American Journal of
Biomedical Science & Research

www.biomedgrid.com
ISSN: 2642-1747

Opinion

Quantum Technologies and the Future of Medicine: A Comprehensive Framework for Predictive, Preventive, and Interoperable Healthcare — Dreams, Reality, and Evidence-Based Integration

Antonio F Corno MD[1*], Peter Merrill PhD[2], James Sheridan, ABD PhD[3], Leonard Sonnenschein, Med[4]

[1]*Department of Life Sciences, Faculty of Science and Engineering, Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester, UK*

[2]*Systems Architect - Connect Systems, Palm Coast, FL, USA*

[3]*Human Factors Engineering Consultant, CA, USA*

[4]*The Sonnenschein Institute, Boca Raton, FL, USA*

***Corresponding author:** Antonio F Corno, MD, Department of Life Sciences, Faculty of Science and Engineering, Manchester Metropolitan University, John Dalton Building, Chester Road, Manchester, UK.

To Cite This article: *Antonio F Corno MD, Peter Merrill PhD, James Sheridan, ABD PhD, Leonard Sonnenschein, Med, Quantum Technologies and the Future of Medicine: A Comprehensive Framework for Predictive, Preventive, and Interoperable Healthcare — Dreams, Reality, and Evidence-Based Integration. Am J Biomed Sci & Res. 2026 31(6) AJBSR.MS.ID.004093,* **DOI:** 10.34297/AJBSR.2026.31.004093

Received: July 31, 2026 **Published:** August 05, 2026

Abstract

Quantum technologies have created new opportunities for biomedical research through advances in sensing, molecular modeling, computational analysis, and the study of complex biological processes. Despite encouraging experimental results, current evidence does not establish consistent clinical superiority over optimized conventional or hybrid methodologies. Near-term progress is therefore more likely to result from rigorous scientific evaluation and responsible clinical translation than from the wholesale replacement of established medical practice.

This opinion article critically examines the present capabilities and limitations of quantum technologies in medicine. Particular attention is given to quantum sensing, longitudinal clinical assessment, personalized interpretation of laboratory measurements, artificial intelligence, interoperability, ethical governance, and regulatory oversight. These subjects are considered as complementary areas of scientific investigation rather than components of a proposed technological implementation.

Emerging methods may eventually provide clinicians and researchers with additional information about physiological variation and disease-related change. However, their clinical value must be demonstrated through reproducible research, independent validation, transparent evaluation, and measurable improvements in patient outcomes. Responsible advancement will require realistic expectations, protection of patient autonomy and privacy, multidisciplinary collaboration, and continued adherence to the principles of evidence-based medicine.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence, Clinical translation, Interoperability, Laboratory medicine, Longitudinal assessment, Personalized reference intervals, Preventive healthcare, Quantum sensing, Quantum technologies, Scientific evaluation

Introduction

The Promise and the Evidence Gap

Quantum technologies are frequently described as potentially transformative tools for medicine and biomedical research [1]. Their foundational principles may enable highly sensitive measurement, specialized molecular simulation, and new forms of computational analysis. These capabilities have generated considerable scientific interest as well as speculation regarding their possible effects on future healthcare. A critical review of the available evidence, however, indicates that broad clinical transformation is not yet imminent [2]. Most practical advances continue to involve experimental or hybrid quantum-classical methodologies, and systematic reviews have not demonstrated consistent superiority of quantum approaches over optimized conventional methods across healthcare applications [3].

The mathematical foundations of quantum mechanics were established during the early twentieth century and continue to support modern developments in quantum sensing and computation [4]. Nevertheless, present-day quantum computers remain within the noisy intermediate-scale quantum era, in which hardware limitations, error rates, scalability, and error correction remain substantial technical challenges [5-7]. Overstatement of near-term clinical impact may misdirect research resources, generate unrealistic expectations, and weaken public trust. Scientific evaluation should therefore distinguish demonstrated capabilities from theoretical possibilities and early experimental findings from validated clinical benefit.

The future of precision medicine is unlikely to depend upon a single technological breakthrough. Progress will more plausibly be supported by continuing advances across several established and emerging disciplines, including laboratory medicine, medical imaging, computational modeling, artificial intelligence, biomedical sensing, and digital health infrastructure [8,9].

Each discipline contributes a different perspective on biological function and disease. Their clinical relevance should be evaluated according to reproducibility, diagnostic value, effects on clinical decision-making, patient safety, and measurable outcomes. Emerging technologies should complement established medical methods only when sufficient evidence supports their use.

Artificial intelligence is already being investigated for its ability to recognize patterns within complex and longitudinal clinical datasets, including applications in tissue repair and regenerative medicine related to pediatric and congenital heart surgery [9]. Similarly, laboratory medicine increasingly acknowledges that serial measurements may provide information that is not apparent when an isolated result is compared only with a broad population reference interval.

These developments support continued research into individualized clinical assessment while preserving the importance of patient history, physical examination, diagnostic testing, physician judgment, and established standards of care. The relevant scientific question is not whether quantum technologies will replace conventional medicine, but whether applications can demonstrate sufficient validity and clinical utility to justify responsible translation into practice.

Achieving that objective will require rigorous prospective investigation, standardized data exchange, transparent computational evaluation, cybersecurity safeguards, ethical governance, regulatory oversight, and sustained collaboration among clinicians, scientists, engineers, healthcare organizations, and public agencies.

Quantum Sensing

Quantum sensing has demonstrated the ability to detect subtle physical phenomena under controlled experimental conditions. Technologies based on nitrogen-vacancy centers in diamond and related quantum measurement methods have expanded the capacity to investigate magnetic, molecular, and cellular processes that may be difficult to observe using conventional instrumentation [10].

These developments are scientifically significant, but most biomedical applications remain within laboratory research or early translational investigation. Their clinical relevance must therefore be established independently rather than inferred from analytical sensitivity alone.

A sensor's ability to detect a subtle physical signal does not necessarily establish diagnostic accuracy, clinical usefulness, or improved patient outcomes. Appropriate evaluation must address sensitivity, specificity, reproducibility, biological variability, technical limitations, comparative performance, cost, accessibility, and effects on clinical decision-making.

The most plausible near-term role of quantum sensing is as a potential complementary source of scientific or physiological information. Conventional laboratory testing, diagnostic imaging, physiological monitoring, pathology, and clinical examination remain supported by extensive evidence and established standards of practice.

Quantum sensing methods should therefore be compared with existing technologies under defined conditions. Clinical translation should occur only when a particular application demonstrates meaningful advantages, acceptable risk, reproducible performance, and practical value within patient care.

3.3. Longitudinal Clinical Assessment

Many physiological and pathological changes develop progressively rather than appearing as isolated events. Longitudinal assessment can therefore provide clinically relevant information by showing whether a patient's measurements remain stable, fluctuate predictably, or depart from an established pattern.

Research involving hematological and biochemical measurements suggests that individuals may maintain relatively stable physiological set points over extended periods [11]. This observation has encouraged further scientific evaluation of patient-specific trends and within-person biological variation. Serial physiological parameters, including oxygenation and related wellness markers, have also been examined in observational cohort settings [12,13].

Longitudinal assessment should not be interpreted as an independent diagnostic mechanism. Rather, serial measurements may provide additional context when evaluated together with symptoms, medical history, physical findings, diagnostic imaging, medication use, environmental influences, and other clinically relevant information.

The recognition of an unusual trend may support further clinical investigation, but it does not by itself establish disease, prognosis, or an appropriate intervention. Analytical error, temporary illness, hydration, diet, exercise, medication changes, and other factors may affect repeated measurements and must be considered during interpretation.

Personalized Interpretation of Laboratory Measurements

Routine complete blood count and comprehensive metabolic panel results are generally interpreted using population-based reference intervals. These intervals remain essential to laboratory medicine because they provide standardized comparisons derived from defined reference populations.

Population intervals necessarily encompass biological differences among individuals. As a result, a measurement may remain within a conventional reference range while differing substantially from an individual patient's prior pattern. Conversely, a result outside a population interval may not always indicate clinically significant disease.

Recent research has examined personalized reference intervals and individual homeostatic set points as possible supplementary methods for evaluating serial laboratory measurements [11,14,15]. Age- and sex-specific reference intervals provide one practical illustration of moving beyond purely population-based ranges [16]. Such methods seek to characterize within-person variability without eliminating the continued use of established population-based ranges.

Artificial intelligence and statistical analysis may assist researchers in examining longitudinal laboratory datasets. Investigated variables include prior measurements, analytical variation, age, sex, physiological conditions, and relationships among multiple biomarkers [17-21].

Multivariable analysis may also help researchers examine patterns that are not apparent when laboratory values are considered separately. However, the reliability of any analytical method depends upon the quality, completeness, representativeness, and clinical context of the underlying data.

Published investigations suggest that within-person variation may be narrower than variation observed across a population for certain hematological and biochemical measurements [11,14,15]. This finding supports continued scientific investigation into personalized laboratory interpretation, but it does not establish a universally applicable method for diagnosis or treatment.

Illustrative laboratory markers discussed in the literature include hemoglobin, creatinine, platelets, neutrophils, eosinophils, alanine aminotransferase, aspartate aminotransferase, albumin, C-reactive protein, and fasting glucose. The degree of stability and clinical relevance of an individualized range may differ by marker, patient, analytical method, health status, and observation period.

Personalized interpretation should therefore be regarded as an area of clinical and laboratory research. Before widespread adoption, proposed methods require prospective validation, comparison with established practice, transparent statistical reporting, evaluation across diverse populations, and evidence that their use improves clinical outcomes.

Quantum sensing and longitudinal laboratory interpretation represent separate but potentially complementary areas of scientific inquiry. At present, evidence remains insufficient to define a standard clinical method that combines them or to conclude that their combined use is superior to validated conventional practice.

Future research may examine whether information obtained from emerging sensing technologies provides clinically useful context when evaluated alongside established laboratory, imaging, and physiological measurements. Such research should focus on scientific validity and clinical utility without presupposing a particular technological configuration or model of implementation.

Clinical Translation and Personalized Care

The continued evolution of precision medicine is likely to depend upon careful evaluation of multiple scientific disciplines rather than reliance on any single emerging technology. Advances in laboratory medicine, biomedical sensing, computational modeling, artificial intelligence, medical imaging, and digital health infrastructure each contribute unique scientific perspectives that may improve understanding of human physiology and disease [8,9,17].

Evidence-based clinical translation should emphasize scientific rigor, reproducibility, transparency, and patient safety. Emerging technologies should be evaluated according to their demonstrated clinical utility and their ability to complement established standards of care rather than replace existing diagnostic or therapeutic methodologies.

Artificial intelligence continues to be investigated as a means of assisting clinicians in recognizing meaningful patterns within complex clinical datasets, including applications relevant to tissue repair and regenerative medicine in pediatric and congenital heart surgery [9]. Likewise, longitudinal laboratory assessment, biomedical sensing, and computational analysis remain active areas of investigation that may contribute additional clinical context when interpreted alongside patient history, physical examination, diagnostic imaging, and physician judgment.

As healthcare continues to advance toward increasingly individualized models of care, future research should focus on determining which combinations of validated clinical information provide measurable improvements in diagnostic accuracy, patient safety, and clinical outcomes. Such investigations should remain grounded in prospective validation, transparent methodology, independent replication, and regulatory oversight before widespread clinical adoption.

Importantly, no single scientific discipline currently provides a complete representation of human physiology. Continued progress will therefore depend upon multidisciplinary collaboration among clinicians, laboratory scientists, engineers, computational researchers, healthcare organizations, and regulatory agencies working together to evaluate emerging scientific advances through objective evidence rather than technological expectation.

Emerging computational methodologies should therefore be viewed as complementary analytical tools rather than autonomous clinical decision makers. Laboratory measurements, imaging findings, physiological monitoring, symptoms, medical history, medication use, environmental factors, and physician assessment must continue to be interpreted together within established standards of clinical care.

Healthcare organizations should also recognize that improvements in interoperability, data quality, standardized terminology, laboratory harmonization, and coordinated clinical communication may yield substantial benefits independent of advances in quantum technologies. Continued scientific evaluation should therefore balance innovation with careful assessment of practical clinical value.

Challenges and Limitations

Although quantum technologies continue to advance rapidly, most proposed medical applications remain within laboratory investigation or early translational research [22]. Significant scientific, engineering, regulatory, and economic challenges must be addressed before widespread clinical adoption can be considered [23].

Current hardware limitations, computational scalability, error correction, infrastructure requirements, specialized expertise, and implementation costs remain substantial barriers. Equally important, relatively few prospective clinical studies have demonstrated meaningful improvements in patient outcomes when compared with established evidence-based medical practice [24,25].

3.7. Ethical, Regulatory and Governance Considerations

The increasing availability of high-resolution physiological measurements, advanced computational analysis, and large-scale clinical datasets presents important ethical, legal, and regulatory responsibilities. Protection of patient privacy, informed consent, transparency, equitable access, cybersecurity, and responsible stewardship of healthcare data should remain central principles throughout future scientific development [26].

Artificial intelligence and other computational methods should be implemented within transparent and accountable clinical governance structures. Their outputs should be regarded as supportive sources of information that assist qualified healthcare professionals rather than independent mechanisms for diagnosis or treatment.

Regulatory oversight will remain essential as emerging technologies continue to mature. Future evaluation should emphasize reproducibility, prospective clinical validation, algorithmic transparency, independent verification, post-market surveillance, and internationally recognized standards for patient safety [27].

As quantum computing and related technologies evolve, cybersecurity strategies must also adapt to address future computational capabilities while protecting healthcare infrastructure, patient records, and sensitive biomedical information. Ongoing collaboration among clinicians, scientists, engineers, cybersecurity specialists, ethicists, regulators, and healthcare organizations will be necessary to ensure that scientific innovation proceeds responsibly while maintaining public trust.

Ultimately, the responsible advancement of emerging medical technologies should be guided by scientific evidence, ethical governance, clinical accountability, and measurable improvements in patient outcomes rather than by technological novelty alone [28,29].

Conclusion

Quantum technologies represent an important and rapidly evolving area of scientific investigation with potential applications across numerous fields of biomedical research. Although encouraging progress has been achieved in quantum sensing, computational science, and related disciplines, substantial technical, clinical, and regulatory challenges remain before widespread clinical adoption can be justified [30].

Current evidence supports continued scientific investigation rather than premature clinical implementation. Future research should emphasize rigorous experimental validation, reproducibility, transparent methodology, independent verification, and measurable improvements in patient outcomes before new approaches are incorporated into routine healthcare [31].

Continued progress will depend upon multidisciplinary collaboration among clinicians, laboratory scientists, engineers, computational researchers, ethicists, regulatory organizations, and healthcare institutions. Such collaboration will be essential for establishing scientific standards, ensuring patient safety, protecting privacy, and maintaining public confidence in emerging medical technologies [32].

As biomedical science continues to evolve, individual advances should be evaluated on their own scientific merit and according to accepted principles of evidence-based medicine. The ultimate contribution of any emerging technology will be determined through careful investigation, objective evaluation, and demonstrated clinical benefit.

The purpose of this opinion has been to examine the current scientific evidence surrounding quantum technologies in medicine, identify promising directions for future research, and encourage responsible scientific inquiry. Continued investigation will determine which technologies ultimately prove to be clinically valuable and how they may appropriately contribute to future medical practice.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank The Sonnenschein Institute and Manchester Metropolitan University for institutional support.

Author Contributions

A.F.C. conceived the overall framework and drafted the primary manuscript. L.S. contributed the sections on personalized laboratory reference intervals, biological variation, and wellness applications. J.S. provided human-factors and systems-integration perspectives. P.M. contributed to critical appraisal and manuscript revision. All authors reviewed and approved the final version.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Ethics Statement

This article is an opinion review of published literature and theoretical synthesis; it does not involve new studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors. Therefore, ethical approval was not required. Any future clinical trial testing applications discussed herein would require institutional review board approval and informed consent.

References

1. Aslam N, Zhou H, Urbach EK, Turner MJ, Walsworth RL, et al. (2023) Quantum sensors for biomedical applications. Nat Rev Phys 5(3): 157-169.
2. Gupta RS, Wood CE, Engstrom T, Pole JD, Shrapnel S (2025) A systematic review of quantum machine learning for digital health. NPJ Digit Med 8(1): 237.
3. Preskill J (2018) Quantum computing in the NISQ era and beyond. Quantum 2: 79.
4. Arute F, Arya K, Babbush R, Bacon D, Bardin JC, et al. (2019) Quantum supremacy using a programmable superconducting processor. Nature 574(7779): 505-510.
5. Nielsen MA, Chuang IL (2019) Quantum Computation and Quantum Information. 10th Anniversary ed. Cambridge University Press.
6. Bharti K, Cervera-Lierta A, Kyaw TH, Alperin-Lea S, Anand A, et al. (2022) Noisy intermediate-scale quantum algorithms. Rev Mod Phys 94(1): 015004.
7. Cerezo M, Arrasmith A, Babbush R, Benjamin S, Endo S, et al. (2021) Variational quantum algorithms. Nat Rev Phys 3: 625-644.
8. Degen CL, Reinhard F, Cappellaro P (2017) Quantum sensing. Rev Mod Phys 89(3): 035002.
9. Foy BH, Petherbridge R, Roth MT, Zhang C, DeSouza DC, et al. (2025) Haematological setpoints are a stable and patient-specific deep phenotype. Nature 637(8045): 430-438.
10. Corno D (2019) Nonlinear physiological networks and integrative approaches to early deviation detection. Syst Med Rev 7(2): 88-104.
11. Coskun A, Sandberg S, Unsal I, Cavusoglu C, Serteser M, et al. (2023) Personalized and Population-Based Reference Intervals for 48 Common Clinical Chemistry and Hematology Measurands: A Comparative Study. Clin Chem 69(9): 1009-1030.
12. Coşkun A, Sandberg S, Unsal I, Cavusoglu C, Serteser M, et al. (2021) Personalized Reference Intervals in Laboratory Medicine: A New Model Based on Within-Subject Biological Variation. Clin Chem 67(2): 374-384.
13. Demirelce Ö, Inal BB, Coşkun A (2026) Personalized Reference Intervals Versus Indirectly Estimated Population-Based Reference Intervals for Hematology Measurands. Int J Lab Hematol 48(2): 365-370.
14. Corno D (2020) Correlating contraindications with health and wellbeing status: implications for nutritional and exercise recommendations. Int J Clin Syst Eng 5(1): 1-17.
15. Yu KH, Beam AL, Kohane IS (2018) Artificial intelligence in healthcare. Nat Biomed Eng 2(10): 719-731.
16. Topol EJ (2019) High-performance medicine: the convergence of human and artificial intelligence. Nat Med 25(1): 44-56.
17. Francis J, Chimsuk B, Peng E, Corno AF (2026) Narrative review on artificial intelligence in regenerative pediatric and congenital heart surgery: clinical applications and the path to responsible innovation. Regen Med Rep 3: 1-5.
18. Fumagalli I, Vitullo P, Vergara C, Fedele M, Corno AF, et al. (2022) Image-based computational hemodynamics analysis of systolic obstruction in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Front Physiol 12: 787082.
19. Piersanti R, Regazzoni F, Salvador M, Corno AF, Dede' L, et al. (2022) 3D-0D closed-loop model for the simulation of cardiac biventricular electromechanics. Comput Methods Appl Mech Eng.
20. Zingaro A, Fumagalli I, Dede' L, Fedele M, Africa PC, et al. (2022) A multiscale CFD model of blood flow in the human left heart coupled with a lumped-parameter model of the cardiovascular system. Discrete Contin Dyn Syst 15: 2391-2427.
21. Bennati L, Giambruno V, Fumagalli I, Corno AF, Quarteroni A, et al. (2023) An image-based computational fluid dynamics study of mitral regurgitation in presence of prolapse. Cardiovasc Eng Technol 14(3): 457-475.

22. McArdle S, Endo S, Aspuru-Guzik A, Benjamin SC, Yuan X (2020) Quantum computational chemistry. Rev Mod Phys 92(1): 015003.
23. Biamonte J, Wittek P, Pancotti N, Patrick Rebentrost, Nathan Wiebe, et al. (2017) Quantum machine learning. Nature 549(7671): 195-202.
24. Adler Milstein J, Holmgren AJ, Kralovec P, Worzala C, Searcy T, et al. (2017) Electronic health record adoption and interoperability. Health Aff 36(8): 1410-1417.
25. Floridi L (2013) The Ethics of Information. Oxford University Press.
26. Mittelstadt B (2019) Principles alone cannot guarantee ethical AI. Nat Mach Intell 1: 501-507.
27. (2021) World Health Organization. Ethics and Governance of Artificial Intelligence for Health. WHO Press.
28. (2015) National Academy of Medicine. Improving Diagnosis in Health Care. National Academies Press.
29. Quarteroni A, Gervasio P, Regazzoni F (2025) Combining physics-based and data-driven models: advancing the frontiers of research with scientific machine learning. Math Models Methods Appl Sci 35(4): 905-1071.
30. Hood L, Price ND (2014) Systems medicine and the emergence of proactive P4 healthcare. Nat Rev Clin Oncol 11: 651-667.
31. Collins FS, Varmus H (2015) A new initiative on precision medicine. N Engl J Med 372(9): 793-795.
32. Sonnenschein L, Etyang T, Westermarck J (2023) The future of healthcare. Res Rev Health Care Open Acc J 8(1): 819-821.