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Determining an unknown quantum state from an ensemble of identical systems is a fundamental, yet experimentally demanding, task in quantum science. Here we study the resources needed to fully characterize an arbitrary multi-mode state containing a definite number of photons. We show this task can be achieved using only linear optics and photon counting, which yield a practical though non-universal set of projective measurements. We derive the minimum number of measurement settings required and show that this lower bound is saturated if the linear optics correspond to Haar-random unitary transformations. Furthermore, we show that for $N$ photons, any unitary $2N$-design can be used to derive an analytical, though non-optimal, state reconstruction protocol.

Introduction— An unknown quantum state can be determined by making a set of suitable measurements on identically prepared copies [1–5]. This procedure, known as quantum state tomography, is a fundamental concept in quantum science with wide ranging applications. For example, tomography allows one to assess quantum systems for use in quantum information processing by quantifying resources such as entanglement [6], quantum correlations [7], and coherence [8]. Indeed, since most measures of these resources require complete knowledge of the density matrix describing a system, full quantum tomography is often necessary. Similarly, tomography can be applied to quantum sensing [9,10] to evaluate the capacity of a quantum probe state to yield enhanced measurement precision [11,12].

A well-established framework for photonic quantum information uses a single photon and multiple modes to encode discrete-variable quantum states. A qubit may be encoded using a single-photon, two-mode state [13], and a qudit may be encoded by incorporating additional modes [14]. Multiqubit states of this form have been employed widely, including entanglement-based quantum-key distribution [15], quantum simulation [16], tests of quantum nonlocality [17], entanglement generation [18], and linear optical quantum computing [19]. For these states, optical tomography can be readily achieved using combinations of single-qubit measurements [2,20], which require only linear optics and single-photon detection. Exact reconstruction of $N$ qubits can thus be achieved using $2^N + 1$ measurement bases. Using this method, full tomography of up to six single-photon qubits has been demonstrated [21].

However, this approach to optical tomography does not apply to more general states of multiple modes containing a definite total number of photons. In this case, a mode may contain multiple photons, which enables new applications including approaches to quantum sampling [22], imaging [23], and error-correction [24,25]. An alternate approach to state tomography for such states is to use balanced homodyne detection and well-developed continuous-variable algorithms to reconstruct the phase-space Wigner function [26,28]. In the general continuous variable setting, however, only partial reconstruction is possible with a finite number of measurement settings. Furthermore, this detection scheme adds substantial experimental requirements, including access to a mode-matched, multimode phase-stable local oscillator. In contrast, since the state has a definite photon number, tomographically complete measurements can theoretically be formulated using a finite number of measurement bases. Whether or not these measurement bases can be achieved using photon counting, though, has not been previously known.

Here we prove that an arbitrary state of $N$ indistinguishable photons in $M$ modes can be reconstructed using a finite number of measurement bases that correspond to different configurations of an $M$-mode linear-optical interferometer followed by photon counting. Notably, this result is not limited to states that can be created from Fock states using linear optics. Furthermore, we derive a minimal number of interferometer configurations required for a given $N$ and $M$.

Our results extend to measurement strategies that incorporate additional modes through the use of ancillary vacuum states. As the number of measured modes increases, the required number of interferometer configurations decreases, eventually reaching one. In this limit, our work relates to previous studies of tomography using a single measurement basis in an extended Hilbert space [29,30], a concept first applied experimentally to nuclear spins [31] and then to single-photon qubits measured using a multimode quantum walk [32,33]. The latter approach was recently extended to two-photon, two-mode states using a six-mode interferometer and it was conjectured this method would work for larger systems [34,35]. Related work has investigated how the number of additional modes required for high-fidelity state estimation depends on the purity of the input state [36]. Our results generalize these photonic studies that use a single measurement configuration by proving tomographic feasibility, deriving a bound on the minimum number of measurement modes, and providing an explicit reconstruction protocol.

We show that use of interferometer configurations that correspond to Haar-random transformations enable tomography using the minimum number of configurations. Additionally, we derive an analytical algorithm for state tomography that employs any unitary $2N$-design [37], thus generalising a known result for qudit systems [38] to the multi-photon case. While unitary designs are not optimal for our task, an advantage is they have been extensively studied in the past for their relevance in many quantum information theory protocols [39] and quantum metrology [40]. Indeed, unitary designs can be
obtained either with random circuits \cite{41,44}, random basis switching \cite{45} or, more physically, by applying random pulses to a controllable system \cite{46}.

**Feasibility of tomography**—Consider a generic quantum state of \(N\) indistinguishable photons in \(M\) modes. Our goal is to completely characterize the state by measuring multiple copies of it using linear optics and photon counting, as illustrated in Fig. 1. In this approach, a measurement basis corresponds to a particular configuration of linear optics. We also allow for measurements over \(M' \geq M\) modes, achieved by appending \(M' - M\) vacuum modes to the state of interest. Our first main result is that full tomography can always be achieved using a finite number of measurement configurations:

**Theorem 1.** An \(N\)-photon, \(M\)-mode state can be reconstructed using photon counting and \(M\)-mode linear optical interferometer with a finite number \(R\) of configurations, where

\[
R < \left(\frac{N + M^2 - 1}{N}\right)^2. \tag{1}
\]

The theorem is proved by building an explicit reconstruction algorithm. Let \(|\nu\rangle\) be the multi-mode Fock basis \(|\nu\rangle \equiv |k_1, \ldots, k_M\rangle\), where \(k_j\) is the number of particles in mode \(j\) and \(\sum_j k_j = N\), while we use a prime to denote a Fock basis \(|\nu'\rangle \equiv |k'_{1}, \ldots, k'_{M'}\rangle\), where the number of output modes \(M'\) may be higher than the number of inputs \(M\). Moreover, let \(U(g)\) be a set of available unitary operations that can be made in the system. In linear optics the most general SU(\(M')\) transformation can be obtained with a collection of beam splitters and phase shifters \cite{47}, as shown in Fig. 1. Such transformation can be expressed in the second quantized notation as

\[
U(g) = e^{\sum_i H_{m|n} a_i^\dagger g a_i}, \quad g = e^{iH} \text{ is a } M' \times M' \text{ unitary matrix.}
\]

State tomography requires reconstruction of the state \(\rho\) from measurement outcomes, each specified by a series of photon counts \(\nu'\). These outcome probabilities are readily calculated as \(p_{\nu',g} = \langle \nu'|U(g)\rho U(g)|\nu'\rangle\) for a specified interferometer configuration \(g\). Expanding the above equation gives

\[
p_{\nu',g} = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} \langle \nu'|U(g)\rangle \langle \alpha|\rho|\beta\rangle \langle \beta|U(g)|\nu'\rangle = [\mathcal{L}(\rho)]_{\nu',g}, \tag{2}
\]

with the superoperator \(\mathcal{L}_{\nu',\alpha\beta} = \langle \nu'|U(g)\rangle \langle \alpha|\rho|\beta\rangle \langle \beta|U(g)|\nu'\rangle\). The superoperator \(\mathcal{L}\) is constructed using different configurations \(g_j\), with \(j = 1, \ldots, R\). The numbers \(\alpha\) and \(\beta\) index the elements of the Fock space, whose dimension is \(D_{N,M} = \binom{N+M-1}{N}\), while \(\nu' = 1, \ldots, D_{N,M'}\). As such, \(\mathcal{L}\) is normally a rectangular operator. Tomography is possible if there is a large enough \(R\) such that the linear system (2) admits a unique solution for any \(p\). A unique solution is obtained \cite{48} when the Gramian matrix \(\mathcal{L}'\mathcal{L}\) has full rank. In this case, the best reconstruction algorithm \cite{48} is given by the pseudo-inverse \(\rho_{\text{best}} := (\mathcal{L}'\mathcal{L})^{-1}\mathcal{L}'[p]\), which is always the best fit solution that minimizes the least-square error.

For any linear optics configuration \(g\), the matrix elements \(\langle \beta|U(g)|\nu'\rangle\) can be calculated exactly, either using combinatorial expressions or matrix permanents \cite{22,49,50}, for \(|\alpha\rangle = |a_1, a_2, \ldots\rangle\) and \(|\beta\rangle = |b_1, b_2, \ldots\rangle\), one finds \(\langle \alpha|U(g)|\beta\rangle = \text{per}(g_{\alpha\beta})/\sqrt{\alpha!\beta!}\) where \(\alpha! = a_1!a_2!\ldots\), and similarly for \(\beta!\), while \(g_{\alpha\beta}\) is the \(N \times N\) matrix obtained by copying \(a_i\) times the \(i\)-th column of \(g\) and, \(b_j\) times the \(j\)-th row of \(g\). Although the computation of the matrix permanent is #P-hard, it is still possible for the values of \(N\) and \(M\) available in near-term devices \cite{51}. Moreover, there are cases for which specific values of the permanent can be computed analytically \cite{52,54}.

Given the above framework, we now sketch our proof of Theorem 1 which is elaborated in the Supplementary Material. In particular, we show that with interferometer configurations \(\{g_j\}_{j=1,\ldots,R}\) corresponding to a unitary \(2N\)-design, exact reconstruction is possible from experimental measurements of \(p_{\nu',g_j}\) for all \(j = 1, \ldots, R\). Our theorem then follows from known properties of unitary designs \cite{37}:

- they exist for all \(N\) and \(M\), and their size is bounded by \(D_{N,M'}^2\).

To connect our tomographic task to unitary designs, we first note that the matrix \(\mathcal{L}\) is composed by \(U(g) \otimes U(g)^\dagger\) matrices. Although \(U(g)\) is an irreducible representation of \(g\), \(U(g) \otimes U(g)^\dagger\) is not, and indeed it can be written as a direct sum of Wigner-D matrices \(D_{m,n}^\lambda\), where \(\lambda\) refer to different irreducible representations and \(m,m'\) are Gelfand-Tsetlin patterns that index the different states (see Supplementary Material). Since the matrices \(D_{m,n}^\lambda\) are orthogonal over \(g\) and \(\mathcal{L} \propto D(g)\), one can use the matrix \(\mathcal{D}(g)^\nu\) to construct an operator \(X_{\nu'}(g)\) such that \(\langle \alpha|\rho|\beta\rangle = \sum_{\nu'} \int dg X_{\nu'}(g)p_{\nu',g}\), where \(p_{\nu',g}\) are the outcome probabilities in Eq. (2).

Tomography is therefore achieved via a formal average over the continuous group. However, this is not practical as it would require an infinite number of measurement configurations. Instead we use the theory of weighted unitary designs \cite{37}, to replace the continuous average with a discrete average over a discrete set of unitaries \(g_j\). A \(q\)-design is a discrete set of unitaries such that the weighted average of group functions \(f(g)\) over those unitaries is equal to the average over the continuous group \(\int dg f(g)\), provided that \(f(g)\) is a polynomial of at most degree \(q\) in \(g\) and \(g^\dagger\). Since the matrices \(\mathcal{D}(g)\) are a polynomial of at most degree \(N\) in \(g\) and \(g^\dagger\), one can choose any weighted \(2N\)-design protocol to analytically perform full tomography, as shown in the Supplementary Material. Calling \(g_j\) those unitaries, \(\langle \alpha|\rho|\beta\rangle = \sum_{\nu'} X_{\nu'}(g_j)p_{\nu',g_j}\). This
concludes the proof of Theorem 1. We note however that unitary $2N$-designs satisfy a more stringent requirement than the simpler inversion of Eq. 2, and consequently, this approach is generally not optimal in terms of the number of measurement configurations used.

Minimum measurement configurations— We now consider the minimum number of linear optics configurations $R$ required to achieve tomography. Our second main result gives a lower bound on the number of configurations required:

**Theorem 2.** An $N$-photon, $M$-mode state can be reconstructed with photon counting and an $M$-mode linear optical interferometer using at least

\[ R_{N,M} = \binom{N + M}{N} \right] - \binom{N + M - 2}{M} \] (3)

configurations. More generally, for an interferometer with $M' > M$ modes and ancillary vacuum states, the minimal number of reconfigurations is

\[ R_{N,M,M'} = \frac{(N + M - 2)! (M' - 1)!}{(N + M - 2)! (M' - 1)!} R_{N,M} \] (4)

where $\lfloor x \rfloor$ is the smallest integer greater or equal to $x$.

Equation (3) shows that the number of measurement configurations is larger than estimated from a simple counting argument. In particular, the number of $M$-mode Fock states with $N$ total photons, $D_{N,M} = \binom{N+M-1}{N}$, gives the dimension of the symmetric Hilbert space. A generic state is thus specified by $D_{N,M}$ independent elements.

A single measurement configuration involves $D_{N,M}$ different outcomes, which provide $D_{N,M} - 1$ independent parameters. Therefore, one may expect that $D_{N,M} + 1$ configuration may be sufficient for full state reconstruction. Instead, our theorem shows a larger number is required, $R_{N,M} > D_{N,M} + 1$. This increased requirement is due to linear optics providing only a subset of the possible unitary operations on the multi-particle state. Nonetheless, complete tomography with a smaller set of configurations is possible with ancillary output modes, as $R_{N,M,M'} < D_{N,M} + 1 < R_{N,M}$ for any $M' > M$.

For the two-mode case, $M = 2$, an explicit measurement protocol which saturates our bound $R_{N,2} = 2N + 1$ is known \[\text{[55]}.\] This protocol exploits the Schwinger boson formalism that maps our problem onto the tomography of a spin $S = N/2$, allowing the use of known algorithms for large spin systems \[\text{[46, 56, 57]}.\] However, this approach exploits properties of SU(2) representations that cannot be easily adapted to larger $M$ \[\text{[58, 59]}.\] Our theorem generalizes the above construction to the general multi-mode case.

Two proofs of Theorem 2 are presented in the Supplementary Material, one based on representation theory and one based on irreducible tensors. Here we briefly describe the main steps of the second proof. Measuring diagonal elements in the Fock basis is equivalent to the measurement of all the expectation values of polynomials of number operators $T_k^a = a_k^\dagger a_k$. According to Wick’s theorem, all independent polynomials in the number operators can be written via the rank $r$ tensors $T_{k_1 \ldots k_r}^{l_1 \ldots l_r} = a_{k_1}^\dagger \cdots a_{k_r}^\dagger a_{l_1} \cdots a_{l_r}$. However, not all $\langle T_{k_1 \ldots k_r} \rangle$ are independent. For instance, if one measures $\langle T_k^a \rangle$ for $k = 1, \ldots, M-1$, then one gets $\langle T_M^a \rangle = N - \sum_{k=1}^{M-1} \langle T_k^a \rangle$ without further measurements. In the Supplementary Material we show that the number of independent rank-$r$ tensors is $D_{r,M-1}$. Their expectation value for $r = 1, \ldots, N$ completely and uniquely specify photodetection measurements. Similarly, the full state is completely and uniquely specified by the expectation value of the tensors $T_{k_1 \ldots k_r}^{l_1 \ldots l_r} = a_{k_1}^\dagger \cdots a_{k_r}^\dagger a_{l_1} \cdots a_{l_r}$. The number of such independent rank-$r$ tensors is $D_{r,M} - D_{r-1,M}$.

Tomography then consists in reconstructing the expectation value of off-diagonal tensors from the measurement of $\langle T_{k_1 \ldots k_r}^{l_1 \ldots l_r} \rangle$ after different configurations $U(g)$. Since the latter corresponds to $\langle U(g) T_{k_1 \ldots k_r}^{l_1 \ldots l_r} U(g) \rangle = [g^\otimes r(T) g^\otimes r \otimes 1_{M-r}]$, all off-diagonal tensors with different rank can be reconstructed independently for $r = 1, \ldots, N$. The most difficult tensor to reconstruct is then that with $r = N$. Via dimensional counting, this reconstruction requires $[D_{N,M}^2 - D_{N-1,M}^2]/D_{N,M-1} = R_{N,M}$ transformations. Equation (4) follows by assuming that the same configurations are sufficient for reconstructing even lower rank tensors. This latter assumption is the reason why Eq. (3) is a lower bound. Similarly, Eq. (4) appears for different number of modes as $R_{N,M,M'} = [(D_{N,M}^2 - D_{N-1,M}^2)/D_{N,M-1}]$.

**Corollary.** An $N$-photon, $M$-mode state can be reconstructed with a single configuration of an $M'$-mode linear optical interferometer if

\[ D_{N,M',-1} \geq D_{N,M}^2 - D_{N-1,M}^2 = R_{N,M} D_{N,M-1} \] (5)

The scaling of Eq. (5) can be investigated for large $N$ and $M$ using the entropic expansion \[\langle T \rangle \approx 2^{nH(k/m)} \] where $H(x) = -x \log_2 x - (1-x) \log_2 (1-x)$ is the binary entropy. Additionally, $N \gg M$, we find that $R_{N,M} D_{N,M-1} \approx N^{2M-3}$, and $D_{N,M-1} \approx N^{M-2}$. Therefore the minimal number of measurement modes required is given by

\[ M' \geq 2M - 1 \] (6)

In this limit, tomography can be achieved using a single measurement configuration with photon counting over twice as many modes as the input state, and this result is independent of $N$.

In the opposite limit $N \ll M$, we approximate \[\langle T \rangle \approx N^{+M}/M!\] to find

\[ M' \geq \frac{M^2}{\sqrt{N!}} \] (7)

This seemingly counterintuitive result shows that the required number of measured modes decreases as the number of photons increases. This is due to the large increase in number of measurement outcomes that results from an increase in the number of photons.
Practical implementation— We have done extensive numerical experiments showing that the bound (5) is achieved by Haar-random configurations \( \{ \beta_n \}_{n=1}^{\beta} \), which can be implemented using programmable interferometers [60, 61]. In particular, we find that \( L \) has full-rank \( D_{L,M}^2 \) only when \( R_{N,M} \), or lower bounds are used. For \( M' > M \), we find that the lower bound (4) is achievable with \( R_{N,M,M'} \), or slightly more configurations. The slightly larger number of configurations or modes required for tomography when \( M' \neq M \) may be due to the simple reconstruction algorithm, which does not explicitly take into account independent components and normalization.

The minimum number of measurement modes \( M' \) required for a single interferometer is shown in Fig. 2 which shows agreement of numerical results calculated using a single sample from the Haar distribution and the minimal number that satisfies Eq. (6). As predicted by Eq. (7), \( M' \) initially decreases as a function of \( N \) and then becomes constant for \( N \approx M \). When \( N \approx M \), we find \( H_2 \approx 1 \) and hence \( M' \approx \alpha M \), thus confirming the scaling relation (6), and its independence on \( N \), although with a larger \( \alpha > 2 \). Based on these numerical experiments, we conjecture that with a single Haar-random configuration one can perform full-reconstruction with a number of measurement modes that increases linearly with \( M \).

In a realistic experiment, the number of detected photons will sometimes be less than \( N \), due to photon loss and imperfect detector efficiency. In this case, the subset of detection events containing all \( N \) photons is sufficient to reconstruct the state, provided these occur at an acceptable rate. For example, consider a model of an imperfect measurement as an extended linear optical interferometer wherein some ancillary modes are unmeasured [62]. For uniform efficiency per mode \( \eta \), the input-output relationship [62] is described by \( \eta U \) where \( U \) is a unitary \( M' \times M' \) matrix (as in Fig. 1). The resulting probability, given by Eq. (2), is then \( p_{\gamma,\epsilon,\delta} = \eta^N p_{\gamma,\epsilon,\delta} \) where \( \eta^N \) is the probability of losing no photons, and \( p_{\gamma,\epsilon,\delta} \) is the conditional output probability, given that no photons have been lost. Because of this, it is possible to use the conditional probability for the state reconstruction protocol, without changes with respect to the lossless case. While non-uniform loss further alters the relevant linear-optical transformation, we conjecture that if this is experimentally characterized then reconstruction can proceed in a similar manner.

Single-photon detectors (SPDs) that merely distinguish between vacuum and non-vacuum states are often employed in realistic experiments, instead of true photon-counting detectors. To achieve sensitivity to photon number, a nondeterministic number resolving detector (NRD) can be built by multiplexing SPDs using linear optics and ancillary vacuum states [63–65]. We note that this concept is consistent with the scheme shown in Fig. 1, and therefore for sufficiently large \( M' \), complete state reconstruction can be achieved with SPDs. Since an NRD sensitive to \( N \) photons requires \( N \) SPDs, Eq. (6) implies that \( O(NM) \) SPDs are required. For \( N < M \) fewer SPDs are required, due to the vanishing probability that multiple photons emerge in the same mode of a random interferometer with \( M \approx O(N^2) \) [22]. More precisely, from Eq. (7) we get \( M' > O(M^2/\sqrt{N}) \approx O(M^2) \).

Conclusion— We have studied the feasibility and resource cost of performing quantum tomography of a multi-mode multi-photon Fock state using linear optics and photon counting. We have shown that any such state can be tomographically reconstructed with a finite number of linear optics configurations (Theorem 1). To do so, we show that configurations corresponding to any unitary 2N-design [37] defines an analytical, thought non optimal, reconstruction protocol. Moreover, Theorem 2 quantifies the minimal number of configurations, even when the number of detectors \( M' \) is larger than \( M \). For sufficiently many detectors, as specified by Eq. (5), this leads to tomography with a single measurement configuration. Our results can be used to test the optimality of tomography protocols with a finite number of particles. For instance, the two-photon protocol presented in [55] saturates our bound, and is therefore optimal. Finally, we presented a simple reconstruction algorithm based on Haar sampled unitary configurations, and we have observed that it is optimal for \( M' = M \) and nearly optimality for \( M' > M \).
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Let us consider a set of bosonic creation and annihilation operators specified by $a_{i\alpha}$ and $a_{i\beta}^\dagger$. Using second quantization notation, we can define the operators

$$E_{ij} = \sum_\alpha a_{i\alpha}^\dagger a_{j\alpha},$$

(A1)

where $i, j = 1, \ldots, M$, and $\sum_i E_{ii} = N$. These operators satisfy the U(M) commutation relations

$$[E_{ij}, E_{k\ell}] = \delta_{jk}E_{i\ell} - \delta_{i\ell}E_{kj}.$$

(A2)

Since bosonic operators are symmetric upon exchange of particles, the extra index $\alpha$ will be used to simulate other symmetries. For instance, a two-mode anti-symmetric wave function

$$\psi_{ij} = \sum_\alpha \psi_{\alpha i}^\dagger \psi_{\alpha j},$$

would have

$$[\psi_{ij}, \psi_{k\ell}] = \delta_{jk}\psi_{i\ell} - \delta_{i\ell}\psi_{kj}.$$
can be obtained with \((a_1^+ a_2^- - a_1^- a_2^+)(0)\), where \(|0\rangle\) is the bosonic vacuum and \(\alpha = H, V\) is an external index, such as the horizontal (H) and vertical (V) photon polarization. The operators \(H_i = E_{ij}\) are called Cartan operators and form the maximal subset of commuting operators in the algebra. Operators \(E_{ij}\) are called raising operators for \(i < j\) and lowering operators for \(i > j\). If an eigenstate \(|\psi\rangle\) is an eigenstate of all Cartan operators \(H_i(|\psi\rangle) = \lambda_i |\psi\rangle\) we say that the set \((\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_M)\) is a weight of the state \(|\psi\rangle\). Clearly \(\sum \lambda_i = N\), where \(N\) is the number of particles, as \(\sum H_i = 0\). Therefore, only \(M - 1\) Cartan operators \(H_i = H_i - H_{i+1}\) are independent. A weight \((\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_M)\) is said to be higher than \((\lambda'_1, \ldots, \lambda'_M)\) if \(\lambda_i > \lambda'_i\), or if \(\lambda_1 > \lambda'_1\) and \(\lambda_2 > \lambda'_2\) etc. Irreducible representations (irreps) of the unitary group are uniquely characterized by their highest weight. All the other states in a certain irrep can be constructed from the highest weight state via multiple applications of the lowering operator [66]. A highest weight is a set of integers \(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_M\) that satisfy \(\lambda_i \geq \lambda_{i+1}\). These numbers can be represented by a Young diagram \(Y(\lambda)\), which is an array of left adjusted boxes, with \(\lambda_1\) boxes on the first row, \(\lambda_2\) boxes in the second row, etc. An alternative labeling of irreps is via Dynkin labels \((b_1 b_2 \ldots)\) where \(b_j\) is the number of columns in the Young diagram with \(j\) boxes.

The Gelfand-Tsetlin (GZ) basis [67] is a convenient basis specified by a set of integers \(m_{ij}\)

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
m_{1,M} & m_{2,M} & m_{3,M} & \cdots & m_{M,M} \\
m_{1,M-1} & m_{2,M-1} & \cdots & m_{M-1,M-1} \\
\vdots & & & & \\
m_{1,2} & m_{2,2} & & & \\
m_{1,1} & & & & 
\end{bmatrix}
\]

In this basis the \(s\)-th row \(m_{rs}\) gives the irreducible representation of the subgroup \(U(s)\) in the chain decomposition \(U(M) \supset U(M-1) \supset \cdots \supset U(1)\). The entries in lower rows satisfy the “betweenness condition” \(m_{ki} \geq m_{k,j-1} \geq m_{k+1,j} \) [66]. The first row then specifies the irreps with \(\lambda = m_{1,M}\) while the other rows (that we collectively call \(m\)) specify the state in that particular irrep. These states will be labeled then as \(|\lambda, m\rangle\). All Cartan operators \(H_i\) are diagonal in the GZ basis, with eigenvalues (weights)

\[w_i = \sum_{k=1}^{i} m_{k,i} - \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} m_{k,i-1}.\]  

Because of the definition Eq. (A1), the boson number operators are diagonal in the GZ basis, namely the GZ basis is like a Fock basis but with a convenient labelling. Highest weight states are such that \(m_{ki} = m_{k,M} \equiv \lambda_k\), namely where all the elements in the same diagonal are equal. These states, that we call \(|\lambda\rangle\), have weights \(w_i = \lambda_i\) and can be written in the second quantized form as [67] \(|\lambda\rangle \propto B(\lambda)|0\rangle\), where \(|0\rangle\) is the bosonic vacuum, and \(B(\lambda)\) is a polynomial in the creation operators

\[
B(\lambda) = \left(\Delta^1\right)^{1-\lambda_1} \left(\frac{\Delta^{12}_{\lambda_1}}{\lambda_1^2}\right)^{1-\lambda_2} \cdots \left(\frac{\Delta^{12}_{\lambda_1}}{\lambda_1^2}\right)^{1-\lambda_M},
\]

where \(\Delta\) is the Slater determinant

\[
\Delta_{i_1, j_1, \ldots} = \det \begin{pmatrix} a_{i_1, j_1} & a_{i_1, j_2} & \cdots \\ a_{i_2, j_1} & a_{i_2, j_2} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \\ a_{i_k, j_1} & a_{i_k, j_2} & \cdots \end{pmatrix}.
\]

The fully symmetric representation with \(N\) particles is then specified by the highest weight state with \(\lambda = (N, 0, \ldots, 0)\). Other states in the same irrep can be constructed from the repeated action of lowering operators. For instance, \(E_{k+1,j}(|m_{ki}\rangle) = \sum \alpha_j(m_{ki})|m_{ki} - \delta_{ij} - \delta_{k,j}\rangle\), where the coefficients \(\alpha\) are explicitly written in [69] (Chapter 18.1.2).

Generally we call a vector \(|\lambda, m\rangle\) where \(\lambda\) specifies the first row in the GZ pattern (and thus defines the irrep), while \(m\) collects the other rows \(m_{ij}\) for \(i < M\). An important vector for our discussion is \(|\lambda, 0\rangle\); using (A3), we see that this vector is defined by the weight \(w_i = 0\) for \(i < M\) and \(w_M = \sum \lambda_i = N\). Therefore, for the bosonic representation \(\lambda = \langle N, 0, \ldots, 0\rangle\) this vector corresponds to the “boson condensate” state where all the particles are in the \(M\)-th mode. Other vectors in \([N]\) are parametrized by the GZ pattern

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
m_{1,M-1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & & & \\
m_{1,2} & 0 & & \\
m_{1,1} & & & 
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

where \(m_{ij}\) is related to the occupation number (A3) via \(w_i = m_{ij} - m_{i,j-1}\), so here \(w_i\) is the number of particles in mode \(i\).

For a given irrep \(\lambda\) the Wigner matrices are defined as

\[
D^{\lambda}_{m,n'}(g) = \langle \lambda, m | U(g) | \lambda, n'\rangle.
\]

These matrices are orthogonal with respect to the scalar product

\[
\int dg D^{\lambda}_{m,n'}(g)D^{\lambda}_{\lambda,\lambda'}(g)^* = \frac{\delta_{m,n}}{d_\lambda} \delta_{\lambda,\lambda'} \delta(m,n'),
\]

where \(dg\) is the Haar measure and \(d_\lambda\) is the dimension of the representation, given by [66]

\[
d_\lambda = \prod_{1 \leq k \leq \lambda \leq M} \left(1 + \frac{\lambda_k - \lambda_{k'}}{k' - k}\right).
\]

Given a representation \(\lambda = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_M)\) the conjugate representation can be defined as \(\lambda' = (-\lambda_M, \ldots, -\lambda_1)\). Indeed, a representation of \(g = e^{i\theta} = U(g) = e^{i\sum_{k} h_k E_k}\) and its conjugate is \(U(g)^* = e^{-i\sum_{k} h_k E_k}\), since the operators (A1) are real (in the Fock basis). Therefore, the Cartan operators \(H_i\) are mapped to \(-H_i\) and so are the weights. However, with these definitions highest weights in the conjugate representation corresponds to lowest weights in the original one. The order reversal \(\lambda' = (-\lambda_M, \ldots, -\lambda_1)\) assures that highest weights are mapped to highest weights. By definition the polynomial \(B(\lambda')\) associated with the conjugate representation can be obtained from (A4) exchanging creation with annihilation operators. For each GZ pattern \(m\) we can also get the corresponding dual
pattern $m^*$ by reflecting each row $m^*_{ij} = (−m_{ij}, \ldots, −m_{ij})$. Although the GZ pattern now contains negative numbers, this is not a problem because two patterns designate the same irrep if $m_{k,M} = m^*_{k,M} + c$—this can be used to bring the GZ basis into the “normalized” form \([65]\) where $M_{M,M} = 0$. However, the polynomials \((A4)\) are defined only when $M_{M,M} \geq 0$.

We consider the tensor product of the symmetric irrep $\{N\} := \{N, 0, \ldots, 0\}$ and its conjugate $\{N\}^* := \{0, \ldots, 0, −N\}$, which in the normalized form is $\{N, \ldots, N, 0\}$. As in the addition of angular momenta, this product can be written as a direct sum of irreps. In general, see \([69]\) Chapter 18.2.6, the product of an irrep $\{m,M\}$ and its fully symmetric one $(N,0,\ldots,0)$ is a direct sum over the irreps $\{m_p + p_k\}$ where the non-negative $p_k$ satisfy $\sum_k p_k = N$ and

$$m_{1,M} + p_1 \geq m_{1,M} \geq m_{2,M} + p_2 \geq \cdots \geq m_{M-2,M} \geq m_{M-1,M} + p_{M-1} \geq m_{M,M} + p_M \geq m_{M,M}.$$  

For the product of the symmetric irrep and its conjugate, the above equations force $p_2 = \cdots = p_{M-1} = 0$. All the solutions can then be parametrized by an integer $0 \leq ℓ \leq N$ such that $p_1 = ℓ$ and $p_M = N - ℓ$. The resulting irreps are then $(N+ℓ, N, \ldots, N, N-ℓ)$ in the normalized form. These can be written in the more compact form $\Gamma_{ℓ,ℓ} := (ℓ, 0, \ldots, 0, −ℓ)$. Important states for our analysis are the ones with zero weight. These are the states such that $Γ_{ℓ,ℓ}^{−1} m_{j,k} = 0$, namely the states such that, if you reflect the GZ pattern $m$ along the central vertical axis, you obtain $−m$. For $M = 2$ and any ℓ, the only state is the one with $m_{1,1} = 0$. For $M = 3$ all the $ℓ + 1$ states with $m_{1,1} = 0$ and $m_{1,2} = −m_{2,2}$ with $0 \leq m_{1,2} \leq ℓ$ have zero weight. In general the number of zero weight states for fixed $ℓ$ is

$$d_ℓ^0,M = \binom{ℓ + M - 2}{ℓ}.$$  \((A9)\)

\section*{Appendix B: Proof of the main theorems}

In Ref. \([4]\) (arXiv version) it has been shown that any bosonic density matrix (in fact any operator) with $N$ bosons and $M$ modes can be written in the integral form (P-representation)

$$\rho = \int_{U_M} dx P_ρ(x)\langle (x)_N |(x)_N \rangle$$  \((B1)\)

where the integration is over the continuous group $U_M = U(M) / U(M−1) × U(1)$,

$$\langle (x)_N |(x)_N \rangle = |x\rangle ^N \circ N = \left( \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{M} x_j a_j^N}{\sqrt{N!}} \right) |0\rangle ,$$  \((B2)\)

is a bosonic condensate, and

$$P_ρ(x) = \sum_{ℓ=0}^{N} \sum_{m} p_ρ(ℓ, m) y_{ℓ,m}(x) ,$$  \((B3)\)

where $p_ρ(ℓ, m)$ are coefficients, $m$ is a GZ pattern corresponding to the irrep $Γ_ℓ$, and $y_{ℓ,m}(g) = D_{m,0}^{\ell}(g)$ is written in terms of the Wigner matrices \((A6)\). A generic $g \in U(M)$ can be decomposed as $g = xh$ with $x \in U_M$ and $h \in U(M−1) × U(1)$. The bosonic condensate \((B2)\) can be written in terms of the state $|λ, 0\rangle$ for $λ = [N]$. Indeed, as shown in the previous section, this state is the one where all the particles are in the $M$-th mode. Since this state is invariant under $U(M−1)$ one finds that $|λ, 0\rangle = (U(g)[N], 0) = U(x)[N], 0)$. Because of this, from the orthogonality of Wigner matrices \((A7)\), one finds that

$$\int_{U_M} dx y_{ℓ,m}(x) y_{ℓ,m}^*(x) = \int_{U(M)} dx Y_{ℓ,m}^*(x) Y_{ℓ,m}(x) = \frac{1}{d_ℓ} δ_{ℓ,ℓ} δ_{m,m},$$  \((B4)\)

where $d_ℓ = d_{ℓ,1}$.

Operators diagonal in the Fock basis are also diagonal in the GZ basis. One can therefore use the latter for calculations. Off-diagonal elements of the density matrix are then

$$\rho_{m,m'} = \langle [N], m |[N], m' \rangle .$$  \((B5)\)

Using the P-representation \((B1)\), one has $\langle [N], m |(x)_{N} \rangle = D_{m,0}^{[N]}(x)$, and similarly $\langle (x)_{N} |[N], m \rangle = (\langle [N], m |(x)_{N} \rangle)^* = D_{m,0}^{(*)}(x)^* = D_{m,0}^{[N]}(x)^*$, so

$$\rho_{m,m'} = \int dx P_ρ(x) D_{m,0}^{[N]}(x) D_{m',0}^{(*)}(x)$$

$$= \int dx P_ρ(x) D_{m',0}^{(*)}(x) D_{m,0}^{[N]}(x)^* .$$  \((B7)\)

An explicit form for the polynomial $D_{m,0}^{[N]}(x)$ for $x \in U_M$ is written in \([68]\) (Chapter 5.2.5)

$$D_{m,0}^{[N]}(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_{[N]}}} \prod_{j=1}^{M} \left( \frac{x_j}{w_j} \right)$$  \((B8)\)

where $w_j = m_{1,j} - m_{1,j−1}$. As we have shown in the previous section the tensor product of $[N]$ and $[N]^*$ is a sum of irreps $Γ_ℓ$. From the expansion of Wigner functions (see \([69]\) Chapter 18.2.1)

$$y_{m',m''}(x) = D_{m',0}^{[N^*]}(x) D_{m'',0}^{(*)}(x)$$

$$= \sum_{ℓ=0}^{N} \sum_{m_0} Γ_{ℓ}^{[N^*]}(m', m'' | m_0, m_0) D_{m,0}^{Γ_{ℓ}}(x)$$  \((B9)\)

where

$$Γ_{ℓ}^{[N^*]}(m', m'' | m_0, m_0) = \sum_{r} ⟨[N^*], m'; [N], m' |λ_ℓ, r, m_0⟩ ×$$

$$× ⟨λ_ℓ, r, m_0 |[N^*], 0; [N], 0⟩$$  \((B10)\)

and $⟨\lambda, m; λ', m' |λ'', r, m''⟩$ is the Clebsch-Gordan coefficient with multiplicity $r$. The Clebsch-Gordan coefficients are real, and different from zero only if the weights \((A3)\) coincide \([68]\), namely if $w_i(m') + w_i(m) = w_i(m'')$ for any $i$. When
The Clebsch-Gordan coefficients of the identity. Inserting the above equation into Eq. (B11) and using the orthogonality relations [69] we find

\[
p_n(g') = \sum_{\ell=0}^{N} \sum_{m_{\ell} \in Z_\ell} \sum_{m_\rho, 0} \Gamma_{\ell}^N (n, n'|m_\rho, 0) \frac{P_\rho(\ell, m)}{d_\ell} D_{m_\rho m_\rho}(g') .
\]

Moreover, when \( \tilde{m} \in Z_\ell \) the selection rule shows that for each \( m \in [N] \) there is only a single \( m' \in [N] \) such that \( w_m(m) + w_{m'}(m') = 0 \); this state is \( m' = m' \). Therefore, we can remove one element from the sum \( \sum_{m_\rho} \) and write

\[
\sum_{n} \Gamma_{\ell}^N (n, n'|\tilde{m}_0, m_0) \Gamma_{\ell}^N (n, n'|m_0', 0) = \delta_{\ell', \ell} \times \delta_{\tilde{m}_0, m_0'} \Gamma_{\ell}^N (0, 0|m_0, 0') ,
\]

for \( \tilde{m}_0 \in Z_\ell, \tilde{m}_0' \in Z_{\ell'} \). From the above relations

\[
\sum_{n} \Gamma_{\ell}^N (n, n'|m_0, 0) P_\rho(g) = \sum_{m} \frac{P_\rho(\ell, m)}{d_\ell} D_{m_\rho m_\rho}(g) .
\]

Since \( \Gamma_{\ell}^N (0, 0|0, 0) \neq 0 \) for any \( 0 \leq \ell \leq N \) (4 Corollary 3), we define then

\[
\rho_{m_{\rho}, g} = \sum_{n} \Gamma_{\ell}^N (n, n'|m_0, 0) P_\rho(g) = \sum_{m} \frac{P_\rho(\ell, m)}{d_\ell} D_{m_{\rho} m_{\rho}}(g) .
\]

The above result shows that if we can find a discrete set of unitaries \( U_\alpha \) such that \( D_{m_{\rho} m_{\rho}}(g) \) is invertible, then we can obtain \( P_\rho(\ell, m) \) and hence \( \rho_{m_{\rho}, g} \). Indeed, if there is a discrete set of unitaries \( \{g_\alpha\} \) and a matrix \( X \) such that

\[
\sum_{m_{\rho}, \alpha} \rho_{m_{\rho}, g} D_{m_{\rho} m_{\rho}}(g) = \delta_{m_{\rho}, m_{\rho}} ,
\]

then from Eq. (B11)

\[
\rho_{m_{\rho}, g} = \sum_{n} \sum_{m_{\rho}, m_0, 0} \Gamma_{\ell}^N (m', m'|\tilde{m}_0, 0) X_{m_{\rho} m_0, \alpha} \rho_{m_0, 0} \delta_{m_{\rho}, m_0} .
\]

1. Proof of Theorem [1] Unitary design

An analytic solution to Eq. (B19) is obtained from the theory of unitary designs [37]. A set of unitaries \( \{g_\alpha\}_{\alpha=1,\ldots, R} \) is called a weighted unitary t-design if

\[
\sum_{\alpha} w(g_\alpha) g_\alpha^{\otimes t} = \int_{U(M)} dg g^{\otimes t} \otimes g^{\otimes t} ,
\]

where \( dg \) is the Haar measure, and \( w \) is a weight. In other terms, a weighted unitary t-design is a collection of unitaries such that the weighted average of any polynomial function \( f(g) \), with maximal degree \( t \) in both \( g_{ij} \) and \( g_{ij}^\dagger \), is equal to the average over the entire continuous group \( f(g) \). From the expansion (B9) and from (B8), we see that \( D_{m_{\rho} m_{\rho}} \), and in particular \( D_{m_{\rho} m_{\rho}} \), are at most polynomial functions of degree \( N \) in \( g \) and \( g^\dagger \). Therefore, if \( g_{\alpha=1,\ldots, R} \) is a weighted 2N-design, then a solution of (B19) is obtained by setting \( X_{m_{\rho} m_0, \alpha} = \delta_{m_{\rho}, m_0} \). Indeed, from the definition of unitary design Eq. (B19) becomes

\[
\sum_{m_{\rho}, \alpha} X_{m_{\rho} m_0, \alpha} D_{m_{\rho} m_{\rho}}(g) = \delta_{m_{\rho}, m_0} \sum_{\alpha} w(g_\alpha) D_{m_{\rho} m_{\rho}}(g_\alpha) = \delta_{m_{\rho}, m_{\rho}} \sum_{\alpha} w(g_\alpha) \delta_{m_{\rho}, m_{\rho}}(g_\alpha) .
\]
where in the last equation we used the orthogonality of Wigner matrices. Therefore, for any weighted unitary $2N$-design, one can find an analytic solution to the tomographic reconstruction of the state

$$\rho_{m,m} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell=0}^{N} \sum_{m_0} \Gamma^\ell (m', m' | m, 0) \langle \lambda \rangle \langle \alpha \rangle E_{\lambda \alpha} \rho_{m_0, m_0}.$$ 

Note that the requirement that the matrices $g_{\alpha}$ form a unitary $2N$-design is much stronger than (B19). Indeed, with a unitary design, the average over any polynomial function is equal to the group integral, while for inverting (B19) it is required that the discrete average is equal to the group integral only for specific set of functions (product of Wigner matrices). Upper and lower bounds on the size of a $2N$-design is given in [37], where they found that

$$B(M, N) \leq R \leq B(M, 2N),$$

(B22)

where

$$B(M, N) = \sum_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \leq N} d^2_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2},$$

(B23)

and $|\lambda_1|$ is the sum of the positive elements in $\lambda$ and $d_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}$, with explicit dependence on $M$, is written in (A8). Moreover, (A8)

$$B(M, N) \leq \left( M^2 + N - 1 \right) \frac{1}{N} \equiv D^2_{N,M}.$$ 

(B24)

2. Proof of Theorem

Let $R$ be the number of unitaries $g_{\alpha=1, \ldots, R}$. The matrix $Y_{\ell}^{\ell} \equiv D_{\ell-m,0}^{\ell} (g_{\alpha})$ has dimension $d^2_{\ell} \times (R d_{\ell,M}^{0})$. As in the main text, we focus on the higher dimensional irreps, namely $\ell = N$, and we want to count the number of matrices $g_{\alpha}$ required to make the matrix $Y^{\ell}$ invertible. Note that the Wigner $D$ functions $D_{\ell-m,0}^{\ell} (g_{\alpha})$ play the same role of the irreducible symmetric tensor of rank $r = \ell$ discussed in the main text. For $R = N$, thanks to Eq. (A9), we find $d^2_{N,M} = D_{N,M-1}$. On the other hand, explicitly solving Eq. (A8), we find $d_N = R_{N,M} D_{N,M-1}$. Therefore, in order to make $Y$ invertible for $\ell = N$, one finds $R \geq R_{N,M}$. This completes the proof of theorem 2 as the inverse in (B19) exists. The lower bound can be achieved if the same unitaries $g_{\alpha}$ enable also the inversion $Y^{\ell}$ for $\ell < N$. The reconstruction algorithm is then Eq. (B20).

Finally, we consider the case where the number of output modes $M'$ is different from the number of inputs. Technically, all equations are still valid, because we can first expand the input space into $M' > M$ modes, and select only inputs coming from $M$ mode subspace. One can still write then Eq. (B19) and (B20). As for Eq. (B19), for the worst case scenario $\ell = N$, the number of possible $m_0$ is now $d^2_{N,M'} = D_{N,M-1}$, while the number of $m$ is $d_N = R_{N,M} D_{N,M-1}$. From this we find an alternative proof our corollary Eq. 3.

3. Analytical solutions for $M=2$

SU(2) is formed by the matrices

$$U(g) = e^{i\delta} e^{i\gamma} e^{i\delta},$$

(B25)

where $S_\alpha$ are the spin matrices in an arbitrary representation. The states $\langle \lambda, m \rangle$ are parametrized by a single integer $-\ell \leq m \leq \ell$. Moreover, there is only one zero-weight state $m_0 = 0$. To map these indices to standard spin notation we parametrize these numbers with semi-integers $S = \ell/2$ and $M = m/2$ (in this section $M$ is not the number of modes, which is always two), therefore

$$D_{\ell-m,0}^{\ell} (g) = e^{i\delta} d_0^S (\theta),$$

(B26)

where $d_0^S (\theta) = \langle S, M | e^{i\delta} S, M' \rangle$ is the Wigner function, and the dependence of $\eta$ disappears. If we choose $X_\alpha (\theta, \phi) = \gamma e^{i\delta} d_0^S (\theta)^{-1}$, where $\gamma$ is a normalization, and hence we need to select $\theta$ such that $d_0^S (\theta) \neq 0$ then the condition (B19) can be written as

$$\gamma \sum_{\alpha} e^{i\delta} d_0^S (\theta) / d_0^S (\theta_0) = \delta_{M,M'},$$

(B27)

for $\alpha = 0, \ldots, 2N$, where $\theta$ is such that $d_0^S (\theta) \neq 0$ for any $M$. This solution is therefore equivalent to the Newton and Young algorithm for SU(2) tomography [50]. As the number of setups is $R = 2N + 1$, this protocol saturates the bound 4.

Appendix C: Alternative proof of the minimal number of configurations

We first present an alternative proof of Eq. (3). We note that photodetection is equivalent to the measurement of all the expectation values of polynomials of number operators $T_k^\dagger = a_k^\dagger a_k$. Not all of these expectation values are independent. For instance, if one measures $\langle T_k^\dagger \rangle$ for $k = 1, \ldots, M - 1$, then one gets $\langle T_M^\dagger \rangle = N - \sum_{k=1}^{M-1} \langle T_k^\dagger \rangle$ without further measurements. Thanks to Wick’s theorem, all independent polynomials in the number operators can be written via the rank $r$ tensors $T_{\alpha_1 \ldots \alpha_r}^\dagger = a_{\alpha_1} a_{\alpha_2} \cdots a_{\alpha_r}$, where we fix the convention that Greek indices $\alpha_i$ range from $1$ to $M - 1$ while Latin indices $k_i$ range from 1 to $M$. Tensors with some indices $\alpha_i$ can be written in terms of other tensors with indices from 1 to $M - 1$. For fixed rank $r$, the number of independent expectation values $\langle T_{\alpha_1 \ldots \alpha_r}^\dagger \rangle$ is $D_{r,M-1}$. Moreover, such expectation values are zero for $r > N$. The expectation values $\langle T_{\alpha_1 \ldots \alpha_r}^\dagger \rangle$ for $r = 1, \ldots, N$ uniquely specify the outcome of photodetection. Indeed, $\sum_{r=1}^N D_{r,M-1} = D_{N,M-1}$ so all the information
about photodetection is contained in the expectation values of the independent tensors \( T^{a_1,\ldots,a_r}_{\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_r} \).

Consider now a linear optical transformation, namely a collection of beam splitters and phase shifters, expressed by an irreducible representation \( U(g) = e^{i \sum \theta_{ij} a_i^\dagger a_j} \) of a SU(M), where \( g = e^{iH} \) is a \( M \times M \) unitary matrix. Applying first a linear optical network and then performing photodetection is equivalent to the measurement of the diagonal elements of \( U(g) \rho U(g)^\dagger \) or, equivalently in the Heisenberg picture, of the independent tensors \( U(g) T^{a_1,\ldots,a_r}_{\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_r} U(g) \). With many choices of \( g \) one then aims at measuring all the rank \( r \) tensors

\[
T^{k_1,\ldots,k_r}_{\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_r} = a_{\ell_1}^\dagger \cdots a_{\ell_r}^\dagger a_{k_1} \cdots a_{k_r},
\]

for \( 1 \leq r \leq N \). Note that the above tensor has Latin indices, each ranging from 1 to \( M \). In fact \( U(g) T^{a_1,\ldots,a_r}_{\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_r} U(g) \) may have some indices equal to \( M \). The above tensor is totally symmetric in its upper and lower indices, but not in mixtures of them. The numbers \( \langle T^{k_1,\ldots,k_r}_{\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_r} \rangle \) provide \( D_{rM}^2 \) expectation values, but not all of them are independent, since \( \langle T^{M,\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_r}_{M,\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_r} \rangle \) can be written in terms of other expectation values. These dependent operators are \( D_{r-1,M}^2 \). Therefore, the number of independent rank \( r \) expectation values is \( D_{r,M}^2 - D_{r-1,M}^2 \). The independent expectation values are the values \( \langle T^{k_1,\ldots,k_r}_{\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_r} \rangle \) where there is never both an upper and lower index \( M \). These numbers completely and uniquely specify the state \( \rho \), and indeed

\[
\sum_{r=1}^N D_{r,M}^2 - D_{r-1,M}^2 = D_{N,M}^2 - 1,
\]

which is the number of independent components in the density matrix \( \rho \). Rank \( r \) tensors transform as \( U(g) T^{k_1,\ldots,k_r}_{\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_r} U(g) = [g^{\ell \ell'} T^k_{\ell',\ell}]_{k_1,\ldots,k_r} \), so each photodetection after the linear transformation \( g \) allows us to measure the independent components \( \langle g^{\ell \ell'} T^k_{\ell',\ell} \rangle \). What is the minimal number of \( g \) to reconstruct all off-diagonal elements \( \langle T^{k_1,\ldots,k_r}_{\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_r} \rangle ? \) Fix a rank \( r \) and all the tensors components are independent (provided that index \( M \) is not both on upper and lower indices), so the most difficult tensor elements to reconstruct are those for \( r = N \). The number of independent components in this tensor is \( D_{N,M}^2 - D_{N-1,M}^2 \), but each photodetection with a fixed choice of \( g \) allows us to get \( D_{N,M-1} \) independent values. Therefore, the minimal number of \( g \) is \( [D_{N,M}^2 - D_{N-1,M}^2]/D_{N,M-1} = R_{N,M} \). This concludes the proof of Eq. (3).

1. Analytical reconstruction algorithm for \( M = 2 \)

It is instructive to rephrase the analytic protocol discussed in Section B 3 for \( M = 2 \), based on the spin tomography protocols [55], so to see why the settings developed for the reconstruction of rank \( N \) tensors are normally enough for the reconstruction of lower-rank tensors. According to [55], SU(2) tomography can be achieved with \( R_{N,2} = 2N + 1 \) unitary matrices \( g \), obtained by first applying different rotations \( \phi_j \) along the \( z \) axis, with \( \phi_j = 2\pi j/(2N + 1) \) and \( j = 1, \ldots, 2N + 1 \), and then a fixed rotation with angle \( \theta \) along the \( y \) axis (see also Appendix B 3).

In the linear optics setup, this corresponds to the application of different phase shifts \( \phi_j \) on a single mode, followed by a beam splitter with transmissivity related to \( \theta \). We set then \( U(g) = e^{i\theta a_i^\dagger a_i + i\phi_j a_j^\dagger a_j} \), and we note that for \( M = 2 \) the Greek indices can only take the single value \( \alpha_j = 1 \). Therefore, \( \langle\prod_{j=1}^r (g^{\ell \ell'} T^k_{\ell',\ell}) \rangle \) provides a way to reconstruct. Calling \( f_{\ell_2}(\theta) \) the \( \theta \) dependent part, we can write

\[
\langle\prod_{j=1}^r (g^{\ell \ell'} T^k_{\ell',\ell}) \rangle = \sum_{k_1,\ldots,k_r} \langle T^{k_1,\ldots,k_r}_{\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_r} \rangle \prod_{j=1}^r (g^{\ell \ell'}_{k_1})
\]

where the left-hand side contains the measured values and the right hand side contains the off-diagonal elements that we want to reconstruct. Calling \( f_{\ell_2}(\theta) \) the \( \theta \) dependent part, we can write

\[
\langle\prod_{j=1}^r (g^{\ell \ell'} T^k_{\ell',\ell}) \rangle = \sum_{k_1,\ldots,k_r} \langle T^{k_1,\ldots,k_r}_{\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_r} \rangle \prod_{j=1}^r (g^{\ell \ell'}_{k_1})
\]

for each photodetection after the linear transformation \( g \) allows us to measure the independent components \( [g^{\ell \ell'} T^k_{\ell',\ell}] \). What is the minimal number of \( g \) to reconstruct all off-diagonal elements \( \langle T^{k_1,\ldots,k_r}_{\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_r} \rangle ? \) Fix a rank \( r \) and all the tensors components are independent (provided that index \( M \) is not both on upper and lower indices), so the most difficult tensor elements to reconstruct are those for \( r = N \). The number of independent components in this tensor is \( D_{N,M}^2 - D_{N-1,M}^2 \), but each photodetection with a fixed choice of \( g \) allows us to get \( D_{N,M-1} \) independent values. Therefore, the minimal number of \( g \) is \( [D_{N,M}^2 - D_{N-1,M}^2]/D_{N,M-1} = R_{N,M} \). This concludes the proof of Eq. (3). Similarly, Eq. (4) appears for different number of modes as \( R_{N,M} = [(D_{N,M}^2 - D_{N-1,M}^2)/D_{N,M-1}] = [R_{N,M} D_{N,M-1}/D_{N,M-1}] \).

Note that this construction does not show that this lower bound is achievable, because the values of \( g \) used to construct the rank \( N \) expectation values may not enable the reconstruction of the other expectation values with \( r < N \). Nonetheless, an explicit protocol which achieves our lower bound is known [55] for \( M = 2 \).