Strategic Entry Deterrence in Quantum Technology Startups: Human Capital Investment as a Commitment Device

Paula Andrea
AMLENTIA
paula.andrea@AMLENTIA.org

October 13, 2025

Abstract

This article examines how incumbent quantum technology startups strategically deploy human capital investments as entry deterrence mechanisms. Drawing on game-theoretic frameworks, we analyze the conditions under which specialized talent acquisition serves as a credible commitment to aggressive market competition, thereby discouraging potential entrants. The analysis reveals that in markets characterized by scarce quantum expertise and high training costs, incumbent firms can strategically overinvest in human capital to signal competitive strength and raise rivals' entry costs. We demonstrate that this strategic behavior creates welfare trade-offs, as it may simultaneously accelerate technological development while reducing market competition. The theoretical model identifies critical thresholds where human capital investments transition from productive capacity building to pure strategic deterrence, with implications for innovation policy in emerging quantum technology sectors.

Keywords: Entry deterrence, human capital, quantum technology, game theory, strategic commitment
JEL Classification: L13, L26, J24, O33

1 Introduction

The quantum technology sector represents one of the most significant technological frontiers of the 21st century, with applications spanning quantum computing, quantum sensing, quantum communications, and quantum cryptography. As emphasized by de Jong (2022), preparing society for the quantum age requires understanding not only the technical dimensions but also the strategic and economic implications of this emerging technology. Unlike traditional technology sectors where capital equipment and intellectual property constitute primary entry barriers, quantum technology startups face unique challenges centered on human capital acquisition. The scarcity of quantum-specialized talent creates a strategic landscape where incumbents can potentially leverage workforce investments as commitment devices to deter entry.

This article develops a theoretical framework for understanding how human capital investments function as strategic entry barriers in quantum technology markets. While traditional industrial organization literature extensively examines capital investment as entry deterrence, the role of specialized human capital as a strategic variable remains underexplored, particularly in nascent technology sectors where expertise scarcity dominates other competitive factors. Recent work by Wolbring (2022) reveals that social dimensions of quantum technologies remain severely underexplored in academic discourse, with only 0.24% of technical abstracts mentioning social terms, underscoring the need for economic analysis of quantum technology markets.

The quantum technology sector provides an ideal context for this analysis due to several distinctive characteristics. First, the talent pool remains extremely limited, with estimates suggesting fewer than 10,000 individuals globally possess the advanced quantum physics and engineering expertise required for quantum technology development. Second, the training period for quantum specialists typically exceeds eight years of post-secondary education, creating significant temporal barriers to talent supply expansion. Third, quantum expertise exhibits high specificity with limited transferability to other sectors, intensifying competition for qualified personnel. The commercial applications of quantum computing identified by Bova et al. (2021) across cybersecurity, materials and pharmaceuticals, banking and finance, and advanced manufacturing further intensify demand for specialized talent.

We employ a sequential game-theoretic model where an incumbent quantum startup first chooses its human capital investment level, and a potential entrant subsequently decides whether to enter the market. Following the framework of Gilles (2010) on cooperative game theory applied to networks and hierarchies, and insights from Holahan and Lubell (2016) on collective action theory, our model incorporates several critical features of quantum technology markets: the non-linear relationship between team size and innovation output, the signaling value of prestigious talent acquisition, and the coordination costs inherent in distributed quantum research teams.

Our analysis yields several key insights. First, we identify conditions under which incumbents engage in strategic overinvestment in human capital, hiring beyond the level that would maximize short-run profits absent entry threats. Second, we demonstrate that the credibility of human capital commitment as an entry deterrent depends critically on the irreversibility of specialized training investments and the reputation costs associated with downsizing quantum research teams. Third, we show that strategic human capital competition can create persistent wage premiums in quantum technology sectors, with implications for talent allocation across the broader scientific workforce.

The welfare implications of strategic human capital investment prove ambiguous. On one hand, competitive pressure for talent accelerates knowledge development and potentially generates positive externalities through faster technological progress. On the other hand, deterrence-motivated overinvestment may reduce the number of competing firms, potentially slowing the exploration of alternative technological approaches and limiting the diversity of quantum applications pursued. As Wheatley Research Consultancy (2024) emphasize, quantum computing will have monumental impacts on security, privacy, and the economy, making the efficient allocation of human capital particularly important.

This research contributes to several literatures. First, it extends strategic entry deterrence theory by identifying human capital investment as a distinct commitment mechanism with properties differing from traditional capital investments. Second, drawing on insights from Saleem and Higuchi (2014) regarding the strategic role of academic institutions using game theory, it contributes to the economics of innovation literature by analyzing how talent market competition shapes technological development trajectories in emerging sectors. Third, it informs policy discussions regarding the appropriate level of public support for quantum education and workforce development programs.

The remainder of this article proceeds as follows. Section 2 reviews relevant literature on entry deterrence, human capital economics, and innovation in emerging technology sectors. Section 3 characterizes the market for quantum technology talent and identifies its distinctive features. Section 4 develops the theoretical framework and analyzes equilibrium outcomes. Section 5 examines strategic implications for firms and policy makers. Section 6 discusses broader implications and limitations, and Section 7 concludes.

2 Literature Review

The theoretical foundations for analyzing strategic entry deterrence originate with the seminal work examining capacity preemption as a mechanism for incumbent firms to discourage market entry. Subsequent developments formalized these insights within game-theoretic frameworks, demonstrating how irreversible capital investments can serve as credible commitments to aggressive post-entry competition. This literature establishes that entry deterrence succeeds when incumbents can credibly commit to strategies that make entry unprofitable, and when these commitments are observable to potential entrants.

However, the traditional entry deterrence literature focuses primarily on physical capital investments and production capacity as strategic variables. The role of human capital investments as commitment devices has received limited attention, despite several features that distinguish human capital from physical capital as a strategic tool. Human capital investments exhibit partial irreversibility due to specific skill development, yet maintain greater flexibility than fixed capital through potential redeployment or voluntary turnover. Additionally, human capital investments generate direct competitive effects through enhanced innovation capability rather than merely signaling commitment to aggressive pricing.

The economics of human capital emphasizes the distinction between general and specific human capital. In quantum technology markets, the high degree of specialization creates investments that are specific both to the technology domain and to particular research approaches. This specificity intensifies competition among firms for qualified personnel and raises the costs of workforce replication for potential entrants. The analysis by Saleem and Higuchi (2014) of educational institutions' strategic role demonstrates how policy choices regarding human capital development affect economic outcomes through game-theoretic mechanisms.

Recent literature on innovation in emerging technology sectors highlights the critical role of human capital in determining competitive outcomes. Studies of biotechnology and nanotechnology industries demonstrate that talent acquisition often proves more strategically significant than equipment or facilities, particularly in early stages of industry development. However, these studies primarily examine human capital competition as a constraint on growth rather than as a strategic variable for entry deterrence. The work of **?** on quantum technologies in manufacturing systems suggests that quantum capabilities will create new pathways for innovation, making human capital even more strategically valuable.

The literature on strategic commitment in research-intensive industries provides additional relevant insights. Research on patent races and investment competition establishes that commitments to research intensity can deter rivals by reducing expected returns to entry. Our analysis extends these insights by examining how human capital investments, distinct from expenditures more broadly, function as both commitment devices and direct competitive advantages. **?** emphasizes that mechanism design principles can structure interactions such that rational self-interested agents achieve designer objectives, applicable to talent market competition.

Game-theoretic models of labor market competition typically focus on wage competition or talent hoarding in the context of established industries. Drawing on **?** regarding experiments on cognition, communication, coordination, and cooperation in relationships, our contribution adapts these frameworks to analyze entry deterrence in emerging sectors where talent scarcity dominates other competitive considerations. The model we develop shares features with coordination models but emphasizes strategic interaction between incumbents and potential entrants rather than competition among symmetric firms.

Several empirical studies document the intensity of talent competition in high-technology sectors. Research on labor markets demonstrates that human capital mobility and concentration drive innovation clustering. Studies of artificial intelligence and machine learning firms reveal that talent acquisition often precedes and determines strategic direction rather than following from predetermined business strategies. While these studies provide valuable context, they do not explicitly model the strategic entry deterrence motives underlying observed talent competition.

The nascent literature on quantum technology economics remains limited. **?** assess that current quantum computers are not at a maturity level for production-scale industrial problems, yet identify trends suggesting quantum computing will achieve economically impactful computations before cryptographically relevant ones. Bova et al. (2021) identify short-term opportunities in quantum-safe cryptography, materials and drug discovery, and quantum-inspired algorithms. Economic analysis of quantum technology markets remains underdeveloped, with limited attention to competitive dynamics or strategic behavior among firms. Our contribution addresses this gap by developing a framework specifically tailored to the distinctive characteristics of quantum technology talent markets.

? review experimental research on institutional choice to solve cooperation problems, finding that subjects with cooperative preferences and optimistic beliefs vote for institutions, and that cooperation tends to be higher under endogenously chosen institutions. This insight applies to quantum technology sectors where firms may collectively benefit from workforce development institutions but face individual incentives for strategic overinvestment. Finally, this research relates to policy debates regarding workforce development in advanced technology sectors. As Raja and Christiaensen (2017) argue, the future of work requires more, not less technology in developing countries, yet this must be balanced against skill mismatches and displacement effects emphasized by **?**.

3 The Market for Quantum Technology Talent

Understanding the strategic role of human capital in quantum technology startups requires detailed characterization of the talent market's distinctive features. This section identifies key characteristics that differentiate quantum expertise from other forms of specialized human capital and examines implications for competitive strategy.

The supply of quantum-qualified personnel remains severely constrained relative to growing demand. Physics PhD programs worldwide produce approximately 2,500 graduates annually, of whom perhaps 15 to 20 percent possess specializations relevant to quantum technology applications identified by Quantum Technology and Application Consortium – QUTAC (2021), including optimization problems, materials simulation, and machine learning applications. Among this already limited pool, only a fraction pursue industry careers rather than academic positions. This supply constraint cannot rapidly adjust to demand changes due to the extended training period required for quantum expertise. Even with immediate expansion of graduate programs, supply increases would materialize only after 5 to 7 year delays.

The nature of quantum expertise creates additional complexity beyond simple scarcity. Quantum technology development requires multidisciplinary teams combining deep quantum physics knowledge with engineering skills, computational expertise, and domain-specific application understanding. As demonstrated by Orús et al. (2019) in their analysis of quantum computing for finance, the required skill combinations vary across quantum technology subfields, with quantum computing demanding different expertise profiles than quantum sensing or quantum communications. This heterogeneity means that apparent abundance in one specialization may coexist with acute scarcity in others, and firms cannot easily substitute one type of quantum expertise for another.

Training quantum specialists requires substantial investments by universities, research institutions, and individuals. A typical path to quantum expertise involves undergraduate physics education, graduate studies with quantum specialization, and often postdoctoral research experience. The total educational investment exceeds 10 years beyond secondary education, with significant opportunity costs given alternative career paths for mathematically talented individuals. This investment exhibits specificity to quantum domains, limiting alternative employment options and creating switching costs for both workers and firms. The work of Saleem and Higuchi (2014) demonstrates through game-theoretic analysis that better policies leading to quality education foster country development, suggesting that talent development requires coordinated institutional support.

The geographic concentration of quantum expertise intensifies competitive dynamics. Quantum research clusters around major universities with strong physics programs and established quantum research groups. This clustering creates local talent markets where a small number of firms compete for graduates from a limited number of programs. Geographic concentration amplifies competitive pressure and may enable incumbents to establish relationships with university programs that disadvantage later entrants.

Compensation structures in quantum technology firms reflect the scarcity and strategic value of quantum expertise. Industry wages for quantum specialists significantly exceed academic salaries, creating strong incentives for industry careers but also raising the costs of team building. Compensation packages frequently include equity stakes, recognizing both the value of quantum expertise and the need to retain personnel given high demand. The resulting compensation levels create substantial financial barriers for startups seeking to compete with established firms for talent.

Team composition and size create non-linearities in research productivity that influence strategic calculations. Quantum technology development typically requires critical mass teams capable of pursuing integrated research programs. Below certain team sizes, firms struggle to address the full scope of scientific and engineering challenges inherent in quantum technology applications. This creates discontinuities in the relationship between human capital investment and competitive capability, with important implications for entry deterrence strategies. Herman et al. (2022) document in their survey of quantum computing for finance that successful implementations require coordinated expertise across quantum algorithms, domain knowledge, and classical computing integration.

The visibility of talent acquisition in quantum technology markets enables signaling through hiring decisions. Academic publications, conference presentations, and professional networks make researcher movements relatively observable. High-profile hires of leading quantum scientists generate publicity and signal competitive commitment. This observability enhances the credibility of human capital investments as commitment devices, as potential entrants can monitor incumbent hiring patterns.

Knowledge spillovers and talent mobility create additional strategic considerations. Quantum researchers maintain professional networks and scientific collaborations that transcend firm boundaries. Personnel movements between firms transfer knowledge and capabilities, potentially eroding competitive advantages. However, the same mobility creates opportunities for strategic talent acquisition from rivals. Firms must balance investments in retention against the benefits of acquiring experienced researchers from competitors.

The role of human capital in quantum technology innovation differs fundamentally from traditional research-intensive industries. In sectors with mature knowledge bases and established technological trajectories, firms can potentially acquire capabilities through equipment, licenses, or partnerships. In quantum technology, where fundamental scientific challenges remain unresolved and technological approaches remain contested, human capital constitutes the primary source of competitive advantage. This centrality of expertise intensifies strategic competition for talent and magnifies the potential for human capital investments to serve as entry barriers.

4 Theoretical Framework

We develop a sequential game model capturing the strategic interaction between an incumbent quantum technology startup and a potential entrant. The model focuses on how human capital investment decisions by the incumbent influence entry decisions and market outcomes. Following the cooperative game theory framework of Gilles (2010), we recognize that organizational structures in quantum technology emerge from strategic interactions over scarce human capital.

Consider two firms, an incumbent denoted I and a potential entrant denoted E. The game unfolds in three stages. In stage one, the incumbent chooses its level of human capital investment, represented by the size of its quantum research team denoted by h_I. In stage two, the potential entrant observes the incumbent's investment and decides whether to enter the market. If entry occurs, the entrant simultaneously chooses its human capital investment level h_E. In stage three, firms compete in the product market, with profits depending on their respective human capital investments and the number of active firms.

The incumbent's profit function when operating as a monopolist is given by:

$$\pi_I^M(h_I) = R^M(h_I) - wh_I \tag{1}$$

where $R^M(h_I)$ represents revenue as a function of human capital investment and w denotes the per-unit cost of quantum-specialized human capital. The revenue function $R^M(h_I)$ is assumed to be strictly increasing and concave in h_I, reflecting diminishing marginal returns to team size. The concavity captures the coordination costs and diminishing marginal productivity associated with expanding research teams beyond efficient scales.

If entry occurs, the incumbent and entrant compete in the product market. We model post-entry competition as generating profits $\pi_I^D(h_I, h_E)$ for the incumbent and $\pi_E^D(h_I, h_E)$ for the entrant, where the superscript D denotes duopoly. The profit functions depend on both firms' human capital investments, capturing the competitive effects of relative capability. We assume that $\pi_I^D(h_I, h_E)$ is increasing in h_I and decreasing in h_E, and symmetrically for the entrant's profits.

The potential entrant faces a fixed entry cost $F > 0$, representing costs beyond human capital investment such as facility establishment, equipment acquisition, and initial business development. The entrant's net profit from entry is therefore:

$$\pi_E^D(h_I, h_E) - wh_E - F \tag{2}$$

The entrant enters if and only if this net profit is non-negative.

To analyze strategic entry deterrence, we compare two benchmark scenarios. First, consider the incumbent's optimal human capital investment absent entry threats, denoted h_I^*. This satisfies the first-order condition:

$$\frac{\partial R^M(h_I)}{\partial h_I} = w \tag{3}$$

where marginal revenue from human capital investment equals marginal cost.

Second, consider the incumbent's optimal investment when entry occurs and the incumbent accommodates entry rather than attempting deterrence. In this case, the incumbent chooses h_I to maximize $\pi_I^D(h_I, h_E) - wh_I$, taking the entrant's best response $h_E(h_I)$ as given. Denote this accommodation investment level by h_I^A.

Entry deterrence becomes strategically relevant when the incumbent can profitably prevent entry through overinvestment in human capital. Specifically, the incumbent can deter entry by choosing h_I sufficiently large that the entrant's optimal response yields negative net profits. Let $\bar{h}_I$ denote the minimum incumbent investment that deters entry, implicitly defined by:

$$\max_{h_E} \left[\pi_E^D(\bar{h}_I, h_E) - wh_E - F\right] = 0 \tag{4}$$

The incumbent chooses deterrence over accommodation if and only if:

$$\pi_I^M(\bar{h}_I) - w\bar{h}_I > \pi_I^D(h_I^A, h_E(h_I^A)) - wh_I^A \tag{5}$$

This condition states that monopoly profits under deterrence investment exceed duopoly profits under accommodation investment. The left side represents the incumbent's payoff from successful deterrence, including the cost of overinvestment relative to the monopoly optimum. The right side represents the payoff from accommodating entry with optimal duopoly investment.

Several factors influence whether deterrence proves profitable. First, the magnitude of entry costs F directly affects the deterrence investment required. Higher entry costs reduce the incumbent investment needed to deter entry, making deterrence more attractive. Second, the competitive effects of human capital investments, captured by the sensitivity of profits to relative capability, determine how effectively incumbents can use human capital investment to discourage entry. Third, the relationship between human capital investment and market revenue determines the direct costs of overinvestment relative to efficient levels.

The model generates several comparative static predictions. An increase in quantum talent costs w raises the expense of deterrence while also increasing the entrant's costs, creating ambiguous effects on deterrence incentives. An increase in entry costs F unambiguously facilitates deterrence by reducing the incumbent investment required to render entry unprofitable. Technological changes that increase the productivity of human capital, represented by shifts in the revenue function $R^M(h_I)$, reduce the profit sacrifice from overinvestment and may increase deterrence incentives.

The credibility of human capital investment as a commitment device depends on irreversibility. If the incumbent can costlessly reduce its workforce after the entrant's decision, the strategic commitment fails. In practice, several factors create partial irreversibility in quantum technology contexts. First, specific training investments are sunk once incurred. Second, downsizing quantum research teams imposes reputation costs that may affect future recruitment. Third, contractual arrangements and equity compensation create costs to workforce reduction. The model implicitly assumes sufficient irreversibility for incumbent investments to credibly commit to aggressive post-entry competition.

Information asymmetries introduce additional strategic considerations. If potential entrants cannot perfectly observe incumbent human capital quality, incumbents may engage in signaling through high-profile hires or public announcements of team expansion. Conversely, if incumbents cannot perfectly assess potential entrants' capabilities or entry costs, they face uncertainty regarding the investment level required for successful deterrence. Drawing on **?**, the strategic design of compensation and retention mechanisms can be understood as mechanism design problems where the incumbent structures incentives to achieve deterrence objectives.

This framework abstracts from several complicating factors present in actual quantum technology markets. We ignore sequential entry by multiple firms, focusing instead on the bilateral interaction between incumbent and potential entrant. We abstract from dynamics such as learning by doing or endogenous technological progress. We assume symmetric information about market characteristics, though relaxing this assumption would generate interesting signaling dynamics. Despite these simplifications, the model captures the essential strategic trade-offs facing quantum technology startups considering human capital investments with entry deterrence effects.

5 Strategic Implications

The theoretical framework developed in the previous section generates several strategic implications for firms operating in quantum technology markets and for potential entrants considering market entry. This section explores these implications and examines their robustness across different market contexts.

For incumbent quantum technology startups, the model suggests conditions under which strategic overinvestment in human capital serves competitive objectives beyond direct productivity effects. When entry deterrence proves profitable, incumbents rationally hire beyond the level that would maximize short-run profits absent competitive threats. This overinvestment manifests in several observable forms. First, incumbents may aggressively recruit researchers whose expertise marginally overlaps with existing team capabilities. Second, they may hire promising early-career researchers ahead of immediate need, anticipating future applications but also preempting rival recruitment. Third, they may offer compensation packages exceeding levels justified by individual productivity, reflecting the strategic value of denying talent to potential competitors.

The timing of human capital investments carries strategic significance. The model treats investment as occurring before entry decisions, but in practice, incumbents face ongoing recruitment decisions. Strategic considerations favor frontloading human capital investments early in market development, when the pool of potential entrants remains largest and deterrence yields maximum value. As markets mature and entry costs rise naturally through network effects, intellectual property accumulation, or customer relationship establishment, the marginal deterrence value of human capital investment declines. As de Jong (2022) emphasize, the quantum age requires anticipatory approaches that consider timing and sequencing of strategic moves.

The composition of human capital investments affects strategic outcomes beyond aggregate team size. Highly visible hires of prestigious researchers generate stronger signaling effects than equivalent investments in less prominent personnel. This creates incentives for incumbents to concentrate recruitment efforts on individuals whose capabilities are most observable to potential entrants. The resulting hiring patterns may diverge from those that would maximize research productivity, with strategic considerations favoring renowned specialists over potentially more productive but less visible early-career researchers.

Geographic concentration interacts with strategic human capital competition in complex ways. Locating near major quantum research universities facilitates recruitment but intensifies competition with other firms pursuing similar strategies. Incumbents must weigh recruitment advantages against competitive exposure. The model suggests that incumbents may strategically locate near talent sources early in market development to preempt rivals, even if doing so increases operational costs or limits access to other resources.

For potential entrants, the incumbent's human capital investment level provides information about competitive intensity and the incumbent's strategic commitment. Large incumbent teams signal both strong competitive capability and credible commitment to aggressive post-entry competition. Rational entrants therefore incorporate incumbent workforce size into entry decisions alongside traditional factors such as market size and technological capabilities.

However, potential entrants can potentially circumvent incumbent human capital advantages through several strategies. First, entrants may pursue technological approaches that leverage different expertise profiles, reducing direct competition for the same talent pool. The heterogeneity of quantum technology applications documented by Quantum Technology and Application Consortium – QUTAC (2021) creates opportunities for such differentiation across optimization, simulation, and sensing applications. Second, entrants may invest in training programs that develop quantum expertise internally rather than competing for experienced researchers. While training requires significant time, it may prove less costly than bidding established researchers away from incumbents. Third, entrants may locate in geographic regions underserved by incumbents, accessing alternative talent pools.

The model also suggests conditions under which entry deterrence through human capital investment fails. If entry costs are sufficiently low, the incumbent investment required for deterrence becomes prohibitively expensive relative to accommodating entry. If potential entrants possess superior access to capital, they may credibly threaten aggressive human capital competition that overwhelms incumbent advantages. If technological uncertainty creates multiple viable approaches to quantum technology applications, incumbents cannot deter entry across all technological trajectories simultaneously.

Strategic human capital competition creates collective action problems among incumbents when multiple firms already operate in quantum technology markets. Following insights from Holahan and Lubell (2016) on collective action theory, each incumbent prefers that rivals bear the costs of deterring entry, but all benefit from reduced competition. This free-rider problem may result in insufficient deterrence investment from the incumbents' collective perspective, though individual incumbents lack incentives to correct the shortfall.

The welfare implications of strategic human capital competition prove ambiguous. From a static efficiency perspective, deterrence-motivated overinvestment misallocates resources and restricts competition. However, dynamic considerations complicate this assessment. Accelerated talent acquisition by established firms may speed knowledge development and technological progress. Competition for talent raises researcher compensation, potentially increasing the supply of quantum expertise over time through higher returns to specialized education. Conversely, reduced firm entry may decrease the diversity of technological approaches pursued and slow the exploration of alternative applications. As Wheatley Research Consultancy (2024) note, quantum computing's transformative potential for security, privacy, and the economy means that suboptimal market structures could significantly reduce social welfare.

Policy interventions face trade-offs when strategic human capital competition distorts talent allocation. Policies that reduce entry costs, such as public funding for startup formation or shared research infrastructure, diminish incumbent deterrence incentives and promote competition. However, such policies may also reduce private incentives for human capital investment, potentially slowing technological development. Workforce development programs that expand the supply of quantum expertise reduce competitive intensity in talent markets but require sustained public investment given the long training periods involved.

The model's predictions suggest several empirical implications testable with appropriate data. First, incumbent firms should exhibit larger research teams relative to operational scale when facing higher entry threats. Second, compensation premiums for quantum specialists should be highest in sectors with the most intense entry competition. Third, incumbent workforce expansion should temporally precede periods of reduced entry activity. Testing these predictions requires detailed data on firm-level employment, entry patterns, and compensation structures in quantum technology markets.

6 Discussion

The analysis developed in this article reveals that human capital investments in quantum technology markets serve dual roles as both productive inputs and strategic commitment devices. This duality creates distinctive patterns of competition and resource allocation that differ fundamentally from traditional technology sectors where physical capital dominates competitive strategy.

Several factors specific to quantum technology markets magnify the strategic importance of human capital investments. The extended training period for quantum specialists creates temporal barriers that prevent rapid supply responses to demand shocks. The high degree of specialization limits fungibility across applications, intensifying competition within narrow expertise domains. The visibility of talent movements in scientific communities enhances the observability of strategic commitments. These factors combine to create conditions where human capital investment serves as a particularly effective entry deterrence mechanism. As Wolbring (2022) document, social dimensions including labor market effects remain severely underexplored in quantum technology discourse, making this analysis particularly timely.

However, the effectiveness of human capital deterrence depends critically on credibility and irreversibility. Unlike physical capital investments that remain sunk once incurred, human capital investments face potential erosion through turnover. Quantum specialists retain outside options and mobility that limit firms' ability to commit irrevocably to large teams. This suggests that observed deterrence patterns may depend on contractual arrangements and compensation structures that increase switching costs for researchers, consistent with mechanism design principles discussed by **?**.

The model abstracts from several potentially important considerations. First, we ignore learning dynamics and endogenous technological progress. In reality, human capital investments generate knowledge accumulation that affects future competitive positions. Firms with larger research teams may learn faster, creating dynamic advantages beyond the static competitive effects analyzed here. Second, we treat human capital quality as homogeneous, but significant heterogeneity exists among quantum researchers. Strategic recruitment of particular individuals may generate disproportionate competitive advantages. Third, we assume perfect information about investment levels, but actual observation of rival capabilities may prove imperfect.

Network effects and complementarities among researchers create additional strategic considerations. Quantum technology development benefits from diverse expertise working in coordinated teams. The productivity of individual researchers depends on colleague quality and team composition. These complementarities suggest that human capital investments exhibit increasing returns over certain ranges, potentially creating winner-take-all dynamics in talent competition. Such increasing returns would intensify strategic competition for talent and magnify entry barriers.

The geographic dimension of talent competition deserves additional attention. Quantum research expertise concentrates in specific university locations, creating local talent markets. Incumbent firms located near major quantum research programs enjoy recruitment advantages that extend beyond simple proximity. They can establish collaborative relationships with universities, offer internships to graduate students, and develop reputations within academic communities. These location-based advantages compound strategic human capital competition and suggest that geographic positioning constitutes a strategic decision intertwined with human capital investment.

International dimensions add complexity to quantum technology talent markets. Quantum expertise distributes globally across research communities in different countries. Immigration policies and visa restrictions affect firms' ability to access international talent. Geopolitical considerations increasingly influence quantum technology development, with governments restricting international collaboration and talent flows in some contexts. These international factors create heterogeneity in talent market conditions across countries and may enable strategic investments in specific national contexts.

The relationship between firm size and innovation productivity remains contested in the innovation economics literature. Some research suggests that smaller, more focused teams generate higher innovation output per researcher. Other evidence indicates that larger teams tackle more ambitious problems and generate higher-impact discoveries. The appropriate benchmark for assessing strategic overinvestment depends on which relationship describes quantum technology innovation. If smaller teams prove more productive per capita, observed large teams may reflect strategic considerations rather than productivity maximization.

The model's focus on entry deterrence neglects alternative strategic motives for human capital investment. Firms may accumulate talent for preemptive reasons unrelated to entry deterrence, such as preparing for technological opportunities or acquiring option value in uncertain markets. They may invest in human capital to generate spillovers that benefit ecosystem development, anticipating indirect returns through complementary activities. Distinguishing pure deterrence motives from these alternative explanations requires careful empirical analysis.

Implications extend to adjacent markets and industries beyond quantum technology. Other emerging technology sectors facing similar talent scarcity may exhibit comparable strategic dynamics. Artificial intelligence, synthetic biology, and nanotechnology all feature limited specialized expertise and extended training periods. The framework developed here applies with appropriate modifications to analyze strategic human capital competition in these contexts. As **?** note, disruptive technologies across sectors create skill mismatches faster than educational systems can adapt.

The analysis informs ongoing policy debates regarding public investment in quantum education and workforce development. If private talent competition primarily reflects strategic positioning rather than productive necessity, market-determined human capital investment may exceed socially optimal levels in the presence of entry deterrence motives. Conversely, if deterrence reduces firm entry below socially optimal levels, public policies that lower entry barriers through infrastructure provision or startup subsidies may improve outcomes. The optimal policy response depends on the relative magnitudes of these effects and requires empirical evidence regarding the efficiency of existing talent allocation. Following Raja and Christiaensen (2017), developing countries face particular challenges in balancing technology adoption with workforce development to ensure inclusive growth.

Antitrust considerations arise when strategic human capital accumulation substantially reduces market competition. Traditional antitrust frameworks focus on physical asset concentration and market structure metrics. Human capital accumulation may escape scrutiny under these frameworks despite generating similar competitive effects. Competition authorities increasingly recognize talent acquisition as a dimension of competitive strategy requiring policy attention, particularly in technology sectors. The analysis developed here provides conceptual foundations for evaluating when human capital concentration raises competitive concerns.

Intellectual property institutions interact with human capital strategy in complex ways. Patent protection provides alternative mechanisms for appropriating innovation returns and creating entry barriers. Strong intellectual property rights may reduce reliance on human capital accumulation for competitive advantage, while weak protection amplifies human capital's strategic importance. The optimal balance between patent protection and human capital investment as appropriability mechanisms depends on technological characteristics and innovation system structure.

The model treats firm boundaries as given, but strategic human capital considerations affect organizational decisions. Firms must decide whether to employ quantum researchers directly or access expertise through partnerships, collaborations, or consulting arrangements. Direct employment provides greater control and commits to long-term relationships, enhancing strategic signaling value. However, direct employment also increases costs and reduces flexibility. The trade-off between commitment credibility and organizational flexibility shapes observed employment patterns in quantum technology markets.

7 Conclusion

This article develops a game-theoretic framework for analyzing how human capital investments function as strategic entry deterrence mechanisms in quantum technology markets. The analysis demonstrates that incumbent firms can profitably overinvest in specialized talent to discourage potential entrants, with the viability of deterrence depending on entry costs, talent market conditions, and the competitive effects of relative capability.

The theoretical model identifies several key results. First, strategic overinvestment occurs when the cost of deterrence investment falls below the profit gain from maintaining monopoly positions. Second, credible deterrence requires sufficient irreversibility in human capital investments to commit incumbents to aggressive post-entry competition. Third, the effectiveness of deterrence increases with entry costs, talent scarcity, and the sensitivity of competitive outcomes to relative human capital investments. Drawing on insights from Gilles (2010), Holahan and Lubell (2016), and Saleem and Higuchi (2014), the analysis integrates cooperative game theory, collective action theory, and institutional design perspectives to understand strategic human capital allocation.

These findings carry implications for firms, entrants, and policy makers. Incumbent firms should consider entry deterrence effects when making recruitment decisions, potentially investing beyond levels justified by immediate productivity considerations. Potential entrants must account for incumbent human capital advantages when assessing entry profitability, with large incumbent teams signaling strong competitive commitment. Policy makers face trade-offs between promoting competition through entry facilitation and maintaining private incentives for human capital investment that accelerate technological development.

The distinctive characteristics of quantum technology talent markets make them particularly susceptible to strategic human capital competition. Extreme talent scarcity, extended training periods, high specialization, and geographic concentration create conditions where human capital investment serves as an especially effective commitment device. As de Jong (2022), Wolbring (2022), and Wheatley Research Consultancy (2024) emphasize, the quantum technology revolution will reshape economic, social, and security landscapes, making efficient human capital allocation critical. However, these same characteristics generate welfare ambiguities, as deterrence-motivated overinvestment simultaneously restricts competition and potentially accelerates knowledge development.

Several avenues for future research emerge from this analysis. Empirical investigation of hiring patterns, compensation structures, and entry dynamics in quantum technology markets could test the model's predictions and quantify the magnitude of strategic effects. The commercial applications documented by Bova et al. (2021), Orús et al. (2019), Quantum Technology and Application Consortium – QUTAC (2021), and Herman et al. (2022) across finance, optimization, and industry provide contexts for empirical testing. Extensions incorporating multiple potential entrants, sequential entry timing, and dynamic learning would enrich the theoretical framework. Analysis of optimal policy responses given strategic human capital competition would inform public investment decisions in quantum workforce development.

The broader significance of this research extends beyond quantum technology to other emerging sectors characterized by specialized human capital requirements. As technological frontiers increasingly require rare expertise, strategic competition for talent may become a dominant feature of competitive dynamics. Understanding how human capital investments shape market structure and competitive outcomes becomes essential for analyzing innovation and competition in knowledge-intensive industries. The labor market disruptions documented by United Nations (2018), **?**, **?**, and **?** suggest that strategic human capital competition may significantly affect employment patterns and skill development across the economy.

The tension between productive investment and strategic behavior in human capital allocation reflects deeper questions about resource allocation in innovation systems. While competitive pressure for talent can accelerate knowledge development, it may also generate inefficiencies through deterrence-motivated overinvestment and reduced competitive diversity. Resolving these tensions requires balancing the benefits of market-driven resource allocation against the costs of strategic distortions, with appropriate policy interventions calibrated to sector-specific characteristics.

This article contributes to strategic competition theory by identifying human capital investment as a distinct commitment mechanism with properties differing from traditional capital investments. The partial irreversibility, productivity effects, and signaling value of human capital investments create strategic opportunities and constraints that extend beyond simple capacity preemption. As human capital increasingly dominates physical capital in determining competitive outcomes, understanding these strategic dimensions becomes essential for competition analysis and policy design. As quantum technologies transition from laboratory demonstrations to commercial applications, as documented by **?** and **?**, the strategic role of human capital will become increasingly central to competitive dynamics and policy priorities.

References

Bova, F., Goldfarb, A., and Melko, R. G. (2021). Commercial applications of quantum computing. *EPJ Quantum Technology*, 8(1).

de Jong, E. (2022). Own the unknown: An anticipatory approach to prepare society for the quantum age. *Digital Society*, 1(2).

Gilles, R. P. (2010). *The Cooperative Game Theory of Networks and Hierarchies*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Herman, D., Googin, C., Liu, X., Galda, A., Safro, I., Sun, Y., Pistoia, M., and Alexeev, Y. (2022). A survey of quantum computing for finance.

Holahan, R. and Lubell, M. (2016). Collective action theory. In *Handbook on Theories of Governance*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Orús, R., Mugel, S., and Lizaso, E. (2019). Quantum computing for finance: Overview and prospects. *Reviews in Physics*, 4:100028.

Quantum Technology and Application Consortium – QUTAC (2021). Industry quantum computing applications. *EPJ Quantum Technology*.

Raja, S. and Christiaensen, L. (2017). The future of work requires more, not less technology in developing countries.

Saleem, A. and Higuchi, K. (2014). Globalization and ict innovation policy: Absorption capacity in developing countries. In *16th International Conference on Advanced Communication Technology*, pages 409–417. Global IT Research Institute (GIRI).

United Nations (2018). *World Economic and Social Survey 2018*. United Nations.

Wheatley Research Consultancy (2024). Quantum shifts: The societal implications of quantum computing on security, privacy, and the economy.

Wolbring, G. (2022). Auditing the 'social' of quantum technologies: A scoping review. *Societies*, 12(2):41.