

# Maximal quantum Fisher information for general $\text{su}(2)$ parametrization processes

Xiao-Xing Jing,<sup>1</sup> Jing Liu,<sup>1</sup> Heng-Na Xiong,<sup>2</sup> and Xiaoguang Wang<sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Zhejiang Institute of Modern Physics, Department of Physics, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310027, China*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Applied Physics, Zhejiang University of Technology, Hangzhou 310023, China*

Quantum Fisher information is a key concept in the field of quantum metrology, which aims to enhance the accuracy of parameter estimation by using quantum resources. In this paper, utilizing a representation of quantum Fisher information for a general unitary parametrization process, we study unitary parametrization processes governed by  $\text{su}(2)$  dynamics. We obtain the analytical expression for the Hermitian operator of the parametrization and the maximal quantum Fisher information. We find that the maximal quantum Fisher information over the parameter space consists of two parts; one is quadratic in time and the other oscillates with time. We apply our result to the estimation of a magnetic field and obtained the maximal quantum Fisher information. We further discuss a driving field with a time-dependent Hamiltonian and find that the maximal quantum Fisher information of the driving frequency attains the optimum when it is in resonance with the atomic frequency.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 03.65.Ta, 06.20.-f

## I. INTRODUCTION

The past two decades have witnessed a dramatic development of quantum metrology [1–18], which is rooted in the theory of quantum parameter estimation. The estimation of unknown parameters plays an important role in physics and engineering. By taking advantage of quantum resources such as entanglement and squeezing, quantum metrology promises a higher precision in parameter estimation than its classical counterpart. Therefore many practical applications have been suggested to reap this benefit, including the detection of gravitational radiation [19–21], quantum frequency standards [9–11], and quantum imaging [22–24].

Quantum parameter estimation usually involves schemes for optimally estimating properties of quantum states or processes. The problem of parameter estimation for quantum processes can be treated as a task of optimal estimation of quantum states, where the states under investigation are the parameterized output states of the quantum processes. The estimation of unitary quantum processes is of interest and has been investigated in many different setups [25, 26]. In a realistic scenario, the system evolution is unavoidably accompanied by some noise and the quantum process is treated as a general trace-preserving completely positive map, which is also called a quantum channel. The optimal estimation of a general one-parameter channel has been studied and some optimal estimation schemes have been proposed [27, 28]. These schemes mainly consist of the identification of an optimal input state and an optimal estimator of the output state. In this paper, we restrict our investigation to unitary quantum processes, for simplicity, and concentrate only on finding the optimal input states and the corresponding accuracy limits.

It is well known that the inverse of Fisher information gives the lower bound of the accuracy limit. Fisher information characterizes the amount of information about the true value of a parameter that can be extracted from a probability distribution. Quantum Fisher information (QFI), which is a key concept in quantum metrology, is defined by maximizing the Fisher information over all possible measurements [1, 29]. The quantum Cramer-Rao theorem asserts that the precision is bounded from below by the inverse of the QFI [30, 31]. Due to its great importance in quantum metrology and parameter estimation, the QFI has attracted a lot of attentions [32–43]. However, analytical expressions for the QFI are difficult to obtain in most cases.

The QFI associated with a state  $\rho$  for a parameter  $\theta$  is defined as [29–31]

$$F = \text{Tr}(\rho L^2), \quad (1)$$

where  $\text{Tr}$  stands for trace and  $L$  is the symmetric logarithmic derivative operator, which is determined by  $\partial_\theta \rho = (L\rho + \rho L)/2$ . Consider a general unitary parametrization process  $U = \exp(-itH)$  for an initial pure state  $|\psi\rangle$ , with the time-independent Hamiltonian  $H$  depending on a parameter  $\theta$ , the QFI is simply connected with the variance of a Hermitian operator  $\mathcal{H}$  in  $|\psi\rangle$ , that is [42, 43],

$$F = 4(\langle \mathcal{H}^2 \rangle - \langle \mathcal{H} \rangle^2), \quad (2)$$

where

$$\mathcal{H} \equiv i(\partial_\theta U^\dagger)U \quad (3)$$

is a Hermitian operator associated with the parametrization.

It has been shown that the variance of an Hermitian operator  $\mathcal{H}$  is maximized when the initial state  $|\psi\rangle$  is an equally weighted superposition of the eigenvectors  $|\lambda_M\rangle$  and  $|\lambda_m\rangle$ , which correspond to the maximum and minimum eigenvalues  $\lambda_M$  and  $\lambda_m$  of the operator  $\mathcal{H}$ , respec-

\* xgwang1208@zju.edu.cn

tively [3, 42]; i.e.,

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\lambda_M\rangle + e^{i\phi}|\lambda_m\rangle), \quad (4)$$

where  $\phi$  is an arbitrary relative phase, and the maximal QFI (MQFI) is [42]

$$F^{\max} = (\lambda_M - \lambda_m)^2. \quad (5)$$

Here  $|\psi\rangle$  is the optimal input state. The convexity of the QFI guarantees that the MQFI is attained by a pure state rather than mixed states [44]. An important observation is that  $|\psi\rangle$  can be a maximal entangled state for a many-body system, e.g., GHZ states, or N00N states. This is consistent with previous research where maximal entangled states are optimal input states to enhance the estimation precision.

Previous research has mainly focused on the estimation of an overall multiplicative factor of a Hamiltonian  $H$  [7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 38, 40]. In such cases, the  $\mathcal{H}$  operator is easily obtained as  $\mathcal{H} = -t\partial_\theta H$  [43]. In a recent work [42], Pang *et al.* studied a general Hamiltonian parameter estimation problem where the parameter does not appear as an overall multiplicative factor. Their study extends the quantum metrology to a more general case. Based on their work, we offered another approach to get the QFI for unitary parametrization processes in [43]. In this approach, the QFI is related to the spectral decomposition of the initial state and the  $\mathcal{H}$  operator of the parametrization process

$$\mathcal{H} = -t\partial_\theta H + i \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(it)^{k+1}}{(k+1)!} H^{\times k} (\partial_\theta H), \quad (6)$$

where the superoperator  $H^{\times k}$  denotes a  $k$ th-order nested commutator operation,  $H^{\times k}(\cdot) = [H, \dots, [H, \cdot]]$ . When  $\theta$  is a multiplicative factor, as in the Mach-Zehnder interferometer setup,  $H = \theta^k H'$ , ( $k = 1, 2, \dots$ ) [12, 13], where  $H'$  is independent of the parameter to be estimated, the summation vanishes, and only the first term on the right-hand side of Eq. (6) contributes.

In this paper, we investigate a general unitary parametrization process governed by an  $\text{su}(2)$  Hamiltonian in the form of  $\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{J}$ , where  $\mathbf{r}$  is a time-independent function of the parameter and  $\mathbf{J}$  is the generator of  $\text{su}(2)$  algebra. This Hamiltonian covers many interesting applications in physics. We derive the analytical expression of the MQFI and find that it can be divided into two parts; one is quadratic in time  $t$  due to the dependence of the norm  $|\mathbf{r}|$  on the parameter  $\theta$ , and the other oscillates with time  $t$  because of the dependence of the direction  $\mathbf{e}_r = \mathbf{r}/|\mathbf{r}|$  on the parameter  $\theta$ . Furthermore, we apply the theoretical expression in three practical examples. The first two examples undergo time-independent  $\text{su}(2)$  parametrization, and the third one is subjected to time-dependent  $\text{su}(2)$  parametrization.

This paper is structured as follows. In Sec II, we derive the  $\mathcal{H}$  operator and the MQFI for a general  $\text{su}(2)$

Hamiltonian. In Sec III, three applications of the theoretical result are listed. The first two are governed by time-independent  $\text{su}(2)$  Hamiltonians. We discuss the corresponding MQFI for the estimated parameters. In the third application, we further study the parameter estimation with a time-dependent  $\text{su}(2)$  Hamiltonian and give the expression of the  $\mathcal{H}$  operator and the MQFI. Finally, we give the discussion and conclusion in Sec IV.

## II. MAXIMAL QUANTUM FISHER INFORMATION FOR A GENERAL TIME-INDEPENDENT $\text{SU}(2)$ HAMILTONIAN

In this section, we investigate the  $\mathcal{H}$  operator and the MQFI for a general  $\text{su}(2)$  parametrization process. Assume that the Hamiltonian takes the form of

$$H = \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{J}, \quad (7)$$

where  $\mathbf{J} = (J_x, J_y, J_z)$  is the generator of  $\text{su}(2)$  algebra and  $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}(\theta)$  is a time-independent parametric curve in the parameter space. We denote the derivative of  $H$  with respect to  $\theta$  as

$$\partial_\theta H = \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{J}, \quad (8)$$

where we define the velocity  $\mathbf{v} \equiv d\mathbf{r}/d\theta$ , which denotes the change of  $\mathbf{r}$  over the parameter space of  $\theta$ , including both of the change of  $|\mathbf{r}|$  over  $\theta$  and the change of the unit vector  $\mathbf{e}_r = \mathbf{r}/|\mathbf{r}|$  over  $\theta$ . Thus the velocity  $\mathbf{v}$  can be decomposed as  $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_r + \mathbf{v}_t$ , with the radial velocity  $\mathbf{v}_r$  and the transverse velocity  $\mathbf{v}_t$  reading as

$$\mathbf{v}_r = \frac{d|\mathbf{r}|}{d\theta} \mathbf{e}_r, \quad (9a)$$

$$\mathbf{v}_t = |\mathbf{r}| \frac{d\mathbf{e}_r}{d\theta}. \quad (9b)$$

Utilizing the commutation relation for  $\text{su}(2)$  algebra  $[\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{J}, \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{J}] = i(\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}) \cdot \mathbf{J}$ , the first two commutators in Eq. (6) read

$$H^{\times} \partial_\theta H = i(\mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{J}, \quad (10a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} H^{\times 2} \partial_\theta H &= -[\mathbf{r} \times (\mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{v})] \cdot \mathbf{J} \\ &= [|\mathbf{r}|^2 \mathbf{v} - (\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{v}) \mathbf{r}] \cdot \mathbf{J}, \end{aligned} \quad (10b)$$

where the relation  $\mathbf{a} \times (\mathbf{b} \times \mathbf{c}) = (\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{c})\mathbf{b} - (\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b})\mathbf{c}$  is used in the last equality. It is shown that both  $H^{\times} \partial_\theta H$  and  $H^{\times 2} \partial_\theta H$  are eigen operators of the superoperator  $H^{\times 2k}$ , i.e.,

$$H^{\times (2k+1)} \partial_\theta H = |\mathbf{r}|^{2k} H^{\times} \partial_\theta H, \quad (11a)$$

$$H^{\times (2k+2)} \partial_\theta H = |\mathbf{r}|^{2k} H^{\times 2} \partial_\theta H, \quad (11b)$$

where  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ . By plugging Eq. (11) into Eq. (6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H} &= -t\partial_\theta H + i \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(it)^{2k+2}}{(2k+2)!} H^{\times(2k+1)} (\partial_\theta H) \\ &\quad + i \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(it)^{2k+3}}{(2k+3)!} H^{\times(2k+2)} (\partial_\theta H) \\ &= -t\partial_\theta H + i (\cos(|\mathbf{r}|t) - 1) \frac{H^{\times} \partial_\theta H}{|\mathbf{r}|^2} \\ &\quad - (\sin(|\mathbf{r}|t) - |\mathbf{r}|t) \frac{H^{\times 2} \partial_\theta H}{|\mathbf{r}|^3},\end{aligned}\quad (12)$$

and inserting the first two commutators in Eq. (10) into Eq. (12), we find that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H} &= \frac{(\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{v}) (\sin(|\mathbf{r}|t) - |\mathbf{r}|t)}{|\mathbf{r}|^3} \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{J} - \frac{\sin(|\mathbf{r}|t)}{|\mathbf{r}|} \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{J} \\ &\quad + \frac{1 - \cos(|\mathbf{r}|t)}{|\mathbf{r}|^2} (\mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{J}.\end{aligned}\quad (13)$$

According to Eq. (9), we have that  $(\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{v})\mathbf{r} = |\mathbf{r}|^2 \mathbf{v}_r$ ,  $\mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{v} = |\mathbf{r}|\mathbf{e}_r \times \mathbf{v}_t = |\mathbf{r}|(\mathbf{v}_r \times \mathbf{v}_t)/(d|\mathbf{r}|/d\theta)$ ; therefore,  $\mathcal{H}$  can be further written as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H} &= \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{J} \\ &= \frac{1 - \cos(|\mathbf{r}|t)}{|\mathbf{r}| \frac{d|\mathbf{r}|}{d\theta}} (\mathbf{v}_r \times \mathbf{v}_t) \cdot \mathbf{J} - t\mathbf{v}_r \cdot \mathbf{J} - \frac{\sin(|\mathbf{r}|t)}{|\mathbf{r}|} \mathbf{v}_t \cdot \mathbf{J}\end{aligned}\quad (14)$$

where

$$\mathbf{A} = \frac{1 - \cos(|\mathbf{r}|t)}{|\mathbf{r}| \frac{d|\mathbf{r}|}{d\theta}} (\mathbf{v}_r \times \mathbf{v}_t) - t\mathbf{v}_r - \frac{\sin(|\mathbf{r}|t)}{|\mathbf{r}|} \mathbf{v}_t. \quad (15)$$

The three terms in Eq. (15) are perpendicular to each other and the norm of  $\mathbf{A}$  is  $|\mathbf{A}| = \sqrt{\mathbf{v}_r^2 t^2 + 4 \frac{\mathbf{v}_t^2}{\mathbf{r}^2} \sin^2\left(\frac{|\mathbf{r}|}{2}t\right)}$ , therefore according to Eq. (5), the MQFI over the parameter  $\theta$  is

$$\begin{aligned}F^{\max} &= [j|\mathbf{A}| - (-j)|\mathbf{A}|]^2 \\ &= 4j^2 \left[ \mathbf{v}_r^2 t^2 + 4 \frac{\mathbf{v}_t^2}{\mathbf{r}^2} \sin^2\left(\frac{|\mathbf{r}|}{2}t\right) \right],\end{aligned}\quad (16)$$

where  $j$  is the maximal eigenvalue of  $J_z$ . Equation (16) shows that the MQFI can be divided into two parts. The first part is quadratic in time  $t$  and is proportional to the square of the radial velocity  $\mathbf{v}_r$ . The second part oscillates with time  $t$  and is proportional to the ratio of the square of the transverse velocity  $\mathbf{v}_t$  to the square of  $\mathbf{r}$ . According to Eq. (9b), this ratio is equal to the square of the derivative  $d\mathbf{e}_r/d\theta$ . Thus the quadratic term is due to the dependence of the norm  $|\mathbf{r}|$  on the parameter  $\theta$ , while the oscillation term is due to the dependence of the direction  $\mathbf{e}_r$  on  $\theta$ .

When  $t$  is small, we can expand Eq. (16) in  $t$  to the second order, and the MQFI is simplified to

$$F^{\max} = 4j^2 t^2 [\mathbf{v}_r^2 + \mathbf{v}_t^2] = 4j^2 t^2 \mathbf{v}^2. \quad (17)$$

That is, the MQFI grows quadratically with time  $t$  and depends only on the norm of  $\mathbf{v}$ .

If the change of  $|\mathbf{r}|$  over the parameter space is 0, i.e.,  $\mathbf{v}_r = \frac{d|\mathbf{r}|}{d\theta} \mathbf{e}_r = 0$ , then the MQFI is reduced to

$$F^{\max} = 16j^2 \frac{\mathbf{v}^2}{\mathbf{r}^2} \sin^2\left(\frac{|\mathbf{r}|}{2}t\right). \quad (18)$$

In this case, the MQFI always oscillates with the time so that its value is bounded. At the time points  $t = (2k+1)\pi/|\mathbf{r}|$ ,  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , the MQFI reaches the optimal value,

$$F_{\text{op}}^{\max} = 16j^2 \frac{\mathbf{v}^2}{\mathbf{r}^2}. \quad (19)$$

### III. APPLICATIONS

In this section, we apply the theoretical expression in three practical examples. The dynamics of the first two examples are governed by time-independent  $\text{su}(2)$  Hamiltonians, and the third one is governed by a time-dependent  $\text{su}(2)$  Hamiltonian. Also note that the Hamiltonians may depend on several parameters, and we only consider the single parameter estimation in this paper, i.e., we suppose that other parameters are known when we estimate a specific parameter.

#### A. Time-independent Hamiltonians

*Case 1.* Let us consider the Hamiltonian, (7), with  $\mathbf{r}$  in the explicit form in the spherical coordinates,

$$\mathbf{r} = r (\sin \theta \cos \varphi, \sin \theta \sin \varphi, \cos \theta), \quad (20)$$

where  $r$  represents the amplitude of the external magnetic field and  $\theta, \varphi$  denotes the direction of the field. Suppose  $\theta$  is the parameter we want to estimate. The velocity vector is readily obtained as  $\mathbf{v} = r (\cos \theta \cos \varphi, \cos \theta \sin \varphi, -\sin \theta)$ . It is obvious that  $\mathbf{v}_r = 0$ . According to Eq. (18), the MQFI over  $\theta$  is

$$F_\theta^{\max} = 16j^2 \sin^2\left(\frac{rt}{2}\right), \quad (21)$$

and when  $t = (2k+1)\pi/r$ ,  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ,  $F_\theta^{\max}$  reaches its optimal value of  $16j^2$ .

Similarly, if  $\varphi$  is the parameter to be estimated, the MQFI can be derived as

$$F_\varphi^{\max} = 16j^2 \sin^2 \theta \sin^2\left(\frac{rt}{2}\right), \quad (22)$$

and when  $t = (2k+1)\pi/r$ ,  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , and  $\theta = \frac{\pi}{2}$ ,  $F_\varphi^{\max}$  reaches its optimal value of  $16j^2$ . In both cases, the MQFI is bounded.




FIG. 1. (Color online) The MQFI  $F_{\omega_0}^{\max}$  as a function of time  $t$  with  $\lambda = 1$  and (a)  $\omega_0 = 0.1$ , (b)  $\omega_0 = 1$ , (c)  $\omega_0 = 10$ . Dashed (red) lines denote the contribution of the first term in Eq. (25) and solid (blue) lines denote the contribution of both terms. (d) We set  $\omega_0 = 1$  and  $t = \pi/K$ , and  $F_{\omega_0}^{\max}$  decreases as  $\lambda$  grows. Here we take  $j = 1$ .

Finally, if  $r$  is the parameter to be estimated, then  $\mathbf{v}^2 = \mathbf{v}_r^2 = 1$  and the second term in Eq. (16) vanishes. Thus the MQFI reads

$$F_r^{\max} = 4j^2 t^2. \quad (23)$$

In this case, the MQFI is unbounded and grows quadratically with time  $t$ .

*Case 2.* Let us consider an ensemble of  $N$  two-level atoms interacting with a static magnetic field. The Hamiltonian of this system can be written as

$$H = \omega_0 J_z + \lambda J_x, \quad (24)$$

where  $\omega_0$  is the atomic transition frequency and  $\lambda$  is the Rabi frequency, which is proportional to the amplitude of the static magnetic field.

Here we find the MQFI of  $\omega_0$  first. Comparing with the previous section, the coefficient vector is  $\mathbf{r} = (\lambda, 0, \omega_0)^T$ . Denote the norm of  $|\mathbf{r}|$  as  $K = \sqrt{\lambda^2 + \omega_0^2}$ ; then the velocity is  $\mathbf{v} = d\mathbf{r}/d\omega_0 = (0, 0, 1)^T$ , the radial velocity  $\mathbf{v}_r^2 = d|\mathbf{r}|/d\omega_0 = \omega_0^2/K^2$ , and the transverse velocity  $\mathbf{v}_t^2 = \mathbf{v}^2 - \mathbf{v}_r^2 = \lambda^2/K^2$ , thus the corresponding MQFI is readily obtained as

$$F_{\omega_0}^{\max} = 4j^2 \left[ \frac{\omega_0^2}{K^2} t^2 + \frac{4\lambda^2}{K^4} \sin^2 \left( \frac{Kt}{2} \right) \right]. \quad (25)$$

When  $t$  is very large, the oscillating term can be neglected. However, this term may also be important in

some cases. We plot the MQFI  $F_{\omega_0}^{\max}$  with and without the oscillating term in Fig. 1. In Fig. 1(a), where we take  $\lambda = 10\omega_0 = 1$ , we see that the effect of the oscillating term is very strong. In Fig. 1(b), we take  $\lambda = \omega_0 = 1$ , and the amplitude of the oscillating term is extremely small in comparison with the quadratic term. And in Fig. 1(c), where we take  $\lambda = 0.1\omega_0 = 1$ , the oscillating term could be neglected even when  $t$  is very small.

On the other hand, in Fig. 1(d), we set  $\omega_0 = 1$  and  $t = \pi/K$ , and we can see that  $F_{\omega_0}^{\max}$  decreases with increasing  $\lambda$ . This can be explained as follows. When  $\lambda$  is very large, the contribution of the first term  $\omega_0 J_z$  in Eq. (24) can be neglected; i.e., when  $\lambda \gg \omega_0$ ,  $F_{\omega_0}^{\max} \rightarrow 0$ .

Following a similar procedure, the MQFI with respect to  $\lambda$  is obtained as

$$F_{\lambda}^{\max} = 4j^2 \left[ \frac{\lambda^2}{K^2} t^2 + \frac{4\omega_0^2}{K^4} \sin^2 \left( \frac{Kt}{2} \right) \right]. \quad (26)$$

This result is similar to Eq. (25) and we omit the discussion here.

## B. Time-dependent Hamiltonian

Hitherto all the Hamiltonians considered in this paper are time independent. If the Hamiltonian is time dependent, generally the unitary operator will involve a time-ordering procedure and Eq. (6) fails. In this subsection, we go beyond the previous situations and investigate a time-dependent Hamiltonian. In the following we replace the static magnetic field in the preceding subsection with a time-dependent driving field, and the Hamiltonian is

$$H = \omega_0 J_z + \lambda [J_x \cos(\omega t) + J_y \sin(\omega t)]. \quad (27)$$

Here  $\omega$  is the frequency of the driving field. This Hamiltonian could reflect many realistic physical systems, such as in the Ramsey spectroscopy and NMR techniques [10, 45]. The  $\mathcal{H}$  operator of this Hamiltonian cannot be written in the form of Eq. (6) and the previous method must be changed. We can circumvent this problem by utilizing a rotating transform. In a rotating frame, the original state vector  $|\psi\rangle$  is transformed as

$$|\tilde{\psi}\rangle = R|\psi\rangle = e^{i\omega t J_z} |\psi\rangle, \quad (28)$$

and the effective Hamiltonian in this new frame is

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\text{eff}} &= RHR^\dagger - iR \frac{\partial R^\dagger}{\partial t} \\ &= \Delta J_z + \lambda J_x, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

which is time independent. Here  $\Delta = \omega_0 - \omega$  denotes the detuning between the atom transition and the driving magnetic field.

Therefore, the unitary evolution in the original frame is readily obtained as

$$U = U_1 U_2 = e^{-i\omega t J_z} e^{-iH_{\text{eff}} t}, \quad (30)$$

with  $U_1 = R^\dagger = e^{-i\omega t J_z}$  and  $U_2 = e^{-iH_{\text{eff}} t}$ . In such a way, we turn the time-dependent Hamiltonian of Eq. (27) into two time-independent ones,  $H_1 = \omega J_z$ , and  $H_{\text{eff}}$ . The  $\mathcal{H}$  operator for two consecutive unitary operation  $U = U_1 U_2$  can be derived as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H} &= i\partial_\theta \left( U_2^\dagger U_1^\dagger \right) U_1 U_2 \\ &= \mathcal{H}_2 + U_2^\dagger \mathcal{H}_1 U_2,\end{aligned}\quad (31)$$

with  $\mathcal{H}_1 = i\partial_\theta U_1^\dagger U_1$  and  $\mathcal{H}_2 = i\partial_\theta U_2^\dagger U_2$ . Here  $\theta$  can be  $\lambda, \omega_0$ , or  $\omega$ . For the case in Eq. (30), if  $\lambda$  or  $\omega_0$  is the parameter to be estimated, it is obvious that  $\mathcal{H}_1 = 0$  and one can simply get the MQFI by replacing  $\omega_0$  in Eq. (25) and (26) with  $\Delta$ . When  $\Delta = 0$ ,  $F_\omega^{\text{max}}$  attains its optimal value of  $4j^2 t^2$ .

Next, let us find the  $\mathcal{H}$  operator with respect to  $\omega$ . The Hamiltonian associated with  $\mathcal{H}_2$  is  $H_2 = H_{\text{eff}}$ , and the corresponding coefficient vector reads  $\mathbf{r} = (\lambda, 0, \Delta)^T$ . Then by utilizing Eq. (9), we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{v}_r &= \frac{\Delta}{K'^2} (-\lambda, 0, -\Delta), \\ \mathbf{v}_t &= \frac{\lambda}{K'^2} (\Delta, 0, -\lambda), \\ \mathbf{v}_r \times \mathbf{v}_t &= \frac{-\lambda\Delta}{K'^2} (0, 1, 0).\end{aligned}\quad (32)$$

Therefore, according to Eq. (14), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_2 &= \frac{1}{K'^3} [\lambda\Delta [K't - \sin(K't)] J_x \\ &\quad + \lambda K' [1 - \cos(K't)] J_y \\ &\quad + [\Delta^2 K't + \lambda^2 \sin(K't)] J_z].\end{aligned}\quad (33)$$

On the other hand, the Hamiltonian associated with  $\mathcal{H}_1$  reads  $H_1 = \omega J_z$ , where the parameter enters in the Hamiltonian as a multiplicative factor. According to Eq. (6), we have  $\mathcal{H}_1 = -t J_z$ . Based on the formula  $\exp(A)B\exp(-A) = \exp(A^\times)B = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{A^\times k}{k!} B$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}U_2^\dagger \mathcal{H}_1 U_2 &= -\frac{t}{K'^2} [\lambda\Delta [1 - \cos(K't)] J_x + \lambda K' \sin(K't) J_y \\ &\quad + [\Delta^2 + \lambda^2 \cos(K't)] J_z],\end{aligned}\quad (34)$$

where we denote  $K' = \sqrt{\lambda^2 + \Delta^2}$ .

Combining Eqs. (31), (33), and (34), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H} &= \mathbf{A}' \cdot \mathbf{J} \\ &= \frac{[\sin(K't) - K't \cos(K't)]}{K'^3} (-\lambda\Delta J_x + \lambda^2 J_z) \\ &\quad + \frac{[1 - \cos(K't) - K't \sin(K't)]}{K'^2} \lambda J_y.\end{aligned}\quad (35)$$

Based on the norm of the vector  $\mathbf{A}'$ , the MQFI is readily obtained as

$$\begin{aligned}F_\omega^{\text{max}} &= 4j^2 \frac{\lambda^2}{K'^4} [2 + K'^2 t^2 \\ &\quad - 2K't \sin(K't) - 2\cos(K't)].\end{aligned}\quad (36)$$




FIG. 2. The MQFI  $F_\omega^{\text{max}}$  as a function of the detuning  $\Delta$  (a) and  $\lambda$  (b). (a) We take  $\lambda = 1$ , and  $t = 1$ .  $F_\omega^{\text{max}}$  attains the optimum when  $\Delta = 0$ . (b), We take  $\Delta = 0$  and  $\lambda = 1$ .  $F_\omega^{\text{max}}$  grows quadratically with time  $t$ . We set  $j = 1$  in both panels.

Figure 2.(a) shows that when  $\Delta = 0$  (resonance),  $F_\omega^{\text{max}}$  attains its optimal value. This can be proved theoretically by taking the derivative of Eq. (36),

$$\frac{d}{d\Delta} F_\omega^{\text{max}}|_{\Delta=0} = 0. \quad (37)$$

When  $\Delta = 0$ , we plot  $F_\omega^{\text{max}}$  in Fig. 2(b) with  $\lambda = 1$ . As  $t$  increases, the MQFI can be approximated as  $F_\omega^{\text{max}} = 4j^2 t^2$  and the oscillation can also be neglected.

#### IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In the previous sections, we have only discussed the single-parameter estimation problem. The extension to multi-parameter estimation is straightforward and has been discussed in our recent work [43].

The quantum Cramér-Rao theorem asserts that the variance of any unbiased estimator is bounded below by the inverse of the QFI. In this paper, we compute the MQFI for  $\text{su}(2)$  parametrization processes, thus getting the corresponding ultimate estimation bound. The achievement of the bound is of practical interest and various methods of building the optimal estimators are discussed in the literature, including Bayes estimators and maximum-likelihood estimators [46, 47]. The optimal quantum estimator is also discussed in [29] and [48] for a general process. The specific form of the optimal estimator for an  $\text{su}(2)$  parametrization process will be discussed in our future works.

In summary, we investigate a unitary parametrization process governed by an  $\text{su}(2)$  Hamiltonian  $\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{J}$ . We find the optimal input state and the MQFI when the Hamiltonian is independent of time. The optimal input state  $|\psi\rangle$  in Eq. (4) can be a maximal entangled state for a many-body system. A similar result is discussed in [44], where the author found that the optimal input state for an isotropic depolarization channel is also a maximally entangled state. We show that the MQFI can be divided

into two parts. One part is quadratic in time  $t$  due to the dependence of the norm  $|\mathbf{r}|$  on the parameter  $\theta$ , and the other part oscillates with time  $t$  because of the dependence of the direction  $\mathbf{e}_r = \mathbf{r}/|\mathbf{r}|$  on the parameter  $\theta$ .

We apply this result to a typical scenario and find the MQFI corresponding to the amplitude and the direction of the magnetic field. We also investigate the MQFI for an ensemble of atoms interacting with a static field. We find that in some cases the oscillating terms can contribute significantly and thus can not be neglected. We further investigate a time-dependent driving field and find that the MQFI of the field frequency reaches its optimum when the driving field is in resonance with the

atomic transition frequency. Moreover, the MQFI of the amplitude of the external field also reaches its optimum when the field is in resonance with the atoms.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the NFRPC through Grant No. 2012CB921602 and by the NSFC through Grant No. 11475146. H. N. Xiong acknowledges the NSFC through Grants No. 11347220 and No.11404287 and the NSF of Zhejiang Province via Grant No. LQ14A04003.

- 
- [1] S. L. Braunstein and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 3439 (1994).
  - [2] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, Science **306**, 1330 (2004).
  - [3] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 010401 (2006).
  - [4] S. M. Roy and S. L. Braunstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 220501 (2008).
  - [5] U. Dorner, R. Demkowicz-Dobrzanski, B. J. Smith, J. S. Lundeen, W. Wasilewski, K. Banaszek, and I. A. Walmsley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 040403 (2009).
  - [6] M. Zwiernik, C. A. Perez-Delgado, and P. Kok, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 180402 (2010).
  - [7] M. D. Lang and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 173601 (2013).
  - [8] M. Jarzyna and R. Demkowicz-Dobrzanski, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 011801(R) (2012).
  - [9] G. Santarelli, Ph. Laurent, P. Lemonde, A. Clairon, A. G. Mann, S. Chang, A. N. Luiten, and C. Salomon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 4619 (1999).
  - [10] J. J. Bollinger, W. M. Itano and D. J. Wineland, and D. J. Heinzen, Phys. Rev. A **54**, R4649(R) (1996).
  - [11] S. F. Huelga, C. Macchiavello, T. Pellizzari, A. K. Ekert, M. B. Plenio, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 3865 (1997).
  - [12] J. Joo, W. J. Munro and T. P. Spiller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 083601 (2011).
  - [13] J. Joo, K. Park, H. Jeong, W. J. Munro, K. Nemoto, and T. P. Spiller, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 043828 (2012).
  - [14] B. M. Escher, R. L. de Matos Filho, and L. Davidovich, Nat. Phys. **7**, 406 (2011).
  - [15] B. M. Escher, R. L. de Matos Filho, L. Davidovich, Braz. J. Phys. **41**, 229(2011).
  - [16] R. Demkowicz-Dobrzanski, J. Kolodynski and M. Guta, Nat. Commun. **3**, 1063 (2012).
  - [17] A. W. Chin, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 233601 (2012).
  - [18] S. Alipour, M. Mehboudi, and A. T. Rezakhani, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 120405 (2014).
  - [19] V. B. Braginsky, S. P. Vyatchanin, Phys. Lett. A **324**, 345 (2004).
  - [20] R. X. Adhikari, Rev. Mod. Phys. **86**, 121 (2014).
  - [21] J. M. McGuirk, G. T. Foster, J. B. Fixler, M. J. Snadden, and M. A. Kasevich, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 033608 (2002).
  - [22] M. Tsang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 253601 (2009).
  - [23] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, L. Maccone, and J. H. Shapiro, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 013827 (2009).
  - [24] G. Brida, M. Genovese and I. Ruo Berchera, Nat. Photonics **4**, 227 (2010).
  - [25] M. A. Ballester, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 022303 (2004).
  - [26] A. Fujiwara and H. Nagaoka, Phys. Lett. A **201**, 119 (1995).
  - [27] A. Fujiwara and H. Imai, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **36**, 8093 (2003).
  - [28] M. Sarovar and G. J. Milburn, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **39**, 8487 (2006).
  - [29] M. G. A. Paris, Int. J. Quant. Inf. **7**, 125 (2009).
  - [30] C. W. Helstrom, Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory, Academic Press, New York (1976).
  - [31] A. S. Holevo, Probabilistic and Statistic Aspects of Quantum Theory, North-Holland, Amsterdam (1982).
  - [32] D. Petz, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **35**, 929 (2002).
  - [33] X. M. Lu, X. G. Wang, and C. P. Sun, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 042103 (2010); X. M. Lu, S. X. Yu, and C. H. Oh, Nat. Commun. **6**, 7282 (2015).
  - [34] S. L. Luo, Lett. Math. Phys. **53**, 3 (2000).
  - [35] O. E. Barndorff-Nielsen and R. D. Gill, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **33**, 4481 (2000).
  - [36] J. Ma, Y. X. Huang, X. G. Wang, and C. P. Sun, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 022302 (2011).
  - [37] W. Zhong, Z. Sun, J. Ma, X. G. Wang and F. Nori, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 022337 (2013).
  - [38] Y. M. Zhang, X. W. Li, W. Yang, and G. R. Jin, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 043832 (2013).
  - [39] J. Liu, X. X. Jing, W. Zhong and X. G. Wang, Commun. Theor. Phys. **61**, 45 (2014).
  - [40] X. X. Jing, J. Liu, W. Zhong and X. G. Wang, Commun. Theor. Phys. **61**, 115 (2014).
  - [41] Y. Yao, X. Xiao, L. Ge, X. G. Wang, and C. P. Sun, Phys. Rev. A **89**, 042336 (2014).
  - [42] S. S. Pang, T. A. Brun, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 022117 (2014).
  - [43] J. Liu, X. X. Jing and X. G. Wang, Sci. Rep. **5**, 8565 (2014).
  - [44] A. Fujiwara, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 042304 (2001).
  - [45] N. F. Ramsey, Rev. Mod. Phys. **62**, 3 (1990).
  - [46] B. Teklu, S. Olivares and M. G. A. Paris, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **42**, 035502 (2009).
  - [47] D. Brivio, S. Cialda, S. Vezzoli, B. Teklu, M. G. Genoni, S. Olivares and M. G. A. Paris, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 012305 (2010).

- [48] W. Zhong, X. M. Lu, X. X. Jing and X. G. Wang, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **47**, 385304, (2014).