

Conservative classical and quantum resolution limits for incoherent imaging

Mankei Tsang^{a,b}

^aDepartment of Electrical and Computer Engineering, National University of Singapore, 4 Engineering Drive 3, Singapore 117583; ^bDepartment of Physics, National University of Singapore, 2 Science Drive 3, Singapore 117551

ARTICLE HISTORY

Compiled March 2, 2022

ABSTRACT

I propose classical and quantum limits to the statistical resolution of two incoherent optical point sources from the perspective of minimax parameter estimation. Unlike earlier results based on the Cramér-Rao bound, the limits proposed here, based on the worst-case error criterion and a Bayesian version of the Cramér-Rao bound, are valid for any biased or unbiased estimator and obey photon-number scalings that are consistent with the behaviors of actual estimators. These results prove that, from the minimax perspective, the spatial-mode demultiplexing (SPADE) measurement scheme recently proposed by Tsang, Nair, and Lu [Phys. Rev. X **6**, 031033 (2016)] remains superior to direct imaging for sufficiently high photon numbers.

1. Introduction

In recent years, the Cramér-Rao bound (CRB) [1] has become the standard measure of resolution for incoherent imaging [2–8], especially in fluorescence microscopy [5–8], where photon shot noise has become the dominant noise source and a statistical treatment of resolution has become essential. An often overlooked caveat of the bound is its assumption of unbiased estimators [1]. Although the fluorescence-microscopy community has embraced the unbiased condition in principle [5–8], many widely used estimators in modern statistics, including the historic maximum-likelihood (ML) estimator [1, 9] and the shrinkage estimators in compressed sensing [10, 11], can be biased and violate the CRB, while statisticians have discovered many counterexamples in which the unbiased condition gives rise to silly results [12–15]. These issues threaten to undermine a large body of work that proclaims the CRB as a fundamental limit.

To remove the unbiased condition, here I propose the use of a Bayesian CRB (BCRB) to derive new classical and quantum resolution limits to incoherent imaging. Following the seminal work in Refs. [16–18], I focus on the problem of estimating the separation between two incoherent sources, such as stars and fluorophores, in the presence of photon shot noise. The CRB for this task via direct imaging has previously been proposed as a fundamental resolution measure to supersede Rayleigh’s criterion [16–18]. In a recent breakthrough, we have discovered new measurement schemes that can significantly improve upon direct imaging and reach the fundamental quan-

tum limit in terms of the Fisher information [19–23]; experimental demonstrations [24–27] and further theoretical advances [28–33] have since been reported. Numerical simulations and experimental data analysis, however, have found that sensible estimators, including the ML estimator, are biased and violate the CRB [19, 21, 23, 24, 26], calling into question the generality of the claims. To overcome this issue, here I adopt a BCRB [1, 34] that is valid for any biased or unbiased estimator, closing the loophole of the original CRB. By applying the bound to a conservative worst-case error measure, I propose new classical and quantum limits to the separation estimation problem, and also prove that the spatial-mode demultiplexing (SPADE) scheme proposed in Ref. [19] remains superior to direct imaging for sufficiently high photon numbers and can reach the quantum limit.

2. Conservative limits to two-source separation estimation

The application of interest here is the estimation of the separation between two incoherent optical point sources from far-field measurements with Poisson noise [16–27]. Each source produces an optical field on the image plane that is blurred by diffraction. Direct imaging, which measures the intensity distribution on the image plane, performs poorly when Rayleigh’s criterion is violated [16–18]. Recently, we have invented an alternative measurement scheme called SPADE that performs further coherent processing on the image-plane field before photon counting and possesses a much higher Fisher information for sub-Rayleigh separations [19, 20]. For the uninitiated readers, Appendix A briefly reviews the prior results on the use of the CRB for this separation estimation problem.

Given an observation random variable y , the expectation operation \mathbb{E}_θ conditioned on the unknown parameter θ , and an estimator $\check{\theta}(y)$, the mean-square error (MSE) is defined as [1]

$$\text{MSE}(\theta) \equiv \mathbb{E}_\theta (\check{\theta} - \theta)^2. \quad (1)$$

If biased estimators are allowed, $\text{MSE}(\theta)$ can be arbitrarily low, and no meaningful lower bound on the whole error function can be derived. To see this point, consider a deterministic estimator $\check{\theta}(y) = \theta_0$, which leads to zero error when θ happens to be θ_0 . This means that $\text{MSE}(\theta)$ at any specific parameter value is a poor indicator of the overall uncertainty of the experiment if arbitrary estimators are permitted. While this example seems artificial, modern statistics research has discovered many biased estimators that can beat the CRB in useful scenarios [10, 35]. To derive limits that are also valid for biased estimators, here I adopt the minimax paradigm [10, 12, 36], which regards the worst-case error $\sup_\theta \text{MSE}(\theta)$ as the central figure of demerit, and use the BCRB as a lower bound on the worst-case error; see Appendix B for a more detailed discussion of the approach.

For simplicity, I assume one-dimensional imaging with L detected photons and a Gaussian point-spread function, the intensity of which has a standard deviation σ with respect to the object-plane dimension; generalizations for two dimensions, uncertain photon numbers, and other point-spread functions should give similar results [19, 20, 23, 30, 33]. For the estimation of the separation parameter θ with SPADE,

Appendix C shows that

$$\sup_{\theta} \text{MSE}^{(\text{SPADE})}(\theta) \geq \frac{4\sigma^2}{L}. \quad (2)$$

The right-hand side of Eq. (2) also serves as a fundamental quantum limit to $\sup_{\theta} \text{MSE}(\theta)$ for any measurement on the image plane. Equation (2) has the appearance of the CRB, but note that this is a lower bound on the worst-case error only, not the whole function $\text{MSE}(\theta)$, and it is valid for any biased or unbiased estimator. Further theoretical and numerical analysis, to be presented in Sec. 3, shows that Eq. (2) is reasonably tight.

For direct imaging, on the other hand, Appendix C shows that

$$\sup_{\theta} \text{MSE}^{(\text{direct})}(\theta) \geq \frac{\sqrt{2}\sigma^2}{3\sqrt{L}}. \quad (3)$$

The $1/\sqrt{L}$ scaling implies that the direct-imaging error must drop more slowly with increasing photon numbers than the optimal $1/L$ scaling. Given the numerous bounds involved in deriving Eq. (3), there is no reason to expect it to be tight, although the $1/\sqrt{L}$ scaling was observed in the numerical analysis of the ML estimator in Sec. 3 and also by Tham *et al.* for their direct-imaging estimator [26], suggesting that at least the scaling is attainable. Most importantly, Eq. (3) holds for any biased or unbiased estimator, closing a crucial loophole in Refs. [16–18].

3. Attaining the limits

For SPADE with the ML estimator, Appendix D proves that

$$\text{MSE}^{(\text{SPADE, ML})}(\theta) \leq \frac{16\sigma^2}{L}. \quad (4)$$

This is a guarantee of the SPADE performance for any photon number and proves that the BCRB given by Eq. (2) is tight up to a prefactor of 4. It is a more conclusive result than the asymptotic argument or the simulations reported in Ref. [19]. Figure 1(a) plots the simulated errors of the ML estimator against the separation θ/σ , showing that the errors can actually stay less than twice the limit. A modified ML estimator described in Appendix E can reduce the worst-case error even further; Fig. 1(b) plots the simulated errors of this estimator, demonstrating its near-optimality with respect to the worst-case error criterion.

For direct imaging, Fig. 1(c) shows that the simulated errors of the ML estimator violate the CRB for small θ , as also reported earlier by Ref. [9], but the important point here is that the worst-case errors must stay above the BCRB given by Eq. (3). Figure 1(d) compares the simulated worst-case errors of the various estimators with the BCRBs given by Eqs. (2) and (3) as a function of L in log-log scale, demonstrating the different photon-number scalings. The direct-imaging limit is less tight to the ML errors, although the latter still appear to obey the same $1/\sqrt{L}$ scaling.




Figure 1. Numerically simulated MSE versus true separation θ/σ for (a) SPADE with the ML estimator, (b) SPADE with a modified ML estimator to reduce \sup_{θ} MSE, and (c) direct imaging with ML. The intensity of the point-spread function is assumed to be one-dimensional and Gaussian with standard deviation σ , and L is the detected photon number. Note that each MSE in plots (a)–(c) is multiplied by $L/(4\sigma^2)$ for comparison with the CRBs. Each data point is an average of the errors computed from 5,000 simulated measurements. (d) Log-log plots of the numerically computed \sup_{θ} MSE for various estimators versus L , compared with the BCRBs given by Eqs. (2) and (3). The lines connecting the data points are guides for eyes.

4. Conclusion

I have presented new limits to the resolution of two incoherent sources from the minimax perspective. These limits are valid for any biased or unbiased estimator, closing a crucial loophole of previous work based on the CRB, while the analytic and numerical results presented here suggest that the limits can have attainable photon-number scalings. The different scalings prove that SPADE can significantly outperform direct imaging for sufficiently high photon numbers. This conclusion is consistent with our earlier claims based on the CRB [19], which is meaningful mainly in terms of asymptotics [12, 37, 38]. Beyond two sources, the BCRB can also be applied to more general imaging scenarios [5–9, 11, 28, 39]; it implies that the Fisher information remains a relevant precision measure even if biased estimators are allowed. As the minimax approach also underpins the theory of compressed sensing [10], which has recently gained popularity not least in superresolution microscopy [11], the approach advocated here can provide a bridge between the vast literature on the CRB [2–8] and the modern minimax statistics literature.

I have focused on the BCRB, but there are in fact more advanced Bayesian bounds, such as the Ziv-Zakai family and the Weiss-Weinstein family [40], that can be much tighter for certain problems. Quantum versions of such bounds have also been proposed [41–52]. Given the need to deal with biased estimators and include prior information in modern statistics, the Bayesian bounds are envisioned to play a more prominent role in future classical and quantum imaging applications.

Acknowledgements

Discussions with Ranjith Nair, Xiao-Ming Lu, Shan Zheng Ang, Shilin Ng, Edwin Tham, Hugo Ferretti, Aephraim Steinberg, Jaroslav Rehacek, and Zdenek Hradil are gratefully acknowledged. This work is supported by the Singapore National Research Foundation under NRF Grant No. NRF-NRFF2011-07 and the Singapore Ministry of Education Academic Research Fund Tier 1 Project R-263-000-C06-112.

References

- (1) Van Trees, H.L. *Detection, Estimation, and Modulation Theory, Part I*; John Wiley & Sons: New York, 2001.
- (2) Farrell, E.J. Information Content of Photoelectric Star Images, *Journal of the Optical Society of America* **1966**, *56* (5), 578–587. <http://www.osapublishing.org/abstract.cfm?uri=josa-56-5-578>.
- (3) Helstrom, C.W. Estimation of Object Parameters by a Quantum-Limited Optical System, *J. Opt. Soc. Am.* **1970**, *60* (2), 233–239. <http://doi.org/10.1364/JOSA.60.000233>.
- (4) Zmuidzinas, J. Cramér–Rao sensitivity limits for astronomical instruments: implications for interferometer design, *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A* **2003**, *20* (2), 218–233. <http://josaa.osa.org/abstract.cfm?URI=josaa-20-2-218>.
- (5) Deschout, H.; Zanicchi, F.C.; Mlodzianoski, M.; Diaspro, A.; Bewersdorf, J.; Hess, S.T.; Braeckmans, K. Precisely and accurately localizing single emitters in fluorescence microscopy, *Nature Methods* **2014**, *11* (3), 253–266. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.2843>.
- (6) Small, A.; Stahlheber, S. Fluorophore localization algorithms for super-resolution mi-

- croscopy, *Nature Methods* **2014**, *11* (3), 267–279. <http://www.nature.com/nmeth/journal/v11/n3/abs/nmeth.2844.html>.
- (7) Chao, J.; Sally Ward, E.; Ober, R.J. Fisher information theory for parameter estimation in single molecule microscopy: tutorial, *Journal of the Optical Society of America A* **2016**, *33* (7), B36. <https://www.osapublishing.org/abstract.cfm?URI=josaa-33-7-B36>.
 - (8) von Diezmann, A.; Shechtman, Y.; Moerner, W.E. Three-Dimensional Localization of Single Molecules for Super-Resolution Imaging and Single-Particle Tracking, *Chemical Reviews* **2017**. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/acs.chemrev.6b00629>.
 - (9) Huang, F.; Schwartz, S.L.; Byars, J.M.; Lidke, K.A. Simultaneous multiple-emitter fitting for single molecule super-resolution imaging, *Biomedical Optics Express* **2011**, *2* (5), 1377–1393. <http://www.osapublishing.org/abstract.cfm?uri=boe-2-5-1377>.
 - (10) Candès, E.J. Modern statistical estimation via oracle inequalities, *Acta Numerica* **2006**, *15*, 257–325. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0962492906230010>.
 - (11) Zhu, L.; Zhang, W.; Elnatan, D.; Huang, B. Faster STORM using compressed sensing, *Nature Methods* **2012**, *9* (7), 721–723. <http://www.nature.com/nmeth/journal/v9/n7/full/nmeth.1978.html>.
 - (12) Cox, D.R.; Hinkley, D.V. *Theoretical Statistics*; Chapman & Hall/CRC: Boca Raton, 1979.
 - (13) Romano, J.P.; Siegel, A.F. *Counterexamples in Probability And Statistics*; Chapman and Hall/CRC: New York, 1986.
 - (14) Jaynes, E.T. *Probability Theory: The Logic of Science*; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2003.
 - (15) MacEachern, S.; Stasny, E.A. An Easy Ridiculous Unbiased Estimator, *Teaching Statistics* **1993**, *15* (1), 12–14. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-9639.1993.tb00248.x/abstract>.
 - (16) Bettens, E.; Van Dyck, D.; den Dekker, A.J.; Sijbers, J.; van den Bos, A. Model-based two-object resolution from observations having counting statistics, *Ultramicroscopy* **1999**, *77* (12), 37–48. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304399199000066>.
 - (17) Van Aert, S.; den Dekker, A.J.; Van Dyck, D.; van den Bos, A. High-resolution electron microscopy and electron tomography: resolution versus precision, *Journal of Structural Biology* **2002**, *138* (12), 21–33. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1047847702000163>.
 - (18) Ram, S.; Ward, E.S.; Ober, R.J. Beyond Rayleigh’s criterion: A resolution measure with application to single-molecule microscopy, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **2006**, *103* (12), 4457–4462. <http://www.pnas.org/content/103/12/4457.abstract>.
 - (19) Tsang, M.; Nair, R.; Lu, X.M. Quantum Theory of Superresolution for Two Incoherent Optical Point Sources, *Physical Review X* **2016**, *6*, 031033. <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevX.6.031033>.
 - (20) Tsang, M.; Nair, R.; Lu, X.M. Quantum information for semiclassical optics, In *Proc. SPIE*, 2016; Quantum and Nonlinear Optics IV, Vol. 10029, p 1002903. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1117/12.2245733>.
 - (21) Nair, R.; Tsang, M. Interferometric superlocalization of two incoherent optical point sources, *Optics Express* **2016**, *24* (4), 3684–3701. <http://www.opticsexpress.org/abstract.cfm?URI=oe-24-4-3684>.
 - (22) Nair, R.; Tsang, M. Far-Field Superresolution of Thermal Electromagnetic Sources at the Quantum Limit, *Physical Review Letters* **2016**, *117* (19), 190801. <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.117.190801>.
 - (23) Ang, S.Z.; Nair, R.; Tsang, M. Quantum limit for two-dimensional resolution of two incoherent optical point sources, *arXiv:1606.00603 [physics, physics:quant-ph]* **2016**. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1606.00603>.
 - (24) Tang, Z.S.; Durak, K.; Ling, A. Fault-tolerant and finite-error localization for point emitters within the diffraction limit, *Optics Express* **2016**, *24* (19), 22004. <https://doi.org/10.1364/OE.24.022004>.

- [//www.osapublishing.org/abstract.cfm?URI=oe-24-19-22004](http://www.osapublishing.org/abstract.cfm?URI=oe-24-19-22004).
- (25) Yang, F.; Tashchilina, A.; Moiseev, E.S.; Simon, C.; Lvovsky, A.I. Far-field linear optical superresolution via heterodyne detection in a higher-order local oscillator mode, *Optica* **2016**, *3* (10), 1148. <https://www.osapublishing.org/abstract.cfm?URI=optica-3-10-1148>.
 - (26) Tham, W.K.; Ferretti, H.; Steinberg, A.M. Beating Rayleigh's Curse by Imaging Using Phase Information, *Physical Review Letters* **2017**, *118* (7), 070801. <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.118.070801>.
 - (27) Paúr, M.; Stoklasa, B.; Hradil, Z.; Sánchez-Soto, L.L.; Rehacek, J. Achieving the ultimate optical resolution, *Optica* **2016**, *3* (10), 1144. <https://www.osapublishing.org/abstract.cfm?URI=optica-3-10-1144>.
 - (28) Tsang, M. Subdiffraction incoherent optical imaging via spatial-mode demultiplexing, *New Journal of Physics* **2017**, *19* (2), 023054. <http://stacks.iop.org/1367-2630/19/i=2/a=023054>.
 - (29) Lu, X.M.; Nair, R.; Tsang, M. Quantum-optimal detection of one-versus-two incoherent sources with arbitrary separation, *arXiv:1609.03025 [quant-ph]* **2016**. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1609.03025>.
 - (30) Rehacek, J.; Paúr, M.; Stoklasa, B.; Hradil, Z.; Sánchez-Soto, L.L. Optimal measurements for resolution beyond the Rayleigh limit, *Optics Letters* **2017**, *42* (2), 231–234. <http://www.osapublishing.org/abstract.cfm?uri=ol-42-2-231>.
 - (31) Lupo, C.; Pirandola, S. Ultimate Precision Bound of Quantum and Subwavelength Imaging, *Physical Review Letters* **2016**, *117* (19), 190802. <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.117.190802>.
 - (32) Krovi, H.; Guha, S.; Shapiro, J.H. Attaining the quantum limit of passive imaging, *arXiv:1609.00684 [physics, physics:quant-ph]* **2016**. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1609.00684>.
 - (33) Kerviche, R.; Guha, S.; Ashok, A. Fundamental limit of resolving two point sources limited by an arbitrary point spread function, *arXiv:1701.04913 [physics, physics:quant-ph]* **2017**. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1701.04913>.
 - (34) Schützenberger, M.P. A generalization of the Fréchet-Cramér inequality to the case of Bayes estimation, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **1957**, *63*, 142. <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9904-1957-10102-5>.
 - (35) Kay, S.; Eldar, Y. Rethinking biased estimation [Lecture Notes], *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine* **2008**, *25* (3), 133–136. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2008.918027>.
 - (36) Berger, J.O. *Statistical Decision Theory and Bayesian Analysis*; Springer-Verlag: New York, 1985.
 - (37) Gill, R.D.; Levit, B.Y. Applications of the Van Trees Inequality: A Bayesian Cramér-Rao Bound, *Bernoulli* **1995**, *1* (1/2), 59–79. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3318681>.
 - (38) Hayashi, M., Ed. *Asymptotic Theory of Quantum Statistical Inference: Selected Papers*; World Scientific: Singapore, 2005.
 - (39) Schiebinger, G.; Robeva, E.; Recht, B. Superresolution without Separation, *arXiv:1506.03144 [cs, math]* **2015**. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1506.03144>.
 - (40) Van Trees, H.L., Bell, K.L., Eds. *Bayesian Bounds for Parameter Estimation and Non-linear Filtering/Tracking*; Wiley-IEEE: Piscataway, 2007.
 - (41) Yuen, H.P.; Lax, M. Multiple-parameter quantum estimation and measurement of non-selfadjoint observables, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **1973**, *19* (6), 740–750. <http://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.1973.1055103>.
 - (42) Gill, R.D.; Massar, S. State estimation for large ensembles, *Phys. Rev. A* **2000**, *61*, 042312. <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.61.042312>.
 - (43) Gill, R.D.; Guță, M.I. *On asymptotic quantum statistical inference*, Banerjee, M., Bunea, F., Huang, J., Koltchinskii, V., Maathuis, M.H., Eds.; Institute of Mathematical Statistics: Beachwood, Ohio, USA, 2013; Collections, Vol. 9, pp 105–127. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1214/12-IMSCOLL909>.
 - (44) Tsang, M.; Wiseman, H.M.; Caves, C.M. Fundamental Quantum Limit to Waveform

- Estimation, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **2011**, *106*, 090401. <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.106.090401>.
- (45) Tsang, M. Quantum metrology with open dynamical systems, *New Journal of Physics* **2013**, *15*, 073005. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/15/7/073005>.
 - (46) Nair, R. Fundamental limits on the accuracy of optical phase estimation from rate-distortion theory, *arXiv:1204.3761 [quant-ph]* **2012**. ArXiv: 1204.3761, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1204.3761>.
 - (47) Hall, M.J.W.; Wiseman, H.M. Does Nonlinear Metrology Offer Improved Resolution? Answers from Quantum Information Theory, *Phys. Rev. X* **2012**, *2*, 041006. <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevX.2.041006>.
 - (48) Tsang, M. Ziv-Zakai Error Bounds for Quantum Parameter Estimation, *Physical Review Letters* **2012**, *108* (23), 230401. <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.230401>.
 - (49) Berry, D.W.; Tsang, M.; Hall, M.J.W.; Wiseman, H.M. Quantum Bell-Ziv-Zakai Bounds and Heisenberg Limits for Waveform Estimation, *Phys. Rev. X* **2015**, *5*, 031018. <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevX.5.031018>.
 - (50) Tsang, M. Quantum limits to optical point-source localization, *Optica* **2015**, *2* (7), 646–653. <http://www.osapublishing.org/optica/abstract.cfm?URI=optica-2-7-646>.
 - (51) Lu, X.M.; Tsang, M. Quantum Weiss-Weinstein bounds for quantum metrology, *Quantum Science and Technology* **2016**, *1* (1), 015002. <http://stacks.iop.org/2058-9565/1/i=1/a=015002>.
 - (52) Liu, J.; Yuan, H. Valid lower bound for all estimators in quantum parameter estimation, *New Journal of Physics* **2016**, *18* (9), 093009. <http://stacks.iop.org/1367-2630/18/i=9/a=093009>.
 - (53) Hayashi, M. *Quantum Information*; Springer: Berlin, 2006.
 - (54) Helstrom, C.W. *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory*; Academic Press: New York, 1976.
 - (55) Holevo, A.S. *Probabilistic and Statistical Aspects of Quantum Theory*; Edizioni della Normale: Pisa, Italy, 2011.

Appendix A. Cramér-Rao bound (CRB)

Let the probability distribution of the observation y be $P(y|\theta)$, which is assumed to be a function of the unknown scalar parameter θ ; generalization for vectoral parameters is straightforward [1]. The expectation \mathbb{E}_θ is defined with respect to $P(y|\theta)$ as $\mathbb{E}_\theta f(y) \equiv \sum_y P(y|\theta) f(y)$. Given the observation, an estimator $\hat{\theta}(y)$ can be computed to estimate the unknown parameter. Its performance can be quantified by the MSE defined by Eq. (1). For any unbiased estimator, which is defined by the condition

$$\mathbb{E}_\theta (\hat{\theta}) = \theta, \quad (\text{A1})$$

the CRB is

$$\text{MSE}(\theta) \geq \frac{1}{J(\theta)}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where

$$J(\theta) \equiv \mathbb{E}_\theta \left[\frac{\partial \ln P(y|\theta)}{\partial \theta} \right]^2 \quad (\text{A3})$$

is the Fisher information. In a quantum problem, the Fisher information is in turn upper-bounded by quantum versions of the Fisher information [53], which depend on the density operator of the quantum object being measured [53–55].

Figure A1 plots the Fisher information for the separation estimation problem with SPADE and direct imaging for a given photon number L [19]. The vertical axis is normalized with respect to the shot-noise limit $L/(4\sigma^2)$ and the horizontal axis is the true separation θ normalized with respect to the point-spread-function width σ . For large separations, both quantities approach the shot-noise limit, but the information $J^{(\text{direct})}(\theta)$ for direct imaging drops to zero for $\theta \lesssim \sigma$, a phenomenon discovered by Refs. [16–18] and called Rayleigh’s curse in our previous work [19]. The CRB $\text{MSE}^{(\text{direct})}(\theta) \geq 1/J^{(\text{direct})}(\theta)$ suggests that the error of any unbiased estimator must blow up for $\theta \rightarrow 0$, but it does not rule out the possibility that biased estimators can do better. Indeed, studies have found that the CRB for direct imaging can be violated for small θ [9, 26]. The Fisher information $J^{(\text{SPADE})}(\theta)$ for SPADE, meanwhile, remains constant and is given by

$$J^{(\text{SPADE})}(\theta) = \frac{L}{4\sigma^2}, \quad (\text{A4})$$

which also coincides with the quantum limit to the Fisher information for any measurement [19].




Figure A1. Fisher information for the estimation of the separation between two incoherent point sources with the SPADE measurement scheme ($J^{(\text{SPADE})}(\theta)$) and direct imaging ($J^{(\text{direct})}(\theta)$) versus normalized separation θ/σ , where σ is the width of the point-spread function and L is the detected photon number. The information is normalized with respect to the shot-noise limit $L/(4\sigma^2)$.

Appendix B. Bayesian Cramér-Rao bound (BCRB)

To investigate fundamental limits to the worst-case error of any estimator, one can take advantage of the fact that the error is always higher than the error averaged over

a prior probability density $p(\theta)$, viz.,

$$\sup_{\theta} \text{MSE}(\theta) \geq \int d\theta p(\theta) \text{MSE}(\theta) \equiv B[p]. \quad (\text{B1})$$

Lower bounds on $B[p]$ can then be used on the worst-case error. In particular, for any $p(\theta)$ that converges to zero at the endpoints of the interval of θ , the BCRB reads [1, 34, 37]

$$\sup_{\theta} \text{MSE}(\theta) \geq B[p] \geq \frac{1}{K[p]}, \quad (\text{B2})$$

$$K[p] \equiv \int d\theta p(\theta) J(\theta) + j[p], \quad (\text{B3})$$

$$j[p] \equiv \int d\theta p(\theta) \left[\frac{\partial \ln p(\theta)}{\partial \theta} \right]^2. \quad (\text{B4})$$

The BCRB is sometimes called the Van Trees inequality [37] but in fact first reported by Schützenberger in 1957 [34, 40]. The bound is appealing for two reasons: it is valid for any estimator, not just unbiased ones, and it depends on the Fisher information, a quantity that has been studied extensively for many applications. Quantum versions of the BCRB [41–45] follow naturally from quantum upper bounds on $J(\theta)$.

The BCRB on the worst-case error is valid for any $p(\theta)$ that satisfies the zero boundary conditions, meaning that one can choose a $p(\theta)$ that tightens the bound. A trick is to assume $p(\theta) = q^2(\theta)$, such that

$$K = \int d\theta \left\{ q^2(\theta) J(\theta) + 4 \left[\frac{dq(\theta)}{d\theta} \right]^2 \right\}, \quad (\text{B5})$$

and the minimizing solution, subject to the normalization condition $\int d\theta q^2(\theta) = 1$, obeys the Euler-Lagrange equation

$$\lambda q(\theta) = -4 \frac{d^2 q(\theta)}{d\theta^2} + J(\theta) q(\theta), \quad (\text{B6})$$

where λ is a Lagrange multiplier. As Eq. (B6) has the same form as the time-independent Schrödinger equation and Eq. (B5) has the form of the average energy of a wavefunction, computing the minimum $K[p]$ is equivalent to finding the ground-state energy in the wave problem, with $J(\theta)$ playing the role of the potential and the prior information $j[p]$ playing the role of the average kinetic energy.

Appendix C. Proof of Eqs. (2) and (3)

For SPADE, the constant Fisher information given by Eq. (A4) means that $\int d\theta p(\theta) J^{(\text{SPADE})}(\theta) = L/(4\sigma^2)$ for any prior, and I can choose an uninformative prior with $j[p] \rightarrow 0$ to obtain $\inf_p K^{(\text{SPADE})}[p] = L/(4\sigma^2)$, which gives Eq. (2) via the BCRB in Eq. (B2). A quantum Fisher information coincides with $J^{(\text{SPADE})}(\theta)$ [19] and mandates that $J(\theta) \leq J^{(\text{SPADE})}(\theta)$ for any quantum measurement [53], so the Bayesian

information for any measurement obeys $K[p] \leq K^{(\text{SPADE})}[p]$, and the right-hand side of Eq. (2) also serves as a fundamental quantum limit.

Deriving a tight bound on $\sup_{\theta} \text{MSE}^{(\text{direct})}(\theta)$ for direct imaging is more nontrivial. To simplify, note that, since $J^{(\text{direct})}(\theta) \propto L$, the optimal $p(\theta)$ should be highly concentrated near $\theta = 0$ for large L , in which case I can use a quadratic upper bound on $J^{(\text{direct})}(\theta)$ that is tight near $\theta = 0$ to approximate it [16], viz.,

$$J^{(\text{direct})}(\theta) \leq \frac{L\theta^2}{8\sigma^4}. \quad (\text{C1})$$

With this upper bound in place of $J^{(\text{direct})}(\theta)$ in Eq. (B6) and the boundary conditions $q(0) = q(\infty) = 0$, it is well known that the solutions of Eq. (B6) are odd-order Hermite-Gaussian functions. Taking the lowest order, the result for $p(\theta) = q^2(\theta)$ is

$$p(\theta) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{\theta^2}{w^3} \exp\left(-\frac{\theta^2}{2w^2}\right), \quad w^2 = \sigma^2 \sqrt{\frac{8}{L}}. \quad (\text{C2})$$

Substituting Eqs. (C1) and (C2) into Eq. (B3) yields

$$K^{(\text{direct})}[p] \leq \frac{3Lw^2}{8\sigma^4} + \frac{3}{w^2} = \frac{3\sqrt{L}}{\sqrt{2}\sigma^2}, \quad (\text{C3})$$

resulting in Eq. (3) by virtue of the BCRB in Eq. (B2). Alternatively, the same result can be obtained by assuming the prior to be Eq. (C2) with a free hyperparameter w and then choosing the w that gives the tightest bound.

Appendix D. Proof of Eq. (4)

Ref. [19] shows that the ML estimator for SPADE can be expressed as

$$\check{\theta}^{(\text{SPADE, ML})} = 4\sigma \sqrt{\frac{Y}{L}}, \quad (\text{D1})$$

where Y is a Poisson statistic summarizing the measurement outcomes, with a mean given by

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta}(Y) = \frac{L\theta^2}{16\sigma^2}. \quad (\text{D2})$$

The error becomes

$$\text{MSE}^{(\text{SPADE, ML})}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\theta} \left(\check{\theta}^{(\text{SPADE, ML})} - \theta \right)^2 \quad (\text{D3})$$

$$= 2\theta \left[\theta - \frac{4\sigma}{\sqrt{L}} \mathbb{E}_{\theta} \left(\sqrt{Y} \right) \right]. \quad (\text{D4})$$

Using the inequality

$$\sqrt{X} \geq 1 + \frac{1}{2}(X-1) - \frac{1}{2}(X-1)^2 \text{ for } X \geq 0, \quad (\text{D5})$$

which follows from $(\sqrt{X}-1)^2(\sqrt{X}+2)\sqrt{X}/2 \geq 0$, setting $X = Y/\mathbb{E}_\theta(Y)$ in Eq. (D5), and taking the expectation on both sides, I obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_\theta(\sqrt{Y}) \geq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_\theta(Y)} - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_\theta(Y)}}. \quad (\text{D6})$$

Combining this inequality with Eqs. (D2) and (D4) leads to Eq. (4).

Appendix E. Modified maximum-likelihood (ML) estimator

The vanishing error at $\theta = 0$ in Fig. 1(a) implies that the ML estimator is heavily biased towards that value. This suggests that the worst-case error, which happens at larger θ , can be improved by introducing a more positive bias. As discovered empirically, an improvement can be obtained simply by setting the ML estimator for $Y = 0$ to $2\sigma/\sqrt{L}$ rather than 0. In other words,

$$\check{\theta} = \begin{cases} 2\sigma/\sqrt{L}, & Y = 0, \\ 4\sigma\sqrt{Y/L}, & Y \neq 0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{E1})$$

Figures 1(b) and (d) plot the simulated errors of this estimator, demonstrating a noticeable improvement over the ML estimator.