Towards superresolution surface metrology: Quantum estimation of angular and axial separations
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We investigate localization of two incoherent point sources with arbitrary angular and axial separations in the paraxial approximation. By using quantum metrology techniques, we show that a simultaneous estimation of the two separations and of the two corresponding coordinates of the centroid is achievable by a single quantum measurement, with a precision saturating the ultimate limit stemming from the quantum Cramér-Rao bound. Such a precision is not degraded in the sub-wavelength regime, thus overcoming the traditional limitations of classical direct imaging derived from Rayleigh’s criterion. Our results are qualitatively independent of the point spread function of the imaging system, and quantitatively illustrated in detail for the Gaussian instance. This analysis may have relevant applications in three-dimensional surface measurements.

**Introduction.**— High-resolution imaging is a cornerstone of modern science and engineering, which has enabled revolutionary advances in astronomy, manufacturing, biochemistry, and medical diagnostics. In traditional direct imaging based on classical wave optics, two incoherent point sources with angular separation smaller than the wavelength of the emitted light cannot be resolved due to fundamental diffraction effects, a phenomenon recently dubbed “Rayleigh’s curse.” Several techniques, including most prominently fluorescence microscopy, have been introduced in recent years to overcome this limitation and achieve sub-wavelength imaging. Nevertheless, to determine the ultimate limits of optical resolution one needs to resort to a full quantum mechanical description of the imaging process. In this respect, a breakthrough has been reported in a series of works initiated by Tsang and collaborators to prove that the achievable error in estimating the angular separation of two incoherent point sources, in the paraxial approximation, is in fact independent of said separation (no matter how small), provided an optimal detection scheme is performed on the image plane. These results, which stem from the fundamental quantum Cramér-Rao bound and de facto banish Rayleigh’s curse, have been corroborated by proof-of-principle experiments.

The studies presented so far on quantum superlocalization, however, were limited to the case of point sources aligned on the same object plane, thus neglecting their axial separation. The optical lateral resolution of an imaging system is an important characteristic but its usefulness can be misleading when considering the measurement of non-flat surfaces. When probing surface topography, the spacing of the points in an image must be considered, along with the ability to accurately determine the heights of features. In other words, the lateral resolution must be considered in conjunction with the ability of the system to transfer surface amplitudes.

To address this issue, here we consider the simultaneous estimation of both angular and axial separations, as well as the corresponding centroid coordinates, of two incoherent point sources aligned in general on different object planes. These point sources may model, e.g., two emitters at the edges of a steep section on a rough surface, as indicated by the red dotted outline in Figure 1.

We tackle the problem by resorting to the toolbox of multiparameter quantum metrology, a branch of quantum technology which is attracting increasing interest thanks to its prominent role in fundamental science and applications. We find that Rayleigh’s curse does not occur even when the sources have a nonzero axial separation, and all four unknown parameters can be estimated simultaneously by means of a single optimal quantum measurement, meeting the compatibility requirements for saturation of the multiparameter quantum Cramér-Rao bound. These results are independent of the point spread function of the imaging system. We then specialize to the illustrative case of a Gaussian point spread function, and derive analytical formulas for the achievable estimation error and its scaling with the parameters of interest as determined by the quantum Fisher information matrix, showing that in the limit of small angular and axial distances all the parameters become statistically independent.

**Sources and imaging system model.**— We approach the problem of estimating both axial and angular separation of two point sources by following a similar approach to Ref. [2], which is in turn inspired by Rayleigh’s work. We assume that the detectable light on the image plane can be described...
as an incoherent mixture of two quasi-monochromatic scalar paraxial waves, one coming from each source. As shown in Figure 1, our two sources are in general not lying on the same object plane (an ‘object plane’ is a plane perpendicular to the optical axis Z), and they feature an angular separation s and an axial separation p.

Considering thermal sources at optical frequencies, we divide the total emission time into short coherence time intervals \(\tau_c\), so that within each interval the sources can be assumed weak, i.e., effectively emitting at most one photon. This is a standard approach for modelling incoherent thermal sources \([52,58]\), and it allows us to describe the quantum state \(\rho\), as a function of four parameters \(\{\lambda_\mu\}_{\mu=1,\ldots,4}\), where

\[
\rho = (1 - \varepsilon) \rho_0 + \varepsilon \rho_1 + o(\varepsilon^2),
\]

where \(\varepsilon \ll 1\) is the average number of photons impinging on the image plane. In practice, a detectable signal is obtained by measuring the optical field for a time \(t \gg \tau_c\), so that many coherence time intervals are included, resulting in a non-negligible mean photon number.

Inspired by the expression for the electric field amplitude of a Gaussian beam \([60]\), we assume that the image-plane field amplitude generated by each source takes the form

\[
\Psi_\mu(x) \equiv \exp[-ikZ_\mu]\psi_\mu(x - X_\mu),
\]

where \(x\) is the image-plane coordinate, \(X_\mu = (X_\mu, Z_\mu)\) are the coordinates of the sources \(r = 1,2\), \(X_\mu\) being the coordinate perpendicular to the optical axis and \(Z_\mu\) the axial distance to the image plane. We are assuming a shift-invariant imaging system, and in the spirit of the paraxial approximation the functions \(\psi_\mu\) are assumed real, so that the phase of each field amplitude \(\Psi_\mu(x)\) is entirely determined by the factor \(\exp[-ikZ_\mu]\), where \(k\) is the (average) wave number of the emitted light \([61]\). We shall indicate with \(a(x)\) the field annihilation operator at position \(x\) on the image plane, satisfying the bosonic commutation rule \([a(x), a^\dagger(x')]=\delta(x-x')\).

We can then write the state \(\rho_1\) as the incoherent mixture

\[
\rho_1 \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left( |\Psi_\mu\rangle \langle \Psi_\mu| + |\Psi_\mu\rangle \langle \Psi_\mu| \right),
\]

where

\[
|\Psi_\mu\rangle = e^{-ikZ_\mu} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \psi_\mu(x - X_\mu) a^\dagger(x) |0\rangle \, dx,
\]

is the quantum state of the optical field on the image plane corresponding to the emission of one photon by the source \(r\), and \(|0\rangle\) is the field vacuum state.

**Multiparameter estimation and quantum Cramér-Rao bound.**— We work under the assumption that the photon statistics of our sources is Poissonian, following a similar approach as in Ref. \([2]\). We can thus assume that in a single run of the experiment, which lasts for \(M\) coherence time intervals, \(M\) copies of the state \(\rho\) in Eq. (1) are prepared and measured (equivalently, one may consider the input state \(\rho^\otimes M\)). On average, this yields \(M\varepsilon\) photons per run. In order to apply the standard tools of estimation theory, we further assume that \(\nu \gg 1\) runs are performed, after which the measurement data are processed to build estimators for the unknown parameters.

In our case, the parameters of interest are the angular and axial relative coordinates and the centroid coordinates of the sources, indicated as \(s, c, p, z\), see Figure 1. We thus write the state \(\rho\) as a function of four parameters \(\{\lambda_\mu\}_{\mu=1,\ldots,4}\), where

\[
\begin{align*}
\lambda_1 &\equiv s = X_2 - X_1, \\
\lambda_2 &\equiv c = \frac{X_2 + X_1}{2}, \\
\lambda_3 &\equiv p = Z_2 - Z_1, \\
\lambda_4 &\equiv z = \frac{Z_2 + Z_1}{2},
\end{align*}
\]

The statistical error (variance) \(\Delta \lambda_\mu^2\) of any unbiased estimator of the unknown parameter \(\lambda_\mu\) is lower bounded via the quantum Cramér-Rao bound (qCRB) \([18,19]\)

\[
\sum_{\mu=1}^{\frac{4}{\nu M\varepsilon}} \frac{\Delta \lambda_\mu^2}{\mu} \leq \frac{1}{\nu M\varepsilon} \text{Tr}[H^{-1}],
\]

where \(H\) is the quantum Fisher information matrix (qFim) of the single-photon state \(\rho_1\) (equivalently, this can be seen as the qFim per coherence time interval per photon). The prefactor on the RHS of Eq. (6) is obtained by exploiting the additivity property qFim(\(\rho^\otimes M\)) = \(M \times \text{qFim}(\rho)\), and by noting that \(\text{qFim}(\rho) \approx \varepsilon \times \text{qFim}(\rho_1)\) at leading order in \(\varepsilon\) (since the field vacuum state \(\rho_0\) is independent of all source parameters). The resulting linear dependence on the total photon number \(\nu M\varepsilon\) is characteristic of classical light sources \([21,62]\).

The qCRb suggests that, the higher the qFim element \(H_{\mu\nu}\), the more precisely (i.e., with lower statistical error) one may be able to estimate the parameter \(\lambda_\mu\), by performing a suitable measurement. While for a single parameter the qCRb can always be saturated asymptotically by means of an adaptive procedure \([20]\), this is no longer the case for multiparameter estimation, as the parameters may not always be compatible \([32]\); we will discuss this issue in detail later in the manuscript.

**Results.**— We recall that the qFim elements are given by

\[
H_{\mu\nu} = \text{Re} \left( \text{Tr}(\rho_1 L_\mu L_\nu) \right),
\]

where \(L_\mu\) is the symmetric logarithmic derivative for the parameter \(\lambda_\mu\), defined implicitly by the equation

\[
2 \frac{\partial \rho_1}{\partial \lambda_\mu} = L_\mu \rho_1 + \rho_1 L_\mu.
\]

The analytical computation of \(H\) is presented in detail in Appendix A and it relies on the expansion of \(\rho_1\) and its derivatives on an appropriate orthonormal basis, followed by standard linear algebraic manipulations. While still tedious, the calculation is simplified by the factorization of the field generated by each source into a real point spread function \(\psi_\mu\) times an independent phase factor \(\exp[-ikZ_\mu]\), as indicated in Eq. (2).
Following this model, we find that the qFim is composed of the diagonal elements

\[
H_{ss} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \Delta X^2 + \Delta Y^2 \right),
\]
\[
H_{cc} = 2 \left( \Delta X^2 + \Delta Y^2 - 2\gamma^2 \right),
\]
\[
H_{pp} = \frac{1}{4(1-\delta^2)} \left\{ 2 \left( \Delta Z^2 + \Delta Z^2 \right)(1-\delta^2) \right.
\]
\[\left. - \left( \Gamma_{12} + \Gamma_{21} \right)^2 - 4\Gamma_{21}\delta \left( \delta Z_1 + \delta Z_2 \right) \right.
\]
\[\left. + \left( \Gamma_{12} + \Gamma_{21} \right) \delta + \left( \Delta Z^2 + \Delta Z^2 \right)^2 \right\},
\]
(9)

while the off-diagonal elements are

\[
H_{sc} = -\left( \Delta Z^2 - \Delta Z^2 \right),
\]
\[
H_{sp} = \frac{\left( \delta Z_1 + \delta Z_2 \right) \gamma \delta}{2(1-\delta^2)}, \quad H_{cc} = \frac{\left( \delta Z_1 + \delta Z_2 \right) \gamma}{2(1-\delta^2)},
\]
\[
H_{cp} = \left( \Gamma_{12} + \Gamma_{21} \right) \gamma, \quad H_{cz} = -2 \left( \Gamma_{12} - \Gamma_{21} \right) \gamma,
\]
\[
H_{pc} = -\frac{1}{2(1-\delta^2)} \left\{ 2 \left( \Delta Z^2 + \Delta Z^2 \right)(1-\delta^2) \right.
\]
\[\left. - \left( \Gamma_{12}^2 - \Gamma_{21}^2 \right)(1-\delta^2) - \delta \left( \delta Z_1 + \delta Z_2 \right) \right.
\]
\[\left. + \left( \delta Z_1 + \delta Z_2 \right) \right\},
\]
(10)

where

\[
\delta = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_0 \left( x - X_1 \right) \psi_0 \left( x - X_2 \right) \, dx,
\]
\[
\Delta Z^2 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left[ \frac{\partial \psi_0 \left( x - X_1 \right)}{\partial x} \right]^2 \, dx,
\]
\[
\Delta Z^2 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left[ \frac{\partial \psi_0 \left( x - X_1 \right)}{\partial x} \right]^2 \, dx,
\]
\[
\gamma = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left[ \frac{\partial \psi_0 \left( x - X_1 \right)}{\partial x} \right] \psi_0 \left( x - s \right) \, dx,
\]
\[
\Gamma_{12} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left[ \frac{\partial \psi_0 \left( x - X_1 \right)}{\partial x} \right] \psi_0 \left( x - X_2 \right) \, dx,
\]
\[
\Gamma_{21} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left[ \frac{\partial \psi_0 \left( x - X_1 \right)}{\partial x} \right] \psi_0 \left( x - X_1 \right) \, dx,
\]
\[
\delta Z_1 = \frac{\delta Z_1}{\Delta \xi}, \quad \delta Z_2 = \frac{\delta Z_2}{\Delta \xi},
\]

are functions of the unknown parameters \( s, c, p \) and \( z \).

While the above formulas are valid for an arbitrary form of the point spread function, in order to provide a concrete example we specialize in what follows to the Gaussian case,

\[
\psi_0 \left( x \right) = \left( 2\pi \sigma^2 \left( Z_0 \right) \right)^{-1/4} \exp \left[ -x^2 / 4\sigma^2 \left( Z_0 \right) \right],
\]
(11)

where we are assuming \( \sigma^2 \left( Z_0 \right) = 2Z_0 / k\sigma_0 \), i.e. the width of the point spread function scales linearly with the axial distance \( Z_0 \), and \( \sigma_0 \) is a reference width parameter. Eq. (11) can be obtained, for example, if the fields generated by the two sources are well approximated by Gaussian beams in the vicinity of the image plane \( 60 \). By utilizing Eq. (11) in the calculations of the qFim elements, we find formulas that are fully analytical (albeit too cumbersome to be reported explicitly here without further approximations) and allow us to perform a comprehensive analysis of the multi-parameter estimation problem under investigation. Furthermore, the Gaussian case bears the advantage that it can be easily compared with the existing literature that tackled the estimation of \( s \) alone (typically fixing \( p = 0 \)). To support the validity of our results, we have indeed checked that, in the limit \( p \to 0 \), our expression for \( H_{ss} \) matches the appropriate quantities in Refs. 2,62.

Figure 2 exemplifies how our results provide new insights on the problem of sub-wavelength imaging, while correctly reproducing what is known for \( p = 0 \)—compare e.g. the top panel with Fig. 2 in Ref. 2. We note in particular that \( H_{ss} \) stays independent of \( s \) also when \( p \neq 0 \), which means that Rayleigh’s curse does not affect the estimation of the angular separation \( s \) even for two sources with nonzero axial separation \( p \). In fact, having a nonzero \( p \) improves the estimation of the angular separation \( s \) and centroid coordinate \( z \), as indicated by the increase of the corresponding qFim elements. In-
terestingly, our results become particularly transparent in the regime $\xi \ll 1$ and $k_s \ll 1$, which is precisely the one of relevance to sub-wavelength imaging: at leading order in these small terms, the qFim simplifies as

$$H \approx \begin{pmatrix}
\left(1 + \frac{3p^2}{z^2}\right)N & \frac{3p}{z^2}N & \frac{z}{z_0}N & \frac{z}{z_0}N \\
\frac{2p}{z^2}N & 4N \left(1 + \frac{3p^2}{z^2} - s^2N\right) & 0 & -\frac{2p}{z^2}N \\
\frac{z}{z_0}N & 0 & \frac{1+16z^2}{z^2} & \frac{16z^2}{z^2} \\
\frac{z}{z_0}N & -\frac{2p}{z^2}N & 0 & \frac{2p}{z^2}N
\end{pmatrix},$$

where $N = \frac{k^2\sigma_0^2}{16z^2}$ is a normalization factor.

Taking advantage of the above approximate formula, we can now move on to investigate the actual precision with which our parameters of interest can be determined, and how close we can get to the limits imposed by the qCRb in practical experiments. In quantum estimation theory, multiparameter problems embody a nontrivial generalization of the single-parameter case [29, 32]: if an estimation scheme is optimized for a particular parameter, it typically results into an increased error in estimating the others. However, in the best case scenario, such a trade-off does not apply, and one can identify an optimal protocol for the estimation of all the parameters simultaneously. This happens if and only if the parameters are compatible, i.e., they satisfy the following conditions [32]: (i) There is a single probe state yielding the maximal qFim element for each of the parameters; (ii) There is a single measurement which is jointly optimal for extracting information on all the parameters from the output state, ensuring the asymptotic saturability of the qCRb; (iii) The parameters are statistically independent, meaning that the indeterminacy of one of them does not affect the error on estimating the others. We recall also that (ii) holds iff $\text{Tr}(\rho_1[L_\mu, L_\nu]) = 0$ $\forall \mu \neq \nu$, while (iii) is equivalent to the condition $H_{\mu\nu} = 0$ $\forall \mu \neq \nu$.

In this paper we do not focus on the first condition, since our theory is built around a realistic imaging scenario in which the emission properties of the sources are fixed in advance. Yet, it is worth investigating conditions (ii) and (iii), since they have crucial implications for the actual achievability of the statistical errors given by the qCRb. Remarkably, we find that condition (ii) is always satisfied in the problem under consideration — independently of the specifics of the point spread function (See Appendix B) — so that it is possible to construct a physical measurement and estimation strategy saturating Eq. (6) asymptotically [29, 32].

On the other hand, condition (iii) does not hold in general. However, as we can see in Eq. (12) for the Gaussian model, the off-diagonal elements of the qFim depend linearly on $s$ and $p$, therefore when $s \approx 0$ and $p \approx 0$ the qFim becomes

$$H \approx \text{diag}\left\{-\frac{k^2\sigma_0^2}{16z^2}, \frac{k^2\sigma_0^2}{4z^2}, \frac{1}{2z^2}, \frac{1}{z^2}\right\},$$

meaning that the four parameters $s, c, p, z$ are approximately statistically independent when the two sources have infinitesimal angular and axial separation. The behaviour of the qFim elements for all four parameters as a function of the angular distance is illustrated in Figure 3. From the plots and from Eq. (13), we see that the qFim diagonal elements tend to a nonzero value when $s, p \to 0$, meaning that the total estimation error $\propto \text{Tr}[H^{-1}]$ achievable by the optimal quantum procedure stays finite even when the two sources are infinitesimally close, instead of diverging as in direct imaging [11, 12].

**Conclusions.**— We determined the ultimate quantum limits to the simultaneous estimation of both angular and axial separations and centroid coordinates of two incoherent point sources on different object planes in the paraxial approximation. Our results indicate that there exists a jointly optimal detection scheme that enables resolving the sources even when arbitrarily close, reasserting that Rayleigh’s curse is merely an artefact of classical detection in direct imaging. In practice, a measurement apparatus approaching the optimal precision can be designed by adapting the methods of [15, 16, 46, 47], in particular extending the “spatial-mode demultiplexing” or “superlocalization by image inversion interferometry” techniques [2, 7] to the axially separated setting considered here.

While some of our findings were illustrated explicitly for Gaussian beams, our framework is general and can be applied to calculate the achievable metrological precision in other relevant cases (such as a Jinc point spread function, resulting from a circular aperture), thanks to the exact expressions in Eqs. (9, 10). This leads to qualitatively similar results as those presented here. In particular, the two most important conclusions, namely that the quantum Fisher information for the angular distance $s$ is independent of $s$ even for a nonzero axial distance $p$, and that the joint estimation of $s, c, p, z$ fulfills the measurement compatibility condition leading to the saturation of the quantum Cramér-Rao bound in Eq. (6), are in fact valid for any point spread function.

This work constitutes an important application of multiparameter quantum estimation theory to a realistic imaging setting, extending the seminal work of Ref. [2]. Our analysis,
combined with the one in [12], yields a quantum enhanced toolbox for full 3D sub-wavelength localization. This paves the way to further experimental demonstrations and innovative metrology solutions in scientific, industrial and biomedical domains, such as sub-nanometre depth mapping in rough surfaces, and dynamical interaction analysis of heterogeneous molecules in a cellular environment [4][5][27][55].
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[59] However, the assumption of weak sources can be lifted as in [35], leading to similar qualitative results for thermal sources of arbitrary intensity.


SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

Appendix A: Derivation of the quantum Fisher information matrix

Here we report the derivation of the quantum Fisher information matrix (qFim) $H$, defined by Eqs. (7) and (8) in the main text, in terms of the symmetric logarithmic derivative (SLD) $L_{ij}$ for the parameter set $\{\lambda_{ij}\}_{i=1,\ldots,4}$, specified by Eq. (3) in the main text. The general expression reported here is valid for an arbitrary point spread function compliant with the condition given by Eq. (2) in the main text, according to the paraxial approximation.

As mentioned, the vacuum state $|\rho_{0}\rangle$ does not contain any information, while multiple photon emissions are neglected as rare events, therefore the information about the parameters is entirely contained in the one-photon state $\rho_{1}$.

Writing $\rho_{1}$ in its eigenbasis,

$$\rho_{1} = \sum_{i} d_{i} |e_{i}\rangle \langle e_{i}|,$$  \hspace{1cm} (S1)

then the SLD $L_{ij}$ can be expressed as

$$L_{ij} = \sum_{d_{i}d_{j}\neq 0} \frac{2}{d_{i} + d_{j}} \langle e_{i}| \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \lambda_{ij}} |e_{j}\rangle \langle e_{j}| \langle e_{i}|.$$  \hspace{1cm} (S2)

To compute the qFim according to Eqs. (7) and (8), therefore, we first need to diagonalize the rank-2 state $\rho_{1}$, completing its eigenbasis so that the eigenvectors $\{|e_{i}\rangle\}$ span the support of $\partial \rho_{1}/\partial \lambda_{ij}$.

The partial derivative of $\rho_{1}$ with respect to $\lambda_{ij}$ can be expressed as

$$\frac{\partial \rho_{1}}{\partial \lambda_{ij}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_{ij}} \sum_{i} d_{i} |e_{i}\rangle \langle e_{i}| + \sum_{i} \left[ \frac{\partial d_{i}}{\partial \lambda_{ij}} |e_{i}\rangle \langle e_{i}| + d_{i} \frac{\partial |e_{i}\rangle \langle e_{i}|}{\partial \lambda_{ij}} \right],$$  \hspace{1cm} (S3)

where the support of $\rho_{1}$ is spanned by the first two eigenvectors,

$$|e_{1}\rangle = \frac{|\Psi_{1}\rangle - e^{-i\gamma Z_{1}} \langle \Psi_{1}|}{\sqrt{2(1-\delta)}}, \quad |e_{2}\rangle = \frac{|\Psi_{2}\rangle + e^{-i\gamma Z_{2}} \langle \Psi_{2}|}{\sqrt{2(1+\delta)}},$$  \hspace{1cm} (S4)

and we need to find more eigenvectors that span the support of $\frac{\partial |e_{1}\rangle}{\partial \lambda_{ij}}$ and $\frac{\partial |e_{2}\rangle}{\partial \lambda_{ij}}$.

Taking into account the form of the point spread function given by Eq. (2) in the main text, we can choose the following orthonormal set to complete the eigenbasis,

$$|e_{3}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_{3}}} \left[ \left| \Psi_{3}\rangle \right|_{X_{1}} + A \left| \Psi_{3}\right|_{X_{2}} + \frac{1 + e^{i\gamma Z_{1}} A}{\sqrt{2(1-\delta)}} |e_{1}\rangle - \frac{1 - e^{i\gamma Z_{1}} A}{\sqrt{2(1+\delta)}} |e_{2}\rangle \right],$$

$$|e_{4}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_{4}}} \left[ \left| \Psi_{4}\rangle \right|_{X_{1}} - A^{*} \left| \Psi_{4}\right|_{X_{2}} + \frac{1 - e^{i\gamma Z_{1}} A}{\sqrt{2(1+\delta)}} |e_{1}\rangle - \frac{1 + e^{i\gamma Z_{1}} A}{\sqrt{2(1-\delta)}} |e_{2}\rangle \right],$$

$$|e_{5}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_{5}}} \left[ \left| \Psi_{5}\rangle \right|_{Z_{1}} + R \left| \Psi_{5}\right|_{Z_{2}} + \frac{\Gamma_{12} - e^{i\gamma Z_{1}} R \Gamma_{21}}{\sqrt{2(1-\delta)}} |e_{1}\rangle - \frac{\Gamma_{12} + e^{i\gamma Z_{1}} R \Gamma_{21}}{\sqrt{2(1+\delta)}} |e_{2}\rangle \right]$$

$$+ \frac{\sqrt{c_{3}}}{(1-\delta^{2})} \left[ \gamma (\Gamma_{12} - A^{*} R \Gamma_{21}) - e^{i\gamma Z_{1}} R \left( \gamma \Gamma_{21} \delta + h_{X_{1}X_{2}} \left( 1 - \delta^{2} \right) \right) + e^{-i\gamma Z_{1}} A^{*} \left( \gamma \Gamma_{12} \delta - h_{Z_{1}X_{2}} \left( 1 - \delta^{2} \right) \right) \right] |e_{3}\rangle,$$  \hspace{1cm} (S5)

$$|e_{6}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_{6}}} \left[ \left| \Psi_{6}\rangle \right|_{Z_{1}} - R^{*} \left| \Psi_{6}\right|_{Z_{2}} + \frac{\Gamma_{12} + e^{i\gamma Z_{1}} R \Gamma_{21}}{\sqrt{2(1+\delta)}} |e_{1}\rangle - \frac{\Gamma_{12} - e^{i\gamma Z_{1}} R \Gamma_{21}}{\sqrt{2(1-\delta)}} |e_{2}\rangle \right]$$

$$+ \frac{\sqrt{c_{4}}}{(1+\delta^{2})} \left[ \gamma (\Gamma_{12} - A^{*} R \Gamma_{21}) + e^{i\gamma Z_{1}} R^{*} \left( \gamma \Gamma_{21} \delta + h_{X_{1}X_{2}} \left( 1 - \delta^{2} \right) \right) + e^{-i\gamma Z_{1}} A \left( \gamma \Gamma_{12} \delta - h_{Z_{1}X_{2}} \left( 1 - \delta^{2} \right) \right) \right] |e_{4}\rangle.$$
where

\[
h_{X;Z} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left[ \frac{\partial \psi_{Z_1}(x - X_1)}{\partial X_1} \right] \left[ \frac{\partial \psi_{Z_2}(x - X_2)}{\partial Z_2} \right] dx,
\]

\[
h_{Z,X} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left[ \frac{\partial \psi_{Z_1}(x - X_1)}{\partial Z_1} \right] \left[ \frac{\partial \psi_{Z_2}(x - X_2)}{\partial X_2} \right] dx,
\]

and \( A \) and \( R \) are two factors that make the vectors mutually orthogonal (their explicit expression is omitted here), while \( c_3, c_4, c_5 \) and \( c_6 \) are the normalization factors, and \( \delta, \gamma, \Gamma \) are defined in the main text. The eigenvalues of \( \rho_1 \) are simply

\[
d_1 = \frac{1 - \delta}{2}, \quad d_2 = \frac{1 + \delta}{2},
\]

\[
d_3 = 0, \quad d_4 = 0, \quad d_5 = 0, \quad d_6 = 0.
\]

From this point, with some tedious algebra calculations, the derivatives (S3) can be evaluated and the SLD (S2) can be computed with respect to the source coordinates \( (X_r, Z_r)_{r=1,2} \) and finally transformed in terms of the angular and axial separations and centroid coordinates, \( s, c, \rho, \zeta \), specified by Eq. 5 in the main text. Explicitly, we find that the SLDs take the following expression:

\[
L_s = \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{\gamma}{1 - \delta} & 0 & -\sqrt{c_4(c_3 - \zeta)} & -\sqrt{c_4(c_3 - \zeta)} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \frac{\gamma}{1 + \delta} & \frac{\sqrt{c_4(c_3 + \zeta)}}{\sqrt{(A + A') \sqrt{1 - \delta}}} & \frac{-\sqrt{c_4(c_3 - \zeta)}}{\sqrt{(A + A') \sqrt{1 + \delta}}} & 0 & 0 \\
\frac{-\sqrt{c_4(c_3 - \zeta)}}{\sqrt{(A + A') \sqrt{1 - \delta}}} & \frac{-\sqrt{c_4(c_3 + \zeta)}}{\sqrt{(A + A') \sqrt{1 + \delta}}} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{2\gamma\delta}{\sqrt{1 - \delta}} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{2\gamma\delta}{\sqrt{1 + \delta}} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{2\gamma\delta}{\sqrt{(A + A') \sqrt{1 - \delta}}} \\
\end{pmatrix},
\]

\[
L_{c} = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & -\frac{2\gamma\delta}{\sqrt{1 - \delta}} & -\sqrt{c_4(c_3 - \zeta)} & \sqrt{c_4(c_3 + \zeta)} & 0 & 0 \\
-\frac{2\gamma\delta}{\sqrt{1 + \delta}} & 0 & \frac{-\sqrt{c_4(c_3 + \zeta)}}{\sqrt{(A + A') \sqrt{1 - \delta}}} & \frac{\sqrt{c_4(c_3 - \zeta)}}{\sqrt{(A + A') \sqrt{1 + \delta}}} & 0 & 0 \\
\frac{-\sqrt{c_4(c_3 + \zeta)}}{\sqrt{(A + A') \sqrt{1 - \delta}}} & \frac{\sqrt{c_4(c_3 - \zeta)}}{\sqrt{(A + A') \sqrt{1 + \delta}}} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{2\gamma\delta}{\sqrt{1 - \delta}} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{2\gamma\delta}{\sqrt{1 + \delta}} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{2\gamma\delta}{\sqrt{(A + A') \sqrt{1 - \delta}}} \\
\end{pmatrix},
\]
\[L_{p,1,1} = \frac{\Gamma_{12} - \Gamma_{21} + \delta_{z_1} + \delta_{z_2}}{2(1 - \delta)}, \quad L_{p,1,2} = \frac{(\Gamma_{12} + \Gamma_{21})\delta}{2\sqrt{1 - \delta^2}},\]

\[L_{p,1,3} = \gamma(\Gamma_{12} - \Gamma_{21}\delta) - h_{x_1x_2}(1 - \delta^2) + \lambda e^{i(k_1x_1 - z_1)} \left(\gamma(\Gamma_{12}\delta - \Gamma_{21}) - h_{x_1x_2}(1 - \delta^2)\right),\]

\[L_{p,1,4} = \frac{\Gamma_{12} - \Gamma_{21} + \delta_{z_1} + \delta_{z_2}}{2(1 - \delta)} - \frac{\lambda e^{i(k_1x_1 - z_1)}}{\sqrt{\delta^2 (1 - \delta) (1 - \delta^2)}} \left(\gamma(\Gamma_{12}\delta - \Gamma_{21}) - h_{x_1x_2}(1 - \delta^2)\right),\]

\[L_{p,1,5} = -\frac{\sqrt{\delta^2 (1 - \delta) (1 - \delta^2)}}{\gamma(\Gamma_{12} - \Gamma_{21}\delta) + \lambda e^{i(k_1x_1 - z_1)}} \left(\gamma(\Gamma_{12}\delta - \Gamma_{21}) - h_{x_1x_2}(1 - \delta^2)\right),\]

\[L_{p,1,6} = \frac{\Gamma_{12} + \Gamma_{21}}{2\sqrt{1 - \delta^2}}, \quad L_{p,2,1} = \frac{(\Gamma_{12} - \Gamma_{21}\delta)}{2\sqrt{1 - \delta^2}},\]

\[L_{p,2,2} = -\frac{\Gamma_{12} - \Gamma_{21} - \delta_{z_1} - \delta_{z_2}}{2(1 - \delta)},\]

\[L_{p,2,3} = \gamma(\Gamma_{12} + \Gamma_{21}\delta) + h_{x_1x_2}(1 - \delta^2) + \lambda e^{i(k_1x_1 - z_1)} \left(\gamma(\Gamma_{12}\delta + \Gamma_{21}) - h_{x_1x_2}(1 - \delta^2)\right),\]

\[L_{p,2,4} = \frac{\Gamma_{12} + \Gamma_{21}\delta}{2\sqrt{1 + \delta}} - \frac{\lambda e^{i(k_1x_1 - z_1)}}{\sqrt{\delta^2 (1 + \delta) (1 - \delta^2)}} \left(\gamma(\Gamma_{12}\delta + \Gamma_{21}) - h_{x_1x_2}(1 - \delta^2)\right),\]

\[L_{p,2,5} = \frac{\sqrt{\delta^2 (1 - \delta) (1 - \delta^2)}}{(R + R^*) \sqrt{2(1 + \delta)}}, \quad L_{p,2,6} = \frac{\sqrt{\delta^2 (1 - \delta) (1 - \delta^2)}}{(R + R^*) \sqrt{2(1 + \delta)}},\]

\[L_{p,3,1} = \gamma(\Gamma_{12} - \Gamma_{21}\delta) - h_{x_1x_2}(1 - \delta^2) + \lambda e^{i(k_1x_1 - z_1)} \left(\gamma(\Gamma_{12}\delta - \Gamma_{21}) - h_{x_1x_2}(1 - \delta^2)\right),\]

\[L_{p,3,2} = \frac{\sqrt{\delta^2 (1 - \delta) (1 - \delta^2)}}{\sqrt{2(1 + \delta)}} \left(\gamma(\Gamma_{12}\delta + \Gamma_{21}) - h_{x_1x_2}(1 - \delta^2)\right),\]

\[L_{p,3,3} = 0, \quad L_{p,3,4} = 0, \quad L_{p,3,5} = 0, \quad L_{p,3,6} = 0,\]

\[L_{p,4,1} = \gamma(\Gamma_{12} - \Gamma_{21}\delta) - h_{x_1x_2}(1 - \delta^2) - \lambda e^{i(k_1x_1 - z_1)} \left(\gamma(\Gamma_{12}\delta - \Gamma_{21}) - h_{x_1x_2}(1 - \delta^2)\right),\]

\[L_{p,4,2} = \gamma(\Gamma_{12} + \Gamma_{21}\delta) + h_{x_1x_2}(1 - \delta^2) + \lambda e^{i(k_1x_1 - z_1)} \left(\gamma(\Gamma_{12}\delta + \Gamma_{21}) - h_{x_1x_2}(1 - \delta^2)\right),\]

\[L_{p,4,3} = 0, \quad L_{p,4,4} = 0, \quad L_{p,4,5} = 0, \quad L_{p,4,6} = 0,\]

\[L_{p,5,1} = \frac{\sqrt{\delta^2 (1 - \delta) (1 - \delta^2)}}{(R + R^*) \sqrt{2(1 + \delta)}}, \quad L_{p,5,2} = \frac{\sqrt{\delta^2 (1 - \delta) (1 - \delta^2)}}{(R + R^*) \sqrt{2(1 + \delta)}},\]

\[L_{p,5,3} = 0, \quad L_{p,5,4} = 0, \quad L_{p,5,5} = 0, \quad L_{p,5,6} = 0,\]

\[L_{p,6,1} = \frac{\sqrt{\delta^2 (1 - \delta) (1 - \delta^2)}}{(R + R^*) \sqrt{2(1 - \delta)}}, \quad L_{p,6,2} = \frac{\sqrt{\delta^2 (1 - \delta) (1 - \delta^2)}}{(R + R^*) \sqrt{2(1 + \delta)}},\]

\[L_{p,6,3} = 0, \quad L_{p,6,4} = 0, \quad L_{p,6,5} = 0, \quad L_{p,6,6} = 0,\]
The final result is given by Eqs. (9) and (10) in the main text. We can now substitute the SLDs into Eq. (7) to compute the qFim $H$. The final result is given by Eqs. (9) and (10) in the main text.
Appendix B: Verification of the measurement compatibility condition

As we mentioned in the main text, the multiparameter Cramér-Rao bound (qCRb), Eq. (6), is not always achievable if the SLDs $L_{\mu}$ corresponding to different parameters do not commute. However, a necessary and sufficient condition to saturate the bound asymptotically is that the SLDs corresponding to different parameters commute on average on the probe state,

$$\text{Tr} (\rho_1 [L_{\mu}, L_{\nu}]) = 0, \quad \forall \mu \neq \nu. \quad \text{(S6)}$$

Taking in account the SLDs reported in Appendix A, it is easy to show that this condition is always satisfied for any point spread function compliant with Eq. (2). Explicitly, given the state

$$\rho_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{1-\delta}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \frac{1+\delta}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{(S7)}$$

the diagonal elements of $\rho_1 [L_{\mu}, L_{\nu}]$ for all $\mu \neq \nu$ are

$$\text{diag}(\rho_1 [L_{s}, L_{c}]) = \text{diag}(y_{sc}, -y_{sc}, 0, 0, 0),$$

$$\text{diag}(\rho_1 [L_{s}, L_{p}]) = \text{diag}(0, 0, 0, 0, 0),$$

$$\text{diag}(\rho_1 [L_{c}, L_{s}]) = \text{diag}(0, 0, 0, 0, 0),$$

$$\text{diag}(\rho_1 [L_{c}, L_{p}]) = \text{diag}(0, 0, 0, 0, 0),$$

$$\text{diag}(\rho_1 [L_{p}, L_{c}]) = \text{diag}(y_{pc}, -y_{pc}, 0, 0, 0),$$

with

$$y_{sc} = \frac{(c_3 A - c_4 A^*) e^{-i k (Z_1 - Z_2)} - (c_3 A^* - c_4 A) e^{i k (Z_1 - Z_2)}}{(A + A^*)^2},$$

$$y_{pc} = \frac{(c_3 R - c_6 R^*) e^{-i k (Z_1 - Z_2)} - (c_3 R^* - c_6 R) e^{i k (Z_1 - Z_2)}}{(R + R^*)^2} + \frac{\gamma (\gamma \Gamma_{12} \Gamma_{21} - \delta (\Gamma_{12} h_{X_1 Z_2} - \Gamma_{21} h_{X_2 Z_1}))}{1 - \delta^2} + \frac{h_{X_1 Z_2} h_{X_2 Z_1}}{c_3 c_4} \frac{(A + A^*)^2}{c_3 c_4} y_{sc}.$$ 

From here, it is immediate to verify that the measurement compatibility condition given by Eq. (S6) is fulfilled.