Quantum Neural Networks for Cloud Cover Parameterizations in Climate Models

Lorenzo Pastori^{1*}, Arthur Grundner¹, Veronika Eyring^{1,2}, Mierk Schwabe¹

¹Institut für Physik der Atmosphäre, Deutsches Zentrum für Luft- und Raumfahrt (DLR), Oberpfaffenhofen, Germany. ²Institute of Environmental Physics (IUP), University of Bremen, Bremen, Germany.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): lorenzo.pastori@dlr.de; Contributing authors: arthur.grundner@dlr.de; veronika.eyring@dlr.de; mierk.schwabe@dlr.de;

Abstract

Long-term climate projections require running global Earth system models on timescales of hundreds of years and have relatively coarse resolution (from 40 to 160 km in the horizontal) due to their high computational costs. Unresolved subgrid-scale processes, such as clouds, are described in a semi-empirical manner by so called parameterizations, which are a major source of uncertainty in climate projections. Machine learning models trained on short high-resolution climate simulations are promising candidates to replace conventional parameterizations. In this work, we take a step further and explore the potential of quantum machine learning, and in particular quantum neural networks (QNNs), to develop cloud cover parameterizations. QNNs differ from their classical counterparts, and their potentially high expressivity turns them into promising tools for accurate datadriven schemes to be used in climate models. Here we perform an extensive comparative analysis between several QNNs and classical neural networks (NNs), by training both ansatzes on data coming from high-resolution simulations with the ICOsahedral Non-hydrostatic weather and climate model (ICON). Our results show that the overall performance of the investigated QNNs is comparable to that of classical NNs of similar size, i.e., with the same number of trainable parameters, with both ansatzes outperforming standard parameterizations used in climate models. Our study also includes an analysis of the generalization ability of the models as well as the geometrical properties of their optimization landscape. We furthermore investigate the effects of finite sampling noise, and show that the

training and the predictions of the QNNs are stable even in this noisy setting. These results demonstrate the applicability of quantum machine learning models to learn meaningful patterns in climate data, and are thus relevant for a broad range of problems within the climate modeling community.

Keywords: Quantum machine learning, Quantum neural networks, Climate modeling, Parameterizations, Cloud cover

1 Introduction

One of the requirements for improving mitigation and adaption strategies against climate change is the ability to perform reliable long-term climate projections using climate models. Climate models are numerical models that simulate the evolution of the various components of the Earth system (Jacobson, 2005; Gettelman and Rood, 2016). In a climate model, the equations governing the dynamics of the atmosphere are discretized on a grid with horizontal extension on the order of tens of kilometers, to enable ensembles of climate projections over several decades. Due to this relatively coarse horizontal resolution, current climate models are still affected by systematic biases compared to observations, despite continuous improvements (Sherwood et al., 2014; Bock et al., 2020). At these horizontal resolutions, important physical processes such as clouds, convection or turbulence cannot be resolved, and their effect must be re-introduced in the climate model in an approximate manner by so-called parameterizations (Stensrud, 2007; McFarlane, 2011; Christensen and Zanna, 2022). The structural and parametric uncertainties in conventional parameterization schemes are a source of the aforementioned remaining biases (Randall et al., 2003; Sherwood et al., 2014; Schneider et al., 2017; Eyring et al., 2021). Machine learning (ML) models are promising candidates to replace conventional parameterizations (Gentine et al., 2021; Eyring et al., 2021, 2024,?). Several uses of ML for parameterizations have been proposed in the literature, with prominent applications to radiation (Chevallier et al., 1998; Krasnopolsky et al., 2005; Lagerquist et al., 2021; Hafner et al., 2024), convection (Krasnopolsky et al., 2013; Rasp et al., 2018; Gentine et al., 2018; Brenowitz and Bretherton, 2019; Yuval and O'Gorman, 2020; Heuer et al., 2024) and cloud cover (Grundner et al., 2022, 2024). One of the strategies in employing ML is to develop data-driven schemes trained on coarse-grained data coming from high-resolution climate simulations, where convection and clouds are more explicitly resolved. While enabling numerous improvements, the use of ML also introduces several requirements, such as the need of complex yet trainable models to encompass various physical scenarios, the need of large amounts of training data, and the ability to generalize to unseen climate regimes (Eyring et al., 2024).

In this work, we explore the potential of quantum machine learning (QML) (Perdomo-Ortiz et al., 2018; Benedetti et al., 2019; Cerezo et al., 2022), and in particular quantum neural networks (QNNs) (Farhi and Neven, 2018), to develop parameterizations for climate models, specifically focusing on the case of cloud cover. QNNs constitute a different type of ansatz compared to classical neural networks

(NNs), and several theoretical works have highlighted their good generalization capability (Caro et al., 2021; Banchi et al., 2021; Caro et al., 2022; Haug and Kim, 2024), their higher expressivity for certain tasks (Du et al., 2020; Yu et al., 2023), as well as provided hints to their well-behaved optimization landscape which may result in a good trainability in certain regimes (Abbas et al., 2021). Motivated by these insights, we perform a thorough comparative analysis between several QNNs and classical NNs models, to understand whether this type of QML models can help addressing the aforementioned challenges.

The field of QML expands in several directions, including supervised learning for regression and classification (Farhi and Neven, 2018), generative modeling (Amin et al., 2018; Dallaire-Demers and Killoran, 2018; Coyle et al., 2020; Gao et al., 2022) and kernel methods (Havlíček et al., 2019; Schuld and Killoran, 2019). The number of QML applications to classical problems and datasets is rapidly growing (see Chen et al. (2022); Hur et al. (2022); Shen et al. (2024); Belis et al. (2024); Corli et al. (2024); Duneau et al. (2024); Aizpurua et al. (2024); Sünkel et al. (2023); Sakhnenko et al. (2024); Slabbert et al. (2024), to name a few), thus potentially increasing its scope beyond purely quantum-related problems. Not surprisingly, there is also growing interest in the application of quantum computing and QML in the context of weather and climate science (Tennie and Palmer, 2023; Lachure et al., 2023; Nivelkar et al., 2023; Otgonbaatar and Kranzlmüller, 2023; Nammouchi et al., 2023; Rahman et al., 2024; Jaderberg et al., 2024; Matsuta and Furue, 2024; Ho et al., 2024; Bazgir and Zhang, 2024; Schwabe et al., 2024). The application of QML to classical data is still in its infancy, also due to the noise and limited size of current noisy intermediate-scale quantum (NISQ) devices. The tests reported in the literature provide an empirical standpoint of the field, and it is still unclear how much quantum advantage can be distilled from QML in the long run (Kölle et al., 2024; Cerezo et al., 2024; Bowles et al., 2024; Gil-Fuster et al., 2024; Bermejo et al., 2024). Nevertheless, it is worth to investigate whether QML models lend themselves to learning patterns in climate-specific data, and whether they can do so better than classical architectures, for potentially bringing quantum or quantum-inspired enhancements into climate projections.

Here, we conduct such an investigation in the context of climate model parameterizations. Specifically, we perform numerical simulations training and evaluating both QNN and classical NN ansatzes on coarse-grained data coming from high-resolution simulations with the ICOsahedral Non-hydrostatic weather and climate model (ICON) (Giorgetta et al., 2018), which were part of the DYnamics of the Atmospheric general circulation Modeled On Non-hydrostatic Domains (DYAMOND) project (Stevens et al., 2019; Duras et al., 2021). Both ansatzes are constructed to take as input the state variables in the climate model's cell, such as humidity, temperature and pressure, and to output the cloud cover, i.e., the fraction of the cell that is occupied by clouds. The models developed here are trained and evaluated offline, i.e., without coupling them with the dynamical core of the climate model. These quantum and classical models are compared on several aspects. First, we focus on the prediction accuracy of the two types of ansatzes, and show that both achieve comparable accuracy when the number of trainable parameters is kept the same, while outperforming the conventional cloud cover scheme used in ICON. We then compare the generalization capabilities



Figure 1 Schematics of our approach for developing a QNN-based parameterization. We coarse-grain high-resolution data to the target resolution, and construct a training dataset with coarse-grained state variables \boldsymbol{x} as inputs and the corresponding coarse-grained cloud cover $clc(\boldsymbol{x})$ as output. The dataset is used to train a QNN, i.e., to optimize the parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ so that the QNN output $f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x})$ approximates $clc(\boldsymbol{x})$.

of the two ansatzes, in terms of the number of training data required to achieve a certain prediction accuracy, and the trainability, i.e., the number of training epochs required for the network (classical or quantum) to reach its optimal configuration. The average prediction performance of quantum and classical models is comparable also w.r.t. these two aspects, despite quantum models having better behaved geometrical properties captured by the Fisher information matrix. Finally, in view of a practical implementation on quantum devices, we investigate the effects of finite sampling noise on the training and the predictions of QNNs. We show that our QNNs can train stably even in presence of shot noise, and that the costs of training and inference in terms of number of measurement shots can be further minimized using recently introduced variance regularization techniques (Kreplin and Roth, 2024). Our study thus highlights an important and timely use case of QML while also discussing its potential limitations.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we describe the training data used. In Section 3 we describe our design choices for the QNNs used, and provide details on our data encoding strategy as well as on the training of these models. In Section 4 we present our results in the noiseless regime, focusing on the aspects of prediction accuracy, generalization and trainability, and including the comparisons with classical NNs. In Section 5 we present the analysis of our QNNs in presence of finite sampling noise. We finally conclude in Section 6.

2 The training data

The training data used in this work is obtained from global high-resolution ICON simulations, from the DYAMOND project (Stevens et al., 2019; Duras et al., 2021; Stephan et al., 2022). These simulations offer an improved representation of clouds and convection compared to simulations at climate model resolutions (Stevens et al., 2020). They consist of 40 simulated days starting on the 1st August 2016, and 40 simulated days starting on the 20th January 2020, with a resolution of approximately 2.5 km in the horizontal. In both cases, the first 10 days have been discarded as spin-up



Figure 2 Schematics of our QNN architecture. The data \boldsymbol{x} is uploaded $n_{\rm enc}$ times as angles of single-qubit rotations (blue boxes). In our implementation, each input feature is uploaded to the same qubit each time. These re-uploading gates are interleaved with variational blocks $\hat{V}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}^{(k)})$ containing entangling gates and trainable parameters $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}^{(k)}$ ($k = 1, \ldots, n_{\rm enc}$). Afterwards, a sequence of $n_{\rm var}$ variational blocks $\hat{W}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^{(\ell)})$ ($\ell = 1, \ldots, n_{\rm var}$) are applied. In the end, the expectation values of $\hat{\sigma}^z$ on all qubits are measured, and a weighted average of those is performed, with trainable weights \boldsymbol{w} and a bias term b. The result $f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x})$ should approximate $\operatorname{clc}(\boldsymbol{x})$ after training the parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \{\{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}^{(k)}\}_k, \{\boldsymbol{\varphi}^{(\ell)}\}_\ell, \boldsymbol{w}, b\}$.

time of the simulation, to have training and testing datasets more closely representing physically realistic conditions.

Following Giorgetta et al. (2022) we define a high-resolution grid cell to be cloudy (cloud cover = 1) whenever a meaningful cloud condensate (cloud water or cloud ice) amount is detected (i.e., when specific cloud condensate content exceeds 10^{-6} kg/kg) and to otherwise be cloud-free (cloud cover = 0). Such a binary setting of cloud cover is much more sensible at the high horizontal and vertical resolution of the storm-resolving model simulations than at coarse climate model resolutions.

The data is then coarse-grained to a horizontal resolution of approximately 80 km (corresponding to an R2B5 ICON grid), and vertically from 58 to 27 model levels below an altitude of 21 km, following Grundner et al. (2022, 2024). After coarse-graining, cloud cover in a given cell can take any value between 0 and 1, representing the fraction of the cell that is occupied by clouds. Given that cloud cover cannot exist in the absence of cloud condensate, we remove from the dataset all the cells where the total amount of cloud condensate is zero. This results in a dataset which is more balanced, i.e., where the cloud-free samples are less over-represented.

3 Quantum neural networks as parameterization models

The approach we use to construct our QNN-based parameterization for cloud cover is summarized in Fig. 1. The data resulting from the coarse-graining procedure described above constitute the training dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{x_i, y_i\}_i$, where $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^N$ denotes the selected coarse-grained state variables used as inputs and $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ the output corresponding to the coarse-grained cloud cover $clc(x_i)$, for the *i*-th model cell (at a specific spatial location and point in time). These data are used for training our QNNs, which are based on a parameterized quantum circuit realizing the unitary operator $\hat{U}_{\theta}(x)$, depending on the inputs x and on the union of all sets of trainable parameters $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^D$.

During optimization, all parameters in $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ are adjusted so that the distance between the QNN output $f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x})$ and $\operatorname{clc}(\boldsymbol{x})$ for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \{\boldsymbol{x}_i\}_i$ is minimized. In the following, we discuss the details of our implementations of $\hat{U}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x})$ and how the QNN output $f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x})$ is constructed.

3.1 Architecture choice

A schematic visualization of the parameterized quantum circuit (PQC) forming the backbone of our QNNs is shown in Fig. 2. The qubit register is initialized in the $|0\rangle$ state. To encode the input features (i.e., the components of the vector \boldsymbol{x}), we adopt the data re-uploading technique (Pérez-Salinas et al., 2020; Schuld et al., 2021), to increase the number of Fourier frequencies that our model can capture (Schuld et al., 2021; Casas and Cervera-Lierta, 2023). Specifically, we encode the input features multiple times as angles of single-qubit rotations, which results in the encoding layer

$$\hat{S}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \prod_{n=1}^{N} e^{-i\frac{\boldsymbol{x}_n}{2}\hat{\sigma}_n^{\alpha}} \equiv \hat{R}_{\alpha}(\boldsymbol{x}) , \qquad (1)$$

where x_n is the *n*-th component of \boldsymbol{x} and $\alpha = x, y, z$ denotes the rotation axis, depending on the specific ansatz. In this construction, the number of qubits is therefore equal to the number of input features N. Subsequent applications of $\hat{S}(\boldsymbol{x})$ are interleaved with variational blocks $\hat{V}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}^{(k)})$ (with $k = 1, ..., n_{\text{enc}}$), which depend on trainable parameters $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}^{(k)}$ and also contain entangling operations. The specific form of these blocks is specified later on in this section. After this stage, amounting to n_{enc} data re-uploads, additional n_{var} variational blocks $\hat{W}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^{(\ell)})$ (with $\ell = 1, ..., n_{\text{var}}$) are applied to increase the number of trainable parameters. These blocks depend on trainable parameters $\boldsymbol{\varphi}^{(\ell)}$ and also contain entangling operations. The resulting unitary operator describing the PQC reads as

$$\hat{U}_{\boldsymbol{\vartheta},\boldsymbol{\varphi}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \prod_{\ell=1}^{n_{\text{var}}} \hat{W}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^{(\ell)}) \prod_{k=1}^{n_{\text{enc}}} \left(\hat{V}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}^{(k)}) \hat{S}(\boldsymbol{x}) \right) , \qquad (2)$$

where the subscripts ϑ, φ denote the dependences on the sets $\vartheta = \{\vartheta^{(k)}\}_k$ and $\varphi = \{\varphi^{(\ell)}\}_{\ell}$. After the PQC computation, the expectation values

$$\langle \hat{\sigma}_n^z
angle_{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\varphi}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \langle 0 | \hat{U}_{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\varphi}}^{\dagger}(\boldsymbol{x}) \, \hat{\sigma}_n^z \, \hat{U}_{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\varphi}}(\boldsymbol{x}) | 0
angle$$

are measured on the output state, and their weighted average with trainable weights \boldsymbol{w} is computed, finally yielding the QNN prediction as

$$f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = b + \sum_{n=1}^{N} w_n \langle \hat{\sigma}_n^z \rangle_{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\varphi}}(\boldsymbol{x}) , \qquad (3)$$

with w_n being the *n*-th component of \boldsymbol{w} , *b* an additional trainable parameter (bias), and $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ summarizing all the parameters $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}$, $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$, \boldsymbol{w} , and *b*.

In this work, we focus on two ansatzes for the encoding and variational blocks in $\hat{U}_{\vartheta,\varphi}(\boldsymbol{x})$. We label the resulting QNN architectures with XYZ and ZZXY. In both architectures, the encoding layer is implemented as $\hat{S}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \hat{R}_x(\boldsymbol{x})$. For the XYZ circuit ansatz, the encoding blocks take the following form

$$\begin{split} \dot{V}_{\rm XYZ}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}) &= \dot{R}_{yy}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{(2N-1)\to(3N-3)}) \, \dot{R}_{xx}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{N\to(2N-2)}) \times \\ & \hat{R}_{zz}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{1\to(N-1)}) \; , \end{split}$$

where $\hat{R}_{\alpha\alpha}(\vartheta) = \prod_{n=1}^{N-1} e^{-i\frac{\vartheta_n}{2}\hat{\sigma}_n^{\alpha}\hat{\sigma}_{n+1}^{\alpha}}$, with $\alpha = x, y, z$, and $\vartheta_{i\to j}$ denoting the slice of ϑ from the *i*-th to *j*-th component. The variational blocks for XYZ read as

$$\begin{split} \hat{W}_{\text{XYZ}}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}) &= \hat{R}_x(\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{(3N-2) \to (4N-3)}) \times \\ & \hat{R}_{yy}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{(2N-1) \to (3N-3)}) \times \\ & \hat{R}_{xx}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{N \to (2N-2)}) \, \hat{R}_{zz}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{1 \to (N-1)}) \; . \end{split}$$

For the ZZXY ansatz the encoding and variational blocks take the following form

$$\hat{V}_{\text{ZZXY}}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}) = \hat{R}_{y}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{N \to (2N-1)}) \,\hat{R}_{zz}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{1 \to (N-1)}) \;,$$

and

$$\begin{split} \hat{W}_{\text{ZZXY}}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}) &= \hat{R}_y(\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{2N \to (3N-1)}) \, \hat{R}_{zz}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{(N+1) \to (2N-1)}) \times \\ & \hat{R}_x(\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{1 \to N}) \; . \end{split}$$

We refer the reader to Appendix A for a comparison with other investigated types of QNNs. In this work, the investigated QNNs are numerically simulated in Python using the Pennylane library (Bergholm et al., 2022) and optimized with JAX (, accessed 2024).

3.2 Input features and pre-processing

The components of the input vector \boldsymbol{x} are the coarse-grained state variables chosen as predictors for the cloud cover in the corresponding model cell. These are chosen among the following state variables

- q_v [kg/kg]: specific humidity,
- $q_c [kg/kg]$: specific cloud water content,
- $q_i [kg/kg]$: specific cloud ice content,
- T [K]: air temperature,
- p [Pa]: pressure,
- $h_{\rm w} = \sqrt{u^2 + v^2}$ [m/s]: magnitude of horizontal wind component (with u and v being the zonal and meridional components, respectively),
- $z_{\rm g}$ [m]: geometric height at full level,
- ϕ [rad]: latitude.

The selection of these variables is based on previous works on ML-based cloud cover parameterizations (Grundner et al., 2022, 2024). Given the different magnitudes and distributions of these input features, it is necessary to suitably transform and rescale them so that they can be encoded as angles in our PQCs. For the features T, p and $z_{\rm g}$ we found it sufficient to perform a min-max (linear) re-scaling within the interval $[0, \pi]$. For the features q_v , q_c , q_i and h_w the situation is slightly more complex, since their distribution is sharply peaked at 0 and contains long decaying tails, in particular for q_c , q_i . For these features we perform a non-linear transformation specifically constructed to (i) make the input feature distribution more uniform, so as to better distinguish from each other the values close to 0, and (ii) retain the input feature variability in the tails, which can be associated with physical scenarios we are interested in capturing. In Appendix \mathbf{B} we provide the details on the transformations we constructed keeping these objectives in mind. The transformed features q_v , q_c , q_i and $h_{\rm w}$ are also approximately distributed in the interval $[0,\pi]$, so that they can be used as angles in the PQCs. To enable a proper comparison between quantum and classical NNs, the same input transformations are used in both cases.

As an additional pre-processing step further enhancing the performance of our networks, it is beneficial to learn a transformed version of cloud cover, i.e., to set the outputs y_i in the training set to $y_i = g(\operatorname{clc}(\boldsymbol{x}_i))$, with g denoting a suitable transformation function. The transformation function g is constructed to have the training outputs y_i approximately uniformly distributed in the interval [0,1]. An explicit expression of this transformation is given in Appendix B.

3.3 Training QNNs

In an actual implementation of QNNs on quantum devices, the training of the parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is achieved via a quantum-classical feedback loop (McClean et al., 2016; Cerezo et al., 2021). At each iteration of this loop the QNN is run on the quantum device for given parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and the cost function is computed, and its value is used to propose new parameters to be used in the QNN at the next iteration. In our case, the computations of the QNN which would take place on a quantum device are simulated numerically. The cost function we minimize for training is the mean squared error (MSE) over the training dataset \mathcal{D} of size $N_{\text{train}} = |\mathcal{D}|$, computed as

$$MSE_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{N_{\text{train}}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{train}}} \left(f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) - y_i) \right)^2, \qquad (4)$$

with $y_i = g(\operatorname{clc}(\boldsymbol{x}_i))$. The parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ are updated using gradient descent methods. Specifically, we use the Adam optimizer (Kingma and Ba, 2017). This requires the ability of calculating the gradients of the cost function with respect to the parameters efficiently, which for QNNs can be done using the parameter-shift rule (Mitarai et al., 2018; Schuld et al., 2019). In our case all the gate generators are (one half times) Pauli operators multiplied by the variational parameters, and we can use the following form

QNN	N	$n_{ m enc}$	n_{v}	ar	D		Input features
$XXY_{5,3}^8$	8	5	3		201		$\{q_{\rm v}, q_{\rm c}, q_{\rm i}, T, p, z_{\rm g}, h_{\rm w}, \phi\}$
$ZZXY_{2,7}^8$	8	2	7		2	00	$\{q_{\rm v}, q_{\rm c}, q_{\rm i}, T, p, z_{\rm g}, h_{\rm w}, \phi\}$
$XXY_{4,2}^6$	6	4	2		1	09	$\{q_{\rm v}, q_{\rm c}, q_{\rm i}, T, p, h_{\rm w}\}$
$ZZXY_{2,5}^6$	6	2	5		1	14	$\{q_{\rm v}, q_{\rm c}, q_{\rm i}, T, p, h_{\rm w}\}$
NN	Hidden layers			D		Inj	put features
$NN_{12,6,2}^{8}$	$12 \rightarrow 6 \rightarrow 2$			20	203 {q		$\mathbf{v}, q_{\mathrm{c}}, q_{\mathrm{i}}, T, p, z_{\mathrm{g}}, h_{\mathrm{w}}, \phi\}$
$NN_{8,3,7}^{6}$	$8 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 7$			11	9	$\{q_{\rm v}, q_{\rm c}, q_{\rm i}, T, p, h_{\rm w}\}$	

Table 1 Summary of the quantum (upper table) and classical (lower table) architectures used in the main text. For the quantum models, N refers to the number of qubits, corresponding to the number of features, and n_{enc} and n_{var} to the number of encoding and variational blocks in the PQC, respectively. For the classical models, the number of nodes in the hidden NN layers is shown (the first 'visible' layer is the input layer with N input nodes, and the last layer is the output layer with one node). Both classical NNs use tanh activations. D is the number of trainable parameters.

for the parameter-shift rule

$$\frac{\partial \langle \hat{O} \rangle_{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}}{\partial \phi_j} = \frac{1}{2} \Big(\langle \hat{O} \rangle_{\boldsymbol{\vartheta} + \frac{\pi}{2} \boldsymbol{e}_j} - \langle \hat{O} \rangle_{\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \frac{\pi}{2} \boldsymbol{e}_j} \Big) , \qquad (5)$$

with $\langle \hat{O} \rangle_{\vartheta} = \langle 0 | \hat{U}_{\vartheta}^{\dagger} \hat{O} \hat{U}_{\vartheta} | 0 \rangle$, where \hat{O} is a generic observable and \hat{U}_{ϑ} is the unitary corresponding to the PQC with parameters ϑ (analogous rules for the derivatives w.r.t. φ apply), where we dropped the possible dependence on the inputs \boldsymbol{x} . Applying this formula to our instances of PQCs, we obtain the gradients of the expectation values $\langle \hat{\sigma}_{n}^{z} \rangle_{\vartheta,\varphi}(\boldsymbol{x})$ and use them for computing the derivatives of Eq. (4).

4 Results in the noiseless regime

In this section we present the results from our QNNs in the absence of sampling noise, i.e., with the expectation values $\langle \hat{\sigma}_n^z \rangle_{\vartheta,\varphi}(\boldsymbol{x})$ evaluated to numerical precision. This allows us to more directly assess the learning and representational capabilities of our networks in the context of cloud cover parameterizations, and to make a better comparison with other existing classical schemes.

4.1 Evaluation of QNN predictions and comparison with classical schemes

We start by presenting the results of our QNNs trained and evaluated on the DYA-MOND dataset, comparing them with classical methods such as classical feed-forward NNs and a traditionally used cloud cover parameterization scheme. To enable a fair comparison between the representational capability of QNNs and classical NNs, we restrict the architectures of the latter to a number of trainable parameters (approximately) equal to that of our QNNs. The specific details of the QNN and NN



Figure 3 Evaluation of quantum neural networks (QNNs) compared to a classical NN and the Xu-Randall scheme. (a) and (b) show the vertical profiles of the mean cloud cover (i.e., the horizontally averaged cloud cover for each model layer) for the XYZ (blue) and ZZXY (orange) QNNs, respectively. These are compared with the predictions from a classical NN (grey), and from the Xu-Randall scheme (brown). The insets show the corresponding vertically resolved R^2 coefficients. The shaded areas correspond to the spread (minimum to maximum) over an ensemble of 20 training instances (i.e., training the model on the same data but starting from different random initial parameters). Panels (c), (d), (e) and (f) show global maps of the difference between the predicted and the true vertically averaged cloud cover for a specific simulated day (29 February 2020, 15:00 UTC+00:00), for predictions from the XYZ QNN, ZZXY QNN, the classical NN and the Xu-Randall scheme, respectively. All networks are trained for 200 epochs with $N_{\text{train}} = 2 \times 10^5$ training data. Remark: the MSE and R^2 shown here are calculated on the non-transformed output, i.e., after applying the inverse output transform clc = $g^{-1}(f)$.

architectures are given in Table 1 (with further details on the classical architectures in Appendix C). For quantum and classical NNs, these design choices are optimized for reaching the best performance for a fixed number of trainable parameters. All compared models are given the same input features and are trained with the same number of training data for the same number of epochs. The influence of the number of training data on the performance of the networks and the analysis of the training dynamics is analyzed in the next sections, while here we focus on the evaluation of the predictions of the trained quantum and classical networks.

The quantum and classical network architectures presented in this section use the eight input features $\{q_v, q_c, q_i, T, p, z_g, h_w, \phi\}$ (corresponding to the XXY⁸_{5,3}, ZZXY⁸_{2,7}, and NN⁸_{12,6,2} models in Table 1). All networks are trained for 200 epochs on $N_{\text{train}} = 2 \times 10^5$ training data from the DYAMOND dataset. After training, we evaluate the networks on a testing dataset $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$, also extracted from the DYAMOND dataset. As for the training set, the testing samples are extracted at random locations in space and time (with care taken in not making them overlap with the training samples). Besides the MSE defined in Eq. (4), another metric we use to evaluate the performance of our

networks is the \mathbb{R}^2 coefficient of determination defined as:

$$R^{2} = 1 - \frac{\text{MSE}_{\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}}}{\text{Var}_{\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}}(\text{clc})} , \qquad (6)$$

where $\operatorname{Var}_{\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}}(\text{clc})$ denotes the variance of the true cloud cover value over the testing dataset. Further evaluation metrics for our networks are discussed in Appendix D. For a better assessment of the performance of our XYZ and ZZXY QNNs, we also compare their predictions to a simplified version of the parameterization scheme developed by Xu and Randall (Xu and Randall, 1996; Wang et al., 2023), which is a semi-empirical scheme and defined by:

$$\operatorname{clc}_{\operatorname{XR}} = \min\{1, \operatorname{RH}(q_{\operatorname{v}}, p, T)^{\beta}(1 - e^{-\alpha(q_{\operatorname{c}} + q_{\operatorname{i}})})\},$$
(7)

where $\alpha = 4.034 \times 10^4$ and $\beta = 0.9942$ are parameters whose values we optimized (via standard MSE minimization) to reach the best performance over our training dataset. In the above equation, RH denotes the relative humidity which is calculated as:

$$\operatorname{RH}(q_{\rm v}, p, T) = \frac{p_{\rm v}(q_{\rm v}, p)}{p_{\rm s}(T)} = \frac{p}{p_{\rm s}(T)} \frac{q_{\rm v}}{0.622 + 0.378 \, q_{\rm v}} \,, \tag{8}$$

where $p_{\rm v}(q_{\rm v}, p)$ is the water vapor pressure and $p_{\rm s}(T)$ is the saturation vapor pressure (calculated according to Murray (1967)).

The QNN and NN predictions and their comparison with the Xu-Randall scheme are shown in Fig. 3. Looking at the vertical mean cloud cover profiles, we see that the quantum and classical NNs accurately predict the true profile (denoted by the dashed black line), while the Xu-Randall scheme exhibits visible biases throughout the whole vertical extent up to approximately 17 km, where the amount of condensate is so low that no cloud cover is diagnosed. Furthermore, quantum and classical networks are comparable also in terms of the prediction spread over the 20 training instances performed (where each instance corresponds to a training run starting from a randomly initialized parameter set). To better address the differences between the accuracy of QNNs and of classical NNs, we consider the vertically resolved R^2 coefficient in the insets. There we can see that, while both types of ansatz achieve a good prediction performance, the classical NN has a slightly better performance with a higher R^2 value of approximately 0.01 throughout the whole vertical extent. The drop in R^2 value for all architectures for altitudes above 15 km is due to the fact that at such high altitudes there is very low probability of observing clouds, meaning that the variance of cloud cover over the testing set at those altitudes is close to zero. Similar conclusions can be drawn the global bias maps shown in panels (c), (d), (e) and (f) of Fig. 3. As before, we see that the Xu-Randall scheme has the strongest prediction biases, whereas XYZ, ZZXY and NNs all achieve similar performances. In particular, we observe that all these networks show similar spatial distributions of the biases, with NNs achieving slightly lower MSE compared to the quantum architectures. We do not have a conclusive explanation for the slightly better performance of classical NNs over our QNNs for our task. However, we find it plausible that the NNs used here



Figure 4 Scaling of network performance with size of the training set N_{train} . The grey points correspond to the tested classical NNs (the six architectures with six input features discussed in Appendix C), with one point corresponding to a specific training instance for the given N_{train} , starting from randomly initialized parameters. The blue and the orange data correspond to the XYZ and the ZZXY QNNs, respectively. We plot 10 training instances per N_{train} value and architecture. For the QNNs, the dots indicate the mean over the training instances for a given N_{train} , while the shading denotes the spread (minimum to maximum). The main panel shows the R^2 score, the inset the MSE, both calculated over a test set of size 10^5 . Remark: the MSE and R^2 shown here are calculated on the non-transformed output, i.e., after applying the inverse output transform clc = $g^{-1}(f)$.

as comparison (which are the best performing ones on our task — see Appendix C for details on them) may be slightly better suited for our task, in terms of the functional properties they can access (i.e., a moderate inductive bias). In future work, one could attempt to change the type of data encoding in the QNNs, e.g., along the lines of Williams et al. (2023), to potentially yield better performance. Overall, our QNNs show very similar performance to the classical networks with both achieving a high prediction accuracy and moderate cloud cover biases, thus demonstrating that QML can yield suitable models to predict patterns in climate data. In the next sections, we compare our QNNs with classical NNs on further aspects beyond the standard performance metrics.

4.2 Generalization in quantum and classical NNs

In this section, we address the in-distribution generalization ability of our QNNs and compare it to that of classical NNs. To this end, for both types of networks, we compute the scaling of the performance metrics (R^2 and MSE) with the size N_{train} of the training dataset, where the metrics are computed on a testing dataset $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$ of size 2×10^5 following the same distribution as the training set. Here, we use slightly smaller networks compared to the previous section, to reduce the training runtime of the QNNs for gathering sufficient statistics for our training instances. Specifically, we use the architectures reported in Table 1 with six input features. In the comparison, both R^2 and the MSE (Fig. 4) show a scaling with N_{train} that is very similar for the classical and quantum networks. The degradation of the prediction performance happens approximately at the same value of N_{train} , and furthermore no significant difference between our XYZ and ZZXY models can be seen. The MSE loss on the testing



Figure 5 (a) Spectra of normalized FIM for classical NN (grey), and the XYZ (blue) and ZZXY (orange) QNNs. The dots correspond to the mean value over the 200 random parameter initializations, while the shading denotes the spread (minimum to maximum). To estimate the FIM we use 9×10^6 input data. The normalized effective dimension $\hat{d}_{\rm eff}$ is also reported in the legend. (b) Training curves for 200 training instances for classical NN (grey), XYZ (blue) and ZZXY (orange) QNNs. Here, $N_{\rm train} = 10^5$.

dataset follows approximately a $1/\sqrt{N_{\text{train}}}$ scaling for $N_{\text{train}} \ge D$ until saturation due to model deficiency starts to occur, which is consistent with the scaling laws reported in the works on generalization in QML (Banchi et al., 2021; Caro et al., 2022). Classical and quantum NNs follow approximately the same scaling with the same pre-factors, and, consistently with the observations in the previous section, we see that for large values of N_{train} the classical NNs achieve a slightly better prediction performance.

4.3 Trainability from the perspective of information geometry

In this section, we analyze the training dynamics of our QNNs and NNs, and try to establish a connection with the geometrical properties of their optimization landscape, along the lines of Abbas et al. (2021). The authors of Abbas et al. (2021) use tools from information geometry, in particular the Fisher information matrix (FIM), setting them in relation with the trainability of a model, and introduce a quantity called "effective dimension", which they use to prove generalization bounds. They conduct numerical experiments comparing classical and quantum NNs, and empirically show that QNNs have a better behaved (i.e., more evenly spread) FIM spectrum and a higher effective dimension, which in their experiments results in a faster and more stable training compared to classical networks. Motivated by these empirical observations, here we conduct a similar experiment. Specifically, for each quantum and classical network tested, we draw an ensemble of random parameters configurations (here consisting of

200 samples), and use it for constructing an ensemble of training instances on the one hand, and to calculate the FIM and the models effective dimension on the other hand. Before presenting the results, we briefly recap the definition and meaning of the FIM and effective dimension.

The FIM describes the geometrical properties of the parameter space of a parameterized model (ichi Amari, 1985). It is a central tool in the field of information geometry, as it defines a metric in the model space, i.e., the space of functions a parameterized model can represent (ichi Amari, 1985, 1997; Pascanu and Bengio, 2014). While the FIM is typically defined for probabilistic models, its definition can be extended to the regression models studied here (see Pennington and Worah (2018); Karakida et al. (2020) and Appendix E for details). In this case, the elements of the FIM are computed as follows

$$F_{j,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \left[\frac{\partial f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x})}{\partial \theta_j} \frac{\partial f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x})}{\partial \theta_k} \right] \\ \approx \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{\partial f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x})}{\partial \theta_j} \frac{\partial f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x})}{\partial \theta_k} , \qquad (9)$$

with \mathbb{E}_{x} denoting the expected value over the input distribution, which is empirically approximated by averaging over the (training) dataset \mathcal{D} . The FIM F is a $D \times D$ positive semi-definite matrix. Giving rise to a metric in model space, the FIM encodes information on which directions in the parameter space lead to appreciable changes in the outputs of the model, and which directions are instead less influential or redundant. This information is reflected in the spectrum of the FIM: an evenly spread and non-zero spectrum indicates that all parameters are almost equally contributing to independent model changes, whereas the presence of small or zero eigenvalues means that the corresponding parameters (or linear combinations thereof) are irrelevant. Based on this observation, the FIM spectrum becomes a useful indication of the capacity of a model to effectively explore its parameter space, 'making use' of all its degrees of freedom. This capacity, according to Abbas et al. (2021), may also be beneficial during training. The (normalized) effective dimension introduced in Abbas et al. (2021) is constructed to capture this capacity, and is defined as

$$\hat{d}_{\text{eff}} = \frac{2\log\left(\frac{1}{V_{\Theta}}\int_{\Theta}\sqrt{\det\left(I_D + c_{N_{\text{data}}}\hat{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right)}d\boldsymbol{\theta}\right)}{D\log c_{N_{\text{data}}}} , \qquad (10)$$

where $c_{N_{\text{data}}} = \frac{N_{\text{data}}}{2\pi \log N_{\text{data}}}$ with $N_{\text{data}} \equiv |\mathcal{D}|$ being the number of input data samples, D the number of parameters, and $\hat{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, the normalized FIM, defined as

$$\hat{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{D}{\frac{1}{V_{\Theta}} \int_{\Theta} \operatorname{tr}(F(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\theta}} F(\boldsymbol{\theta}) , \qquad (11)$$

with $\frac{1}{V_{\Theta}} \int_{\Theta} \operatorname{tr}(F(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\theta} \approx \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \operatorname{tr}(F(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{m}))$. The \hat{d}_{eff} is normalized to the dimensionality of the parameter space D, hence being bounded in [0, 1]. Furthermore, it is computed from averages over the parameter space, hence depending solely on the architecture choices and the input distribution.

Equipped with these definitions, we can now present the results of our experiments. From the spectra of the normalized FIM shown in Fig. 5(a) we can make two observations. First, on average the QNNs have larger FIM eigenvalues and a flatter spectrum, and second, the spread over the 200 parameter samples is larger for NNs compared to the QNNs. These observations are consistent with those of Abbas et al. (2021), and are reflected in the higher value of \hat{d}_{eff} for the QNNs, as reported in the legend.

We now move on to investigate whether these different geometrical properties result in practical differences in the training dynamics of our networks. This is shown in panel (b) of Fig. 5. Here, we observe that both quantum and classical architectures train to approximately the same value of the loss function, with the classical NN achieving slightly lower loss. The behavior of the training loss, in particular the speed at which the training has approximately converged, is very similar when comparing classical and quantum networks, unlike the observations in Abbas et al. (2021). Therefore, for our test case we cannot pinpoint a strong relationship between the geometrical properties described before and the effectiveness of training (similar observations have been also raised in a recent work Mingard et al. (2024)). We refer the reader to Appendix E for a further analysis of the relation between training dynamics and FIM, which also includes tests on other NNs and QNNs. We conclude this section by mentioning that the trainability aspects investigated here concern only the training dynamics of QNNs for a fixed number of qubits, and that we are not addressing the problem of barren plateaus in this work, expected to occur for general QNN architectures with large numbers of qubits (McClean et al., 2018; Thanasilp et al., 2023; Larocca et al., 2024).

5 Influence of shot noise

In a real quantum device, the expectation values $\langle \hat{\sigma}_n^z \rangle_{\vartheta,\varphi}(\boldsymbol{x})$ used in our QNNs would need to be estimated from a finite number of repeated measurements, also called shots, on the output quantum state. This introduces statistical fluctuations, i.e., shot noise, in the estimates for $\langle \hat{\sigma}_n^z \rangle_{\vartheta,\varphi}(\boldsymbol{x})$. In this section we analyze the effects of shot noise on the training and performance of our QNNs, and their dependence on the number n_{shots} of measurement shots. Furthermore, we present an application of the variance regularization technique introduced in Kreplin and Roth (2024) to our use case, and show that it can help to reduce the effects of shot noise in the training and subsequent inference stage of our QNN models.

5.1 Training and inference with shot noise

We now analyze the influence of shot noise on the training dynamics and on the prediction performance of our QNNs. To this end, it is instructive to recall how shot noise influences the predictions of our QNNs. The QNNs' predictions $f_{\theta}(\boldsymbol{x})$ are calculated from a weighted average of the expectation values $\langle \hat{\sigma}_n^z \rangle_{\vartheta,\varphi}$ which, in a realistic quantum device, would be estimated from a finite number n_{shots} of measured bit-strings



Figure 6 (a) and (b) Training curves for XYZ (blue) and ZZXY (orange) QNNs, respectively, for different values of $n_{\rm shots}$ used in the evaluation of predictions and gradients. The different solid lines correspond to different training instances performed starting from the same initial parameter configuration, but with different shot noise realizations. The dashed line corresponds to the noiseless limit, i.e., predictions and gradients evaluated to numerical precision. Here, $N_{\rm train} = 10^5$. (c) Test set performance of XYZ (blue) and ZZXY (orange) QNNs trained in the noiseless regime, against $n_{\rm shots}$ used at inference, for a test set of size 2×10^5 . Remark: The MSE and R^2 shown here are calculated on the non-transformed output, i.e., after applying the inverse output transform clc = $g^{-1}(f)$.

 \mathbf{as}

$$\operatorname{Est}_{n_{\operatorname{shots}}}[\langle \hat{\sigma}_n^z \rangle_{\boldsymbol{\vartheta},\boldsymbol{\varphi}}] = \frac{1}{n_{\operatorname{shots}}} \sum_{s=1}^{n_{\operatorname{shots}}} b_n^{(s)} ,$$

with $b_n^{(s)} \in \{-1, +1\}$ denoting the *n*-th 'bit' of the *s*-th measured bit-string. Let us call $z_n \equiv \operatorname{Est}_{n_{\text{shots}}}[\langle \hat{\sigma}_n^z \rangle_{\vartheta,\varphi}]$ (we drop here the dependence on $\boldsymbol{x}, \vartheta$ and φ for notational convenience). The z_n are random variables with covariance given by

$$\operatorname{Cov}[z_m, z_n] = \frac{\langle \hat{\sigma}_m^z \hat{\sigma}_n^z \rangle - \langle \hat{\sigma}_m^z \rangle \langle \hat{\sigma}_n^z \rangle}{n_{\mathrm{shots}}} \ .$$

Using this, we can calculate the variance of the final prediction as

$$\operatorname{Var}[f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x})] = \sum_{m,n=1}^{N} w_m w_n \operatorname{Cov}[z_m, z_n] , \qquad (12)$$

with w_n being the *n*-th trainable weight in \boldsymbol{w} (see Eq. (3)). Every QNN evaluation for calculating both predictions and gradients (with the parameter-shift rule) is then affected by statistical fluctuations which in general negatively impact the training and prediction performance of the model.

We start by analyzing the training dynamics with a finite $n_{\rm shots}$ for the XYZ and ZZXY networks. The results are shown in panels (a) and (b) of Fig. 6, where we plot the training MSE during the training epochs for different $n_{\rm shots}$ (fixed throughout the training) for both the XYZ and ZZXY architectures, respectively. The different curves with the same color correspond to different training instances obtained by starting from the same initial parameter set, but with different shot noise realizations. For both architectures it is visible that for $n_{\rm shots}$ sufficiently large (i.e., on the order of 10^4) the training is successful, closely following the noiseless training curve. For smaller values of $n_{\rm shots}$, the MSE is minimized in the initial iterations before the training becomes unstable, which happens when the gradients' magnitude becomes comparable to the noise in the gradients' evaluation. These results demonstrate that there is a regime where our QNNs train stably in the presence of shot noise, albeit it being relatively costly in the number of necessary circuit evaluations. We discuss in the next section a method targeted towards minimizing these costs.

Second, we analyze the performance of our QNNs on a testing dataset when varying n_{shots} . Specifically, we use the optimal network parameters configurations for both QNNs obtained after training in the noiseless regime, and test how a finite n_{shots} (in particular smaller than 10^4) affects their prediction performance. A useful metric we compute to understand the (average) impact of shot noise on the test set is the mean prediction variance (MPV), which is defined on a dataset \mathcal{D} as

$$MPV_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}_i \in \mathcal{D}} Var[f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x}_i)] .$$
(13)

The results are shown in panel (c) of Fig. 6, where we plot the R^2 and the MSE for different $n_{\rm shots}$ for the XYZ and ZZXY architectures. From these results it is clear that the quality of the predictions rapidly degrades for $n_{\rm shots} < 10^4$ while it is stable for larger values. The slight difference between the two architectures can be attributed to the difference in the value of the MPV, which is indicated in the plot. Specifically, the ZZXY architecture has a slightly lower MPV, which results in a lower number of shots needed to achieve a given accuracy. The MPV, capturing this difference, becomes therefore a crucial ingredient for the method presented in the next section.



Figure 7 Variance regularization results. (a) and (b) Post-training mean squared error (MSE) and mean prediction variance (MPV) on testing set for XYZ and ZZXY QNNs, respectively. The color scale refers to the value of λ , the training is performed in the noiseless regime, with 2×10^5 training data for 150 epochs, and 2×10^5 testing data points are used. (c) and (d) Noisy training curves using variance regularization with $\lambda = 0.005$ for XYZ (c) and ZZXY (d) QNNs, respectively. The upper row (solid lines) shows the mean squared error (MSE), the middle row (dashed lines) shows the mean prediction variance (MPV). The different color shades correspond to different $n_{\rm shots}$ used, while the six different curves with the same colors correspond to six different training instances (from the same initial parameters, but different shot noise realizations). The lower row (dash-dotted line) shows the difference between the MSE without variance regularization and the MSE with variance regularization ($\Delta_{\rm VR}$ MSE \equiv MSE_{no var. reg.} – MSE_{var. reg.}). The shading correspond to the spread over the training instances.

5.2 Variance regularization

In this section, we discuss the variance regularization technique introduced in Kreplin and Roth (2024) and apply it to our QNNs for cloud cover. Variance regularization is a technique aimed at reducing the effects of measurement shot noise in the training and inference stage of a QML model. This is achieved by adding to the loss function (here the MSE) a term which is proportional to the variance of the output of the model, in order to simultaneously minimize both terms (if possible) and therefore obtain a model requiring fewer shots to be evaluated, both during and after training (Kreplin and Roth, 2024). In our context, the loss function that we minimize in the training reads as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \lambda) = \mathrm{MSE}_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \lambda \,\mathrm{MPV}_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) , \qquad (14)$$

where $\text{MPV}_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is defined in Eq. (13) and λ is a regularization parameter. In general, the evaluation of $\text{MPV}_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ requires measurements in addition to those performed for evaluating the model output. In our case however, we can estimate both MSE and MPV from the same set of measurement shots, since $f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x})$ is constructed only from $\hat{\sigma}^{z}$ expectation values. Calculating the gradients of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \lambda)$ can be done with the same parameter-shift rule of Eq. (5), therefore this changing of the loss does not result in additional training overhead.

We test this technique on our two QNN architectures in the same setting as in the previous section. The regularization parameter λ is chosen to be constant during

training, although we remark here that Kreplin and Roth (2024) also proposes a dynamical regularization approach which may further improve the training. The results are shown in Fig. 7. Training the QNNs with variance regularization in the noiseless regime (Fig. 7 (a) and (b)) shows that there exist values of λ for which the MPV can be reduced of more than one order of magnitude while still keeping the MSE low (i.e., below 10^{-2}). In other words, these results show that there are regions of the QNNs' parameter space where both the prediction error and the prediction variance can be low, and that variance regularization can effectively target them provided one chooses a suitable value for λ .

With these positive results, we move on to applying variance regularization with a finite $n_{\rm shots}$, to assess whether a finite λ can help in stabilizing the training even when $n_{\rm shots} < 10^4$ (Fig. 7 (c) and (d)). From both panels it is evident that a value of $\lambda = 0.005$ is already sufficient to stabilize the training even for a relatively low $n_{\rm shots} = 100$. For a better comparison with the case of no variance regularization, we also show the difference with respect to the training MSE in the previous section (Fig. 6(a)), in the lower row of panels (c) and (d). For $n_{\rm shots} < 10^4$, the difference $\Delta_{\rm VR}$ MSE \equiv MSE_{no var. reg.} – MSE_{var. reg.} remains positive throughout the training, indicating a better training performance when using a finite λ . For a large number of shots $n_{\rm shots} \geq 10^4$, the difference is very small or negative, which indicates that in this regime adding the MPV to the loss contrasts the MSE minimization. For further minimizing the MSE one could continue the training potentially gradually decreasing λ , as mentioned above and done in Kreplin and Roth (2024). Overall, the results presented here show that variance regularization is an effective approach for achieving a stable training of a QNN even with a moderate number of shots.

6 Discussion and outlook

In this paper we explore the potential of QNNs as parameterization schemes in climate models, focusing on the specific case of cloud cover parameterizations. With the goal of predicting cloud cover from coarse-grained state variables, we compare different QNN architectures with classical NNs of similar size (i.e., similar number of parameters) on several aspects: prediction accuracy, generalization ability and trainability. Overall, the investigated QNNs show a similar performance (at least in the noiseless setting) to classical NNs in all these aspects, which is a promising indication of the applicability of these models to learn patterns in climate data. Our work opens up several directions for further investigating the applicability of QML in developing parameterizations for climate models. We outline those in the following, while also discussing criticalities and potential limitations associated to them.

A first extension to our work would be to study the performance and learning behavior of the proposed architectures for problems of larger size, which would require moving away from the cell-based approach we took here, by considering also neighboring model cells (as done in Grundner et al. (2022) in the context of classical NNs). Furthermore, while we have performed a thorough analysis of possible QNN ansatzes, we are aware that our architecture search is not exhaustive. Notable interesting examples to investigate in future works could include quantum convolutional neural networks (Cong et al., 2019) or QNNs with measurement feedforwards (Foss-Feig et al., 2023; Sahay and Verresen, 2024; Chan et al., 2024; Iqbal et al., 2024). While increasing the size of the problem, and thus the number of qubits, may introduce trainability issues such as barren plateaus with increasing number of qubits (McClean et al., 2018; Thanasilp et al., 2023; Larocca et al., 2024), we note that there exist architectures that are immune to such problems (Pesah et al., 2021), and parameter initialization strategies to mitigate them (Grant et al., 2019; Friedrich and Maziero, 2022; Zhang et al., 2022; Gelman, 2024).

Our construction could be also tested on parameterization schemes other than cloud cover. Changing the parameterization scheme would likely result in a more complex learning task, which may also increase the chance of observing a separation between the quantum and classical ML algorithms for the considered dataset. In fact, it is to a large extent unknown what types of classical datasets are better suited to quantum learning models than to a classical ones, and extensive tests on several architectures and datasets as done here are very valuable to pinpoint features that may help answering this question.

Going beyond regression, another interesting extension would be to re-frame the parameterization learning problem in a probabilistic setting. Specifically, one could build quantum generative models (Amin et al., 2018; Dallaire-Demers and Killoran, 2018; Coyle et al., 2020; Gao et al., 2022) for learning the full probability distribution of the process considered (here cloud cover). Switching to generative modeling, a task that is to some extent more natural to quantum computing, may increase the chance of observing a separation between the quantum and classical models for the given problem (Du et al., 2020).

Finally, another direction concerns the online implementation of the proposed QNNs, i.e., their coupling to the dynamical core of the climate model solving the Navier-Stokes equations. While QNNs consisting of a small number of qubits can be numerically simulated and thus in principle be readily used within a climate model, a larger number of qubits would require the coupling of a quantum device to the dynamical core. Given that parameterization schemes need to be run for every cell of the model at every time-step, such a coupling could become impractical in terms of computation runtime. To address this limitation, a possibility would be to build classical surrogates (Schreiber et al., 2023; Landman et al., 2022; Sweke et al., 2023; Jerbi et al., 2024) of the trained QNNs, to be then used online. In this way, the quantum device would be used only in the development stage of the parameterization, and our work lays a solid basis for developing such a workflow. Another possible direction are quantum-inspired methods such as tensor networks (Orús, 2019), which already find applications as (Q)ML models (Stoudenmire and Schwab, 2016; Efthymiou et al., 2019; Haghshenas et al., 2022; Ran and Su, 2023; Rieser et al., 2023), in classical data compression and loading (Dilip et al., 2022; Jumade and Sawaya, 2023; Jobst et al., 2023), and generative modeling (Han et al., 2018; Merbis et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2023).

Data and code availability. The code and the data used for this work can be made available from the authors upon reasonable request.

Acknowledgements. This project was made possible by the DLR Quantum Computing Initiative and the Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Climate Action;

qci.dlr.de/projects/klim-qml. A.G. and V.E. were funded by the European Research Council (ERC) Synergy Grant "Understanding and Modelling the Earth System with Machine Learning (USMILE)" under the Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Grant agreement No. 855187). V.E. was additionally supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) through the Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Prize awarded to Veronika Eyring (Reference No. EY 22/2-1). This work used resources of the Deutsches Klimarechenzentrum (DKRZ) granted by its Scientific Steering Committee (WLA) under project ID bd1179.

Appendix A Other QNN architectures tested

In this appendix we provide the details of the other QNN architectures tested in our work but not shown in the main text. The CNOT-PBC architecture contains as entangling gates CNOT gates arranged in a chain ring pattern. The encoding layer for this architecture is $\hat{S}_{\text{CNOT-PBC}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \hat{R}_{\boldsymbol{x}}(\boldsymbol{x})$. The encoding blocks for the CNOT-PBC read as

$$\begin{split} \hat{V}_{\text{CNOT-PBC}}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}) &= \hat{R}_z(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{(N+1)\to 2N}) \times \\ \hat{R}_y(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{1\to N}) \, \widehat{\text{CNOT}}_{\text{PBC}} \;, \end{split}$$

with $\widehat{\text{CNOT}}_{\text{PBC}} = \widehat{\text{CNOT}}_{N,1} \prod_{n=1}^{N-1} \widehat{\text{CNOT}}_{n,n+1}$, and the variational blocks as

$$\begin{split} \hat{W}_{\text{CNOT-PBC}}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}) &= \hat{R}_x(\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{(2N+1)\to 3N}) \, \hat{R}_z(\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{(N+1)\to 2N}) \times \\ & \hat{R}_y(\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{1\to N}) \, \widehat{\text{CNOT}}_{\text{PBC}} \, . \end{split}$$

The CNOT-NN architecture contains as entangling gates CNOT gates acting between neighboring qubits in a chain. The encoding layer for this architecture is $\hat{S}_{\text{CNOT-NN}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \hat{R}_x(\boldsymbol{x})$. The encoding blocks for the CNOT-NN read as

$$\hat{V}_{\text{CNOT}-\text{NN}}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}) = \hat{R}_{z}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{(N+1)\to 2N}) \, \hat{R}_{y}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{1\to N}) \, \widehat{\text{CNOT}}_{\text{NN}} \; ,$$

with $\widehat{\text{CNOT}}_{NN} = \prod_{n=1}^{N-1} \widehat{\text{CNOT}}_{n,n+1}$, and the variational blocks as

$$\begin{split} W_{\text{CNOT}-\text{NN}}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}) = & R_x(\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{(2N+1)\to 3N}) \, R_z(\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{(N+1)\to 2N}) \times \\ & \hat{R}_y(\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{1\to N}) \, \widehat{\text{CNOT}}_{\text{NN}} \, . \end{split}$$

The IONS architecture contains as entangling operation one that is naturally implemented in trapped ions quantum simulators, generated by a long-range Hamiltonian of the form $\sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \sum_{m < n} \frac{\hat{\sigma}_n^x \hat{\sigma}_m^x}{m-n}$, coming from the laser coupling of the ions internal states to the center-of-mass vibrational mode of the ion chain. The IONS architecture takes as input the state $\prod_{n=1}^{N} \hat{H}_n |0\rangle$ with \hat{H}_n being the Hadamard gate on qubit n. The encoding layer for this architecture is $\hat{S}_{\text{IONS}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \hat{R}_z(\boldsymbol{x})$. The encoding blocks



Figure B1 Input and output transformation functions and histograms. (a) Histogram of specific humidity q_v in the training dataset (blue) and transformation function h(x) (red). (b) Histogram of the transformed $h(q_v)$. (c) Histogram of cloud water q_c in the training dataset (blue) and transformation function h(x) (red). (d) Histogram of the transformed $h(q_c)$. (e) Histogram of cloud ice q_i in the training dataset (blue) and transformation function h(x) (red). (f) Histogram of the transformed $h(q_i)$. (g) Histogram of cloud cover clc in the training dataset (blue) and transformation function g(x) (red). (h) Histogram of the transformed g(clc).

for the IONS architecture read as

$$\hat{V}_{\text{IONS}}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}) = \hat{R}_{y}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{2 \to (N+1)}) \hat{U}_{\text{IONS}}(\vartheta_{1})$$

with $\hat{U}_{\text{IONS}}(\vartheta) = \exp(-\frac{\mathrm{i}\vartheta}{2}\sum_{n < m} \frac{\hat{\sigma}_n^x \hat{\sigma}_m^x}{m-n})$, and the variational blocks

$$\begin{split} \hat{W}_{\text{IONS}}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}) &= \hat{R}_y(\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{(2N+2) \to (3N+1)}) \, \hat{U}_{\text{IONS}}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{(2N+1)}) \times \\ & \hat{R}_z(\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{(N+1) \to 2N}) \, \hat{R}_x(\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{1 \to N}) \ . \end{split}$$

Additionally, we also experimented with augmenting the CNOT-PBC and CNOT-NN architectures with higher-order angle encoding layers of the form $\hat{S}_{\text{HONE}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \hat{R}_x(\boldsymbol{x}^{[2]}) \hat{R}_x(\boldsymbol{x})$, with $\boldsymbol{x}^{[2]}$ being a vector with (N-1) components which are computed from \boldsymbol{x} as $x_m^{[2]} = \frac{x_m x_{m+1}}{2\pi}$.

Appendix B Details on input and output transformations

In this appendix we discuss the input and output transformations that we applied to the DYAMOND data before feeding them to our classical and quantum models. For the input features, the idea behind the transformation is to make the feature distribution more uniform within a specified interval, and to still retain the input

feature variability in the tails, which can be associated with physical scenarios we are interested in capturing. The transformation function we designed in this case reads as

$$h(x) = \frac{\log\left[1 + (e - 1)\left(\frac{x}{x_{\text{high}}}\right)^{b}\right] - h_{0}(b, x_{\text{low}}, x_{\text{high}})}{1 - h_{0}(b, x_{\text{low}}, x_{\text{high}})}$$

where $h_0(b, x_{\text{low}}, x_{\text{high}}) = \log \left[1 + (e - 1) \left(\frac{x_{\text{low}}}{x_{\text{high}}} \right)^b \right]$ and $x_{\text{low}}, x_{\text{high}}$ corresponding to the (approximate) minimum and maximum value of the given feature x estimated on the training dataset. We used the following parameters for the input features:

- Specific humidity q_v [kg/kg]: b = 0.25, $x_{low} = 10^{-7}$, $x_{high} = 0.025$,
- Cloud water $q_c \text{ [kg/kg]}: b = 0.25, x_{low} = 0, x_{high} = 0.00145,$
- Cloud ice q_i [kg/kg]: b = 0.25, $x_{low} = 0$, $x_{high} = 0.00055$,
- Horizontal wind h_w [m/s]: b = 0.5, $x_{low} = 0.0015$, $x_{high} = 115.0$.

The remaining input features are transformed using a simple min-max scaling, and all features (including those listed above) are scaled within the interval $[0, \pi]$ (i.e., we multiplied the above h(x) by a factor π). The transformations for q_v , q_c and q_i and the resulting histograms of the transformed values are shown in Fig. B1. In our experiments, the input features are then rescaled to the interval $[0, \pi]$.

Also the output transformation function g(x) is constructed in order to have the training outputs (targets) in a more uniform distribution compared to the original one in the DYAMOND dataset, which in our case improved the performance of both our quantum and classical models. The transformation function is invertible, and reads as

$$g(x) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\pi} \arcsin\left[2\left(\frac{e^{b\,x^a} - 1}{e^b - 1}\right)^c - 1\right]$$

with parameters a = 1.29407913, b = -3.20011015, c = 0.70308237, which have been chosen in order to have approximate uniformity. The transformation and the resulting transformed outputs histogram are shown in panels (g) and (h) of Fig. B1.

Appendix C Details on classical NNs tested

In this Appendix we detail the structure of the classical NNs used as comparison for our QNNs. The NNs presented here are the result of an extensive architecture search with the constraint of keeping the number of parameters approximately equal to that of the QNNs discussed in the main text. We start from the networks taking as inputs the eight input features $\{q_v, q_c, q_i, T, p, z_g, h_w, \phi\}$, and containing a number D of trainable parameters between 200 and 210. In the following lists, the number denotes the number of nodes in the given layer, and in parentheses we write the activation function used.

- 8 (inputs) \rightarrow 10 (tanh) \rightarrow 7 (tanh) \rightarrow 4 (tanh) \rightarrow 1 (linear output).
- 8 (inputs) \rightarrow 9 (tanh) \rightarrow 4 (tanh) \rightarrow 9 (tanh) \rightarrow 4 (tanh) \rightarrow 1 (linear output).



Figure C2 Output distributions. (a) Histogram of predicted (blue) and true (black) clc from ZZXY QNN. (b) Histogram of true vs. predicted clc for ZZXY QNN (logarithmic color scale). (c) Histogram of predicted (orange) and true (black) clc from classical NN. (d) Histogram of true vs. predicted clc for classical NN (logarithmic color scale). (e) Histogram of predicted (brown) and true (black) clc from Xu-Randall scheme. (f) Histogram of true vs. predicted clc for Xu-Randall scheme (logarithmic color scale). The histograms are obtained for a testing set of 6×10^6 data points. We report also the values of the mean squared error (MSE), R^2 coefficient, Hellinger distance (HD) and Wasserstein distance (WD) on the same testing set.

- 8 (inputs) \rightarrow 8 (tanh) \rightarrow 8 (tanh) \rightarrow 6 (tanh) \rightarrow 1 (linear output).
- 8 (inputs) \rightarrow 12 (tanh) \rightarrow 6 (tanh) \rightarrow 2 (tanh) \rightarrow 1 (linear output): best performing, chosen for Fig. 3.
- 8 (inputs) \rightarrow 10 (tanh) \rightarrow 10 (tanh) \rightarrow 1 (linear output).
- 8 (inputs) \rightarrow 8 (tanh) \rightarrow 8 (tanh) \rightarrow 4 (tanh) \rightarrow 4 (tanh) \rightarrow 1 (linear output).

For the networks taking as inputs the six input features $\{q_v, q_c, q_i, T, p, h_w\}$, containing a number D of trainable parameters between 109 and 120, we used the following layouts.

- 6 (inputs) \rightarrow 8 (tanh) \rightarrow 3 (tanh) \rightarrow 7 (tanh) \rightarrow 1 (linear output): best performing, chosen for Fig. 5.
- 6 (inputs) \rightarrow 6 (tanh) \rightarrow 5 (tanh) \rightarrow 5 (tanh) \rightarrow 1 (linear output).
- 6 (inputs) \rightarrow 7 (tanh) \rightarrow 3 (tanh) \rightarrow 7 (tanh) \rightarrow 2 (tanh) \rightarrow 1 (linear output).
- 6 (inputs) \rightarrow 8 (tanh) \rightarrow 3 (leaky-ReLU) \rightarrow 3 (tanh) \rightarrow 2 (tanh) \rightarrow 2 (leaky-ReLU) \rightarrow 2 (tanh) \rightarrow 1 (linear output).
- 6 (inputs) \rightarrow 10 (tanh) \rightarrow 4 (tanh) \rightarrow 1 (linear output).
- 6 (inputs) \rightarrow 5 (tanh) \rightarrow 5 (tanh) \rightarrow 4 (tanh) \rightarrow 4 (tanh) \rightarrow 1 (linear output).

All the architectures in the last list are the ones also used for generating the plots in Fig. 4 and E4. For these architectures as well as for the quantum ones, the initial learning rate for the Adam optimizer is set to 0.001 and the batch size to 100, which are approximately optimal settings in both classical and quantum cases for our problem.



Figure D3 Evaluation metrics for the different QNNs tested: mean squared error (MSE, in blue), Hellinger distance (HD, in orange) and Wasserstein distance (WD, in green). HD and WD have been rescaled in order for all the metrics to have values in the same order of magnitude (scaling factor in the legend). The shaded area corresponds to the spread over 20 training instances. All QNNs for this plot have six input features $\{q_v, q_c, q_i, T, p, h_w\}$, the number of trainable parameters is between 110 and 120, and are trained with 2×10^5 training data for 150 epochs.

Appendix D Other evaluation metrics

In this appendix we discuss further metrics that can be used to evaluate our quantum and classical networks beyond MSE and R^2 . The additional metrics we compute measure the distance between the distributions of the model predictions and the distribution of cloud cover in a testing dataset. Specifically, we calculate the Hellinger distance:

$$\operatorname{HD}(P,Q) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left\| \sqrt{P} - \sqrt{Q} \right\|_2 \,,$$

where P and Q are the predicted and the true (discretized) probability distributions for cloud cover, and $\|\cdot\|_2$ denotes the Euclidean norm. Additionally, we calculate the Wasserstein distance

$$WD(P,Q) = \inf_{\Pi \in \Gamma(P,Q)} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \Pi} (||x-y||) ,$$

where $\Gamma(P,Q)$ is the set of all joint probability distributions that have P and Q as marginals (we calculate WD using the SciPy package in Python).

In Fig. C2 we show the histograms of the outputs from our ZZXY and NN architectures (the XYZ architecture has very similar performance and we do not show it here), compared with the Xu-Randall scheme, for the QNNs with eight input features used in Section 4.1, and report also the values of the additional distance metrics just discussed. The histograms together with the additional metrics further confirm the observations made in the main text, namely, that the quantum and classical NNs perform comparably on the task at hand, with the classical ones being slightly better, while both outperform the Xu-Randall scheme. In Fig. D3 we show these metrics together with the MSE for all the QNNs tested in this work, including those not shown in the main text but described in Appendix A. Here we can observe that all QNNs



Figure E4 Analysis of training dynamics of classical and quantum networks. (a) Mean squared displacement (MSD) evolution during training. Here each step corresponds the evolution after 100 batch updates during the Adam optimization (we use 10^5 training samples, so each epoch consists of 1000 batch updates with a batch size of 100). The dashed lines are guides to the eye indicating specific slopes. (b) Integrated MSD (over time) against normalized effective dimension \hat{d}_{eff} . (c) Spread of MSE loss function averaged over all training epochs plotted against \hat{d}_{eff} . (d) Spread of MSE loss function averaged over all 200 training instances (walkers), plotted against \hat{d}_{eff} . (f) Mean spread of final parameters plotted against \hat{d}_{eff} . The error bars correspond to the estimated statistical uncertainty bootstrapped from the 200 random parameter realizations. All networks have six input features and the number of trainable parameters is between 109 and 120.

tested have comparable performance in the noiseless case, which is why we show only two types of QNNs in the main text.

Appendix E Details on FIM calculation and other trainability metrics

In this appendix, we give more details on the calculation of the Fisher information matrix (FIM) presented in the main text, and provide a further analysis of the training dynamics of our networks. We start by deriving the formula used for calculating the FIM in our case of regression with MSE loss function. For a statistical model $p(x, y; \theta)$ the elements of the FIM are defined as (ichi Amari, 1985, 1997; Pascanu and Bengio, 2014)

$$F_{j,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbb{E}_{(\boldsymbol{x},y)\sim p} \left[\frac{\partial \log p(\boldsymbol{x},y;\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_j} \frac{\partial \log p(\boldsymbol{x},y;\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_k} \right],$$
(E1)

which can be rewritten as

$$F_{j,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbb{E}_{(\boldsymbol{x},y)\sim p} \left[\frac{\partial \log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(y|\boldsymbol{x})}{\partial \theta_j} \frac{\partial \log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(y|\boldsymbol{x})}{\partial \theta_k} \right],$$
(E2)

by noticing that $p(\boldsymbol{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = p(\boldsymbol{x})p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(y|\boldsymbol{x})$, with $p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(y|\boldsymbol{x})$ being the model output probability conditioned on the input \boldsymbol{x} . The quantity $\ell(y, \boldsymbol{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = -\log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(y|\boldsymbol{x})$ corresponds

to the negative log-likelihood, a typical loss function used for statistical models. In our case, with our networks outputting a deterministic value $f_{\theta}(\boldsymbol{x})$ the loss function corresponds to the MSE, which amounts to setting $p_{\theta}(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}) = \mathcal{N}_{f_{\theta}(\boldsymbol{x}),\sigma^2}(\boldsymbol{y})$ for a fictitious σ (Pennington and Worah, 2018; Karakida et al., 2020). Therefore, using $\partial_{\theta_j} p_{\theta}(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}) = \sigma^{-2}(f_{\theta}(\boldsymbol{x}) - \boldsymbol{y}) \partial_{\theta_j} f_{\theta}(\boldsymbol{x})$, we can rewrite the FIM as

$$F_{j,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \left[\int \mathcal{N}_{f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x}),\sigma^{2}}(y) \left(f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x}) - y\right)^{2} \sigma^{-4} \times \frac{\partial f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x})}{\partial \theta_{j}} \frac{\partial f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x})}{\partial \theta_{k}} \, \mathrm{d}y \right].$$
(E3)

Performing the Gaussian integration over y, we finally arrive at

$$F_{j,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sigma^{-2} \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \left[\frac{\partial f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x})}{\partial \theta_j} \frac{\partial f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x})}{\partial \theta_k} \right], \qquad (E4)$$

which is proportional to the definition given in Eq. (9).

We now move on to discussing further aspects of the training dynamics of our networks beyond the training curves shown in Fig. 5 in the main text. To this end, we not only monitor the value of the MSE loss during training, but also track the dynamics of the parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, viewing each training experiment starting from a random parameter configuration as a walker in the parameter space. We denote with $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(m)}(t)$ (m = 1, ..., M) the parameter configuration of the *m*-th walker at a selected training step *t*. A quantity that is natural to analyze when looking at ensembles of random walkers is the mean squared displacement (MSD), defined as

$$\mathrm{MSD}(t) = \overline{\|\boldsymbol{\theta}(t) - \boldsymbol{\theta}(0)\|^2} \equiv \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \|\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(m)}(t) - \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(m)}(0)\|^2$$

see Fig. E4 (a). We observe the same qualitative behavior for both classical and quantum networks, with the initial dynamics being faster (super-diffusive), then progressively slowing down to a sub-diffusive regime when the gradients have significantly decreased in magnitude. Interestingly, it appears that for the QNNs tested here this slow-down of the training dynamics happens faster compared to classical NNs. Attempting to correlate this observation with the geometrical properties of the models captured by the FIM, we consider the integrated MSD, $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \text{MSD}(t)$ as function of the normalized effective dimension \hat{d}_{eff} defined in Eq. (10) (Fig. E4 (b)). While we still observe a difference between classical and quantum architectures, no clear correlation between the training dynamics and \hat{d}_{eff} can be seen. The absence of a clear correlation between the training dynamics and \hat{d}_{eff} can also be seen in panels (c) and (e). In panel (c) we plot the average of the spread of the MSE loss during

training, which we compute as

$$\left\langle \sqrt{\text{Var}(\text{MSE})} \right\rangle_{\text{evo}} = \frac{1}{N_{\text{epochs}}} \sum_{j=1}^{N_{\text{epochs}}} \sqrt{\text{Var}(\text{MSE}(j))} ,$$

where Var(MSE(j)) is the variance of the training MSE at epoch j, calculated over the different walkers. In panel (e) we show the trace of parameter correlation matrix Caveraged over all M walkers, as a measure of the cumulative variance of the parameters during their evolution. Specifically, the parameters correlation matrix for the m-th walker is calculated as

$$C^{(m)} = \frac{1}{T} \Theta^{(m) \top} \Theta^{(m)} ,$$

where $\Theta^{(m)}$ is a $(T \times D)$ centered data matrix with elements $\Theta^{(m)}_{t,i} = \theta^{(m)}_j(t) - \frac{1}{T} \sum_t \theta^{(m)}_j(t)$. The eigenvectors of $C^{(m)}$ associated to the largest eigenvalues denote the directions along which the parameters have changed the most, and the associated eigenvalues their variance. Hence

$$\overline{\operatorname{tr}(C)} \equiv \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \operatorname{tr}(C^{(m)})$$

gives an estimate of the parameters cumulative variance during the evolution. Despite the two quantities sharing similar behavior, from panels (c) and (e) no correlation with \hat{d}_{eff} can be concluded. The same holds when focusing on only the final part of the training dynamics, as shown in panel (d), as well as when looking at the mean spread of the final parameters $\frac{1}{D} \sum_{i=1}^{D} \text{Var}(\theta_i^{\text{f}})$, with $\theta_i^{\text{f}} = \theta_i(T)$ and the variance taken over the walkers ensemble, which is shown in panel (f). Thus, to summarize, in our analysis we see no clear correlation between the geometrical properties captured by the FIM and the training dynamics of our networks.

In particular, we expect the effectiveness of training to be dependent not only on the model ability to effectively explore the parameter space, but also on how well the functions it can represent are suited to the problem at hand (i.e., its inductive bias), an aspect to which the FIM is agnostic. Hence, given the slightly better performance of NNs on our task, their structure may be more favorable for learning cloud cover, which in turn has a positive impact on the training dynamics.

References

- Amin, M.H., Andriyash, E., Rolfe, J., Kulchytskyy, B., Melko, R.: Quantum Boltzmann machine. Phys. Rev. X 8, 021050 (2018) https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevX. 8.021050
- Aizpurua, B., Jahromi, S.S., Singh, S., Orus, R.: Quantum Large Language Models via Tensor Network Disentanglers (2024). https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.17397

- Abbas, A., Sutter, D., Zoufal, C., Lucchi, A., Figalli, A., Woerner, S.: The power of quantum neural networks. Nature Comp. Sci. 1, 403–409 (2021) https://doi.org/10. 1038/s43588-021-00084-1
- Bowles, J., Ahmed, S., Schuld, M.: Better than classical? The subtle art of benchmarking quantum machine learning models (2024). https://arxiv.org/abs/2403. 07059
- Brenowitz, N.D., Bretherton, C.S.: Spatially extended tests of a neural network parametrization trained by coarse-graining. Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems 11(8), 2728–2744 (2019) https://doi.org/10.1029/2019MS001711
- Bermejo, P., Braccia, P., Rudolph, M.S., Holmes, Z., Cincio, L., Cerezo, M.: Quantum Convolutional Neural Networks are (Effectively) Classically Simulable (2024). https: //arxiv.org/abs/2408.12739
- Bergholm, V., Izaac, J., Schuld, M., Gogolin, C., Ahmed, S., Ajith, V., Alam, M.S., Alonso-Linaje, G., AkashNarayanan, B., Asadi, A., Arrazola, J.M., Azad, U., Banning, S., Blank, C., Bromley, T.R., Cordier, B.A., Ceroni, J., Delgado, A., Matteo, O.D., Dusko, A., Garg, T., Guala, D., Hayes, A., Hill, R., Ijaz, A., Isacsson, T., Ittah, D., Jahangiri, S., Jain, P., Jiang, E., Khandelwal, A., Kottmann, K., Lang, R.A., Lee, C., Loke, T., Lowe, A., McKiernan, K., Meyer, J.J., Montañez-Barrera, J.A., Moyard, R., Niu, Z., O'Riordan, L.J., Oud, S., Panigrahi, A., Park, C.-Y., Polatajko, D., Quesada, N., Roberts, C., Sá, N., Schoch, I., Shi, B., Shu, S., Sim, S., Singh, A., Strandberg, I., Soni, J., Száva, A., Thabet, S., Vargas-Hernández, R.A., Vincent, T., Vitucci, N., Weber, M., Wierichs, D., Wiersema, R., Willmann, M., Wong, V., Zhang, S., Killoran, N.: PennyLane: Automatic differentiation of hybrid quantum-classical computations (2022). https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.04968
- Bock, L., Lauer, A., Schlund, M., Barreiro, M., Bellouin, N., Jones, C., Meehl, G.A., Predoi, V., Roberts, M.J., Eyring, V.: Quantifying progress across different CMIP phases with the ESMValTool. J. Geophys. Res.: Atmos. 125(21) (2020) https://doi. org/10.1029/2019jd032321
- Benedetti, M., Lloyd, E., Sack, S., Fiorentini, M.: Parameterized quantum circuits as machine learning models. Quantum Science and Technology 4(4), 043001 (2019) https://doi.org/10.1088/2058-9565/ab4eb5
- Banchi, L., Pereira, J., Pirandola, S.: Generalization in quantum machine learning: A quantum information standpoint. PRX Quantum 2, 040321 (2021) https://doi.org/ 10.1103/PRXQuantum.2.040321
- Belis, V., Woźniak, K.A., Puljak, E., Barkoutsos, P., Dissertori, G., Grossi, M., Pierini, M., Reiter, F., Tavernelli, I., Vallecorsa, S.: Quantum anomaly detection in the latent space of proton collision events at the lhc. Communications Physics 7, 334 (2024) https://doi.org/10.1038/s42005-024-01811-6

- Bazgir, A., Zhang, Y.: QESM: A Leap Towards Quantum-Enhanced ML Emulation Framework for Earth and Climate Modeling (2024). https://arxiv.org/abs/2410. 01551
- Cerezo, M., Arrasmith, A., Babbush, R., Benjamin, S.C., Endo, S., Fujii, K., Mc-Clean, J.R., Mitarai, K., Yuan, X., Cincio, L., Coles, P.J.: Variational quantum algorithms. Nature Reviews Physics 3, 625–644 (2021) https://doi.org/10.1038/ s42254-021-00348-9
- Cong, I., Choi, S., Lukin, M.D.: Quantum convolutional neural networks. Nature Physics 15, 1273–1278 (2019) https://doi.org/10.1038/s41567-019-0648-8
- Casas, B., Cervera-Lierta, A.: Multidimensional fourier series with quantum circuits. Phys. Rev. A **107**, 062612 (2023) https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.107.062612
- Chevallier, F., Chéruy, F., Scott, N.A., Chédin, A.: A neural network approach for a fast and accurate computation of a longwave radiative budget. Journal of Applied Meteorology **37**(11), 1385–1397 (1998) https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0450(1998) 037(1385:ANNAFA)2.0.CO;2
- Caro, M.C., Gil-Fuster, E., Meyer, J.J., Eisert, J., Sweke, R.: Encoding-dependent generalization bounds for parametrized quantum circuits. Quantum 5, 582 (2021) https://doi.org/10.22331/q-2021-11-17-582
- Caro, M.C., Huang, H.-Y., Cerezo, M., Sharma, K., Sornborger, A., Cincio, L., Coles, P.J.: Generalization in quantum machine learning from few training data. Nat. Commun. 13(1) (2022) https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-32550-3
- Cerezo, M., Larocca, M., García-Martín, D., Diaz, N.L., Braccia, P., Fontana, E., Rudolph, M.S., Bermejo, P., Ijaz, A., Thanasilp, S., Anschuetz, E.R., Holmes, Z.: Does provable absence of barren plateaus imply classical simulability? Or, why we need to rethink variational quantum computing (2024). https://arxiv.org/abs/2312. 09121
- Corli, S., Moro, L., Dragoni, D., Dispenza, M., Prati, E.: Quantum Machine Learning Algorithms for Anomaly Detection: a Survey (2024). https://arxiv.org/abs/2408. 11047
- Coyle, B., Mills, D., Danos, V., Kashefi, E.: The Born supremacy: quantum advantage and training of an Ising Born machine. npj Quantum Inf. 6, 60 (2020) https://doi. org/10.1038/s41534-020-00288-9
- Chan, A., Shi, Z., Dellantonio, L., Dür, W., Muschik, C.A.: Measurement-based infused circuits for variational quantum eigensolvers. Phys. Rev. Lett. **132**, 240601 (2024) https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.132.240601

- Cerezo, M., Verdon, G., Huang, H.-Y., Cincio, L., Coles, P.J.: Challenges and opportunities in quantum machine learning. Nat. Comput. Sci. 2, 567–576 (2022) https://doi.org/10.1038/s43588-022-00311-3
- Chen, S.Y.-C., Wei, T.-C., Zhang, C., Yu, H., Yoo, S.: Quantum convolutional neural networks for high energy physics data analysis. Phys. Rev. Res. 4, 013231 (2022) https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevResearch.4.013231
- Christensen, H., Zanna, L.: Parametrization in Weather and Climate Models. Oxford University Press (2022). https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228620.013. 826 . https://oxfordre.com/climatescience/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228620. 001.0001/acrefore-9780190228620-e-826
- Duneau, T., Bruhn, S., Matos, G., Laakkonen, T., Saiti, K., Pearson, A., Meichanetzidis, K., Coecke, B.: Scalable and interpretable quantum natural language processing: an implementation on trapped ions (2024). https://arxiv.org/abs/2409. 08777
- Dallaire-Demers, P.-L., Killoran, N.: Quantum generative adversarial networks. Phys. Rev. A 98, 012324 (2018) https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.98.012324
- Du, Y., Hsieh, M.-H., Liu, T., Tao, D.: Expressive power of parametrized quantum circuits. Phys. Rev. Res. 2, 033125 (2020) https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevResearch. 2.033125
- Dilip, R., Liu, Y.-J., Smith, A., Pollmann, F.: Data compression for quantum machine learning. Phys. Rev. Res. 4, 043007 (2022) https://doi.org/10.1103/ PhysRevResearch.4.043007
- Duras, J., Ziemen, F., Klocke, D.: The DYAMOND Winter Data Collection. (2021). https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-egu21-4687,2021
- Eyring, V., Collins, W.D., Gentine, P., Barnes, E.A., Barreiro, M., Beucler, T., Bocquet, M., Bretherton, C.S., Christensen, H.M., Gagne, D.J., Hall, D., Hammerling, D., Hoyer, S., Iglesias-Suarez, F., Lopez-Gomez, I., McGraw, M.C., Meehl, G.A., Molina, M.J., Monteleoni, C., Mueller, J., Pritchard, M.S., Rolnick, D., Runge, J., Stier, P., Watt-Meyer, O., Weigel, K., Yu, R., Zanna, L.: Pushing the frontiers in climate modelingand analysis with machine learning. Nature Climate Change 14, 916–928 (2024) https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-024-02095-y
- Eyring, V., Gentine, P., Camps-Valls, G., Lawrence, D.M., Reichstein, M.: Aiempowered next-generation multiscale climate modelling for mitigation and adaptation. Nature Geoscience **17**, 963–971 (2024) https://doi.org/10.1038/ s41561-024-01527-w
- Efthymiou, S., Hidary, J., Leichenauer, S.: TensorNetwork for Machine Learning (2019). https://arxiv.org/abs/1906.06329

- Eyring, V., Mishra, V., Griffith, G.P., Chen, L., Keenan, T., Turetsky, M.R., Brown, S., Jotzo, F., Moore, F.C., Linden, S.: Reflections and projections on a decade of climate science. Nat. Clim. Change 11(4), 279–285 (2021) https://doi.org/10.1038/ s41558-021-01020-x
- Foss-Feig, M., Tikku, A., Lu, T.-C., Mayer, K., Iqbal, M., Gatterman, T.M., Gerber, J.A., Gilmore, K., Gresh, D., Hankin, A., Hewitt, N., Horst, C.V., Matheny, M., Mengle, T., Neyenhuis, B., Dreyer, H., Hayes, D., Hsieh, T.H., Kim, I.H.: Experimental demonstration of the advantage of adaptive quantum circuits (2023). https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.03029
- Friedrich, L., Maziero, J.: Avoiding barren plateaus with classical deep neural networks. Phys. Rev. A 106, 042433 (2022) https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.106. 042433
- Farhi, E., Neven, H.: Classification with Quantum Neural Networks on Near Term Processors (2018). https://arxiv.org/abs/1802.06002
- Gao, X., Anschuetz, E.R., Wang, S.-T., Cirac, J.I., Lukin, M.D.: Enhancing generative models via quantum correlations. Phys. Rev. X 12, 021037 (2022) https://doi.org/ 10.1103/PhysRevX.12.021037
- Giorgetta, M.A., Brokopf, R., Crueger, T., Esch, M., Fiedler, S., Helmert, J., Hohenegger, C., Kornblueh, L., Köhler, M., Manzini, E., Mauritsen, T., Nam, C., Raddatz, T., Rast, S., Reinert, D., Sakradzija, M., Schmidt, H., Schneck, R., Schnur, R., Silvers, L., Wan, H., Zängl, G., Stevens, B.: ICON-A, the atmosphere component of the ICON Earth System Model: I. Model description. JAMES 10(7), 1613–1637 (2018) https://doi.org/10.1029/2017ms001242
- Grundner, A., Beucler, T., Gentine, P., Iglesias-Suarez, F., Giorgetta, M.A., Eyring, V.: Deep learning based cloud cover parameterization for ICON. JAMES 14(2), 2021–002959 (2022) https://doi.org/10.1029/2021ms002959
- Grundner, A., Beucler, T., Gentine, P., Eyring, V.: Data-driven equation discovery of a cloud cover parameterization. JAMES **16**(3), 2023–003763 (2024) https://doi.org/10.1029/2023MS003763
- Gentine, P., Eyring, V., Beucler, T.: Deep learning for the parametrization of subgrid processes in climate models. In: Camps-Valls, G., Tuia, D., Zhu, X.X., Reichstein, M. (eds.) Deep Learning for the Earth Sciences, Second Edition. Wiley, ??? (2021). https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119646181.ch21
- Gelman, M.: A Survey of Methods for Mitigating Barren Plateaus for Parameterized Quantum Circuits (2024). https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.14285
- Gil-Fuster, E., Gyurik, C., Pérez-Salinas, A., Dunjko, V.: On the relation between trainability and dequantization of variational quantum learning models (2024).

https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.07072

- Gentine, P., Pritchard, M., Rasp, S., Reinaudi, G., Yacalis, G.: Could machine learning break the convection parameterization deadlock? Geophys. Res. Lett. 45(11), 5742– 5751 (2018) https://doi.org/10.1029/2018gl078202
- Gettelman, A., Rood, R.B.: Demystifying Climate Models. Springer, ??? (2016). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-48959-8
- Giorgetta, M.A., Sawyer, W., Lapillonne, X., Adamidis, P., Alexeev, D., Clément, V., Dietlicher, R., Engels, J.F., Esch, M., Franke, H., et al.: The icon-a model for direct qbo simulations on gpus (version icon-cscs: baf28a514). Geoscientific Model Development 15(18), 6985–7016 (2022)
- Grant, E., Wossnig, L., Ostaszewski, M., Benedetti, M.: An initialization strategy for addressing barren plateaus in parametrized quantum circuits. Quantum 3, 214 (2019) https://doi.org/10.22331/q-2019-12-09-214
- Ho, K.T.M., Chen, K.-C., Lee, L., Burt, F., Yu, S., Po-Heng, Lee: Quantum Computing for Climate Resilience and Sustainability Challenges (2024). https://arxiv.org/abs/ 2407.16296
- Havlíček, V., Córcoles, A.D., Temme, K., Harrow, A.W., Kandala, A., Chow, J.M., Gambetta, J.M.: Supervised learning with quantum-enhanced feature spaces. Nature 567, 209–212 (2019) https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-0980-2
- Haghshenas, R., Gray, J., Potter, A.C., Chan, G.K.-L.: Variational power of quantum circuit tensor networks. Phys. Rev. X 12, 011047 (2022) https://doi.org/10.1103/ PhysRevX.12.011047
- Hafner, K., Iglesias-Suarez, F., Shamekh, S., Gentine, P., Giorgetta, M.A., Pincus, R., Eyring, V.: Interpretable machine learning-based radiation emulation for icon. ESS Open Archive (2024) https://doi.org/10.22541/essoar.173169996.65100750/v1
- Haug, T., Kim, M.S.: Generalization of quantum machine learning models using quantum fisher information metric. Phys. Rev. Lett. 133, 050603 (2024) https: //doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.133.050603
- Hur, T., Kim, L., Park, D.K.: Quantum convolutional neural network for classical data classification. Quantum Machine Intelligence 4, 3 (2022) https://doi.org/10.1007/s42484-021-00061-x
- Heuer, H., Schwabe, M., Gentine, P., Giorgetta, M.A., Eyring, V.: Interpretable multiscale machine learning-based parameterizations of convection for icon. Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems 16(8), 2024–004398 (2024) https: //doi.org/10.1029/2024MS004398

- Han, Z.-Y., Wang, J., Fan, H., Wang, L., Zhang, P.: Unsupervised generative modeling using matrix product states. Phys. Rev. X 8, 031012 (2018) https://doi.org/10. 1103/PhysRevX.8.031012
- Amari, S.-i.: Differential-geometrical methods in statistics. In: Lecture Notes in Statistics. Springer, ??? (1985). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-5056-2
- Amari, S.-i.: Natural gradient works efficiently in learning. Neural Computation 10, 251–276 (1997) https://doi.org/10.1162/089976698300017746
- Iqbal, M., Tantivasadakarn, N., Gatterman, T.M., Gerber, J.A., Gilmore, K., Gresh, D., Hankin, A., Hewitt, N., Horst, C.V., Matheny, M., Mengle, T., Neyenhuis, B., Vishwanath, A., Foss-Feig, M., Verresen, R., Dreyer, H.: Topological order from measurements and feed-forward on a trapped ion quantum computer. Communications Physics 7, 205 (2024) https://doi.org/10.1038/s42005-024-01698-3
- Jacobson, M.Z.: Fundamentals of Atmospheric Modeling. Cambridge University Press, ??? (2005). https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139165389 . https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139165389
- JAX: High performance array computing (accessed 2024). https://jax.readthedocs.io/ en/latest/index.html
- Jaderberg, B., Gentile, A.A., Ghosh, A., Elfving, V.E., Jones, C., Vodola, D., Manobianco, J., Weiss, H.: Potential of quantum scientific machine learning applied to weather modelling (2024). https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.08737
- Jerbi, S., Gyurik, C., Marshall, S.C., Molteni, R., Dunjko, V.: Shadows of quantum machine learning. Nature Communications 15, 5676 (2024) https://doi.org/10.1038/ s41467-024-49877-8
- Jumade, R., Sawaya, N.P.: Data is often loadable in short depth: Quantum circuits from tensor networks for finance, images, fluids, and proteins (2023). https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.13108
- Jobst, B., Shen, K., Riofrío, C.A., Shishenina, E., Pollmann, F.: Efficient MPS representations and quantum circuits from the Fourier modes of classical image data (2023). https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.07666
- Karakida, R., Akaho, S., Amari, S.-i.: Universal statistics of fisher information in deep neural networks: mean field approach*. Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment 2020(12), 124005 (2020) https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-5468/abc62e
- Kingma, D.P., Ba, J.: Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization (2017). https://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6980

Krasnopolsky, V.M., Fox-Rabinovitz, M.S., Belochitski, A.A.: Using ensemble of neural

networks to learn stochastic convection parameterizations for climate and numerical weather prediction models from data simulated by a cloud resolving model. Advances in Artificial Neural Systems **2013**(1), 485913 (2013) https://doi.org/10.1155/2013/485913

- Krasnopolsky, V.M., Fox-Rabinovitz, M.S., Chalikov, D.V.: New approach to calculation of atmospheric model physics: Accurate and fast neural network emulation of longwave radiation in a climate model. Monthly Weather Review 133(5), 1370–1383 (2005) https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR2923.1
- Kölle, M., Maurer, J., Altmann, P., Sünkel, L., Stein, J., Linnhoff-Popien, C.: Disentangling Quantum and Classical Contributions in Hybrid Quantum Machine Learning Architectures (2024). https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.05559
- Kreplin, D.A., Roth, M.: Reduction of finite sampling noise in quantum neural networks. Quantum 8, 1385 (2024) https://doi.org/10.22331/q-2024-06-25-1385
- Lachure, S.S., Lohidasan, A., Tiwari, A., Dhabu, M., Bokde, N.D.: 4. Quantum Machine Learning Applications to Address Climate Change: A Short Review. IGI Global Scientific Publishing, ??? (2023). https://doi.org/10.4018/ 978-1-6684-6697-1.ch004
- Liu, J., Li, S., Zhang, J., Zhang, P.: Tensor networks for unsupervised machine learning. Phys. Rev. E 107, 012103 (2023) https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.107. L012103
- Landman, J., Thabet, S., Dalyac, C., Mhiri, H., Kashefi, E.: Classically Approximating Variational Quantum Machine Learning with Random Fourier Features (2022). https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.13200
- Lagerquist, R., Turner, D., Ebert-Uphoff, I., Stewart, J., Hagerty, V.: Using deep learning to emulate and accelerate a radiative transfer model. Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology 38(10), 1673–1696 (2021) https://doi.org/10.1175/ JTECH-D-21-0007.1
- Larocca, M., Thanasilp, S., Wang, S., Sharma, K., Biamonte, J., Coles, P.J., Cincio, L., McClean, J.R., Holmes, Z., Cerezo, M.: A Review of Barren Plateaus in Variational Quantum Computing (2024). https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.00781
- McClean, J.R., Boixo, S., Smelyanskiy, V.N., Babbush, R., Neven, H.: Barren plateaus in quantum neural network training landscapes. Nature Communications 9, 4812 (2018) https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-07090-4
- McFarlane, N.: Parameterizations: representing key processes in climate models without resolving them. WIREs Climate Change 2(4), 482–497 (2011) https://doi.org/ 10.1002/wcc.122

- Merbis, W., Mulatier, C., Corboz, P.: Efficient simulations of epidemic models with tensor networks: application to the one-dimensional SIS model (2023). https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.06815
- Matsuta, T., Furue, R.: Formulation and evaluation of ocean dynamics problems as optimization problems for quantum annealing machines (2024). https://arxiv.org/ abs/2405.11782
- Mitarai, K., Negoro, M., Kitagawa, M., Fujii, K.: Quantum circuit learning. Phys. Rev. A **98**, 032309 (2018) https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.98.032309
- Mingard, C., Pointing, J., London, C., Nam, Y., Louis, A.A.: Exploiting the equivalence between quantum neural networks and perceptrons (2024). https://arxiv.org/ abs/2407.04371
- McClean, J.R., Romero, J., Babbush, R., Aspuru-Guzik, A.: The theory of variational hybrid quantum-classical algorithms. New Journal of Physics 18(2), 023023 (2016) https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/18/2/023023
- Murray, F.W.: On the computation of saturation vapor pressure. Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology 6(1), 203–204 (1967) https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0450(1967)006(0203:OTCOSV)2.0.CO;2
- Nivelkar, M., Bhirud, S., Singh, M., Ranjan, R., Kumar, B.: Quantum computing to study cloud turbulence properties. IEEE Access 11, 70679–70690 (2023) https: //doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3289924
- Nammouchi, A., Kassler, A., Theorachis, A.: Quantum Machine Learning in Climate Change and Sustainability: a Review (2023). https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.09162
- Otgonbaatar, S., Kranzlmüller, D.: Quantum-inspired tensor network for Earth science (2023). https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.07528
- Orús, R.: Tensor networks for complex quantum systems. Nature Reviews Physics 1, 538–550 (2019) https://doi.org/10.1038/s42254-019-0086-7
- Pascanu, R., Bengio, Y.: Revisiting Natural Gradient for Deep Networks (2014). https://arxiv.org/abs/1301.3584
- Pesah, A., Cerezo, M., Wang, S., Volkoff, T., Sornborger, A.T., Coles, P.J.: Absence of barren plateaus in quantum convolutional neural networks. Phys. Rev. X 11, 041011 (2021) https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevX.11.041011
- Perdomo-Ortiz, A., Benedetti, M., Realpe-Gómez, J., Biswas, R.: Opportunities and challenges for quantum-assisted machine learning in near-term quantum computers. Quantum Science and Technology 3(3), 030502 (2018) https://doi.org/10.1088/ 2058-9565/aab859

- Pérez-Salinas, A., Cervera-Lierta, A., Gil-Fuster, E., Latorre, J.I.: Data re-uploading for a universal quantum classifier. Quantum 4, 226 (2020) https://doi.org/10.22331/ q-2020-02-06-226
- Pennington, J., Worah, P.: The spectrum of the fisher information matrix of a singlehidden-layer neural network. In: Bengio, S., Wallach, H., Larochelle, H., Grauman, K., Cesa-Bianchi, N., Garnett, R. (eds.) Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, vol. 31. Curran Associates, Inc., ??? (2018)
- Rahman, S.M., Alkhalaf, O.H., Alam, M.S., Tiwari, S.P., Shafiullah, M., Al-Judaibi, S.M., Al-Ismail, F.S.: Climate change through quantum lens: Computing and machine learning. Earth Systems and Environment 8, 705–722 (2024) https://doi.org/ 10.1007/s41748-024-00411-2
- Randall, D., Khairoutdinov, M., Arakawa, A., Grabowski, W.: Breaking the cloud parameterization deadlock. Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society 84(11), 1547–1564 (2003) https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-84-11-1547
- Rieser, H.-M., Köster, F., Raulf, A.P.: Tensor networks for quantum machine learning. Proceedings of the Royal Society A 479, 20230218 (2023) https://doi.org/10.1098/ rspa.2023.0218
- Rasp, S., Pritchard, M.S., Gentine, P.: Deep learning to represent subgrid processes in climate models. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. 115(39), 9684–9689 (2018) https://doi.org/ 10.1073/pnas.1810286115
- Ran, S.-J., Su, G.: Tensor networks for interpretable and efficient quantum-inspired machine learning. Intelligent Computing 2, 0061 (2023) https://doi.org/10.34133/ icomputing.0061 https://spj.science.org/doi/pdf/10.34133/icomputing.0061
- Stevens, B., Acquistapace, C., Hansen, A., Heinze, R., Klinger, C., Klocke, D., Rybka, H., Schubotz, W., Windmiller, J., Adamidis, P., et al.: The added value of largeeddy and storm-resolving models for simulating clouds and precipitation. Journal of the Meteorological Society of Japan. Ser. II 98(2), 395–435 (2020)
- Sherwood, S.C., Bony, S., Dufresne, J.-L.: Spread in model climate sensitivity traced to atmospheric convective mixing. Nature 505(7481), 37–42 (2014) https://doi.org/ 10.1038/nature12829
- Schuld, M., Bergholm, V., Gogolin, C., Izaac, J., Killoran, N.: Evaluating analytic gradients on quantum hardware. Phys. Rev. A 99, 032331 (2019) https://doi.org/ 10.1103/PhysRevA.99.032331
- Stephan, C.C., Duras, J., Harris, L., Klocke, D., Putman, W.M., Taylor, M., Wedi, N., Žagar, N., Ziemen, F.: Atmospheric energy spectra in global kilometre-scale models. Tellus A: Dynamic Meteorology and Oceanography 74(1) (2022)

- Schreiber, F.J., Eisert, J., Meyer, J.J.: Classical surrogates for quantum learning models. Phys. Rev. Lett. 131, 100803 (2023) https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.131. 100803
- Shen, K., Jobst, B., Shishenina, E., Pollmann, F.: Classification of the Fashion-MNIST Dataset on a Quantum Computer (2024). https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.02405
- Schuld, M., Killoran, N.: Quantum machine learning in feature Hilbert spaces. Phys. Rev. Lett. 122, 040504 (2019) https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.040504
- Slabbert, D., Lourens, M., Petruccione, F.: Pulsar classification: comparing quantum convolutional neural networks and quantum support vector machines. Quantum Machine Intelligence 6(2) (2024) https://doi.org/10.1007/s42484-024-00194-9
- Sünkel, L., Martyniuk, D., Reichwald, J.J., Morariu, A., Seggoju, R.H., Altmann, P., Roch, C., Paschke, A.: Hybrid quantum machine learning assisted classification of covid-19 from computed tomography scans. In: 2023 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering (QCE), pp. 356–366. IEEE, ??? (2023). https://doi.org/10.1109/qce57702.2023.00048 . http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/QCE57702.2023.00048
- Schwabe, M., Pastori, L., Vega, I., Gentine, P., Iapichino, L., Lahtinen, V., Leib, M., Lorenz, J.M., Eyring, V.: Quantum computing to improve and accelerate climate models. Environmental Data Science submitted (2024)
- Sweke, R., Recio, E., Jerbi, S., Gil-Fuster, E., Fuller, B., Eisert, J., Meyer, J.J.: Potential and limitations of random Fourier features for dequantizing quantum machine learning (2023). https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.11647
- Stoudenmire, E., Schwab, D.J.: Supervised learning with tensor networks. In: Lee, D., Sugiyama, M., Luxburg, U., Guyon, I., Garnett, R. (eds.) Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, vol. 29. Curran Associates, Inc., ??? (2016)
- Stevens, B., Satoh, M., Auger, L., Biercamp, J., Bretherton, C.S., Chen, X., Düben, P., Judt, F., Khairoutdinov, M., Klocke, D., Kodama, C., Kornblueh, L., Lin, S.-J., Neumann, P., Putman, W.M., Röber, N., Shibuya, R., Vanniere, B., Vidale, P.L., Wedi, N., Zhou, L.: DYAMOND: the DYnamics of the atmospheric general circulation modeled on non-hydrostatic domains. Prog. Earth Planet. Sci. 6(1) (2019) https://doi.org/10.1186/s40645-019-0304-z
- Sakhnenko, A., Sikora, J., Lorenz, J.: Buildung continuous quantum-classical bayesian neural networks for a classical clinical dataset. In: Proceedings of Recent Advances in Quantum Computing and Technology. ReAQCT '24, pp. 62–72. ACM, ??? (2024). https://doi.org/10.1145/3665870.3665872 . http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3665870.3665872

Schuld, M., Sweke, R., Meyer, J.J.: Effect of data encoding on the expressive power

of variational quantum-machine-learning models. Phys. Rev. A **103**, 032430 (2021) https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.103.032430

- Schneider, T., Teixeira, J., Bretherton, C.S., Brient, F., Pressel, K.G., Schär, C., Siebesma, A.P.: Climate goals and computing the future of clouds. Nature Climate Change 7, 3–5 (2017) https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate3190
- Stensrud, D.J.: Parameterization Schemes: Keys to Understanding Numerical Weather Prediction Models. Cambridge University Press, ??? (2007). https://doi.org/10. 1017/CBO9780511812590
- Sahay, R., Verresen, R.: Finite-Depth Preparation of Tensor Network States from Measurement (2024). https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.17087
- Tennie, F., Palmer, T.N.: Quantum computers for weather and climate prediction: The good, the bad, and the noisy. Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society 104(2), 488–500 (2023) https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-22-0031.1
- Thanasilp, S., Wang, S., Nghiem, N.A., Coles, P., Cerezo, M.: Subtleties in the trainability of quantum machine learning models. Quantum Machine Intelligence 5, 21 (2023) https://doi.org/10.1007/s42484-023-00103-6
- Williams, C.A., Paine, A.E., Wu, H.-Y., Elfving, V.E., Kyriienko, O.: Quantum Chebyshev Transform: Mapping, Embedding, Learning and Sampling Distributions (2023). https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.17026
- Wang, Y., Yang, S., Chen, G., Bao, Q., Li, J.: Evaluating two diagnostic schemes of cloud-fraction parameterization using the cloudsat data. Atmospheric Research 282, 106510 (2023) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2022.106510
- Xu, K.-M., Randall, D.A.: A semiempirical cloudiness parameterization for use in climate models. Journal of Atmospheric Sciences **53**(21), 3084–3102 (1996) https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1996)053(3084:ASCPFU)2.0.CO;2
- Yu, Z., Chen, Q., Jiao, Y., Li, Y., Lu, X., Wang, X., Yang, J.Z.: Provable Advantage of Parameterized Quantum Circuit in Function Approximation Preprint at https: //arxiv.org/abs/2310.07528 (2023). https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2310.07528
- Yuval, J., O'Gorman, P.A.: Stable machine-learning parameterization of subgrid processes for climate modeling at a range of resolutions. Nat. Commun. 11(1) (2020) https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-17142-3
- Zhang, K., Liu, L., Hsieh, M.-H., Tao, D.: Escaping from the Barren Plateau via Gaussian Initializations in Deep Variational Quantum Circuits (2022). https://arxiv.org/ abs/2203.09376