid and baseline models; and 6) validating the importance of brain regions in model performances in each ROI condition.



Figure 1: The research scheme of this study.

2.1 Data source

The rs-fMRI data utilized in our research were sourced from the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI), which serves as a multi-site longitudinal-data repository [36]. This initiative enables researchers to access publicly accessible data after obtaining approval, thereby significantly contributing to the advancement of research on AD. Within this repository, a vast collection of medical images, including MRI and Positron emission tomography (PET) scans, is available, alongside clinical, genomic, and biomarker data with the detailed five AD stages (i.e., healthy control, EMCI, MCI, late MCI, and AD). From several internal cohorts in ADNI (ADNI1, ADNI2, ADNIGO, and ADNI3), our study focused on the initial rs-fMRI images acquired during the medical follow-up of 365 individuals, encompassing 93 EMCI patients and 272 healthy individuals from all cohorts (male: 180, female: 185 / age: 74.75 \pm 7.86 / weight: 75.77 \pm 18.36).

2.2 MRI acquisition and preprocessing

In ADNI, all MRI data were obtained on 3T scanners based on the unified scanning protocols (detailed MR protocols and parameters are reported on: http://adni.loni.usc.edu/methods/mri-tool/mri-acquisition/). Because there are some differences in MR parameter between internal cohorts, rs-fMRI images were selected using the same three protocol conditions (200 timepoints, TR: 3000ms, and 48 slices). Consequently, the rs-fMRI images in ADNI2, ADNIGO, and ADNI3 were utilized in this study.

We conducted the preprocessing on all the rs-fMRI images stored in the Digital Imaging and Communications in Medicine (DICOM) format using the DPABI (toolbox for data processing & analysis for brain imaging) Toolkit [37]. This preprocessing workflow encompassed several important steps: conversion from DICOM to Neuroimaging Informatics Technology Initiative (NIFTI) format, slice-timing correction, realignment, head-motion correction, normalization to the MNI standard space, smoothing, detrending, and filtering (from 0.01 Hz to 0.1 Hz). Subsequently, we employed the automatic anatomical labeling (AAL) atlas, which divides the human brain into 116 distinct regions, to extract time-series data from these regions [38]. Consequently, we obtained 116 ROI time-courses in the rs-fMRI datasets measured from healthy and EMCI groups.

Using the calculated 116 ROI time-series, we constructed final datasets to train and evaluate the hybrid quantumclassical and baseline models. The final datasets, $D = \{(X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2), ..., (X_{N-1}, Y_{N-1}), (X_N, Y_N)\}$, included a collection of pairs, (X_i, Y_i) , where X_i indicates a univariate time-series with 140 data points $(X_i = [x_1, x_2, ..., x_{139}, x_{140}])$ and Y_i represents a class-label vector $(Y_i = 0$: healthy group and $Y_i = 1$: EMCI group). The dimension of the final dataset was (790, 141) (790 represents the number of rows and 141 indicates the number of columns). Among the 790 rows in the final dataset, the numbers of rows for the healthy and EMCI groups were 483 and 307, respectively.

2.3 Hybrid quantum-classical classification model

2.3.1 Model architecture

The hybrid quantum-classical model for the detection of EMCI was devised as follows. As the classical parts, we utilized one-dimensional CNN (1D CNN). This model was chosen based on the reported latent feature extraction performance of these algorithms from time-series data in previous studies. Among the various time-series data, the utility of 1D CNN for feature extraction from bio-signals such as electrocardiogram (ECG) or EEG was investigated. Jang *et al.* applied 1D CNN layer architecture in an autoencoder model to extract latent features from actigraphy signal datasets in a denoising task [39]. Furthermore, kang *et al.* conducted a photoplethysmogram (PPG) and galvanic skin response (GSR) signal classification analysis with 1D CNN models [40]. They found that the 1D CNN model showed improved classification performances using the limited computing resource and short input signals. From previous studies that showed the applicability of 1D CNN to the bio-signal classification, we determined that the classical parts in the hybrid model were set by the 1D CNN model structure. For the quantum part of the hybrid model, the QCNN proposed by Hur *et al.* was utilized to investigate the effects of integrating quantum computing techniques with the 1D CNN model [41]. The QCNN was selected because it has been shown to outperform its classical counterparts in the few-parameter regime [41, 33, 34]. To test the change of the hybrid model.

Based on the aforementioned previous studies, our model architecture included the QCNN and classical 1D convolutional layers to evaluate influences of the quantum algorithm about model performance in the classification of fMRI time-series. In the two consecutive parts of our hybrid classification model (i.e., convolutional layer for the latent feature extraction and fully connected layer for the final classification), the classical 1D convolutional layers and QCNN, including quantum convolutional and quantum pooling layers, were used together in the convolutional layer. Therefore, the ROI signal was split into two parts for the QCNN and classical 1D convolutional layers. The latent features extracted from the classical 1D convolutional layers and measurement results (two probability values for 0 and 1) from the QCNN were concatenated as a single vector and applied to classify the two class labels in the classical fully connected layers.

In the QCNN of the hybrid model, the partial classical data in the ROI time-series were encoded to amplitudes of four qubits of the QCNN. The amplitude encoding applied in this study is among the general approaches to encoding classical data into a quantum state by normalizing classical input data as probability amplitudes of a quantum state. The formula for this encoding scheme is as follows:

$$U_{\phi}(x): x \in \mathbb{R}^{N} \to |\phi(x)\rangle = \frac{1}{\|x\|} \sum_{i=1}^{N} x_{i} |i\rangle$$
(1)

where $U_{\phi}(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^N \to |\phi(x)\rangle$ indicate a unitary transformation (a quantum feature map) to make $U_{\phi}(x) |0\rangle^{\otimes n} = |\phi(x)\rangle$ from the initial state $|0\rangle^{\otimes n}$ of n qubits. x in the above formula represents the classical input sample ($x = (x_1, ..., x_N)^T$) with dimension $N = 2^n$ and $|i\rangle$ is the *i*th computational basis state in an n-qubit quantum state $|\phi(x)\rangle$. Therefore, sixteen classical data embedded to amplitudes of four qubits (i.e., $2^4 = 16$).

In the quantum convolutional layer, the two-qubit PQC that represented the parameterization of an SU(4) gate with fifteen trainable parameters was applied [42, 43]. The PQC for the quantum convolutional layer is depicted in (a) of Figure 2. In the quantum pooling layer, the approach is built upon two-qubit controlled rotation gates with two trainable parameters. The applied PQC in the quantum pooling layer are shown in (b) of Figure 2. In two PQCs depicted in Figure 2, $R_i(\theta)$ denotes a rotation gate around the *i* axis of the Bloch sphere by an angle θ and $U3(\theta, \phi, \lambda)$ indicates an arbitrary single qubit gate ($U3(\theta, \phi, \lambda) = R_z(\phi)R_x(-\pi/2)R_z(\theta)R_x(\pi/2)R_z(\lambda)$).

The remaining classical data in the ROI time-series were processed by classical 1D convolutional layers (total 140 data points - 16 data points for the single QCNN = 124 data points for the classical 1D convolutional layer). To compare model performances with varying numbers of the QCNN in the hybrid model, three different conditions for the number of QCNNs were tested (single, two, and four QCNNs). For the hybrid model with two QCNNs, 108 data points were applied as input data to the classic 1D convolutional layer (total 140 data points - 32 data points for two QCNNs = 108 classical data points to the classic 1D convolutional layer). Additionally, for the four QCNNs, 76 data points were processed by the classic 1D convolution layer (140 data points in total - 64 data points for the four QCNNs = 76

Figure 2: The parameterized quantum circuit (PQC) used in the QCNN (the PQC a indicates the PQC for the quantum convolutional layer and the PQC b represents the PQC for the quantum pooling layer).



data points for the classic 1D convolution layer). An example of the hybrid-model architecture with a single QCNN is depicted in Figure 3. Detailed descriptions of the remaining conditions, namely hybrid models with two and four QCNNs, can be found in Appendices A and B. In addition, the details of the proposed hybrid model with a single QCNN are listed in Table 1.

2.3.2 Simulation of hybrid quantum-classical model

Due to the difficulty of accessing real quantum hardware, we performed simulations on classical hardware to validate the classification performance of our hybrid quantum-classical algorithms under ideal conditions. We simulated the hybrid models and compared the performances with that of the classical 1D CNN model as a baseline model. The baseline model had a similar structure to that of the proposed hybrid quantum-classical algorithms. The baseline model's architectures are listed in Table 2. We also calculated the number of parameters in the hybrid and baseline models to compare model performances corresponding the number of parameters. The number of trainable parameters in each model condition is shown in Table 3.

Moreover, the same training and evaluation conditions were used for the hybrid and baseline models. To optimize the trainable parameters of the hybrid and baseline models in the classification task, the cross-entropy loss function was applied. The optimizer for model training, batch size, the number of epochs, and learning rate was randomly selected (Adam optimizer, learning rate : 0.0001, and batch size : 1). Furthermore, class weight was used to reflect the imbalance of the rs-fMRI dataset in model training. All the models were validated in the 5-fold cross-validation with an 8:2 ratio of training to test datasets to evaluate the model performance based on all data. Additionally, because we need to consider true positive, true negative, false positive, and false negative together in the evaluation of disease classification model, balanced accuracy was applied in our study as an evaluation index to reflect the classification results including both the correctly classified and incorrectly classified samples. The formula for balanced accuracy is as follows:

Balanced accuracy =
$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{TP}{TP + FN} + \frac{TN}{TN + FP} \right)$$
 (2)

Additional analysis : seed-based functional connectivitiy (SBFC) 2.4

Following the comparisons of the classification performance between the hybrid and baseline models, we examined which brain region condition showed a larger difference in performance in the hybrid models than the baseline model. To examine the importance of the selected brain regions in the distinction between the two groups (healthy and EMCI groups), we additionally conducted SBFC analysis of selected brain regions.

Functional connectivity analysis in the seed-based approach requires seed regions with ROI time-series [44, 45]. The time-series is extracted from the seed region and the connectivity is then computed by temporally correlating seed time-series with the time-series of all other brain regions. From this analysis, we wanted to compare connectivity maps from the two groups with the same seeds based on the statistical tests. In addition, we assumed that if the differences in connectivity maps were in most brain regions with the same seed, the selected seed region was the main region to distinguish the two groups.





Model structure	Input	Channel	Kernel	Output vectors
	Dimension	Input /	Kernel size /	Dimension
	$(H\times W\times D)$	Output	Stride	$(H\times W\times D)$
Input	(1, 1, 140)			
Partial input1	(1, 1, 16)			
Quantum Conv. layer1	(1, 1, 16)			
Quantum Pooling layer1				
Quantum Conv. layer2				
Quantum Pooling layer2				(1, 1, 2)
Partial input2	(1, 1, 124)			
Classical 1D Conv. layer1	(1, 1, 124)	1/8	30/2	(1, 8, 48)
Classical 1D Conv. layer2	(1, 8, 48)	8/16	20/2	(1, 16, 15)
Classical 1D Conv. layer3	(1, 16, 15)	16/32	10/2	(1, 32, 3)
Dropout 1D				
Concatenate outputs				
from quantum and classical Conv layers	(1, 1, 98)			
Classical fully connected layer1	(1, 1, 98)			(1, 1, 18)
Classical fully connected layer2	(1, 1, 18)			(1, 1, 9)
Classical fully connected layer3	(1, 1, 9)			(1, 1, 2)
Output				(1, 2)

Table 1: The hybrid quantum-classical model architecture with a single QCNN

2.5 Tools

Hybrid quantum-classical and baseline algorithm codes were written by the Pennylane and Pytorch (Pennylane, version 0.25.1; Pytorch, version 1.7.1). Data preprocessing and visualization were built and operationalized using Python (version 3.7.1; scikit-learn, version 2.4.1).

3 Results

3.1 Classification performance in the hybrid and baseline models

To investigate the algorithm performance in the proposed hybrid quantum-classical models, we compared averaged balanced-accuracy values calculated from the hybrid and baseline models with the 5-fold cross-validation in the experimental conditions. In most experimental conditions with the 116 ROI time-series, the hybrid models showed higher classification performances than the baseline models (averaged balanced accuracy of the baseline model: 0.523; averaged balanced accuracy of the hybrid model with the single QCNN: 0.562; averaged balanced accuracy of the hybrid model with two QCNNs : 0.575; and averaged balanced accuracy of the hybrid model with four QCNNs : 0.581).

Moreover, in additional conditions pertaining to the number of QCNNs in the hybrid models, higher averaged balanced-accuracy values were found when using more QCNNs (averaged balanced accuracy of hybrid model with single QCNN : 0.562; averaged balanced accuracy of hybrid model with two QCNNs : 0.575; and averaged balanced accuracy of hybrid model with four QCNNs : 0.581). Furthermore, All differences between model conditions are statistically significant (*p*-value <0.05). Detailed averaged balanced accuracies and normalized differences of balanced accuracy in the baseline and hybrid models with 116 experimental conditions are listed in Tables 4 and 5. The performance changes of the hybrid model according to the number of parameters are summarized in Figure 4. Statistical

Model structure	Input	Channel	Kernel	Output vectors	
woder structure	Dimension	Input/	Kernel size/	Dimension	
	$(H\times W\times D)$	Output	Stride	$(H\times W\times D)$	
Input	(1, 1, 140)				
Classical 1D Conv. layer1	(1, 1, 140)	1/8	30/2	(1, 8, 56)	
Classical 1D Conv. layer2	(1, 8, 56)	8 / 16	20/2	(1, 16, 19)	
Classical 1D Conv. layer3	(1, 16, 19)	16/32	10/2	(1, 32, 5)	
Dropout 1D					
Classical fully connected layer1	(1, 1, 160)			(1, 1, 18)	
Classical fully connected layer2	(1, 1, 18)			(1, 1, 9)	
Classical fully connected layer3	(1, 1, 9)			(1, 1, 2)	
Output				(1, 2)	

Table 2: Model architecture of the baseline model (classical CNN)

test (independent two-sample t-test) results to validate statistical significance between model conditions are listed in Appendix C.

3.2 Comparisons of model performances in 116 brain regions

We evaluated the hybrid-model performances in a classical simulation based on comparisons with the baseline model using a quantitative indicator (averaged balanced accuracy). In addition, the hybrid-model performance must be investigated in terms of a qualitative evaluation (i.e., a function of the selected brain regions). To find ROI time-course conditions with the largest differences from the baseline model, three performance-difference categories of the baseline and hybrid models (hybrid with the single QCNN – baseline; hybrid with two QCNNs – baseline; and hybrid with four QCNNs - baseline) were averaged and normalized to single values. Based on the summarized single-difference values, 9 ROIs with the largest performance differences between the baseline and hybrid models (ROI 1, 84, 18, 17, 39, 38, 23, 92, and 110) were selected. We validated the selected 9 ROIs following interpretations for brain regions reported in previous studies. The selected 9 ROIs, with related information, are listed in Table 6.

3.3 SBFC with selected ROIs

Based on the aforementioned 9 ROIs, we additionally analyzed the importance of the selected brain regions in the distinction between healthy and EMCI groups. To investigate the centrality of the selected 9 brain regions in group comparisons, 9 brain regions were set as a seed in SBFC analysis. We compared brain regions with statistical significance in the difference between the two groups' connectivity maps from the independent two-sample t-test. From the SBFC analysis results, statistically significant differences in connectivity maps were found in many regions. The different brain regions with statistically significant differences (*t-statistics* > 2.0 and *p-value* < 0.05) in the SBFC maps are depicted in Figures 5 and 6.

Furthermore, brain regions can categorize into five higher categories (frontal lobe, temporal lobe, occipital lobe, parietal lobe, and posterior fossa) than the detailed 116 ROIs that were applied in this study as criteria. Therefore, to investigate which brain-region category among the 5 higher categories included the connections found, the connections between the brain regions in the SBFC results with 9 seed regions were summarized into a single circos plot. It was confirmed that brain regions belonging to the frontal lobe were selected the most as regions with the highest connectivity. The summarized connections based on the SBFC results are depicted in Figure 7.



Figure 4: The classification performance and the number of parameter changes of the hybrid model with the number of the QCNN (blue line with circles: the averaged balanced accuracy / red line with diamonds: the number of parameters).

Figure 5: The different brain regions with statistically significant differences in the SBFC maps between healthy and early-MCI groups (seed : ROI 1, 84, 18, 17, 39, and 38).



No.	Model conditions	# of parameters
1	Baseline model	11,605
2	Hybrid model cond. 1	0.083
2	(single quantum convolutional neural network)	9,905
2	Hybrid model cond. 2	8 001
5	(two quantum convolutional neural networks)	8,901
	Hybrid model cond. 3	1 177
4	(four quantum convolutional neural networks)	4,177

Table 3: The number of trainable parameters in the hybrid and baseline models

Figure 6: The different brain regions with statistically significant differences in the SBFC maps between healthy and early-MCI groups (seed : ROI 23, 92, and 110).







ROI	Baseline model	Hybrid Cond.1	Hybrid Cond.2	Hybrid Cond.3	Normalized difference 1 (Hybrid1 - baseline)	Normalized difference 2 (Hybrid2 - baseline)	Normalized difference 3 (Hybrid3 - baseline)
1	0.510	0.591	0.632	0.615	0.918	0.977	1.000
2	0.526	0.617	0.570	0.619	0.983	0.459	0.914
3	0.530	0.489	0.552	0.573	0.108	0.320	0.584
4	0.558	0.587	0.592	0.601	0.580	0.399	0.589
5	0.512	0.600	0.508	0.529	0.967	0.148	0.411
6	0.517	0.501	0.594	0.585	0.276	0.676	0.752
7	0.537	0.536	0.511	0.515	0.373	0.000	0.151
8	0.497	0.530	0.525	0.522	0.598	0.357	0.465
9	0.524	0.530	0.578	0.576	0.420	0.526	0.643
10	0.542	0.565	0.565	0.575	0.538	0.325	0.519
11	0.522	0.521	0.572	0.584	0.374	0.500	0.710
12	0.546	0.553	0.587	0.585	0.431	0.444	0.559
13	0.530	0.544	0.590	0.570	0.480	0.567	0.565
14	0.512	0.560	0.567	0.578	0.705	0.534	0.741
15	0.513	0.561	0.587	0.570	0.705	0.659	0.676
16	0.521	0.535	0.567	0.596	0.477	0.473	0.799
17	0.486	0.549	0.597	0.577	0.797	0.898	0.902
18	0.504	0.578	0.630	0.569	0.871	1.000	0.732
19	0.528	0.582	0.502	0.501	0.741	0.003	0.123
20	0.497	0.497	0.552	0.569	0.380	0.536	0.780
21	0.522	0.545	0.550	0.595	0.535	0.359	0.782
22	0.519	0.538	0.579	0.613	0.509	0.567	0.925
23	0.502	0.568	0.585	0.596	0.823	0.722	0.923
24	0.499	0.551	0.530	0.547	0.723	0.373	0.617
25	0.522	0.491	0.569	0.527	0.175	0.484	0.331
26	0.542	0.484	0.522	0.543	0.000	0.043	0.303
27	0.504	0.472	0.536	0.545	0.173	0.382	0.570
28	0.502	0.525	0.598	0.573	0.532	0.803	0.772
29	0.540	0.560	0.602	0.594	0.517	0.578	0.658
30	0.536	0.555	0.598	0.613	0.510	0.577	0.810
31	0.528	0.566	0.571	0.547	0.634	0.455	0.423
32	0.515	0.504	0.551	0.547	0.308	0.411	0.509
33	0.513	0.538	0.597	0.591	0.548	0.722	0.813
34	0.506	0.577	0.588	0.579	0.854	0.709	0.779
35	0.510	0.561	0.579	0.551	0.718	0.625	0.571
36	0.524	0.550	0.587	0.585	0.552	0.583	0.700
37	0.512	0.559	0.596	0.579	0.695	0.726	0.741
38	0.545	0.615	0.632	0.638	0.847	0.744	0.918
39	0.511	0.602	0.600	0.595	0.982	0.753	0.852
40	0.555	0.594	0.580	0.624	0.642	0.338	0.757
41	0.540	0.574	0.565	0.559	0.605	0.339	0.421
42	0.537	0.549	0.583	0.603	0.461	0.476	0.735
43	0.517	0.558	0.564	0.583	0.655	0.482	0.740
44	0.535	0.564	0.583	0.583	0.574	0.491	0.621
45	0.512	0.568	0.602	0.587	0.753	0.768	0.796
46	0.550	0.591	0.578	0.567	0.652	0.354	0.412
47	0.514	0.554	0.578	0.570	0.645	0.588	0.667
48	0.536	0.573	0.615	0.616	0.624	0.686	0.828
49	0.542	0.594	0.574	0.615	0.723	0.383	0.783
50	0.529	0.588	0.594	0.607	0.775	0.599	0.819
51	0.509	0.587	0.568	0.598	0.900	0.559	0.890
52	0.545	0.573	0.591	0.572	0.568	0.474	0.475
53	0.539	0.571	0.568	0.591	0.594	0.360	0.642
54	0.526	0.574	0.601	0.623	0.705	0.666	0.944
55	0.511	0.578	0.579	0.580	0.827	0.619	0.759
56	0.540	0.582	0.576	0.568	0.658	0.410	0.483
57	0.536	0.585	0.578	0 491	0 711	0.122	0.000
58	0.505	0.516	0.569	0.565	0.459	0.597	0.704
59	0.553	0.557	0.565	0.546	0.412	0.254	0.252
~ /	0.000	0.007	0.000	0.010	0.112	0.201	0.202

Table 4: Averaged balanced accuracy from the hybrid quantum-classical and baseline models trained by time-series from ROI 1 to 59.

ROI	Baseline model	Hybrid Cond.1	Hybrid Cond.2	Hybrid Cond.3	Normalized difference 1 (Hybrid1 - baseline)	Normalized difference 2 (Hybrid2 - baseline)	Normalized difference 3 (Hybrid3 - baseline)
60	0.501	0.558	0.599	0.572	0.761	0.817	0.767
61	0.536	0.574	0.578	0.550	0.631	0.446	0.385
62	0.526	0.567	0.563	0.576	0.658	0.417	0.635
63	0.540	0.585	0.521	0.539	0.681	0.051	0.293
64	0.519	0.538	0.583	0.563	0.510	0.595	0.596
65	0.537	0.579	0.557	0.580	0.658	0.303	0.585
66	0.505	0.581	0.566	0.573	0.887	0.573	0.750
67	0.518	0.592	0.596	0.588	0.871	0.685	0.761
68	0.537	0.584	0.569	0.581	0.691	0.382	0.586
69	0.510	0.583	0.557	0.587	0.865	0.478	0.809
70	0.524	0.544	0.569	0.572	0.515	0.470	0.617
71	0.516	0.567	0.594	0.586	0.717	0.685	0.765
72	0.537	0.593	0.603	0.571	0.758	0.605	0.525
73	0.568	0.582	0.550	0.543	0.475	0.056	0.127
74	0.515	0.578	0.538	0.580	0.796	0.319	0.730
75	0.522	0.570	0.570	0.581	0.702	0.491	0.692
76	0.523	0.591	0.582	0.608	0.838	0.561	0.867
77	0.531	0.574	0.566	0.608	0.669	0.400	0.807
78	0.527	0.571	0.553	0.575	0.672	0.340	0.619
79	0.522	0.583	0.570	0.578	0.791	0.488	0.673
80	0.528	0.579	0.596	0.585	0.722	0.618	0.678
81	0.525	0.589	0.570	0.576	0.808	0.472	0.642
82	0.504	0.567	0.557	0.594	0.799	0.520	0.897
83	0.511	0.566	0.585	0.599	0.747	0.661	0.884
84	0.499	0.591	0.596	0.590	1.000	0.809	0.910
85	0.522	0.595	0.584	0.588	0.869	0.583	0.739
86	0.518	0.569	0.561	0.594	0.719	0.450	0.800
87	0.535	0.570	0.552	0.567	0.614	0.280	0.507
88	0.523	0.580	0.609	0.603	0.762	0.735	0.829
89	0.531	0.594	0.595	0.598	0.798	0.594	0.744
90	0.532	0.610	0.546	0.613	0.897	0.260	0.834
91	0.531	0.598	0.580	0.612	0.830	0.497	0.843
92	0.521	0.590	0.592	0.620	0.841	0.641	0.959
93	0.555	0.570	0.509	0.520	0.009	0.010	0.248
94	0.525	0.303	0.303	0.397	0.030	0.455	0.795
95	0.552	0.505	0.575	0.014	0.399	0.455	0.840
90	0.509	0.571	0.508	0.585	0.789	0.337	0.790
97	0.525	0.551	0.571	0.004	0.309	0.490	0.855
90	0.520	0.571	0.582	0.587	0.720	0.382	0.750
100	0.538	0.580	0.555	0.507	0.669	0.209	0.763
101	0.520	0.545	0.502	0.590	0.502	0.486	0.729
102	0.498	0.515	0.575	0.572	0.582	0.160	0.837
102	0.120	0.520	0.570	0.576	0.615	0.540	0.777
104	0.509	0.538	0.573	0.587	0.580	0.599	0.823
101	0.518	0.528	0.575	0.563	0.447	0.546	0.599
106	0.501	0.539	0.567	0.586	0.632	0.602	0.862
107	0.521	0.562	0.572	0.578	0.650	0.504	0.677
108	0.529	0.561	0.571	0.595	0.593	0.448	0.735
109	0.519	0.550	0.578	0.583	0.588	0.562	0.721
110	0.493	0.536	0.589	0.592	0.667	0.808	0.957
111	0.515	0.539	0.621	0.612	0.541	0.867	0.940
112	0.535	0.560	0.598	0.591	0.547	0.587	0.674
113	0.544	0.573	0.584	0.605	0.576	0.435	0.703
114	0.518	0.548	0.590	0.557	0.581	0.646	0.561
115	0.507	0.540	0.577	0.591	0.599	0.633	0.856
116	0.512	0.551	0.593	0.597	0.639	0.709	0.868

Table 5: Averaged balanced accuracy from the hybrid quantum-classical and baseline models trained by time-series from ROI 60 to 116.

Table 6: Selected top 9 ROIs by averaged performance differences between the baseline and hybrid models.

Rank	Brain region (abbreviation)	Brain region (full name)	Average of Norm. diff	ROI No.
1	Precentral_L	Precentral gyrus	0.965	1
2	Templ_Pole_Sup_R	Temporal pole: superior temporal gyrus	0.906	84
3	Rolandic_Oper_R	Rolandic operculum	0.868	18
4	Rolandic_Oper_L	Rolandic operculum	0.866	17
5	ParaHippo_L	Parahippocampus	0.862	39
6	Hippocampus_R	Hippocampus	0.836	38
7	Frontl_Sup_Medl_L	Medial frontal gyrus	0.823	23
8	Cerebelm_Crus1_R	Cerebelm crus	0.814	92
9	Vermis_3	Cerebellar Vermis	0.810	110

4 Discussion

In summary, we proposed a hybrid quantum-classical algorithm to classify patients' early-stage cognitive impairment based on rs-fMRI time-series datasets. Rs-fMRI datasets collected from healthy and EMCI groups in the ADNI dataset were analyzed. After preprocessing the datasets, raw rs-fMRI time-series were applied as input data to the proposed hybrid model. A total of 116 time-series on 116 brain regions were used to evaluate the hybrid model's performance. In the hybrid model, both classical 1D convolutional layers and the QCNN was applied. To investigate the influences of the QCNN in terms of the model's performance, the baseline model's performances were compared under the same experimental conditions. Based on the model performance for each brain region, we examined the relative importance of brain region in this classification task. Furthermore, confirmed brain regions that were associated with higher classification performance were additionally validated through SBFC analysis. From this study, the following three main perspectives to interpret our experimental results are found: first, input data type from the rs-fMRI datasets; second, the proposed hybrid model's architecture. Third, the brain region comparison from the model performance. We discuss these points as follows:

First, in the case of the input dataset for algorithm evaluation, most previous studies that analyzed fMRI datasets using ML models were based on post-processed datasets such as connectivity matrices or feature vectors from the connectivity matrix [45, 46]. In addition, to model fMRI time-series signals measured from task-based research (task fMRI), Huang *et al.* applied raw time-series datasets to classical convolutional autoencoder models [47]. They examined the application of raw time-course signals from fMRI to detect AD. Among possible approaches regarding the type of fMRI datasets, we selected the raw ROI time-course dataset as the model input. This is because examining the usabilities of raw fMRI time-series signals with improved classification performance on the hybrid approach with QCNN can facilitate dataset post-processing for further studies using fMRI datasets.

Second, associated with the use of raw time-series, we confirmed higher averaged balanced-accuracy values from our hybrid models than those obtained in the baseline models. Moreover, the hybrid models' classification performance showed gradual improvements when the number of QCNN was increased (single-, two-, and four-QCNN conditions). Furthermore, we found that the number of trainable parameters in the hybrid models decreased relative to that in the baseline models. The baseline model included 11,065 parameters. Meanwhile, the hybrid models with the QCNN included 9,983 (single QCNN), 8,901 (two QCNNs), and 4,177 (four QCNNs) parameters. Based on our experimental results, we found that the hybrid algorithm's classification performances can be improved based on the application of the QCNN along with the classical 1D convolutional layers.

Third, for the hybrid model structure with the QCNN, many studies have reported hybrid algorithms with sequential compositions of the PQC and classical DL algorithms. For example, Lockwood and Si investigated the performance of hybrid quantum-classical reinforcement learning algorithms in Atari game as a testbed [48]. Their hybrid algorithms included QCNNs and classical double deep Q learning (DDQN) algorithms repeated in a single data flow. In addition, Houssein *et al.* applied quantum convolutional layers consisted of PQCs in hybrid models to predict COVID-19 from chest X-ray images [49]. These quantum convolutional layers was utilized to extract information from two-dimensional X-ray images. The output of quantum convolutional layers was sequentially inputted to classical neural networks. Unlike previous studies, we attempted a non-sequential arrangement of the QCNN and the classical CNN in our hybrid models. In this arrangement, partial informations in splited raw rs-fMRI signals were processed by the QCNN and classical CNN were concatenated to single vectors as an input vector for classical fully connected layers. From our experiments, we checked that applications of the QCNN and classical CNN with a non-sequential composition in the hybrid model can improve the model performance in the time-series classification task.

Fourth, a recurrent neural network (RNN) structure has been widely utilized for temporal-data analysis. We conducted the additional experiment to verify the classification performance of the hybrid model with other baseline models with a classical long short-term memory (LSTM) algorithm. The baseline model including the classical LSTM algorithm showed the lower averaged balanced accuracy values than the baseline model which we originally applied in this work. From this result, we additionally confirmed the model performance improvement in our hybrid model from two different baseline models. Detailed experimental results are listed in Appendix D.

Finally, regarding the differences in model performance between the 116 brain ROI conditions, nine ROI conditions that showed the highest averaged balanced accuracy were selected. We considered that the selected nine ROIs had higher relative importance for the classification between EMCI and AD than other ROIs. Moreover, the importance of each ROI was compared with that in previous studies. For the selected nine ROIs, the association of the precentral gyrus (Precentral_L / ROI 1) and hippocampus (Hippocampus_R / ROI 38 and ParaHippo_L / ROI 39) in functional connectivity on cognitive decline was confirmed by Han *et al* [50]. In addition, based on our experimental results, we reconfirmed the correlation between the superior temporal gyrus (Templ_Pole_Sup_R / ROI 84) and MCI in

patients found in previous studies in fMRI research[51]. Furthermore, the relationships that were previously found between cognitive decline and the rolandic operculum (Rolandic_Oper_L, R / ROI 17, 18) and medial frontal gyrus (Frontl_Sup_Medl_L / ROI 23) were identical to those found in our study [52, 53]. Furthermore, brain regions in the cerebellum have received attention as related regions for cognitive impairment in recent studies [54, 55]. We found that cerebellum crus 1 (Cerebelm_Crus1_R / ROI 92) and cerebellar vermis (Vermis_3 / ROI 110) were important in detecting EMCI, as found in previous studies.

To validate the selected nine ROIs, we additionally conducted an SBFC analysis based on the selected ROIs as seed regions. Brain regions that showed a statistically significant difference between the two groups' connectivity maps were organized to examine the influences of seed regions on the classification. Most of the brain regions in the 116 ROIs were found in the SBFC results. The frontal lobe region, which has already been proved to play a major role in cognitive impairment, was also identified in the summarized result [56, 57]. We concluded that these selected regions from our hybrid models played central roles in the classification.

5 Conclusion

In this study, we proposed hybrid quantum-classical ML algorithms for the classification of ROI time-series datasets from healthy and EMCI groups. Our research scheme found improved classification performances in hybrid models with fewer parameters than baseline models. From our experimental results, we found that the hybrid model with a higher number of the QCNN achieved higher classification performance than the classical CNN model (baseline model). Moreover, a total of nine ROI conditions that showed the largest differences between the hybrid and baseline models' performances were selected from 116 ROI conditions. We validated that the selected nine ROIs were associated with cognitive decline among patient groups with cognitive impairment, as reported in previous studies. The selected nine ROIs were used as seed regions for an SBFC analysis to additionally confirm whether they were the main regions for the classification.

Our study has several strengths in various aspects. First, we proposed hybrid quantum-classical algorithms with the QCNN and classical CNN together. Second, our model showed higher classification performance with raw fMRI time-series signals from rs-fMRI datasets as input data without any additional post-process such as a connectivity matrix. Third, we validated that some ROI signals that showed a larger improvement in algorithm performance were related to those reported in previous studies. However, there are some limitations. First, only rs-fMRI time-series signal datasets were applied in this study. Therefore, various other dataset modalities (e.g., structural MRI or demographic variables) should be adopted to improve model performance. Second, the proposed hybrid quantum-classical algorithms were only examined by numerical simulations. To evaluate the robustness of our hybrid algorithm on the NISQ device, we need to examine the performance of the proposed algorithms using real quantum hardware. We plan to include other modalities in analysis and test our algorithm on real quantum hardware in future studies with same research theme.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by Institute for Information & communications Technology Promotion (IITP) grant funded by the Korea government (No. 2019-0-00003, Research and Development of Core technologies for Programming, Running, Implementing and Validating of Fault-Tolerant Quantum Computing System), the Yonsei University Research Fund of 2023 (2023-22-0072), and the National Research Foundation of Korea (Grant No. 2022M3E4A1074591).

References

- [1] Howard Chertkow, Ziad Nasreddine, Yves Joanette, Valérie Drolet, John Kirk, Fadi Massoud, Sylvie Belleville, and Howard Bergman. Mild cognitive impairment and cognitive impairment, no dementia: Part a, concept and diagnosis. *Alzheimer's & Dementia*, 3(4):266–282, 2007.
- [2] Kenneth M Langa and Deborah A Levine. The diagnosis and management of mild cognitive impairment: a clinical review. *Jama*, 312(23):2551–2561, 2014.
- [3] Jennifer N Vega and Paul A Newhouse. Mild cognitive impairment: diagnosis, longitudinal course, and emerging treatments. *Current psychiatry reports*, 16:1–11, 2014.
- [4] Antonio Eduardo Damin, Ricardo Nitrini, and Sonia Maria Dozzi Brucki. Cognitive change questionnaire as a method for cognitive impairment screening. *Dementia & Neuropsychologia*, 9:237–244, 2015.
- [5] EH Kua and SM Ko. A questionnaire to screen for cognitive impairment among elderly people in developing countries. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 85(2):119–122, 1992.
- [6] Carla M Startin, Erin Rodger, Lucy Fodor-Wynne, Sarah Hamburg, and André Strydom. Developing an informant questionnaire for cognitive abilities in down syndrome: The cognitive scale for down syndrome (cs-ds). *PLoS One*, 11(5):e0154596, 2016.
- [7] Nikki L Hill, Jaqueline Mogle, Emily B Whitaker, Andrea Gilmore-Bykovskyi, Sakshi Bhargava, In Young Bhang, Logan Sweeder, Pooja Anushka Tiwari, and Kimberly Van Haitsma. Sources of response bias in cognitive self-report items: "which memory are you talking about?". *The Gerontologist*, 59(5):912–924, 2019.
- [8] Brian L Brooks, Grant L Iverson, James A Holdnack, and Howard H Feldman. Potential for misclassification of mild cognitive impairment: A study of memory scores on the wechsler memory scale-iii in healthy older adults. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, 14(3):463–478, 2008.
- [9] Tomas Nikolai, Filip Děchtěrenko, Beril Yaffe, Hana Georgi, Miloslav Kopecek, Markéta Červenková, Martin Vyhnálek, and Ondrej Bezdicek. Reducing misclassification of mild cognitive impairment based on base rate information from the uniform data set. Aging, Neuropsychology, and Cognition, 30(3):301–320, 2023.
- [10] Ran Wang, Nian Liu, Yun-Yun Tao, Xue-Qin Gong, Jing Zheng, Cui Yang, Lin Yang, and Xiao-Ming Zhang. The application of rs-fmri in vascular cognitive impairment. *Frontiers in Neurology*, 11:951, 2020.
- [11] Anne Hämäläinen, Maija Pihlajamäki, Heikki Tanila, Tuomo Hänninen, Eini Niskanen, Susanna Tervo, Pasi A Karjalainen, Ritva L Vanninen, and Hilkka Soininen. Increased fmri responses during encoding in mild cognitive impairment. *Neurobiology of aging*, 28(12):1889–1903, 2007.
- [12] Tingting Zhang, Zanzan Zhao, Chao Zhang, Junjun Zhang, Zhenlan Jin, and Ling Li. Classification of early and late mild cognitive impairment using functional brain network of resting-state fmri. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 10:572, 2019.
- [13] Jie Sun, Bin Wang, Yan Niu, Yuan Tan, Chanjuan Fan, Nan Zhang, Jiayue Xue, Jing Wei, and Jie Xiang. Complexity analysis of eeg, meg, and fmri in mild cognitive impairment and alzheimer's disease: a review. *Entropy*, 22(2):239, 2020.
- [14] Mohammed Rasool, Nor Azman Ismail, Arafat Al-Dhaqm, Wael MS Yafooz, and Abdullah Alsaeedi. A novel approach for classifying brain tumours combining a squeezenet model with svm and fine-tuning. *Electronics*, 12(1):149, 2022.
- [15] Muhammad Umar Nasir, Taher M Ghazal, Muhammad Adnan Khan, Muhammad Zubair, Atta-ur Rahman, Rashad Ahmed, Hussam Al Hamadi, and Chan Yeob Yeun. Breast cancer prediction empowered with fine-tuning. *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 2022, 2022.
- [16] Saman Sarraf, Danielle D Desouza, John AE Anderson, and Cristina Saverino. Mcadnnet: Recognizing stages of cognitive impairment through efficient convolutional fmri and mri neural network topology models. *IEEE Access*, 7:155584–155600, 2019.
- [17] Abdulaziz Alorf and Muhammad Usman Ghani Khan. Multi-label classification of alzheimer's disease stages from resting-state fmri-based correlation connectivity data and deep learning. *Computers in Biology and Medicine*, 151:106240, 2022.
- [18] Yu Zhang, Han Zhang, Xiaobo Chen, Seong-Whan Lee, and Dinggang Shen. Hybrid high-order functional connectivity networks using resting-state functional mri for mild cognitive impairment diagnosis. *Scientific reports*, 7(1):6530, 2017.
- [19] Neil C Thompson, Kristjan Greenewald, Keeheon Lee, and Gabriel F Manso. The computational limits of deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.05558*, 2020.

- [20] Jacob Biamonte, Peter Wittek, Nicola Pancotti, Patrick Rebentrost, Nathan Wiebe, and Seth Lloyd. Quantum machine learning. *Nature*, 549(7671):195–202, 2017.
- [21] Patrick Rebentrost, Masoud Mohseni, and Seth Lloyd. Quantum support vector machine for big data classification. *Physical review letters*, 113(13):130503, 2014.
- [22] Marcello Benedetti, Erika Lloyd, Stefan Sack, and Mattia Fiorentini. Parameterized quantum circuits as machine learning models. *Quantum Science and Technology*, 4(4):043001, 2019.
- [23] Marco Cerezo, Andrew Arrasmith, Ryan Babbush, Simon C Benjamin, Suguru Endo, Keisuke Fujii, Jarrod R McClean, Kosuke Mitarai, Xiao Yuan, Lukasz Cincio, et al. Variational quantum algorithms. *Nature Reviews Physics*, 3(9):625–644, 2021.
- [24] Amira Abbas, David Sutter, Christa Zoufal, Aurélien Lucchi, Alessio Figalli, and Stefan Woerner. The power of quantum neural networks. *Nature Computational Science*, 1(6):403–409, 2021.
- [25] Danyal Maheshwari, Ubaid Ullah, Pablo A Osorio Marulanda, Alain García-Olea Jurado, Ignacio Diez Gonzalez, Jose M Ormaetxe Merodio, and Begonya Garcia-Zapirain. Quantum machine learning applied to electronic healthcare records for ischemic heart disease classification. *Hum.-Cent. Comput. Inf. Sci*, 13(06), 2023.
- [26] Divya Garg, Gyanendra Kumar Verma, and Awadhesh Kumar Singh. Eeg-based emotion recognition using quantum machine learning. SN Computer Science, 4(5):480, 2023.
- [27] Tony Felefly, Camille Roukoz, Georges Fares, Samir Achkar, Sandrine Yazbeck, Philippe Meyer, Manal Kordahi, Fares Azoury, Dolly Nehme Nasr, Elie Nasr, et al. An explainable mri-radiomic quantum neural network to differentiate between large brain metastases and high-grade glioma using quantum annealing for feature selection. *Journal of Imaging Informatics in Medicine*, 36(6):2335–2346, 2023.
- [28] YaoChong Li, Ri-Gui Zhou, RuiQing Xu, Jia Luo, and She-Xiang Jiang. A quantum mechanics-based framework for eeg signal feature extraction and classification. *IEEE transactions on emerging topics in computing*, 10(1):211– 222, 2020.
- [29] Sharanya Prabhu, Shourya Gupta, Gautham Manuru Prabhu, Aarushi Vishal Dhanuka, and K Vivekananda Bhat. Qucardio: Application of quantum machine learning for detection of cardiovascular diseases. *IEEE Access*, 11:136122–136135, 2023.
- [30] John Preskill. Quantum computing in the nisq era and beyond. *Quantum*, 2:79, 2018.
- [31] Matthias C Caro, Hsin-Yuan Huang, Marco Cerezo, Kunal Sharma, Andrew Sornborger, Lukasz Cincio, and Patrick J Coles. Generalization in quantum machine learning from few training data. *Nature communications*, 13(1):4919, 2022.
- [32] Arthur Pesah, Marco Cerezo, Samson Wang, Tyler Volkoff, Andrew T Sornborger, and Patrick J Coles. Absence of barren plateaus in quantum convolutional neural networks. *Physical Review X*, 11(4):041011, 2021.
- [33] Juhyeon Kim, Joonsuk Huh, and Daniel K Park. Classical-to-quantum convolutional neural network transfer learning. *Neurocomputing*, 555:126643, 2023.
- [34] Hyeondo Oh and Daniel K Park. Quantum support vector data description for anomaly detection. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06375, 2023.
- [35] Tak Hur, Israel F Araujo, and Daniel K Park. Neural quantum embedding: Pushing the limits of quantum supervised learning. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.11412, 2023.
- [36] Michael W Weiner, Paul S Aisen, Clifford R Jack Jr, William J Jagust, John Q Trojanowski, Leslie Shaw, Andrew J Saykin, John C Morris, Nigel Cairns, Laurel A Beckett, et al. The alzheimer's disease neuroimaging initiative: progress report and future plans. *Alzheimer's & Dementia*, 6(3):202–211, 2010.
- [37] Chao-Gan Yan, Xin-Di Wang, Xi-Nian Zuo, and Yu-Feng Zang. Dpabi: data processing & analysis for (restingstate) brain imaging. *Neuroinformatics*, 14:339–351, 2016.
- [38] Nathalie Tzourio-Mazoyer, Brigitte Landeau, Dimitri Papathanassiou, Fabrice Crivello, Octave Etard, Nicolas Delcroix, Bernard Mazoyer, and Marc Joliot. Automated anatomical labeling of activations in spm using a macroscopic anatomical parcellation of the mni mri single-subject brain. *Neuroimage*, 15(1):273–289, 2002.
- [39] Jong-Hwan Jang, Junggu Choi, Hyun Woong Roh, Sang Joon Son, Chang Hyung Hong, Eun Young Kim, Tae Young Kim, Dukyong Yoon, et al. Deep learning approach for imputation of missing values in actigraphy data: Algorithm development study. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, 8(7):e16113, 2020.
- [40] Dong-Hyun Kang and Deok-Hwan Kim. 1d convolutional autoencoder-based ppg and gsr signals for real-time emotion classification. *IEEE Access*, 10:91332–91345, 2022.

- [41] Tak Hur, Leeseok Kim, and Daniel K Park. Quantum convolutional neural network for classical data classification. *Quantum Machine Intelligence*, 4(1):3, 2022.
- [42] Farrokh Vatan and Colin Williams. Optimal quantum circuits for general two-qubit gates. *Physical Review A*, 69(3):032315, 2004.
- [43] Ian MacCormack, Conor Delaney, Alexey Galda, Nidhi Aggarwal, and Prineha Narang. Branching quantum convolutional neural networks. *Physical Review Research*, 4(1):013117, 2022.
- [44] Fanyu Tang, Donglin Zhu, Wenying Ma, Qun Yao, Qian Li, and Jingping Shi. Differences changes in cerebellar functional connectivity between mild cognitive impairment and alzheimer's disease: a seed-based approach. *Frontiers in Neurology*, 12:645171, 2021.
- [45] Yuxia Li, Xiaoni Wang, Yongqiu Li, Yu Sun, Can Sheng, Hongyan Li, Xuanyu Li, Yang Yu, Guanqun Chen, Xiaochen Hu, et al. Abnormal resting-state functional connectivity strength in mild cognitive impairment and its conversion to alzheimer's disease. *Neural plasticity*, 2016, 2016.
- [46] Abdulaziz Alorf and Muhammad Usman Ghani Khan. Multi-label classification of alzheimer's disease stages from resting-state fmri-based correlation connectivity data and deep learning. *Computers in Biology and Medicine*, 151:106240, 2022.
- [47] Heng Huang, Xintao Hu, Yu Zhao, Milad Makkie, Qinglin Dong, Shijie Zhao, Lei Guo, and Tianming Liu. Modeling task fmri data via deep convolutional autoencoder. *IEEE transactions on medical imaging*, 37(7):1551– 1561, 2017.
- [48] Owen Lockwood and Mei Si. Playing atari with hybrid quantum-classical reinforcement learning. In *NeurIPS* 2020 workshop on pre-registration in machine learning, pages 285–301. PMLR, 2021.
- [49] Essam H Houssein, Zainab Abohashima, Mohamed Elhoseny, and Waleed M Mohamed. Hybrid quantum-classical convolutional neural network model for covid-19 prediction using chest x-ray images. *Journal of Computational Design and Engineering*, 9(2):343–363, 2022.
- [50] S Duke Han, Debra A Fleischman, Lei Yu, Victoria Poole, Melissa Lamar, Namhee Kim, Sue E Leurgans, David A Bennett, Konstantinos Arfanakis, and Lisa L Barnes. Cognitive decline and hippocampal functional connectivity within older black adults. *Human Brain Mapping*, 43(16):5044–5052, 2022.
- [51] Ziyan Lai, Qingping Zhang, Lingyan Liang, Yichen Wei, Gaoxiong Duan, Wei Mai, Lihua Zhao, Peng Liu, and Demao Deng. Efficacy and mechanism of moxibustion treatment on mild cognitive impairment patients: an fmri study using alff. *Frontiers in Molecular Neuroscience*, 15:852882, 2022.
- [52] Yi Shan, Jing-Juan Wang, Zhi-Qun Wang, Zhi-Lian Zhao, Mo Zhang, Jian-Yang Xu, Ying Han, Kun-Cheng Li, Jie Lu, et al. Neuronal specificity of acupuncture in alzheimer's disease and mild cognitive impairment patients: a functional mri study. *Evidence-Based Complementary and Alternative Medicine*, 2018, 2018.
- [53] Dan D Jobson, Yoshiki Hase, Andrew N Clarkson, and Rajesh N Kalaria. The role of the medial prefrontal cortex in cognition, ageing and dementia. *Brain communications*, 3(3):fcab125, 2021.
- [54] Fanyu Tang, Donglin Zhu, Wenying Ma, Qun Yao, Qian Li, and Jingping Shi. Differences changes in cerebellar functional connectivity between mild cognitive impairment and alzheimer's disease: a seed-based approach. *Frontiers in Neurology*, 12:645171, 2021.
- [55] Heidi IL Jacobs, David A Hopkins, Helen C Mayrhofer, Emiliano Bruner, Fred W van Leeuwen, Wijnand Raaijmakers, and Jeremy D Schmahmann. The cerebellum in alzheimer's disease: evaluating its role in cognitive decline. *Brain*, 141(1):37–47, 2018.
- [56] T Hanninen, M Hallikainen, K Koivisto, K Partanen, MP Laakso, PJ Riekkinen, and H Soininen. Decline of frontal lobe functions in subjects with age-associated memory impairment. *Neurology*, 48(1):148–153, 1997.
- [57] CA Gregory and JR Hodges. Clinical features of frontal lobe dementia in comparison to alzheimer's disease. *New Trends in the Diagnosis and Therapy of Non-Alzheimer's Dementia*, pages 103–123, 1996.



Appendix A Example of the hybrid quantum-classical models with two and four QCNNs.



Figure A.2: The hybrid-model architecture example with four QCNNs.

Appendix B Model architectures in the hybrid quantum-classical models with two and four QCNNs.

Model structure	Input	Channel	Kernel	Output vectors	
Model structure	Dimension	Input /	Kenel size /	Dimension	
	$(H\times W\times D)$	Output	Stride	$(H\times W\times D)$	
Input	(1, 1, 140)				
Partial input1	(1, 1, 16)				
Quantum Conv. layer1	(1, 1, 16)				
Quantum Pooling layer1					
Quantum Conv. layer2					
Quantum Pooling layer2				(1, 1, 2)	
Partial input2	(1, 1, 16)				
Quantum Conv. layer1	(1, 1, 16)				
Quantum Pooling layer1					
Quantum Conv. layer2					
Quantum Pooling layer2				(1, 1, 2)	
Partial input3	(1, 1, 108)				
Classical 1D Conv. layer1	(1, 1, 108)	1/8	30/2	(1, 8, 40)	
Classical 1D Conv. layer2	(1, 8, 40)	8 / 16	20/2	(1, 16, 11)	
Classical 1D Conv. layer3	(1, 16, 11)	16/32	10/2	(1, 32, 1)	
Concatenate outputs	$(1 \ 1 \ 26)$				
from quantum and classical Conv layers	(1, 1, 50)				
Classical fully connected layer1	(1, 1, 36)			(1, 1, 18)	
Classical fully connected layer2	(1, 1, 18)			(1, 1, 9)	
Classical fully connected layer3	(1, 1, 9)			(1, 1, 2)	
Output				(1, 2)	

Table B1: Model architecture in the hybrid quantum-classical model with two QCNNs

Model structure	Input	Channel	Kernel	Output vectors
Wodel structure	Dimension	Input /	Kenel size /	Dimension
	(HxWxD)	Output	Stride	(HxWxD)
Input	(1, 1, 140)			
Partial input1	(1, 1, 16)			
Quantum Conv. layer1	(1, 1, 16)			
Quantum Pooling layer1				
Quantum Conv. layer2				
Quantum Pooling layer2				(1, 1, 2)
Partial input2	(1, 1, 16)			
Quantum Conv. layer1	(1, 1, 16)			
Quantum Pooling layer1				
Quantum Conv. layer2				
Quantum Pooling layer2				(1, 1, 2)
Partial input3	(1, 1, 16)			
Quantum Conv. layer1	(1, 1, 16)			
Quantum Pooling layer1				
Quantum Conv. layer2				
Quantum Pooling layer2				(1, 1, 2)
Partial input4	(1, 1, 16)			
Quantum Conv. layer1	(1, 1, 16)			
Quantum Pooling layer1				
Quantum Conv. layer2				
Quantum Pooling layer2				(1,1,2)
Partial input5	(1, 1, 56)			
Classical 1D Conv. layer1	(1, 1, 56)	1/8	30/2	(1, 8, 24)
Classical 1D Conv. layer2	(1, 8, 24)	8/16	20/2	(1, 16, 3)
Concatenate outputs	(1 1 56)			
from quantum and classical Conv layers	(1, 1, 30)			
Classical fully connected layer1	(1, 1, 56)			(1, 1, 18)
Classical fully connected layer2	(1, 1, 18)			(1, 1, 9)
Classical fully connected layer3	(1, 1, 9)			(1, 1, 2)
Output				(1, 2)

Table B2: Model architecture in the hybrid quantum-classical model with four QCNNs

Appendix C Statistical test results for classification performances between hybrid quantum-classical and baseline models.

		Urbuid model 1
	Baseline model	(with single quantum part)
Mean	0.5228	(with single quantum part)
Variance	0.0228	0.502
Observations	116	116
Paerson Correlation	0.313536158	110
Hunothesized Mean Difference	0.515550158	
Af	115	
ui t Stat	115	
t Stat $P(T < -t)$ one toil	-13.04306714 1 50E 20	
$P(1 \le t)$ one-tail	1.50E-30	
	1.038211//	
$P(1 \le t)$ two-tail	2.99E-30	
t Critical two-tail	1.980807476	
	Baseline model	Hybrid model 2
		(with two quantum parts)
Mean	0.5228	0.5745
Variance	0.0002	0.0006
Observations	116	116
Pearson Correlation	-0.084718363	
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	115	
t Stat	-18.6588469	
P(T<=t) one-tail	6.94E-37	
t Critical one-tail	1.65821177	
P(T<=t) two-tail	1.39E-36	
t Critical two-tail	1.980807476	
	B asalina modal	Hybrid model 3
	Dasenne moder	(with four quantum parts)
Mean	0.5228	0.5806
Variance	0.0002	0.0007
Observations	116	116
Pearson Correlation	0.029713522	
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	115	
t Stat	-21.21479802	
P(T<=t) one-tail	7.29E-42	
t Critical one-tail	1.65821177	
P(T<=t) two-tail	1.46E-41	
t Critical two-tail	1.980807476	

Table C1: t-test results for differences between the hybrid and the baseline models.

Hybrid model 1 (with single quantum part) Hybrid model 2 (with two quantum parts) Mean 0.562 0.5745 Variance 0.0008 0.0006 Observations 116 116 Pearson Correlation 0.163658677 116 Hypothesized Mean Difference 0 115 t Stat -3.962273896 P(T<=) one-tail P(T<=) one-tail 6.46E-05 t Critical one-tail t Critical one-tail 1.65821177 P(T<=) two-tail P(T<=) one-tail 1.980807476 User quantum parts) Mean 0.552 0.5806 Variance 0.0008 0.0007 Observations 116 116 Parson Correlation 0.302224092 Hypothesized Mean Difference 0 0 115 15 Stat -6.341725888 P(T< Hybrid model 2 P(T<=t) one-tail 1.65821177 Vertail model 3 (with wo quantum parts) (with four quantum parts) P(T<=t) not-tail 1.65821177 P(T<<) two-tail			
(with single quantum part)(with two quantum parts)Mean0.5620.5745Variance0.00080.0006Observations116116Pearson Correlation0.163658677Hypothesized Mean Differencedf11515t Stat-3.962273896		Hybrid model 1	Hybrid model 2
Mean 0.562 0.5745 Variance 0.0008 0.0006 Observations 116 116 Pearson Correlation 0.163658677 116 Hypothesized Mean Difference 0 115 t Stat -3.962273896		(with single quantum part)	(with two quantum parts)
Variance0.00080.0006Observations116116Pearson Correlation0.163658677116Hypothesized Mean Difference0115t Stat-3.962273896	Mean	0.562	0.5745
Observations116116Pearson Correlation0.163658677Hypothesized Mean Difference0df115t Stat-3.962273896P(T<=t) one-tail	Variance	0.0008	0.0006
Pearson Correlation0.163658677Hypothesized Mean Difference0df115t Stat-3.962273896P(T<=1) one-tail	Observations	116	116
Hypothesized Mean Difference0df115t Stat-3.962273896P(T<=t) one-tail	Pearson Correlation	0.163658677	
df115t Stat-3.962273896P(T<=t) one-tail	Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
t Stat -3.962273896 P(T<=t) one-tail	df	115	
P(T<=t) one-tail6.46E-05t Critical one-tail1.65821177P(T<=t) two-tail	t Stat	-3.962273896	
t Critical one-tail1.65821177P(T<=t) two-tail	P(T<=t) one-tail	6.46E-05	
P(T<=t) two-tail1.29E-04t Critical two-tail1.980807476Hybrid model 1Hybrid model 3 (with single quantum part)Mean0.5620.5806Variance0.00080.0007Observations116116Pearson Correlation0.302224092Hypothesized Mean Difference0df115t Stat-6.341725888P(T<=t) one-tail	t Critical one-tail	1.65821177	
t Critical two-tail1.980807476Hybrid model 1Hybrid model 3 (with single quantum part)Mean0.562Variance0.0008Observations116Pearson Correlation0.302224092Hypothesized Mean Difference0df115t Stat-6.341725888P(T<=t) one-tail	P(T<=t) two-tail	1.29E-04	
Hybrid model 1 (with single quantum part)Hybrid model 3 (with four quantum parts)Mean 0.562 0.5806 Variance 0.0008 0.0007 Observations116116Pearson Correlation 0.302224092 Hypothesized Mean Difference 0 df115t Stat -6.341725888 P(T<=t) one-tail	t Critical two-tail	1.980807476	
(with single quantum part)(with four quantum parts)Mean0.5620.5806Variance0.00080.0007Observations116116Pearson Correlation0.302224092Hypothesized Mean Difference0df115t Stat-6.341725888P(T<=t) one-tail		Hybrid model 1	Hybrid model 3
Mean 0.562 0.8806 Variance 0.0008 0.0007 Observations 116 116 Pearson Correlation 0.302224092 Hypothesized Mean Difference 0 df df 115 t t Stat -6.341725888 $P(T<=t)$ one-tail $2.31E-09$ t Critical one-tail 1.65821177 $P(T<=t)$ two-tail $4.62E-09$ t Critical one-tail 1.980807476 $(with four quantum parts)$ Mean 0.5745 0.5806 Variance 0.0006 0.0007 Observations 116 116 Pearson Correlation 0.638690571 116 Hypothesized Mean Difference 0 0 df 115 115 514 t Stat -3.085865669 $P(T<=t)$ one-tail 0.0001 t Critical one-tail 1.65821177 $P(T<=t)$ two-tail 0.003 t Critical two-tail 1.980807476 115 116		(with single quantum part)	(with four quantum parts)
Variance0.00080.0007Observations116116Pearson Correlation0.302224092Hypothesized Mean Difference0df115t Stat-6.341725888P(T<=t) one-tail	Mean	0.562	0.5806
Observations116116Pearson Correlation0.302224092Hypothesized Mean Difference0df115t Stat-6.341725888P(T<=t) one-tail	Variance	0.0008	0.0007
Pearson Correlation 0.302224092 Hypothesized Mean Difference 0 df 115 t Stat -6.341725888 P(T<=t) one-tail	Observations	116	116
Hypothesized Mean Difference0df115t Stat-6.341725888P(T<=t) one-tail	Pearson Correlation	0.302224092	
df 115 t Stat -6.341725888 P(T<=t) one-tail	Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
t Stat-6.341725888 $P(T<=t)$ one-tail $2.31E-09$ t Critical one-tail1.65821177 $P(T<=t)$ two-tail $4.62E-09$ t Critical two-tail1.980807476T Critical two-tail1.980807476Mean0.57450.5806Variance0.00060.0007005ervations116116Pearson Correlation0.638690571Hypothesized Mean Difference0df115t Stat-3.085865669 $P(T<=t)$ one-tail0.0001t Critical one-tail1.65821177 $P(T<=t)$ two-tail0.003t Critical two-tail1.980807476	df	115	
P(T<=t) one-tail 2.31E-09 t Critical one-tail 1.65821177 P(T<=t) two-tail	t Stat	-6.341725888	
t Critical one-tail 1.65821177 P(T<=t) two-tail $4.62E-09$ t Critical two-tail 1.980807476 Hybrid model 2Hybrid model 3(with two quantum parts)(with four quantum parts)Mean 0.5745 0.5806 Variance 0.0006 0.0007 Observations116116Pearson Correlation 0.638690571 Hypothesized Mean Differencedf115115t Stat -3.085865669 -3.085865669 P(T<=t) one-tail	P(T<=t) one-tail	2.31E-09	
P(T<=t) two-tail $4.62E-09$ t Critical two-tail 1.980807476 Hybrid model 2Hybrid model 3(with two quantum parts)(with four quantum parts)Mean 0.5745 0.5806 Variance 0.0006 0.0007 Observations116116Pearson Correlation 0.638690571 Hypothesized Mean Differencedf115115t Stat -3.085865669 -3.085865669 P(T<=t) one-tail	t Critical one-tail	1.65821177	
t Critical two-tail 1.980807476 Hybrid model 2 Hybrid model 3 (with two quantum parts) (with four quantum parts) Mean 0.5745 0.5806 Variance 0.0006 0.0007 Observations 116 116 Pearson Correlation 0.638690571 116 Hypothesized Mean Difference 0 0 df 115 115 t Stat -3.085865669 -3.085865669 P(T<=t) one-tail	P(T<=t) two-tail	4.62E-09	
Hybrid model 2 Hybrid model 3 (with two quantum parts) (with four quantum parts) Mean 0.5745 0.5806 Variance 0.0006 0.0007 Observations 116 116 Pearson Correlation 0.638690571 116 Hypothesized Mean Difference 0 0 df 115 115 t Stat -3.085865669 -3.085865669 P(T<=t) one-tail	t Critical two-tail	1.980807476	
(with two quantum parts) (with four quantum parts) Mean 0.5745 0.5806 Variance 0.0006 0.0007 Observations 116 116 Pearson Correlation 0.638690571 116 Hypothesized Mean Difference 0 0 df 115 115 t Stat -3.085865669		Hybrid model 2	Hybrid model 3
Mean 0.5745 0.5806 Variance 0.0006 0.0007 Observations116116Pearson Correlation 0.638690571 116Hypothesized Mean Difference 0 -3.085865669 df115 -3.085865669 -73.085865669 P(T<=t) one-tail		(with two quantum parts)	(with four quantum parts)
Variance 0.0006 0.0007 Observations 116 116 Pearson Correlation 0.638690571 116 Hypothesized Mean Difference 0 115 df 115 115 t Stat -3.085865669 -3000000000000000000000000000000000000	Mean	0.5745	0.5806
Observations 116 116 Pearson Correlation 0.638690571 115 Hypothesized Mean Difference 0 115 t Stat -3.085865669 -3.085865669 P(T<=t) one-tail	Variance	0.0006	0.0007
Pearson Correlation 0.638690571 Hypothesized Mean Difference 0 df 115 t Stat -3.085865669 P(T<=t) one-tail	Observations	116	116
Hypothesized Mean Difference 0 df 115 t Stat -3.085865669 P(T<=t) one-tail 0.001 t Critical one-tail 1.65821177 P(T<=t) two-tail 0.003 t Critical two-tail 1.980807476	Pearson Correlation	0.638690571	
df 115 t Stat -3.085865669 P(T<=t) one-tail	Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
t Stat -3.085865669 P(T<=t) one-tail	df	115	
P(T<=t) one-tail 0.001 t Critical one-tail 1.65821177 P(T<=t) two-tail	t Stat	-3.085865669	
t Critical one-tail 1.65821177 P(T<=t) two-tail	P(T<=t) one-tail	0.001	
P(T<=t) two-tail 0.003 t Critical two-tail 1.980807476	t Critical one-tail	1.65821177	
t Critical two-tail 1.980807476	P(T<=t) two-tail	0.003	
	t Critical two-tail	1.980807476	

Table C2: t-test results for differences between three model conditions in the hybrid model.

Appendix D The classification performance of the baseline model with the Long shot-term memory (LSTM) structure

To investigate the classification performance of the baseline model including the recurrent neural network (RNN) structure, we conducted additional experiments on the new baseline model with the single LSTM layer. The model architecture of the new baseline model is depicted in Figure D.1. The new baseline model has 13,002 trainable parameters, which is similar to the number of trainable parameters in the original baseline model (11,605 parameters) used in this study (Table D1). All experimental conditions remain the same (0.0001 learning rate, cross-entropy loss function with class weight, single batch, and 100 epochs). An independent two-sample t-test was performed to compare the classification performance between the new and the original baseline models. The results showed similar averaged balanced-accuracy values (Table D2).



Figure D.1: The baseline model architecture with the single LSTM layer.

Table D1:	The number	of trainable	parameters in	the base	ine mode	l with th	ie LSTM	layer and	baseline	model	that was
used in thi	s study.										

No.	Model conditions	# of parameters
1	Baseline model	11,605
2	Baseline model	12 002
Z	with the single LSTM layer	15,002

Table D2: t-test results of the classification performance between the baseline model with the single LSTM layer and the baseline model that was used in this study.

	Baseline model	Baseline model
	(with the single LSTM layer)	(original)
Mean	0.5184	0.5227
Variance	0.0003	0.0002
Observations	116	116
t Stat	-2.116	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0.0183	
t Critical one-tail	1.658	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0.0365	
t Critical two-tail	1.981	