

---

# BENCHMARKING MEDMNIST DATASET ON REAL QUANTUM HARDWARE

---

**Gurinder Singh, Hongni Jin, and Kenneth M. Merz, Jr.**  
Center for Computational Life Sciences, Lerner Research Institute  
Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, Ohio 44106, United States  
{singhg12, jinh2, merzk}@ccf.org

## ABSTRACT

Quantum machine learning (QML) has emerged as a promising domain to leverage the computational capabilities of quantum systems to solve complex classification tasks. In this work, we present first comprehensive QML study by benchmarking the MedMNIST—a diverse collection of medical imaging datasets on a 127-qubit real IBM quantum hardware, to evaluate the feasibility and performance of quantum models (without any classical neural networks) in practical applications. This study explore recent advancements in quantum computing such as device-aware quantum circuits, error suppression and mitigation for medical image classification. Our methodology comprised of three stages: preprocessing, generation of noise-resilient and hardware-efficient quantum circuits, optimizing/training of quantum circuits on classical hardware, and inference on real IBM quantum hardware. Firstly, we process all input images in the preprocessing stage to reduce the spatial dimension due to the quantum hardware limitations. We generate hardware-efficient quantum circuits using backend properties expressible to learn complex patterns for medical image classification. After classical optimization of QML models, we perform the inference on real quantum hardware. We also incorporates advanced error suppression and mitigation techniques in our QML workflow including dynamical decoupling (DD), gate twirling, and matrix-free measurement mitigation (M3) to mitigate the effects of noise and improve classification performance. The experimental results showcase the potential of quantum computing for medical imaging and establishes a benchmark for future advancements in QML applied to healthcare.

**Keywords** Quantum machine learning · Medical image classification · Device-aware quantum circuit · Error mitigation

## 1 Introduction

Biomedical image analysis plays a critical role in advancing human healthcare. Recently, machine learning (ML) has demonstrated remarkable potential in this domain, excelling in tasks such as medical image classification [1, 2, 3], segmentation [4, 5], and reconstruction [6, 7]. Simultaneously, QML an emerging paradigm of ML implemented on quantum computers, is anticipated to offer quantum advantages over classical ML. These advantages include enhanced speed-ups, improved model expressivity, efficient exploration of high-dimensional feature spaces, and the ability to address certain classically intractable problems [8, 9, 10, 11, 12]. QML capitalizes on the unique properties of quantum mechanics, such as superposition, entanglement, and interference, to unravel complex relationships between inputs and labels. In the current noisy intermediate-scale quantum (NISQ) era, QML faces notable challenges. Limited access to large-scale quantum systems constrains the ability to encode high-dimensional data into quantum states. Hardware noise and decoherence further impact accuracy and restrict circuit depth, thereby limiting the expressivity of QML models. Rapid advancements in quantum hardware, including improved quantum error correction techniques [13], are expected to overcome these limitations and enable the practical deployment of QML for real-world applications in the near future.

Despite these obstacles, QML research has witnessed significant growth [14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28]. Generally, QML approaches are based on parameterized quantum circuits (PQCs) [29] consisting of fixed gates (such as SWAP and CNOT) and single-qubit (such as Pauli rotation) gates with trainable parameters. These PQCs

comprised of three stages: data encoding, a variational ansatz circuit with trainable parameters, and measurement to classical bits. The data encoding stage encode the classical input data to quantum states. The parameters of the ansatz circuit are optimized using classical gradient descent algorithms, typically relying on the parameter-shift rule [30], enabling the circuit to solve machine learning tasks.

Over the last few years, researchers have explored QML algorithms for medical imaging in various studies including [26, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39] to harness potential quantum advantages over classical machine learning approaches. These studies address a variety of medical imaging modalities, including MRI, CT, X-ray, OCT, and ultrasound, targeting tasks such as clinical data classification and detection. The QML algorithms investigated in these works include quantum support vector machines (SVM) [34], hybrid quantum-classical neural networks [26, 35, 36, 38, 39], quantum transfer learning [33, 37], and variational quantum circuits [31, 32]. To the best of our knowledge, few studies such as [26, 33, 34, 37, 39] have used real quantum hardware for evaluation purposes but at a limited scale. Cherrat et al. proposed a quantum vision transformer (QViT) in [26] based on shallow PQCs capable of performing complex image classification tasks. This QViT introduces trainable quantum orthogonal layers adaptable to varying levels of quantum hardware connectivity. The authors have evaluated their QViT on open source MedMNIST (a collection of 12 biomedical imaging datasets) [1] using a simulator and real hardware results are provided for only one dataset (RetinaMNIST) out of 12. In [33], Acar and Yilmaz designed a hybrid classical-quantum transfer learning based QML model for COVID-19 detection using CT images. The authors claimed to achieve a classification accuracy of 94-100% on quantum devices with limited qubit capacity compared to 90% on classical systems using a small dataset. This highlights the potential of quantum computers for efficient and accurate medical image classification, particularly with limited data. Moradi et al. [34] designed two QML methods i.e., quantum distance classifier and quantum-kernel SVM for clinical data classification on quantum hardware. The findings observed in this study also highlight the promise of QML in clinical data analysis, especially for tasks constrained by dataset size and feature complexity. Azevedo et al. [37] employed hybrid quantum-classical neural network for mammogram classification into malignant and benign categories. The authors compared the results obtained from quantum device and simulator, highlighting the potential of QML in medical diagnostics while emphasizing the need for further validation. Similarly, the study conducted in [39] by Landman et al. introduces two quantum neural networks: quantum-assisted neural networks, which leverage quantum computer to estimate inner products during the training and inference of classical neural networks, and quantum orthogonal neural networks, built on quantum pyramidal circuits for orthogonal matrix multiplication. This study also considered only two datasets (PneumoniaMNIST and RetinaMnist) out of 12 datasets from MedMNIST for evaluation purposes on real hardware. Moreover, all of these studies showing evaluation on quantum hardwares are small-scale devices with 5, 7, 15, 16, and 27 qubits. It is also worth noting that most of these QML studies are based on hybrid quantum-classical neural networks which combines quantum circuits with classical neural networks, leaving the potential of purely quantum approaches underexplored. Also, the individual contribution of both quantum and classical parts is unclear. While some studies claim potential quantum advantages, these are often observed only in restricted settings (e.g., small datasets or low-qubit systems) with limited evidence of their generalization across different image classification domains or modalities. Demonstrating clear, reproducible quantum advantages over classical machine learning models remains a significant challenge.

To address above mentioned limitations, we conducted a comprehensive QML study for medical image classification on a 127 qubits IBM quantum hardware. This research study aims to explore the different aspects of QML for image classification including efficient encoding of high-dimensional image data to quantum states, generation of device-aware quantum circuits having optimal expressivity for different image datasets, advantages of error suppression and mitigation techniques. By exclusively employing quantum methods without classical neural networks, our work addresses critical gaps in the current QML literature, offering insights into the practical applicability and performance of quantum-only models for medical image classification tasks. This effort not only highlights the promise of QML in addressing real-world problems but also sets a foundational benchmark for future explorations in this domain. The main contributions of our research study are as follows:

- We present the first comprehensive QML study by benchmarking the MedMNIST dataset on real IBM Cleveland quantum hardware.
- This research leverages and evaluates the recent quantum computing capabilities such as generation of device-aware quantum circuits and error suppression/mitigation techniques for medical image classification.
- We also conducted an ablation study on different error suppression and mitigation techniques to provide an intuitive understanding.
- The experimental results provide foundational insights into the performance and scalability of quantum models for medical image classification, establishing a benchmark for future QML research for healthcare applications.

In the remaining sections of this research study, we firstly discussed our QML methodology in detail in Section 2. Then, we provide the experiment results with discussion in Section 3. Lastly, concluding remarks are provided in Section 4.

## 2 Methodology

In this section, we discuss our QML methodology for medical image classification, as illustrated in Fig. 1. Our approach is structured into four key stages: data preprocessing, generation of device-aware quantum circuits, training of the quantum circuits on classical hardware using training dataset, and inference of the trained quantum model on real IBM quantum devices, training quantum models with large datasets directly on hardware remains infeasible. To address this challenge, our QML workflow adopts a hybrid strategy, where the training phase is executed on classical hardware, leveraging their computational power, while the inference stage is performed on real quantum hardware to validate the model’s performance. The following subsections provide a detailed explanation of each stage of our QML methodology.




Figure 1: QML framework for medical image classification.

### 2.1 Data preprocessing

The preprocessing stage focuses on reducing the feature dimensionality of input images, a necessary step in our QML workflow due to the constraints of current quantum hardware. Specifically, we employ angle encoding to map classical data to quantum states. The angle encoding method is limited by the hardware’s inability to handle high-dimensional feature spaces in the current NISQ era. Therefore, it is very important to reduce the spatial dimension of the images effectively. We used average pooling to downscale the input image dimension from  $224 \times 224$  to  $7 \times 7$  and  $8 \times 8$  for the considered MedMNIST datasets, thereby providing 49 and 64 features, respectively. This indicates that performing angle encoding for 49 and 64 features requires the incorporation of 49 and 64 Pauli rotation gates, respectively, within the quantum circuit. The quantum circuit representational capacity should be adjusted accordingly to effectively capture the patterns in the input features. Post-feature reduction, the pixel values are normalized to the range  $[0, \pi]$ , aligning with the requirements of angle encoding for efficient quantum state preparation. It is important to note that this preprocessing stage introduces information loss compared to classical machine learning models, which can process entire images as input without dimensionality reduction. In QML workflow, this limitation arises due to the constraints of current quantum hardware, which restrict the number of features that can be encoded into quantum states. Consequently, while classical models can leverage the full spatial resolution of input images, quantum models operating with a reduced feature set, potentially impacting the overall representational capacity. This trade-off underscores the need for effective feature reduction techniques that preserve essential information while ensuring compatibility with the limitations of quantum devices.

## 2.2 Efficient and noise-resilient quantum circuits for QML

The second crucial step of our QML framework involves designing a noise-robust and efficient quantum circuit that is expressively powerful enough to learn meaningful patterns from the input data for medical imaging classification task. In the current NISQ era, developing device-aware quantum circuits tailored to the target backend properties, such as qubit connectivity and gate fidelities, has emerged as a key strategy to mitigate the impact of hardware noise. However, designing such circuits remains a significant challenge due to the lack of well-defined guidelines for quantum circuit architecture in QML workflows. Additionally, the optimal design of a quantum circuit is highly dataset-dependent, as varying datasets require different levels of expressivity to effectively capture their underlying patterns.

To address these challenges, we incorporated the Élivágar framework [40] into our QML workflow to generate hardware-aware quantum circuits tailored to our medical image classification task. This framework allowed us to create noise-resilient and computationally efficient quantum circuits that align with the physical constraints of the target quantum hardware while maximizing model performance. The quantum circuits in our workflow comprise three key components: (1) data encoding gates, (2) a variational or ansatz circuit, and (3) measurement operations that map quantum states to classical bits. The data encoding layer leverages parameterized rotation gates to embed classical input data into quantum states. The ansatz, or variational circuit, contains trainable Pauli rotation gates interspersed with CNOT gates to ensure qubit entanglement. The parameters of these gates ( $\theta$ ) are optimized during training to minimize the loss function. Input data from the preprocessing stage is encoded using a number of rotation gates equal to the feature count of each input sample. An essential step in the Élivágar framework is computing the Clifford Noise Resilience (CNR) to assess the robustness of candidate circuits against hardware-induced errors. While this process is typically conducted on quantum device, it is time-intensive due to the need to run thousands of circuits, often facing significant queuing delays. To streamline the process, we performed CNR calculations using a simulator, enabling efficient evaluation of circuit noise resilience while saving considerable time.

To ensure adaptability and effectiveness, we designed multiple quantum circuits with varying levels of expressivity by systematically adjusting the number of trainable parameters and the depth of the ansatz. These circuits were carefully tailored to meet the unique requirements of the MedMNIST datasets. Specifically, we generated quantum circuits with different configurations, incorporating varying numbers of trainable parameters—such as 60, 80, 100, and 120 for all the MedMNIST datasets under consideration. This approach allowed us to explore the impact of circuit expressivity on the performance of our quantum models and ensured optimal alignment with the specific characteristics of each dataset. Importantly, to thoroughly investigate the potential of quantum circuits in medical imaging classification, our QML framework exclusively employs quantum models without incorporating any classical neural network components. This approach highlights the intrinsic capabilities of quantum circuits and paves the way for future advancements in leveraging QML for medical imaging tasks.

## 2.3 Training quantum model on classical hardware

The training phase of our QML framework for medical image classification is executed on classical hardware as illustrated in Fig. 1. This approach circumvents the current limitations of quantum hardware in the NISQ era, such as limited qubits, high noise levels, and decoherence effects by performing the computationally expensive training process on classical GPUs even for large-scale datasets. Our QML workflow integrates classical optimization technique with noise-resilient, hardware-efficient quantum circuits tailored for medical imaging tasks. The training pipeline includes iterative optimization using gradient-based method and loss evaluation. The variational quantum circuit parameters ( $\theta$ ) are iteratively updated within a classical optimization loop to minimize a task-specific loss function. This iterative process continues until convergence is achieved or the maximum number of training epochs is reached, ensuring the parameters are optimized for the target classification task.

We conducted the training on noiseless simulators using the TorchQuantum library [41], which provides an ideal environment for parameter optimization without interference from hardware-induced noise. This approach significantly reduces computational overhead compared to direct hardware training and ensures consistent gradient computation. During each training iteration, the preprocessed input data is mapped to quantum states via encoding gates in the quantum circuit, which is then executed on the simulator. Expectation values obtained from circuit measurements are used to compute the loss function. Gradients of the loss function are calculated using the parameter-shift rule [30]. Afterwards, these gradients guide precise updates to the trainable parameters ( $\theta$ ). In our implementation, all the quantum circuits were trained for 200 epochs using the Adam optimizer with a learning rate of 0.01 and a batch size of 128, ensuring convergence to optimal parameter configurations. The MedMNIST contains datasets having different number of classes. During training, we measure one qubit and two qubits for two class and four class datasets, respectively and mean square loss function is used to calculate the loss. For the remaining multi-class datasets, we measure the number of qubits equals to the number of classes in the dataset and cross entropy loss function is used

to calculate the loss. To ensure compatibility with MedMNIST datasets, we trained circuits with varying numbers of trainable parameters, such as 60, 80, 100, and 120 for each dataset of MedMNIST to account for differences in dataset complexity. The best-performing models are saved along with their parameters, losses, and accuracies for later inference on real quantum hardware. We also performed inference of these trained quantum models on simulator for all the considered MedMNIST datasets. All the quantum models are trained on a A100 Nvidia GPU of 43 GB RAM.

### 2.4 Inference on real IBM Cleveland hardware

The trained quantum models demonstrating the best classification performance on the simulator were selected for validation on the IBM Cleveland quantum hardware. During the inference stage of our QML framework, the trained quantum models with optimized parameters were utilized for evaluating the test samples. For each testing sample, the corresponding quantum circuit is dynamically constructed and transpiled at optimization level 3 to minimize circuit depth and gate count while ensuring compatibility with the hardware topology. Moreover, qubit connectivity was carefully configured to align with the hardware’s topology, minimizing the need for SWAP gates, which can introduce unnecessary noise and overhead. To further enhance the quantum model performance, we employed error suppression techniques, i.e. dynamical decoupling and gate twirling (Twir) during the sampling process on real IBM hardware. The DD is used to suppress the decoherence effects introduced due to the unwanted interaction between the qubits and the environment. Gate twirling applies random single-qubit gates around a target gate to average out coherent errors. The sampling on real hardware is performed using Qiskit SamplerV2 in Session execution mode. Moreover, we also integrated M3 error mitigation [42] in our QML workflow. M3 mitigation is a scalable quantum error correction approach that operates within the noisy bitstring subspace, correcting correlated and uncorrelated errors using a memory-efficient, matrix-free iterative solver. The integration of these error suppression and mitigation strategies enables quantum models to achieve optimal inference performance on real quantum hardware. Lastly, classical post-processing is applied on the mitigated bitstrings to obtain the predicted classification labels. To achieve this, the mitigated bitstrings are processed to compute qubit probabilities defined as:

$$P(q, m) = \frac{N_{q,m}}{N_{\text{shots}}}, \quad m \in \{0, 1\} \tag{1}$$

where  $P(q, m)$  is the probability of measuring state  $m$  on qubit  $q$ ,  $N_{q,m}$  is the number of times the  $q$ -th qubit is measured in state  $|m\rangle$  during the experiment. The measurement outcome  $m = 0$  corresponds to the state  $|0\rangle$  and  $m = 1$  corresponds to the state  $|1\rangle$ .  $N_{\text{shots}}$  represents the total number of measurement shots and we used  $N_{\text{shots}} = 32000$  for all the MedMNIST datasets. These probabilities provide the final expectation values for classification computed as:

$$\langle Z_q \rangle = P(q, 0) - P(q, 1) \tag{2}$$

where  $\langle Z_q \rangle$  denotes the expectation value of the Pauli-Z operator for the  $q$ -th qubit, calculated as the difference between the probabilities of measuring 0 and 1. This expectation value vector is obtained for each test sample is processed to obtain the predicted class labels. The results from all test samples were aggregated to compute the performance metrics, providing insights into the performance of the quantum circuits on real quantum hardware. By conducting inference on real quantum device, we demonstrated the feasibility of deploying noise-resilient and device-aware quantum circuits for practical medical image classification tasks.

## 3 Experimental results

In this section, we conducted extensive experimental analysis to evaluate our QML workflow using both simulator and IBM Cleveland real hardware to benchmark MedMNIST datasets [1]. The MedMNIST contains 12 two-dimensional biomedical imaging datasets of different medical modalities and complexity levels. These 12 datasets includes 2-class as well as multi-class datasets including 4-class, 5-class, 7-class, 8-class, 9-class, and 11-class. For this benchmarking, we considered 8 datasets out of 12 by considering atleast one dataset from each category of different classes as shown in Table 1. The different medical modalities considered in these 8 datasets are illustrated in Fig. 2. We considered two widely used classification metrics i.e., accuracy (ACC) and area under the curve (AUC) to measure the performance of QML models. It is important to note that ACC provides a straightforward interpretation of model performance but it is highly sensitive to class imbalance, often leading to biased evaluations. On the contrary, AUC offers a more comprehensive evaluation of the classifier’s separability and is inherently robust to class imbalance. This makes AUC particularly suitable for datasets where class distributions are skewed. It is clear from the Table 1 that MedMNIST datasets are quite imbalance in nature. Therefore, we prioritized AUC over ACC to select model for real hardware

execution. By focusing on AUC, we ensured that the chosen quantum models were able to effectively distinguish between classes across various thresholds, providing a fairer and more reliable assessment of performance.

Table 1: Data summary of MedMNIST-v2 datasets used in our QML workflow.

MedMNIST2D	Data Modality	Classes	Training / Test	Sample distribution
PneumoniaMNIST	Chest X-Ray	2	4,708 / 624	Train: 1214, 3494; Test: 234, 390
BreastMNIST	Breast Ultrasound	2	546 / 156	Train: 147, 399; Test: 42, 114
OCTMNIST	Retinal OCT	4	97,477 / 1,000	Train: 33484, 10213, 7754, 46026; Test: 250, 250, 250, 250
RetinaMNIST	Fundus Camera	5	1,080 / 400	Train: 486, 128, 206, 194, 66; Test: 174, 46, 92, 68, 20
DermaMNIST	Dermatoscope	7	7,007 / 2,005	Train: 228, 359, 769, 80, 779, 4693, 99 Test: 66, 103, 220, 23, 223, 1341, 29
BloodMNIST	Blood Cell Microscope	8	11,959 / 3,421	Train: 852, 2181, 1085, 2026, 849, 993, 2330, 1643 Test: 244, 624, 311, 579, 243, 284, 666, 470
PathMNIST	Colon Pathology	9	89,996 / 7,180	Train: 9366, 9509, 10360, 10401, 8006, 12182, 7886, 9401, 12885 Test: 1338, 847, 339, 634, 1035, 592, 741, 421, 1233
OrganSMNIST	Abdominal CT	11	13,932 / 8,827	Train: 1148, 630, 614, 721, 1132, 1119, 3464, 741, 803, 2004, 1556 Test: 811, 439, 445, 510, 704, 693, 2078, 397, 439, 1343, 968




Figure 2: MedMNIST datasets for 2D biomedical image classification.

The classical post-processing of M3-mitigated bitstrings in the inference stage provides expectation values vector for all test samples. These expectation values are used to calculate the ACC and AUC metrics. For binary datasets (where we measure one qubit), the accuracy is calculated by measuring the proportion of predictions that deviate from the true labels by less than a threshold of 1. It evaluates how many predictions are close enough to the actual labels, providing an overall measure of correctness for the model's outputs in binary classification tasks. The binary AUC is computed by

assessing the separability of the two classes based on the predicted expectation values. We generate signed prediction labels to align with the true labels and calculate the AUC score using the AUC score function [43] from scikit-learn. For the multi-class datasets (where we are measuring more than 2 qubits), the model’s predicted class is determined by taking the index of the maximum value along each row of expectation values vector. This is compared against the true labels to compute the classification accuracy as:

$$ACC = \frac{\text{Number of correct predictions}}{\text{Total number of samples}} \quad (3)$$

To calculate the AUC metric for multi-class datasets, we first applied softmax activation function to convert the raw expectation values into class probabilities. This ensures that the outputs for each test sample sum to 1 and can be interpreted as probabilities for each class. Then, we use the AUC function [43] from scikit-learn to calculate the AUC.

Table 2: Performance analysis of QML framework on simulator based on classification accuracy (ACC) and area under the curve (AUC) metrics under different configurations of quantum models.

Dataset	Number of qubits	Number of embedding gates	Number of trainable parameters	Noiseless ACC	Noiseless AUC
PneumoniaMNIST	4	49	60	0.8478	0.8098
			80	0.8462	0.8137
			100	0.8462	0.8068
			120	<b>0.8526</b>	<b>0.8197</b>
		64	60	0.8253	0.785
			80	0.8462	0.8128
			100	<b>0.8526</b>	0.812
			120	0.8478	0.8132
BreastMNIST	4	49	60	0.769	0.652
			80	0.801	0.684
			100	<b>0.814</b>	0.674
			120	0.808	0.693
		64	60	0.776	0.681
			80	0.769	<b>0.722</b>
			100	0.775	0.658
			120	0.794	0.694
OCTMNIST	4	49	60	0.433	0.657
			80	0.41	0.656
			100	0.404	0.648
			120	0.415	0.657
		64	60	0.388	0.628
			80	0.409	0.631
	100		0.423	0.651	
	120		0.413	0.648	
	8	49	60	0.387	0.62
			80	0.379	0.623
			100	<b>0.443</b>	<b>0.659</b>
			120	0.441	0.652
64		60	0.393	0.621	
		80	0.36	0.593	
	100	0.398	0.631		
	120	0.379	0.628		
RetinaMNIST	5	49	60	0.4775	0.6268
			80	0.48	0.6646
			100	0.485	0.6434
			120	0.5	0.6458
		64	60	0.5025	<b>0.6648</b>
			80	0.505	0.6474
			100	0.5025	0.6586
			120	<b>0.5175</b>	0.6559

Table 3: Performance analysis of QML framework on simulator based on classification accuracy (ACC) and area under the curve (AUC) metrics under different configurations of quantum models.

Dataset	Number of qubits	Number of embedding gates	Number of trainable parameters	Noiseless ACC	Noiseless AUC
DermaMNIST	7	49	60	0.6688	0.6873
			80	0.6698	0.7144
			100	0.6698	0.7013
			120	0.6693	0.7059
		64	60	0.6723	0.6938
			80	0.6693	0.7094
			100	0.6728	0.6959
			120	<b>0.6738</b>	<b>0.7343</b>
BloodMNIST	8	49	60	0.415	0.774
			80	0.371	0.781
			100	0.462	0.811
			120	0.432	0.782
		64	60	0.44	0.792
			80	0.434	0.796
			100	0.421	0.791
			120	<b>0.482</b>	<b>0.821</b>
PathMNIST	9	49	60	0.3398	0.7542
			80	0.3553	0.7492
			100	0.3467	0.7703
			120	0.3614	0.7796
		64	60	0.3443	0.7574
			80	0.3341	0.7708
			100	0.3558	0.7682
			120	<b>0.3723</b>	<b>0.784</b>
OrganSMNIST	11	49	60	0.3735	0.7492
			80	0.3711	0.7585
			100	0.369	0.7624
			120	0.3544	0.7689
		64	60	0.3353	0.729
			80	0.3528	0.7709
			100	<b>0.3786</b>	0.7599
			120	0.3681	<b>0.7802</b>

We present the noiseless results of the QML framework using simulator based on ACC and AUC metrics under different settings of input embedding features and quantum circuit trainable parameters for the considered MedMNIST datasets in Tables 2 and 3. The QML evaluation is performed by considering all the training and testing samples of MedMNIST datasets as given in Table 1. The bold values in the Tables 2 and 3 represent the best accuracy and AUC values. For PneumoniaMNIST dataset, our QML model with 4 qubits, 49 input embedding features, and 120 trainable parameters provides the highest classification accuracy of 85.26% and AUC of 81.97% as compared to the other settings as shown in Table 2. In the case of BreastMNIST dataset, we got best accuracy of 81.40% for the 4-qubit quantum model having 49 embedding features and 100 trainable parameters, while highest AUC of 72.20% is achieved for the model with 64 embedding features and 80 trainable parameters. Similarly, we got the highest accuracy of 44.30% and AUC of 65.90% for 8-qubit quantum model having 49 embedding features and 100 trainable parameters for OCTMNIST dataset. For RetinaMNIST dataset, we achieved best classification accuracy of 51.75% for the 5-qubit quantum model having 64 input embedding features and 120 trainable parameters. The highest AUC of 66.48% is obtained for the quantum model having 64 embedding features and 60 trainable parameters as depicted in Table 2. A 7-qubit quantum model with 64 input embedding features and 120 trainable parameters provides highest accuracy of 67.38% and AUC of 73.43% for the 7-class DermaMNIST dataset as shown in Table 3. For a 8-class BloodMNIST dataset, we achieved the highest accuracy of 48.20% and AUC of 82.10% using the QML model with 64 embedding features and 120 trainable parameters. Similarly, we got the best accuracy of 37.23% and AUC of 78.40% for a 9-class PathMNIST dataset using the QML model having 64 embedding features and 120 trainable parameters. Lastly, the QML model with 64 features and 100 trainable parameters provides best classification accuracy of 37.86% for 11-class OrganSMNIST dataset, while best AUC of 78.02% is achieved for the QML model having 64 embedding features and



120 trainable parameters. It is clear from these results that the quantum models without any classical neural networks part and with very limited input features showing promising capability to classify medical imaging datasets. Also, it is observed from the Tables 2 and 3 that there is a significant difference between the accuracy and AUC values, for instance, we got an accuracy of 48.20% and AUC of 82.10% for BloodMNIST dataset. Similar trend can be seen for the PathMNIST and OrganSMNIST datasets. Note that we considered AUC as our primary performance evaluation metric because it is less sensitive to the class imbalance of MedMNIST datasets as compared to the accuracy metric. Moreover, it can be noted that for most of the multi-class datasets, we got best results corresponding to the QML models having more number of embedding features and trainable parameters in the quantum circuit.

Table 4: Ablation of different error suppression/mitigation techniques using OCTMNIST dataset on real IBM Cleveland hardware.

	IBM Cleveland (ACC)	IBM Cleveland (AUC)
No error suppression/mitigation	0.286	0.545
Error suppression (DD+Twirling)	0.33	0.591
M3 error mitigation	0.285	0.533
DD+Twirling+M3	<b>0.397</b>	<b>0.622</b>

We also conducted an ablation study on IBM Cleveland real hardware to understand the impact of error suppression and error mitigation techniques on the performance of QML models for medical imaging classification as shown in Table 4. We performed this ablation on the OCTMNIST dataset because of the significant effect of hardware noise on the performance of QML model. For OCTMNIST dataset, our QML workflow provides the noiseless accuracy of 44.30% and AUC of 65.90% as shown in Table 2. When we run this quantum model on real IBM hardware without any error suppression and mitigation techniques, we got an accuracy of 28.60% and AUC of 54.50%. Therefore, we observed the reduction of 15.70% and 11.40% in accuracy and AUC, respectively due to the noise of IBM Cleveland hardware. In this ablation, since we are using sampler in the inference stage as shown in Fig. 1, we considered two error suppression techniques i.e., dynamical decoupling and gate twirling and one error mitigation technique i.e., M3 mitigation. It is observed from the Table 4 that when we use both error suppression techniques and M3 mitigation together (DD+Twirling+M3), we got best accuracy of 39.70% and AUC of 62.20%, thereby providing an improvements of 11.10% and 7.7% in accuracy and AUC respectively as compared to the case when no suppression and mitigation is used. Based on this ablation study on OCTMNIST dataset, we used this combination (DD+Twirling+M3) for all the considered MedMNIST datasets.

Table 5: Performance analysis of QML framework on real IBM Cleveland hardware based on classification accuracy (ACC) and area under the curve (AUC) metrics for different MedMNIST datasets.

Dataset	Qubits	Embed gates	Tunable params	Circuit gates	Circuit depth	Noiseless		IBM Cleveland			
						ACC	AUC	No supp./miti.		DD+Twir+M3	
								ACC	AUC	ACC	AUC
PneumoniaMNIST	4	49	120	184	51	0.8526	0.8197	0.8381	0.8038	0.8542	0.8218
BreastMNIST	4	64	80	187	59	0.769	0.722	0.782	0.738	0.769	0.714
OCTMNIST	8	49	100	208	47	0.443	0.659	0.286	0.545	0.397	0.622
RetinaMNIST	5	64	60	140	29	0.5025	0.6648	0.5025	0.6638	0.505	0.6642
DermaMNIST	7	64	120	212	33	0.6738	0.7343	0.671	0.6825	0.677	0.6982
BloodMNIST	8	64	120	211	27	0.482	0.821	0.422	0.824	0.424	0.826
PathMNIST	9	64	120	218	27	0.3723	0.784	0.35	0.7544	0.418	0.7795
OrganSMNIST	11	64	120	213	23	0.3681	0.7802	0.227	0.7322	0.34	0.7678

We selected the best performing QML models from Tables 2 and 3 based on the AUC metric for inference on real IBM Cleveland hardware for all the considered MedMNIST datasets. Due to the hardware limitations, we considered 1000 testing samples to evaluate the QML models for the datasets having large number of testing samples. We presented noiseless and IBM hardware results (with and without error suppression and mitigation) together in Table 5 for better understanding along with the quantum models specifications such as number of qubits, number of embedded features/gates, trainable parameters, quantum circuit gates, and circuit depth. It is observed from the Table 5 that even with the small number of input embedding features, our QML models consistently provide promising results in terms of classification accuracy and AUC metrics. It is worth noting that the noiseless results and hardware results (without error suppression and mitigation) are quite comparable for most of the MedMNIST datasets except OCTMNIST and OrganSMNIST dataset. This is because we generated device-aware quantum circuits with optimal circuit gates, depth, and robust against hardware noises. For OCTMNIST dataset, the classification accuracy and AUC on the hardware (without error suppression and mitigation) reduce by 15.70% and 11.40% respectively as compared to the noiseless results. Similarly, accuracy and AUC decrease by 14.11% and 4.8% respectively for OrganSMNIST dataset as compared

to the noiseless results. This indicates that there is scope for further improvement in the design of device-aware quantum circuits. To mitigate the effect of hardware noises, we run the hardware experiments for all the considered MedMNIST datasets using error suppression and error mitigation combination (DD+Twirling+M3) based on the ablation study conducted in Table 4. We noted improvements in classification accuracy and AUC results using DD+Twirling+M3 combination as compared to the hardware results without error suppression and mitigation for all the datasets except BreastMNIST dataset. For instance, the classification accuracy and AUC values are significantly improved by 11.10% and 7.7% respectively as compared to the hardware results without error suppression and mitigation for OCTMNIST dataset. For BreastMNIST dataset, the accuracy and AUC values decreased by 1.3% and 2.4% respectively as compared to the hardware results without error suppression and mitigation.

It is important to mention that all classical ML models leverage the full spatial dimensions of input images, whereas our QML model operates on a significantly reduced feature set, dictated by quantum hardware constraints. Despite this, our QML model achieves promising results on real IBM cleveland hardware in terms of classification accuracy and AUC values. For the 2-class PneumoniaMNIST dataset, we got very good classification accuracy and AUC of 85.42% and 82.18%, respectively. Similarly, we achieved an accuracy and AUC of 76.90% and 71.40%, respectively in the case of 2-class BreastMNIST dataset. Even for 7-class DermaMNIST dataset, our QML model obtained very good results with an accuracy and AUC values of 67.70% and 69.82%, respectively. Our QML model is able to achieve the AUC of more than 70% for all considered MedMNIST datasets except OCTMNIST, RetinaMNIST, and DermaMNIST datasets. It is worth mentioning that for 2-class PneumoniaMNIST and 8-class BloodMNIST datasets, we got the AUC of more than 80% on real quantum hardware. To the best of our knowledge, this benchmarking study is the first to provide a comprehensive evaluation of QML (without using any classical neural networks) on real IBM quantum hardware considering large-scale MedMNIST datasets. Our study provides a critical evaluation of QML for realistic applications, showcasing its capability even in the evolving phase of quantum computing. By systematically benchmarking QML performance on real IBM Cleveland hardware across diverse MedMNIST datasets, this work paves the way for future advancements in QML and highlights its potential to complement classical ML in the years to come.

## 4 Conclusion

This work demonstrates the potential of QML in the context of medical imaging by benchmarking the MedMNIST datasets on real quantum hardware. We effectively trained and validated noise-resilient quantum circuits and leveraging advanced error suppression and mitigation techniques to tackle the hardware noise. The experimental results highlight the feasibility of applying QML to complex real-world datasets such as MedMNIST. In the current NISQ era, we are able to achieve promising results in terms of classification accuracy and AUC values for binary as well as multi-class datasets with very limited number of input embedding features. This study serves as an important benchmark, demonstrating the readiness of quantum computing for practical applications in healthcare. It also underscores the need for further research to enhance scalability, mitigate hardware limitations, and explore novel quantum algorithms tailored to medical data. As quantum technology continues to evolve, its integration into medical imaging workflows has the potential to transform healthcare analytics, paving the way for more advanced and efficient diagnostic tools.

## Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge financial support from the NIH (GM130641). We also extend our sincere gratitude to Danil Kaliakin (Research Associate, Cleveland Clinic) and Abdullah Ash Saki (Researcher at IBM Quantum) for their valuable insights and support throughout this project. We are also grateful to the authors of Élivágar and Torchquantum for their great work and open-sourcing the code.

## References

- [1] Jiancheng Yang, Rui Shi, Donglai Wei, Zequan Liu, Lin Zhao, Bilian Ke, Hanspeter Pfister, and Bingbing Ni. Medmnist v2 - a large-scale lightweight benchmark for 2d and 3d biomedical image classification. *Scientific Data*, 10(1), January 2023.
- [2] Rakesh Kumar, Pooja Kumbharkar, Sandeep Vanam, and Sanjeev Sharma. Medical images classification using deep learning: a survey. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, 83(7):19683–19728, 2024.
- [3] Yubiao Yue and Zhenzhang Li. Medmamba: Vision mamba for medical image classification, 2024.
- [4] Jun Ma, Yuting He, Feifei Li, Lin Han, Chenyu You, and Bo Wang. Segment anything in medical images. *Nature Communications*, 15(1), January 2024.

- [5] Yichi Zhang, Zhenrong Shen, and Rushi Jiao. Segment anything model for medical image segmentation: Current applications and future directions, 2024.
- [6] George Webber and Andrew J Reader. Diffusion models for medical image reconstruction. *BJR| Artificial Intelligence*, 1(1):ubae013, 2024.
- [7] Firas Khader, Gustav Mueller-Franzes, Soroosh Tayebi Arasteh, Tianyu Han, Christoph Haarbuerger, Maximilian Schulze-Hagen, Philipp Schad, Sandy Engelhardt, Bettina Baessler, Sebastian Foersch, Johannes Stegmaier, Christiane Kuhl, Sven Nebelung, Jakob Nikolas Kather, and Daniel Truhn. Medical diffusion: Denoising diffusion probabilistic models for 3d medical image generation, 2023.
- [8] Yunchao Liu, Srinivasan Arunachalam, and Kristan Temme. A rigorous and robust quantum speed-up in supervised machine learning. *Nature Physics*, 17(9):1013–1017, July 2021.
- [9] Amira Abbas, David Sutter, Christa Zoufal, Aurelien Lucchi, Alessio Figalli, and Stefan Woerner. The power of quantum neural networks. *Nature Computational Science*, 1(6):403–409, June 2021.
- [10] Hongni Jin and Kenneth M. Merz Jr. Integrating machine learning and quantum circuits for proton affinity predictions, 2024.
- [11] Hayata Yamasaki, Natsuto Isogai, and Mio Murao. Advantage of quantum machine learning from general computational advantages, 2023.
- [12] Tailong Xiao, Xinliang Zhai, Xiaoyan Wu, Jianping Fan, and Guihua Zeng. Practical advantage of quantum machine learning in ghost imaging. *Communications Physics*, 6(1):171, 2023.
- [13] Rajeev Acharya, Laleh Aghababaei-Beni, Igor Aleiner, Trond I. Andersen, Markus Ansmann, Frank Arute, Kunal Arya, Abraham Asfaw, Nikita Astrakhantsev, Juan Atalaya, Ryan Babbush, Dave Bacon, Brian Ballard, Joseph C. Bardin, Johannes Bausch, Andreas Bengtsson, Alexander Bilmes, Sam Blackwell, Sergio Boixo, Gina Bortoli, Alexandre Bourassa, Jenna Bovaird, Leon Brill, Michael Broughton, David A. Browne, Brett Bruchea, Bob B. Buckley, David A. Buell, Tim Burger, Brian Burkett, Nicholas Bushnell, Anthony Cabrera, Juan Campero, Hung-Shen Chang, Yu Chen, Zijun Chen, Ben Chiaro, Desmond Chik, Charina Chou, Jahan Claes, Agnetta Y. Cleland, Josh Cogan, Roberto Collins, Paul Conner, William Courtney, Alexander L. Crook, Ben Curtin, Sayan Das, Alex Davies, Laura De Lorenzo, Dripto M. Debroy, Sean Demura, Michel Devoret, Agustin Di Paolo, Paul Donohoe, Ilya Drozdov, Andrew Dunsworth, Clint Earle, Thomas Edlich, Alec Eickbusch, Aviv Moshe Elbag, Mahmoud Elzouka, Catherine Erickson, Lara Faoro, Edward Farhi, Vinicius S. Ferreira, Leslie Flores Burgos, Ebrahim Forati, Austin G. Fowler, Brooks Foxen, Suhas Ganjam, Gonzalo Garcia, Robert Gasca, Élie Genois, William Giang, Craig Gidney, Dar Gilboa, Raja Gosula, Alejandro Grajales Dau, Dietrich Graumann, Alex Greene, Jonathan A. Gross, Steve Habegger, John Hall, Michael C. Hamilton, Monica Hansen, Matthew P. Harrigan, Sean D. Harrington, Francisco J. H. Heras, Stephen Heslin, Paula Heu, Oscar Higgott, Gordon Hill, Jeremy Hilton, George Holland, Sabrina Hong, Hsin-Yuan Huang, Ashley Huff, William J. Huggins, Lev B. Ioffe, Sergei V. Isakov, Justin Iveland, Evan Jeffrey, Zhang Jiang, Cody Jones, Stephen Jordan, Chaitali Joshi, Pavol Juhás, Dvir Kafri, Hui Kang, Amir H. Karamlou, Kostyantyn Kechedzhi, Julian Kelly, Trupti Khaire, Tanuj Khattar, Mostafa Khezri, Seon Kim, Paul V. Klimov, Andrey R. Klots, Bryce Kobrin, Pushmeet Kohli, Alexander N. Korotkov, Fedor Kostritsa, Robin Kothari, Borislav Kozlovskii, John Mark Kreikebaum, Vladislav D. Kurilovich, Nathan Lacroix, David Landhuis, Tiano Lange-Dei, Brandon W. Langley, Pavel Laptev, Kim-Ming Lau, Loïck Le Guevel, Justin Ledford, Kenny Lee, Yuri D. Lensky, Shannon Leon, Brian J. Lester, Wing Yan Li, Yin Li, Alexander T. Lill, Wayne Liu, William P. Livingston, Aditya Locharla, Erik Lucero, Daniel Lundahl, Aaron Lunt, Sid Madhuk, Fionn D. Malone, Ashley Maloney, Salvatore Mandrá, Leigh S. Martin, Steven Martin, Orion Martin, Cameron Maxfield, Jarrod R. McClean, Matt McEwen, Seneca Meeks, Anthony Megrant, Xiao Mi, Kevin C. Miao, Amanda Mieszala, Reza Molavi, Sebastian Molina, Shirin Montazeri, Alexis Morvan, Ramis Movassagh, Wojciech Mruczkiewicz, Ofer Naaman, Matthew Neeley, Charles Neill, Ani Nersisyan, Hartmut Neven, Michael Newman, Jiun How Ng, Anthony Nguyen, Murray Nguyen, Chia-Hung Ni, Thomas E. O’Brien, William D. Oliver, Alex Opremcak, Kristoffer Ottosson, Andre Petukhov, Alex Pizzuto, John Platt, Rebecca Potter, Orion Pritchard, Leonid P. Pryadko, Chris Quintana, Ganesh Ramachandran, Matthew J. Reagor, David M. Rhodes, Gabrielle Roberts, Elliott Rosenberg, Emma Rosenfeld, Pedram Roushan, Nicholas C. Rubin, Negar Saei, Daniel Sank, Kannan Sankaragomathi, Kevin J. Satzinger, Henry F. Schurkus, Christopher Schuster, Andrew W. Senior, Michael J. Shearn, Aaron Shorter, Noah Shuttly, Vladimir Shvarts, Shraddha Singh, Volodymyr Sivak, Jindra Skrzuzny, Spencer Small, Vadim Smelyanskiy, W. Clarke Smith, Rolando D. Somma, Sofia Springer, George Sterling, Doug Strain, Jordan Suchard, Aaron Szasz, Alex Szein, Douglas Thor, Alfredo Torres, M. Mert Torunbalci, Abeer Vaishnav, Justin Vargas, Sergey Vdovichev, Guifre Vidal, Benjamin Villalonga, Catherine Vollgraff Heidweiller, Steven Waltman, Shannon X. Wang, Brayden Ware, Kate Weber, Theodore White, Kristi Wong, Bryan W. K. Woo, Cheng Xing, Z. Jamie Yao, Ping Yeh, Bicheng Ying, Juhwan Yoo, Noureldin Yosri, Grayson Young, Adam Zalcman, Yaxing Zhang, Ningfeng Zhu, and Nicholas Zobrist. Quantum error correction below the surface code threshold, 2024.

- [14] Edward Grant, Marcello Benedetti, Shuxiang Cao, Andrew Hallam, Joshua Lockhart, Vid Stojevic, Andrew G. Green, and Simone Severini. Hierarchical quantum classifiers. *npj Quantum Information*, 4(1), December 2018.
- [15] Edward Farhi and Hartmut Neven. Classification with quantum neural networks on near term processors, 2018.
- [16] Vojtěch Havlíček, Antonio D. Córcoles, Kristan Temme, Aram W. Harrow, Abhinav Kandala, Jerry M. Chow, and Jay M. Gambetta. Supervised learning with quantum-enhanced feature spaces. *Nature*, 567(7747):209–212, March 2019.
- [17] Jordanis Kerenidis, Jonas Landman, and Anupam Prakash. Quantum algorithms for deep convolutional neural networks, 2019.
- [18] Iris Cong, Soonwon Choi, and Mikhail D. Lukin. Quantum convolutional neural networks. *Nature Physics*, 15(12):1273–1278, August 2019.
- [19] Jonathan Allcock, Chang-Yu Hsieh, Jordanis Kerenidis, and Shengyu Zhang. Quantum algorithms for feedforward neural networks, 2019.
- [20] Héctor Iván García Hernández, Raymundo Torres Ruiz, and Guo-Hua Sun. Image classification via quantum machine learning, 2020.
- [21] Bobak Toussi Kiani, Agnes Villanyi, and Seth Lloyd. Quantum medical imaging algorithms, 2020.
- [22] Kouhei Nakaji and Naoki Yamamoto. Quantum semi-supervised generative adversarial network for enhanced data classification. *Scientific Reports*, 11(1), October 2021.
- [23] Maria Schuld, Ryan Sweke, and Johannes Jakob Meyer. Effect of data encoding on the expressive power of variational quantum-machine-learning models. *Physical Review A*, 103(3):032430, 2021.
- [24] Maria Schuld, Francesco Petruccione, Maria Schuld, and Francesco Petruccione. Quantum models as kernel methods. *Machine Learning with Quantum Computers*, pages 217–245, 2021.
- [25] Georgios Kollias, Vassilis Kalantzis, Theodoros Salonidis, and Shashanka Ubaru. Quantum graph transformers. In *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2023.
- [26] El Amine Cherrat, Jordanis Kerenidis, Natansh Mathur, Jonas Landman, Martin Strahm, and Yun Yvonna Li. Quantum vision transformers. *Quantum*, 8(arXiv: 2209.08167):1265, 2024.
- [27] Fan Fan, Yilei Shi, Tobias Guggemos, and Xiao Xiang Zhu. Hybrid quantum-classical convolutional neural network model for image classification. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 2023.
- [28] Aijuan Wang, Jianglong Hu, Shiyue Zhang, and Lusi Li. Shallow hybrid quantum-classical convolutional neural network model for image classification. *Quantum Information Processing*, 23(1):17, 2024.
- [29] Marcello Benedetti, Erika Lloyd, Stefan Sack, and Mattia Fiorentini. Parameterized quantum circuits as machine learning models. *Quantum Science and Technology*, 4(4):043001, November 2019.
- [30] Kosuke Mitarai, Makoto Negoro, Masahiro Kitagawa, and Keisuke Fujii. Quantum circuit learning. *Physical Review A*, 98(3):032309, 2018.
- [31] Soumik Adhikary, Siddharth Dangwal, and Debanjan Bhowmik. Supervised learning with a quantum classifier using multi-level systems. *Quantum Information Processing*, 19(3), January 2020.
- [32] Maria Schuld, Alex Bocharov, Krysta M. Svore, and Nathan Wiebe. Circuit-centric quantum classifiers. *Physical Review A*, 101(3), March 2020.
- [33] Erdi Acar and Ihsan Yilmaz. Covid-19 detection on ibm quantum computer with classical-quantum transfer learning. *Turkish Journal of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences*, 29(1):46–61, 2021.
- [34] Sasan Moradi, Christoph Brandner, Clemens Spielvogel, Denis Krajnc, Stefan Hillmich, Robert Wille, Wolfgang Drexler, and Laszlo Papp. Clinical data classification with noisy intermediate scale quantum computers. *Scientific reports*, 12(1):1851, 2022.
- [35] Essam H Houssein, Zainab Abohashima, Mohamed Elhoseny, and Waleed M Mohamed. Hybrid quantum-classical convolutional neural network model for covid-19 prediction using chest x-ray images. *Journal of Computational Design and Engineering*, 9(2):343–363, 2022.
- [36] Santiago Toledo-Cortés, Diego H Useche, Henning Müller, and Fabio A González. Grading diabetic retinopathy and prostate cancer diagnostic images with deep quantum ordinal regression. *Computers in biology and medicine*, 145:105472, 2022.
- [37] Vanda Azevedo, Carla Silva, and Inês Dutra. Quantum transfer learning for breast cancer detection. *Quantum Machine Intelligence*, 4(1):5, 2022.

- [38] Luca Parisi, Daniel Neagu, Renfei Ma, and Felician Campean. Quantum relu activation for convolutional neural networks to improve diagnosis of parkinson’s disease and covid-19. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 187:115892, 2022.
- [39] Jonas Landman, Natansh Mathur, Yun Yvonna Li, Martin Strahm, Skander Kazdaghli, Anupam Prakash, and Iordanis Kerenidis. Quantum methods for neural networks and application to medical image classification. *Quantum*, 6:881, 2022.
- [40] Sashwat Anagolum, Narges Alavisamani, Poulami Das, Moinuddin Qureshi, Eric Kessler, and Yunong Shi. élivágar: Efficient quantum circuit search for classification, 2024.
- [41] Hanrui Wang, Yongshan Ding, Jiaqi Gu, Zirui Li, Yujun Lin, David Z Pan, Frederic T Chong, and Song Han. Quantumnas: Noise-adaptive search for robust quantum circuits. In *The 28th IEEE International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA-28)*, 2022.
- [42] Paul D. Nation, Hwajung Kang, Neereja Sundaresan, and Jay M. Gambetta. Scalable mitigation of measurement errors on quantum computers. *PRX Quantum*, 2(4), November 2021.
- [43] Scikit-learn Developers. *ROC AUC Score — Scikit-learn Documentation*, 2025. Accessed: January 3, 2025.