Robustifying Twist-and-Turn Entanglement with Interaction-Based Readout
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The use of multi-particle entangled states has the potential to drastically increase the sensitivity of atom interferometers and atomic clocks. The twist-and-turn (TNT) Hamiltonian can create multi-particle entanglement much more rapidly than the ubiquitous one-axis twisting (OAT) Hamiltonian in the same spin system. In this paper, we consider the effects of detection noise - a key limitation in current experiments - on the metrological usefulness of nonclassical states generated under TNT dynamics. We also consider a variety of interaction-based readouts to maximize their performance. Interestingly, the optimum interaction-based readout is not the obvious case of perfect time reversal.

I. INTRODUCTION

There is currently considerable interest in methods that can produce highly entangled states of atomic ensembles with the motivation of enhancing the sensitivity of atom interferometers and atomic clocks [1]. Without many-body entanglement, the phase sensitivity of such experiments is fundamentally shot-noise-limited (SNL) \[ \Delta \phi = 1/\sqrt{N} \] [2, 3]. In recent years, experiments in atomic systems based on the one-axis twisting (OAT) spin squeezing scheme of Kitagawa and Ueda [4, 5] have demonstrated metrologically useful spin-squeezing [6, 7], and sub-shot-noise phase detection [8–10]. However, typical experiments are limited to only moderate quantum enhancement due to constraints on the state preparation stage, where the quantum Fisher information (QFI, denoted \( F_Q \)) of the (typically un-entangled) initial state \( |\psi_0\rangle \) is increased via the unitary operator \( U_1 \). The QFI bounds the precision of an estimate via the quantum Cramér-Rao bound (QCRB), which states \( \Delta \phi \geq 1/\sqrt{F_Q} \). The classical parameter to be estimated \( \phi \) is then encoded onto the state via a measurement device (for example, a Mach-Zehnder interferometer) described by the unitary operator \( U_\phi \). The interaction-based read-out is then implemented by applying another unitary operator \( U_2 \) directly before the final measurement, such that the final state is

\[ |\psi\rangle = U_2 U_\phi U_1 |\psi_0\rangle. \] (1)

\( U_2 \) does not alter the QFI, but can affect the classical Fisher information (CFI, denoted \( F_c \)) when a measurement is made in a particular basis. Specifically, it has been shown that protocols which perfectly time reverse the initial unitary operator \( U_2 = U_1^\dagger \), which we refer to as an echo, followed by a measurement that projects onto the initial state, saturates the QCRB [22], indicating the measurement is optimal. It has also been shown that using \( U_2 = U_1^\dagger \) can improve robustness against detection noise [23, 24]. However, in [25] it was shown that when a measurement that resolves the probability of all results in a particular basis is made, there are many choices of \( U_2 \) (including the trivial choice \( U_2 = 1 \)) that saturate the QCRB. Furthermore, in many circumstances, there are choices for \( U_2 \) that provide greater robustness than \( U_2 = U_1^\dagger \). In this paper we investigate how interaction-based readouts improve robustness specifically for the case where the state preparation \( (U_1) \) and interaction based read-out \( (U_2) \) are based on the TNT interaction.
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II. INTERACTION-BASED READOUT PROTOCOL

Let us consider an ensemble of $N$ two-level atoms which are prepared in initial state $|\psi_0\rangle$. The interaction-based readout protocol includes the following four steps:

i State preparation: This increases the QFI of the initial state via unitary evolution $U_1$ as $\rho = U_1|\psi_0\rangle \langle \psi_0| U_1^\dagger$. In particular, we use the TNT Hamiltonian for this purpose [defined in the next Section, Eq. 3].

ii Phase encoding: An unknown phase is encoded into the state by performing linear unitary evolution $U_1$ of $\phi = e^{-i\phi \hat{S}_n}$ on the system such that $U_1^\dagger \rho U_1 = |\psi_0\rangle \langle \psi_0| U_1^\dagger$. This process corresponds to making a rotation around an arbitrary spin direction $\vec{n}$.

iii Interaction-based readout: A second entangling evolution $U_2$ is applied onto the state as $U_2 U_{\phi} \rho U_{\phi}^\dagger U_2^\dagger$. Echo protocols refer to the special case of perfect time reversal $U_2 = U_1^\dagger$. Under certain conditions, which we demonstrate below, $U_2$ allows measurements made in the appropriate basis to saturate the QCRB.

iv Spin-resolving measurement: A spin-resolving measurement projects on to some complete orthogonal basis $\{|m\rangle\}$. This is equivalent to estimating the full probability distribution $P_m(\phi) = \langle m|U_2 U_{\phi} \rho U_{\phi}^\dagger U_2^\dagger|m\rangle$.

Consequently, the phase $\phi$ can be estimated by examining the probabilities $P_m(\phi)$. Based on parameter estimation theory, the precision of the estimate is bounded by $\Delta \phi^2 = 1/F_c(\phi)$ where

$$F_c(\phi) = \sum_m \frac{1}{P_m(\phi)} \left( \frac{\partial P_m(\phi)}{\partial \phi} \right)^2$$

the classical Fisher information (CFI). For single-variate parameter estimation, it can be shown that a measurement basis yielding $F_c = F_Q$ is guaranteed to exist [31, 32]. This measurement is optimal - the measurement saturates QCRB, which is the ultimate sensitivity limit imposed by $\rho$. As was shown in [26], the conditions that $U_2$ and the measurement basis $\{|m\rangle\}$ saturate the QCRB are (see Appendix A for a more detailed proof):

1. The initial state is the parity eigenstate in the measurement basis $\{|m\rangle\}$; i.e. $\hat{\Pi} \rho = (-1)^p \rho$ where, $p = 0, 1$ for $\hat{\Pi} = \sum_m (-1)^m |m\rangle \langle m|$. 

2. The generator $\hat{S}_n$ flips the parity; i.e. $\hat{\Pi} \hat{S}_n \hat{\Pi} = -\hat{S}_n$.

3. The interaction-based readout $U_2$ conserves the parity with respect to the measurement basis, $[U_2, \hat{\Pi}] = 0$.

Thus, it is always possible to saturate the QCRB conditioned on suitable choices of measurement basis, readout and phase generator. The conditions (1,2) can be used to determine the optimal measurement basis, which is typically easily accessible. Note that even for the trivial case of readout (ie, $U_2 = 1$), so long as the conditions (1,2) hold, the sensitivity saturates the QCRB [31]. Nevertheless, a non-trivial choice of $U_2$ (ie, $U_2 \neq 1$) often increases the robustness against detection noise. In this spirit, we are allowed to pick the best readout strategy which satisfies the parity conservation requirement (the third condition).

In the following Section, we consider the TNT Hamiltonian and demonstrate that the conditions for saturating the QCRB are satisfied.

III. TWIST-AND-TURN INTERFEROMETRY

We consider the TNT Hamiltonian [15, 17]

$$H_{TNT} = \hbar \hat{S}_z^2 - \hbar J \hat{S}_x$$

such that $U_1 = \exp(-it_1 H_{TNT}/\hbar)$, where the adjustable parameter $t_1$ is the state preparation time. Here, the collective spin operators obey the usual SU(2) commutation relations: $[\hat{S}_i, \hat{S}_j] = i\epsilon_{ijk} \hat{S}_k$ where $\epsilon_{ijk}$ is the Levi-Civita symbol. Moreover, $\chi$ and $J$ denote the magnitude of the spin-spin interaction and the rate of rotation about the $\hat{S}_x$ axis, respectively. One can alter the macroscopic properties of the system by adjusting the parameter $\Lambda = N \chi / \hbar$ [36, 37], where $N$ is the total number of particles. Specifically, it has been shown that $\Lambda = 2$, corresponding to maximal criticality of the unstable fixed point in mean-field approximation, provides the maximum rate of entanglement generation [15, 18]. In the limit of $\chi \gg J$ the TNT Hamiltonian reduces to the well-known one-axis-twisting form $H_{OAT} = \hbar S_z^2$.

The TNT Hamiltonian can accelerate the rate of entanglement generation compared to the OAT Hamiltonian for the same $\chi t_1$ [17]. This is the direct consequence of interplay between twist ($\propto S_z^2$) and turn ($\propto \hat{S}_x$) terms of the Hamiltonian. The generation of spin-squeezing under TNT dynamics has been investigated theoretically [15, 18, 38] and realized experimentally in atomic Bose-Einstein condensates [16, 17] and cold atomic ensembles [39].

Figure 4 shows the time evolution of the $SU(2)$ Husimi Q-function [35, 40], and the QFI under TNT dynamics. The QFI is defined as $F_Q = 4\Delta S_z^2$, where $\Delta S_z$ is the collective spin operator pointing in the direction that maximises the QFI [41]. However, the QFI is silent on what measurement choice saturates the QCRB. If the $\phi$ estimate is obtained from the mean spin component $\langle \hat{S}_n \rangle$, the error propagation formula gives

$$\Delta \phi^2 = \Delta S_z^2 / \partial_\phi \langle \hat{S}_n \rangle = \xi^2 / N, \quad \xi^2 = N \Delta S_z^2 / \langle \hat{S}_n \rangle^2$$

is the spin-squeezing parameter normal to mean spin direction $\hat{S}_n$ [42]. For small values of $\chi t_1$, this method of
The metrological gain can exceed that of spin-squeezed states when the state becomes non-Gaussian. Non-Gaussian estimation is very close to the QCRB, but breaks down when the state becomes non-Gaussian. Non-Gaussian states with $F_Q > N$ are called entangled non-Gaussian states (ENGS), and an analysis of their CFI reveals their metrological gain can exceed that of spin-squeezed states.

We now consider the requirements for performing a measurement that saturates the QCRB with a state generated via TNT dynamics. Assuming the initial state is an eigenstate of $\hat{S}_x$, then $H_{\text{TNT}}$ couples only to $\hat{S}_x$ eigenstates of the same parity. That is, $U_1$ conserves parity with respect to the $\hat{S}_x$ eigenbasis $\{|m\rangle_x\}$. Subsequently, we align the interferometer along the optimal $F_Q$ direction such that $U_\phi = \exp(i\hat{S}_n \phi)$. It has been shown that this operator is in the $y-z$ plane, ie, $\hat{S}_n = \alpha \hat{S}_y + \beta \hat{S}_z$ normal to the mean spin direction $\hat{S}_x$. Since the generator of the interferometer $\hat{S}_n$ flips the parity (ie, $\hat{\Pi} \hat{S}_n \hat{\Pi} = -\hat{S}_n$, for $\hat{\Pi} = \sum_m |m\rangle_x (m|_x)$, we see that a measurement that projects into the $\hat{S}_x$ eigenbasis will saturate the QCRB. This is applicable to all readouts that conserve parity with respect to $\hat{S}_x$ (see Appendix B for details).

In realistic situations however, there is detection noise which limits the estimation sensitivity. Both spin-squeezed states and ENGS are more sensitive to detection noise than un-entangled states of the same size, and ENGS typically demand detection noise at the single-atom level. Since the generator of the interferometer $\hat{S}_n$ couples only to $\hat{S}_x$ eigenstates of the same parity, there is a finite chance that the detector will read $S_x = N/2$ for a maximal $\hat{S}_x$ eigenstate. However, if there is noise introduced, there is a finite chance that the detector will read $S_x = m \neq N/2$. To model detection noise we follow and take the convolution of the probability distribution with a Gaussian distribution with detection noise $\sigma$.

$$\hat{P}_m(\phi) = \sum_{m'} C_{m'}(\sigma) \exp \left[-(m-m')^2/2\sigma^2 \right] P_{m'}(\phi).$$  

(4)
We note that this is equivalent to introducing the normalisation factor,

$$C_{m'}(\sigma) = \left( \sum_m \exp\left[-(m - m')^2/2\sigma^2\right]\right)^{-1}. \quad (5)$$

We note that this is equivalent to introducing the positive-operator-valued measurement (POVM) $\{\hat{M}_m\}$

$$\{\hat{M}_m\} = \{|m\rangle\langle m|\}$$

$$= \sum_{m'} C_{m'}(\sigma)e^{-(m - m')^2/2\sigma^2}|m'\rangle\langle m'|. \quad (6)$$

such that the probability distribution of making measurements on the noisy POVMs is given by

$$\hat{P}_m(\phi) = \text{Tr}(\hat{M}_mU_2U_\delta\rho U_{1\phi}^\dagger U_2^\dagger).$$

Note that in the limit of negligible detection noise ($\sigma \to 0$) the POVMs approach the orthogonal basis (Section II). In Figure (2b) we show the CFI calculated from this convolved probability distribution $\hat{P}_m$ for the state $U_2U_1|\psi_0\rangle$, for different values of $\sigma$. For $\sigma \lesssim 0.1$, our measurement saturates the QCRB. However, for moderate values of $\chi_t$, a small increase in detection noise significantly degrades the sensitivity. Fortunately, by adding an interaction-based readout such that the final state is $U_2U_3U_1|\psi_0\rangle$, with $U_2 = U_1^\dagger$, the sensitivity is much more robust to the presence of noise [Figure (2b)].

We can understand why the interaction-based echo makes the system so much more robust by looking at the $Q$-function and the probability distributions. Figure (3) shows the $Q$-functions and $S_x$ probability distribution for states with $\phi = 0$ and a small phase shift $\delta \phi$, for the case with $(U_2 = U_1^\dagger)$ and without $(U_2 = 1)$ an interaction-based readout. In the absence of detection noise, the fidelity between the state with $\phi = 0$ and $\delta \phi$ is identical with and without the interaction-based readout. Similarly, the Hellinger distance between the distributions is also identical. The Hellinger distance defines a statistical distance between $P_m(\phi_1)$ and $P_m(\phi_2)$, defined as $d_H^2(\phi_1, \phi_2) = 1 - \sum_m \sqrt{P_m(\phi_1)P_m(\phi_2)}$. Adding detection noise, it becomes difficult to distinguish the distributions when $U_2 = 1$. Compare this to $U_2 = U_1^\dagger$, and the two distributions are more easily distinguished. Quantitatively, without the interaction-based readout, the Hellinger distance is $d_H^2 = 0.01$, but when we include the readout it is significantly larger: $d_H^2 = 0.17$ (compared to $d_H^2 = 0.40$ in both cases when no noise is included). However, there is no guarantee that $U_2 = U_1^\dagger$ is the best choice of interaction-based readout. In the next section, we examine several possibilities to determine what is the best choice for maximising robustness in TNT squeezing.
IV. ROBUSTIFYING ENTANGLEMENT AGAINST DETECTION NOISE

We now examine the robustness to detection noise, for a different choices of $U_2$, all satisfying the conditions for optimality. In particular, we chose the trivial case of no interaction-based readout ($U_2 = 1$), and the simple time-reversal read-out ($U_2 = U^\dagger_1(t_2)$). The latter choice includes asymmetric echo where $t_2 \neq t_1$, which implies $U_2 \neq U^\dagger_1$. In this case, we have increased the interaction time for the read-out compared to the state preparation step. Moreover, We also include $U_2 = U_1$, which may be applicable in the case when it is not easy to reverse the sign of the interaction constant $\chi$, such as when one is working with bright-solitons [48], or enhanced nonlinear interactions due to state-dependent potentials [9].

Figure 4 shows $F_c$ as a function of detection noise for different choices of $U_2$ when $\chi t_1 = 0.027$ (when the metrological gain using the spin squeezing parameter is maximum) and 0.072 (when the QFI is maximum). For the case of weak entanglement ($\chi t_1 = 0.027$), we see that the trivial case ($U_2 = 1$) is degraded to below shot-noise levels for noise of approximately $\sigma \approx 4.40$. However, by adding the ‘echo’ unitary ($U_2 = U^\dagger_1$), sub-shot-noise sensitivities are retained up to $\sigma \approx 16.45$. Interestingly the choice $U_2 \neq U^\dagger_1$ provides greater robustness again, with sub-shot-noise sensitivities with up to $\sigma = 39.17$, which is significantly greater than $\sqrt{N}$. For this value of $\chi t_1$, $U_2 = U_1$ provides no advantage compared to the trivial case. However, for the case of maximum QFI ($\chi t = 0.072$), this choice does provide some additional robustness compared to the trivial case. The asymmetric echo provides the greatest robustness of the schemes considered, and therefore may be useful when there is unavoidably large detection noise. To obtain $F_c$, we have numerically optimised the measurement basis in the planes normal to $S_x$ and $S_\phi$. Based on our numerical calculations, it seems that by increasing the detection noise, the optimal measurement basis moves into the normal plane to $S_x$.

We now more closely examine the effect of an asymmetric echo on the TNT scheme. In Figure 5 we have changed the time duration of the echo $t_2/t_1$ for fixed detection noises $\sigma = 0.1, 5.0$ when the TNT Hamiltonian produces the maximum value of spin squeezing ($t_1 = 0.027$) or maximum value of quantum Fisher information ($t_1 = 0.072$) respectively. For small values of detection noise $\sigma = 0.1$, $U_2$ does not affect the classical Fisher information. In this case, as mentioned before, $F_c$ saturates the QCRB. In contrast, for more noise ($\sigma = 5.0$) we see that in the Gaussian regime ($t_1 = 0.027$), by increasing the duration of the echo ($t_2/t_1$) the sensitivity becomes more robust against detection noise and eventually approaches the QCRB value for large enough $t_2$. Compare this to the non-Gaussian regime ($t_1 = 0.072$), where there is a clear optimum readout time of roughly $t_2/t_1 \approx 1.5$. Recently, similar behaviour has been reported in two-axis-counter-twisted interaction-based readout scheme [28].

In a realistic spin-squeezing set-up, the duration of the experiment may be limited by the particle losses as well as dephasing [11, 12] and multi-mode dynamics [13, 14]. Therefore, it is important to consider the optimal portion of time for entangling ($U_1$) and re-entangling ($U_2$) sequences, as there is a trade-off between the desire to maximise the QFI via the state preparation operation $U_1(t_1)$, and robustifying against detection noise via the interaction-based readout operation $U_2(t_2)$, while keeping the total time fixed $T = t_1 + t_2$. In Figure 6 we have given the optimized Fisher information versus entangling unitary time for total experimental duration $T = 0.1$ with $N = 100$ and $\Lambda = 2$ and time reversal echo case $U_2 = U^\dagger_1$. When the detection noise is small ($\sigma = 0.1$), there is little benefit in increasing $t_2$ and the optimum strategy is to choose $U_2 = 1$. However this is certainly not true for large detection noise, as devoting more time
to the entangling operation compromises the interaction-based readout. Therefore, to maximise the CFI there is a balance to be found between twisting the initial state for longer (increasing $t_1$) and robustifying the state (increasing $t_2$). For larger values of detection noise ($\sigma = 1.0$, 5.0) we see that the optimal strategy is close to an echo ($t_1 \approx T/2 = 0.050$). The reason is that when we devote less than half of the time to the TNT entangling operation, there is always a possibility to perform an echo with $t_2/t_1 \geq 1$. Thus, the decrease in $F_c$ as a result of reducing the first TNT unitary is compensated for by increased robustness provided by the second unitary. For instance, Figure 5 gives the typical behaviour of the asymmetric echo within this region, which approaches to the QCRB as $t_2/t_1$ increases beyond 1. On the other hand, by increasing the portion of the entangling duration more than $T/2$, the echo time ratio $t_2/t_1$ decreases below unity, and is far more susceptible to detection noise.

V. CONCLUSION

Many-body entangled states are a crucial resources for quantum-enhanced metrology. Current experiments are working to devise schemes that are able to rapidly manufacture these states in large atomic ensembles, but detection noise is currently a key limitation [1]. The TNT interaction is capable of generating entanglement faster than the conventional one-axis-twisting interaction. TNT is capable of rapidly producing both spin-squeezed states and ENGS. In this work we explore the use of interaction-based readout protocols to provide rapid quantum-enhanced metrology based on twist-and-turn dynamics, which is also robust to detection noise and optimally utilises the state’s entanglement. This is done with a spin-resolving measurement in the optimal basis, which we provide criteria for determining. In this regard, we have confirmed the usefulness of standard symmetric echo protocols in boosting the measurement performance against noise. However, our results imply that for weakly entangled initial states, using an asymmetric echo provides better robustness than the symmetric case. Finally, we have considered TNT echo protocols in realistic situation where there is a limitation on the total time allowed for both the initial interaction and the readout. We have shown that the best outcomes require balance between entangling and re-entangling time durations. When detection noise is small, any readout is sub-optimal. In presence of considerable noise, the optimal strategy is close to an echo, but the precise time trade-off depends on the magnitude of detection noise present in the system.
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Appendix A: The conditions of QCRB saturation

Here, we present our conditions for saturation of QCRB (Section 2) when applying spin-resolving measurement [20].

To begin, let’s ignore the re-entangling readout operator, and consider only $U_2 = 1$. After the state preparation and phase encoding steps, the probability of estimating the small, unknown phase $\phi$ is given by $P_m(\phi) = \langle m | U_\phi \rho U_\phi^\dagger | m \rangle$ with $U_\phi = e^{-iS_n \phi}$. Our phase estimation is limited by the CFI. For small values of $\phi$ the CFI can be approximated as the leading term in the expansion of the Hellinger statistical distance in the space of probability distributions [10].

$$d_H^2(0, \phi) = 1 - \sum_m \sqrt{P_m(0) P_m(\phi)} = F_c(0) \phi^2 / 8 + O(\phi^3) \quad (A1)$$

For small $\phi$, Taylor expanding the probability amplitude gives

$$P_m(\phi) = P_m(0) + \frac{\partial P_m(\phi)}{\partial \phi} \bigg|_{\phi=0} \phi + \frac{\partial^2 P_m(\phi)}{\partial \phi^2} \bigg|_{\phi=0} \frac{\phi^2}{2} + O(\phi^3). \quad (A2)$$

We have

$$P_m(\phi) = \langle m | U_\phi \rho U_\phi^\dagger | m \rangle,$$
$$\frac{\partial P_m(\phi)}{\partial \phi} = i \langle m | \dot{S}_n U_\phi \rho U_\phi^\dagger | m \rangle + c.c.$$
$$\frac{\partial^2 P_m(\phi)}{\partial \phi^2} = \langle m | \dot{S}_n U_\phi \rho U_\phi^\dagger \dot{S}_n | m \rangle - \langle m | \ddot{S}_n U_\phi \rho U_\phi^\dagger | m \rangle + c.c. \quad (A3)$$

which leads to

$$P_m(0) = \langle m | \rho | m \rangle,$$
$$\frac{\partial P_m(\phi)}{\partial \phi} \bigg|_{\phi=0} = i \langle m | \dot{S}_n \rho | m \rangle + c.c.$$
$$\frac{\partial^2 P_m(\phi)}{\partial \phi^2} \bigg|_{\phi=0} = \langle m | \ddot{S}_n \rho | m \rangle - \langle m | \dddot{S}_n \rho | m \rangle + c.c. \quad (A4)$$

Now, suppose that the density operator is an eigenstate of the parity operator $\hat{\Pi} = \sum_m (-1)^m | m \rangle \langle m |$ such that $\hat{\Pi} \rho = (-1)^p \rho$ for $p = 0, 1$. Also, let $\hat{\Pi} \hat{S}_n \hat{\Pi} = -\hat{S}_n$ (Section 11). Under these two conditions,

$$\langle m | \rho | m \rangle = (-1)^{m+p} \langle m | \rho | m \rangle,$$
$$\langle m | \ddot{S}_n | m \rangle = 0,$$
$$\langle m | \dddot{S}_n \rho \hat{S}_n | m \rangle = (-1)^{m+p+1} \langle m | \dddot{S}_n \rho \hat{S}_n | m \rangle, \quad (A5)$$

which also yields

$$P_m(0) \langle \dddot{S}_n \rho \hat{S}_n | m \rangle = 0, \quad (A6)$$

as $P_m(0) = 0$ if $m + p$ is odd, and $\langle m | \dddot{S}_n \rho \hat{S}_n | m \rangle = 0$ if $m + p$ is even. After using $[A2]$ and $[A6]$ in $[A1]$ followed by a binomial expansion of square root for small $\phi$, we obtain

$$d_H^2(\phi) = \sum_m \langle m | \dddot{S}_n^2 \rho | m \rangle / 2 \quad (A7)$$

up to third order in $\phi$. Finally, as $\langle \dddot{S}_n | m \rangle = 0$ $[A5]$, up to third order in $\phi$ the Fisher information is

$$F_c(0) = 4 \sum_m \langle \dddot{S}_n^2 \rho | m \rangle$$
$$= 4 \Delta S_n^2$$
$$= F_Q \quad (A8)$$

where, $\Delta S_n^2$ is the variance of generator. The last equality appears since $F_c \leq F_Q \leq \Delta S_n^2$. Thus, the first two parity conditions (section 11) ensure the saturation of the QCRB. There is no need to use the re-entangling step to obtain this result. However, in order to robustify the scheme against noise, we include the readout operator $U_2$ after phase encoding which gives, $P_m(\phi) = \langle m | U_\phi U_\phi^\dagger U_\phi U_\phi^\dagger U_\phi U_\phi^\dagger \hat{S}_n | m \rangle$. This probability distribution has equivalent CFI when compared to the distribution $P_m(\phi) = \langle m | U_\phi U_\phi^\dagger | m \rangle$ if $[U_2, \hat{\Pi}] = 0$, i.e. the readout operator has the same parity as measurement basis $| m \rangle$ (condition 3 given in section 11).

Appendix B: Fulfillment of parity conditions for TNT scenario

The TNT Hamiltonian conserves parity, $[H_{\text{TNT}}, \hat{S}_z] = 0$ [44, 45]. Consequently by taking the initial state as $\hat{S}_z$ eigenstate, the first parity condition of section 11 is satisfied. Moreover, the parity symmetry leads to $\hat{\Pi}_x (\hat{S}_x, \hat{S}_y, \hat{S}_z) \hat{\Pi}_x = (\hat{S}_x, -\hat{S}_y, -\hat{S}_z)$. Considering the fact that optimal QFI is in the $y - z$ plane $[14, 15]$, $\hat{S}_n = \alpha \hat{S}_y + \beta \hat{S}_z$, one obtains $\hat{\Pi}_x \hat{S}_n \hat{\Pi}_x = -\hat{S}_n$ which demonstrates the second condition. To demonstrate the third condition, we again note that the re-entangling unitary conserves parity in the $\hat{S}_y$ eigenbasis. Of course, asymmetry in the entangling and re-entangling operations does not affect this result.
[34] Also, note that using $U_2$ does not change the QFI. This can be easily verified when using the equation \begin{equation} \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} \langle \psi \mid U \rangle \langle U \mid \psi \rangle \right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} \langle \psi \mid U \rangle \langle U \mid \psi \rangle. \end{equation}


[49] In order to numerically evaluate the optimal value of the CFI in the presence of detection noise, we have considered the optimization of the measurement basis in the planes normal to $S_n$ as well as $S_x$. 