Optimal measurements for quantum multi-parameter estimation with general states
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We generalize the approach by Braunstein and Caves [Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 3439 (1994)] to quantum multi-parameter estimation with general states. We derive a matrix bound of the classical Fisher information matrix due to each measurement operator. The saturation of all these bounds results in the saturation of the matrix Helstrom Cramér-Rao bound. Remarkably, the saturation of the matrix bound is equivalent as the saturation of the scalar bound with respect to any positive definite weight matrix. Necessary and sufficient conditions are obtained for the optimal measurements that give rise to the Helstrom Cramér-Rao bound associated with a general quantum state. To guarantee the existence of the optimal measurement, we find it is necessary for the symmetric logarithmic derivatives commute on the support of the state. As an important application of our results, we construct several local optimal measurements for the problem of estimating the three-dimensional separation of two incoherent optical point sources.

Introduction.—Metrology [1–3], the science of precision measurements, has found wide applications in various fields of physics and engineering, including interferometry [4–8], atomic clocks [9–11], optical imaging [12–15], and detection of gravitational waves [16]. In classical metrology, the covariance matrix of a maximum likelihood estimator can always asymptotically achieve the classical Cramér-Rao (CR) bound proportional to the inverse of the Classical Fisher Information Matrix (CFIM) [17, 18]. In quantum metrology, the CR bound can be further minimized over all possible quantum measurements to yield the its quantum generalization. However, over the years different quantum generalizations of the CR bound have been developed motivated by the fact that the minimum variance for all the parameters may not be achievable simultaneously in a single measurement. The most stronger bound in the current literature is the Holevo CR bound [19–22]. However, the bound involves a complicated minimization over a set of locally unbiased operators. Yuen and Lax [23] derived a bound in terms of the right logarithmic derivatives. The widely used quantum CR bound by quantum physicists is the one proposed by Helstrom [24, 25] due to its simplicity and intimate connections to the geometric structure of quantum states [26]. Therefore we focus on the saturation of the Helstrom CR bound in this paper. In the Helstrom CR bound, the CFIM is maximized over all POVM measurements to give the Quantum Fisher Information Matrix (QFIM). Throughout this paper, we assume the limit of the large sample size. Therefore the saturation of the Helstrom CR bound, becomes the search for optimal measurements that saturates the QFIM. Braunstein and Caves showed [27] that for single parameter estimation such an optimal measurement always exists. However the QFIM in multi-parameter estimation in general may not be achievable by any quantum measurement even in the asymptotic sense of the large sample size [28].

A general theory of quantum multi-parameter estimation is desired in many practical scenarios, including superresolution [29–39] spurred by the seminal work [12], Hamiltonian estimation [40–43], parameter estimation in interferometry [44–48]. For a pure state, the saturation of the Helstrom CR bound is now fully understood due to the works of Matsumoto [49] and Pezzè et al [45]. However, for a general mixed state, the necessary and sufficient conditions for any positive operator-valued measure (POVM) measurement to saturate the Helstrom CR bound are still uncharted. Since the saturations of the scalar and matrix Helstrom CR bound are equivalent [50], we will focus on the saturation of the matrix bound in what follows. We find the saturation conditions by generalizing the earlier approach developed by Braunstein and Caves [27] for single parameter estimation to multi-parameter estimation. For the POVM operator corresponding to a zero probability outcome, we find that the saturation of the Helstrom CR bound imposes a constraint which is satisfied automatically in the case of single parameter estimation and therefore does not appear there. It is also found that for the existence of optimal measurements it is necessary to have the symmetric logarithmic derivatives commute on the support of a state. Based on the saturation conditions, we also construct several local optimal measurements in the problem of estimating the three-dimensional separation of two monochromatic, incoherent point sources. We emphasize that the saturation conditions we find may have possible applications not only in the superresolution of optical imaging, but also in quantum sensing [5].

Notations and definitions.—Before starting our derivations, some notations and definitions are in order for...
Later use: (a) A general probe state is described by the density operator \( \rho_\lambda = \sum_s p_{s\lambda} |\psi_{s\lambda}\rangle \langle \psi_{s\lambda}| \), where \( p_{s\lambda} \)'s are strictly positive and \( |\psi_{s\lambda}\rangle \)'s are orthonormal and do not vanish globally for all \( \lambda \). We denote the kernel (null space) of \( \rho_\lambda \) at some specific value \( \lambda_0 \) as \( \text{ker}(\rho_{\lambda_0}) = \text{span}\{|\psi\rangle : \langle \psi_{\lambda_0} | \psi \rangle = 0, \forall n \} \) and the support of \( \rho_\lambda \) at \( \lambda_0 \) as \( \text{supp}(\rho_{\lambda_0}) = \text{span}\{|\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle \}'s \}. For a vector \( |\psi\rangle \), its projection on \( \text{ker}(\rho_\lambda) \) is denoted as \( |\psi^\perp\rangle \) and projection on \( \text{supp}(\rho_\lambda) \) is denoted as \( |\psi^\parallel\rangle \) [54].

(b) We use a short hand notation \( \partial_i \) as the derivative with respect to the estimation parameter \( \lambda_i \), for example \( \partial_i \rho_\lambda = \partial \rho_\lambda / \partial \lambda_i \). In addition the projections of \( |\partial_i \psi_\lambda\rangle \) and \( |\partial_i^\perp \psi_\lambda\rangle \) respectively, where \( |\partial_i \psi_\lambda\rangle \equiv |\partial_i \psi_\lambda\rangle − |\partial_i^\perp \psi_\lambda\rangle \) and \( |\partial_i^\perp \psi_\lambda\rangle \equiv \sum_s |\psi_{s\lambda}\rangle \langle \psi_{s\lambda}| \partial_i \psi_\lambda\rangle \).

(c) The POVM operator is denoted as \( \Pi_k \) with spectral decomposition \( \Pi_k \equiv \sum_n q_{kn} |\pi_{kn}\rangle \langle \pi_{kn}| \), where \( q_{kn} \)'s are strictly positive and \( |\pi_{kn}\rangle \)'s are orthonormal.

Correction of the Helstrom CR bound.—The physical implications of \( F^k \) and \( I^k \) are very important in understanding the saturation of the Helstrom CR bound: from Eq. (1), we see that for each POVM operator \( \Pi_k \), either regular or null, the corresponding QFIM \( F^k \) is a matrix bound for the corresponding CFIM \( F^k \). The saturation of the Helstrom CR bound requires the saturation of all these matrix bounds. Following this idea, we can derive the saturation conditions for the Helstrom CR bound by saturating Eq. (1) for regular and null POVM operators respectively. We summarize our main findings as the theorems below (see Secs. II A and II B of [50] for proofs).

**Theorem 1.** The matrix bound of the CFIM due to a regular operator \( \Pi_k \) is saturated at \( \lambda \), if and only if

\[
\Pi_k L_{i\lambda} |\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle = \xi^{ik} \Pi_k |\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle, \quad \forall i, k, n
\]

where \( \xi^{ik} \) is real and independent of \( n \).

**Theorem 2.** The matrix bound of the CFIM due to a null operator \( \Pi_k \) is saturated at \( \lambda \), if and only if

\[
\Pi_k L_{i\lambda} |\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle = \eta^{ijk} \Pi_k L_{j\lambda} |\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle, \quad \forall i, j, k, n
\]

where \( \eta^{ijk} \) is real and independent of \( n \).

Up to now Theorems 1–2 focus on the exact saturation of the QFIM. For limited experimental situations, where only separable measurements or collective measurements that involve only a small number of states are experimentally implementable, the CFIM scales exactly linearly with the number of identical states. As a result, the
QFIM can only be saturated exactly. In this case, Theorems 1-2 imply that for the exact saturation, reaching the Helstrom bound requires that the SLD must commute on the support of $\rho_{\lambda}$, i.e., $\langle \psi_{n\lambda}|[L_{i\lambda}, L_{j\lambda}]|\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle = 0$, $\forall n, m$, which we dub as the partial commutativity condition (see Sec. II C [50]). It reduces to the weak commutativity condition [49] for pure states and the full commutativity condition for full rank states. While the sufficiency of the partial commutativity to saturate the bound has been proved to be true in the case of pure states [45, 49] and is trivially true in the case of the full rank states, whether it is still true in the general case is beyond the scope of the current work.

When collective measurements that entangle a large number of states are allowed, where the CFIM has the sublinear corrections in general besides the linear term, asymptotic saturation becomes relevant. However, we emphasize that our Theorems 1-2 should be asymptotically satisfied if QFIM is asymptotically saturated. Ref. [46] concludes that if all possible measurements are allowed to perform on the large number of states, the weak commutativity condition $\text{Tr}(\rho_{\lambda}[L_{i\lambda}, L_{j\lambda}]) = 0$ is necessary and sufficient for the saturation of the Helstrom bound. However, the precise connection between our formalism here and Ref. [46] is still an open question.

When one considers spectral decomposition of the POVM operator and the matrix representation of $L_{i\lambda}$ given in Sec. III A of [50], the above two Theorems can be simplified as follows:

**Theorem 3.** The matrix bound of the CFIM due to a regular operator $\Pi_k = \sum_\alpha q_{k\alpha} |\pi_{k\alpha}\rangle \langle \pi_{k\alpha}|$ is saturated at $\lambda$, if and only if

$$
\langle \psi_{n\lambda}|L_{i\lambda}|\pi_{k\alpha}\rangle + 2 \langle \partial_\psi^0 \psi_{n\lambda}|\pi_{k\alpha}\rangle = \xi_k^n \langle \psi_{n\lambda}|\pi_{k\alpha}\rangle \forall i, n, \alpha,
$$

where $\xi_k^n$ is real and independent of $n$ and $\alpha$, and $L_{i\lambda}$ denotes the projection of $L_{i\lambda}$ onto sup$(\rho_{\lambda})$.

**Theorem 4.** The matrix bound of the CFIM due to a null operator $\Pi_k = \sum_\alpha q_{k\alpha} |\pi_{k\alpha}\rangle \langle \pi_{k\alpha}|$ is saturated at $\lambda$, if and only if

$$
\langle \partial_\psi \psi_{n\lambda}|\pi_{k\alpha}\rangle = \eta_k^n \langle \partial_j \psi_{n\lambda}|\pi_{k\alpha}\rangle \forall i, j, n, \alpha,
$$

where $\psi_{n\lambda}$ is not necessarily normalized and $\eta_k^n$ is real and independent of $n$ and $\alpha$.

Theorems 3-4 can recover the results for pure states and rank one projectors recently found by Pezzè et al. [45] (see Sec. IV of [50]). Furthermore they will be useful when one deals with specific problems, e.g., the problem of superresolution of two incoherent optical point sources we will discuss subsequently. We emphasize that at the critical point of the change of the rank of $\rho_{\lambda}$, where there exists $|\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle$ that locally vanishes at $\lambda$ and therefore $|\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle$ is not well-defined. While Eq. (5) is still valid in this case, Eq. (4) should be understood in the sense of taking the limit $\lambda' \to \lambda$ on both sides. We will illustrate this issue in the example of superresolution subsequently, but will not delve into rigorous mathematical discussion on the removable discontinuity of the QFIM at the critical point [57, 58]. Note that $\eta_k^n = 1$, thus for a null projector in single parameter estimation Eq. (5) is satisfied automatically. Moreover, $\eta_k^n = 1/\eta_j^n$. Thus in order to check whether a null projector satisfies Theorem 4, one only needs to verify whether the upper or lower (excluding the diagonal) matrix elements of $\eta_k^n$ are real and independent of $n$ and $\alpha$.

**Application to superresolution.**—Let us now apply the above theorems to estimate the three-dimensional separation of two incoherent point sources of monochromatic light. Fig. 1 shows the basic setup of the problem: The longitudinal axis ($Z$ axis) is taken to be the direction of light propagation. We assume the coordinates of the centroid of the two sources is known and chosen as the origin. The coordinates of the two sources are $s_s \equiv (s_1, s_2, s_3)$ respectively. The transverse coordinates are denoted as $s_\perp \equiv (s_1, s_2)$ and the dimensionless coordinates at the pupil plane are denoted as $r = (x_1, x_2)$ respectively. We consider the one photon mixed state $\rho_s = 1/2 \{ |\Psi_+\rangle \langle \Psi_+| + 1/2 |\Psi_-\rangle \langle \Psi_-| \}$, where $|\Psi_{\pm}\rangle \equiv e^{i\theta_{\psi}} |\Phi_{\pm}\rangle$. The pupil function is $\Phi_{\pm}(r) \equiv \langle r|\Phi_{\pm}\rangle = A \text{circ}(r/a)^{\text{exp}[i k (s_\perp \cdot r - s_\perp r^2/2)]}$ [30, 59], where the normalization constant $A = 1/(\sqrt{\pi}a)$, circ$(r/a)$ is one if $0 \leq r \leq a$ and vanishes everywhere else, and $r = \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}$. The overall phase $\theta_{\psi}$ is chosen such that $\Delta_s \equiv e^{2i\theta_{\psi}} \int dr \Phi_{s}^2(r)$ is real. It is straightforward to show that $\theta_s = -\theta_{\psi}$ (see Sec. V A of [50]). Therefore we find $\langle r|\Psi_{-}\rangle \equiv e^{-i\theta_{\psi}} \Phi_{-}(r)$ and $\langle \Psi_{-}|\Psi_{+}\rangle = \Delta_s$ is also real. With this observation, we can diagonalize $\rho_s$ with the states $|\psi_{1s}\rangle = |\psi_1\rangle / \sqrt{\mathcal{M}_{1s}}$ and $|\psi_{2s}\rangle = |\psi_2\rangle / \sqrt{\mathcal{M}_{2s}}$, where $|\psi_{1s}\rangle = |\Psi_{+}\rangle + |\Psi_{-}\rangle$, $|\psi_{2s}\rangle = -i(|\Psi_{+}\rangle - |\Psi_{-}\rangle)$ and the corresponding eigenvalues $p_{1s} = 1 + \Delta_s/2$. The QFIM associated with $\rho_s$ has been shown in Ref. [29], which is $I_{s} = 4 \text{Re} \{ |\partial_\psi \Phi_{s}\rangle \langle \partial_\psi \Phi_{s}| + \langle \Phi_{s}| \partial_\psi \Phi_{s}\rangle \langle \Phi_{s}| \partial_\psi \Phi_{s}| \}$. A straightforward calculation shows that the QFIM is diagonal with diagonal matrix elements $k^2 a^2, k^2 a^2$ and $k^2 a^2/12$. We will focus on the saturation of the QFIM subsequently and construct the corresponding optimal measurements.

Since now we have successfully diagonalized $\rho_s$, we can apply Theorems 3-4 to this problem to obtain the necessary and sufficient conditions for optimal measurements. We summarize the results as two corollaries below (see Secs. V B-V D of [50] for proofs). Note that our approach to optimal measurements is quite different from the approach of direct calculations by many papers [12, 29, 33, 35], where one needs to calculate the QFIM first and then check whether the CFIM associated with a specific measurement coincides with the QFIM.

**Corollary 1.** The matrix bound of CFIM corresponding to a projector $\Pi_k = \sum_\alpha |\pi_{k\alpha}\rangle \langle \pi_{k\alpha}|$ can be saturated...
locally at in the limit \( s \to 0 \) [60], if and only if
\[
\langle \partial_i \Phi_s | \pi_{ka} \rangle |_{s=0} = 0 \forall i, \alpha,
\]
provided the projector is regular and if and only if
\[
\langle \partial_i \Phi_s | \pi_{ka} \rangle |_{s=0} = \eta^k_i \langle \partial_j \Phi_s | \pi_{ka} \rangle |_{s=0} \forall i, j, \alpha,
\]
provided the projector is null, where \( \xi^k_i \) and \( \eta^k_i \) are real and independent of \( \alpha \).

**Corollary 2.** On the line \( s_{\perp} = 0 \) the matrix bound of CFIM of estimating the transverse separation corresponding to a projector \( \Pi_k = \sum_\alpha | \pi_{ka} \rangle \langle \pi_{ka} | \) can be saturated locally, if and only if
\[
\langle \partial_i \tilde{\psi}_{ns} | \pi_{ka} \rangle = \xi^k_i \langle \tilde{\psi}_{ns} | \pi_{ka} \rangle, \ i = 1, 2, \forall n, \alpha,
\]
provided the projector is regular, and if and only if
\[
\langle \partial_i \tilde{\psi}_{ns} | \pi_{ka} \rangle = \eta^k_i \langle \partial_j \tilde{\psi}_{ns} | \pi_{ka} \rangle, \ i, j = 1, 2, \forall n, \alpha,
\]
provided the projector is null, where \( \xi^k_i \) and \( \eta^k_i \) are real and independent of \( n \) and \( \alpha \).

Based on Corollary 2, we propose the following recipe of searching for the optimal measurements: (i) Identify the regular and null basis vectors in a given complete and orthonormal basis \( \{| \pi_{ka} \rangle \} \). (ii) For each regular basis vector \( | \pi_{ka} \rangle \), calculate the coefficient \( \xi^k_i \) defined in Eq. (8) and check whether \( \xi^k_i \)'s are real for each \( i \) and independent of the index \( n \). (iii) Assemble regular basis vectors that have the same coefficient \( \xi^k_i \) as a regular projector \( \Pi_k = \sum_\alpha | \pi_{ka} \rangle \langle \pi_{ka} | \). (iv) A null basis vector \( | \pi_{ka} \rangle \) is flexible if \( \langle \partial_i \tilde{\psi}_{ns} | \pi_{ka} \rangle \) and \( \langle \partial_j \tilde{\psi}_{ns} | \pi_{ka} \rangle \) vanishes for some \( i \) and \( j \). \( \eta^k_i \) can be set arbitrarily. (vi) Assemble null basis vectors that have the same \( \eta \) matrix as a null projector \( \Pi_k = | \pi_{ka} \rangle \langle \pi_{ka} | \). A similar recipe can also be constructed based on Corollary 1. It is clear from Theorems 3-4 that any partition of a set of optimal projectors is also optimal. However, from the experimental point of view, we would like to minimize the number of projectors for an optimal measurement.

For the case of \( s = 0 \), we consider the Zernike basis vectors denoted as \( | Z_{n}^{m} \rangle \) [61], where \( | Z_{0}^{0} \rangle = | \Phi_s \rangle |_{s=0} \). Following the recipe above (details can be found in Sec. V B of [50]): (i) \( | Z_{0}^{0} \rangle \) is the only regular basis vector and the remaining basis vectors are null. (ii) We find \( \langle \partial_i \Phi_s | Z_{0}^{0} \rangle |_{s=0} = 0 \) for \( i = 1, 2, 3 \). (iii) Thus we obtain a regular projector \( | Z_{0}^{0} \rangle \langle Z_{0}^{0} | \). (iv) For null basis vectors \( | Z_{n}^{m} \rangle \) with \( (n, m) \neq (1, \pm 1), (2, 0) \), we find \( \langle \partial_i \Phi_s | Z_{n}^{m} \rangle = 0 \) for all \( i \). Thus these basis vectors are flexible and can be lumped to the previous regular projector to form a new regular projector \( \Pi_1 \). (v-vi) We then calculate the \( \eta \) matrices corresponding to the null basis vectors \( | Z_{n}^{m} \rangle \) and find they are all distinct. Therefore we obtain three more null projectors \( \Pi_2 = | Z_{1}^{1} \rangle \langle Z_{1}^{1} | \), \( \Pi_3 = | Z_{1}^{-1} \rangle \langle Z_{1}^{-1} | \), and \( \Pi_4 = | Z_{2}^{2} \rangle \langle Z_{2}^{2} | \). We conclude that the projectors \( \{\Pi_i\}_{i=1}^{4} \) are the optimal measurement in the limit \( s \to 0 \).

On the line \( s_{\perp} = 0 \), we are interested in estimating the transverse separation and therefore set \( i = 1, 2 \). After some algebra, it is readily shown that \( \tilde{\psi}_{1,2s}(r) \) are real and \( \partial_i \tilde{\psi}_{1,2s}(r) |_{s_{\perp}=0} \) are odd. We still consider Zernike basis vectors \( | Z_{n}^{m} \rangle \). Following the previously proposed recipe (details can be found in Sec. V C of [50]): (i) Even basis vectors are either regular or flexible. Odd basis vectors are null and they are also flexible except for \( m = \pm 1 \). (ii) For regular and even basis vectors \( | Z_{2m}^{2m} \rangle \), it is easily calculated that \( \xi^k_i | Z_{2m}^{2m} \rangle = 0 \) for all \( i \) and \( \xi^k_i | Z_{1,2s} \rangle \). (iii) Thus we can construct a regular projector as a sum of the rank one projectors formed by all the regular and even basis vectors. (iv) We add all the rank one projectors formed by flexible basis vectors to the previous regular projector to obtain a regular projector \( \Pi_1 = 1 - \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} | Z_{2n+1}^{1} \rangle \langle Z_{2n+1}^{1} | \). (v) For the remaining null basis vectors, where \( m = \pm 1 \), we find \( \eta^k_{2n+1} = 0 \) and \( \eta^k_{2n+1} = 0 \) for \( | Z_{1,2s} \rangle \). (vi) Since the set \( \{ | Z_{2n+1}^{1} \rangle \} \) has the same \( \eta \) matrix and so does the set \( \{ | Z_{2n+1}^{1} \rangle \} \), we
obtain two null projectors $\Pi_2 = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |Z_{2n+1}\rangle \langle Z_{2n+1}|$, $\Pi_3 = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |Z_{2n+1}^{-1}\rangle \langle Z_{2n+1}^{-1}|$. Note that these optimal projectors are independent of functional form of the radial parts of the Zernike basis functions due to the fact that the radial parts for a fixed angular index $m$ are complete in the radial subspace. In fact, for a state $\langle r | \psi \rangle = \psi(r, \phi)$, one can show that $\langle \psi | \Pi_2 | \psi \rangle = 1/\pi \int_0^\infty rdrr\int_0^{2\pi} d\psi(r, \phi) \cos \phi \rangle^2$ and $\langle \psi | \Pi_3 | \psi \rangle = 1/\pi \int_0^\infty rdrr\int_0^{2\pi} d\psi(r, \phi) \sin \phi \rangle^2$, where one can explicitly see that the probabilities do not depend on the functional form of the radial parts of the basis functions. Furthermore the probability distribution corresponding to such a measurement is insensitive to the small change in the longitudinal separation. Thus one cannot extract any information about $s_3$ from this measurement. Fig. 2 is the numerical calculation of classical CR bound of estimating $s_1$ associated with this measurement. As we clearly see from Fig. 2, the Helstrom CR bound of estimating $s_1$ is saturated near the origin where $s_1 = 0$. Note that the Helstrom CR bound of estimating $s_3$ is the same as that of estimating $s_1$ and hence is omitted here.

On the plane $s_3 = 0$, for the case of $i = 1, 2$, i.e., estimating the transverse separation, following the previous recipe (see Sec. V D of [50] for details) we find rank one projectors formed by real and parity definite basis functions are optimal on the plane $s_3 = 0$. This result is a generalization of previous one-dimensional transverse estimation [33].

**Conclusion.**—We gave the necessary and sufficient conditions for any POVM measurement to give the Helstrom CR bound. Based on these saturation conditions, we predicted several local optimal measurements in the problem of estimating the three-dimensional separation of two incoherent light sources. These predictions are confirmed by numerical simulations. Our work has potential applications in quantum sensing, quantum enhanced imaging, mating the transverse separation, following the previous recipe (see Sec. V D of [50] for details) we find rank one projectors formed by real and parity definite basis functions are optimal on the plane $s_3 = 0$. This result is a generalization of previous one-dimensional transverse estimation [33].
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According to linear algebra the decomposition $|\psi\rangle = |\psi^0\rangle + |\psi^+\rangle$ is unique.
SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL: OPTIMAL MEASUREMENTS FOR QUANTUM MULTI-PARAMETER ESTIMATION WITH GENERAL STATES

In this Supplemental Material, we provide the proof of Eq. (1), equivalence between the saturations of the matrix and scalar Helstrom Cramér-Rao bounds, the proofs of Theorems 1-2, derivations of the partial commutativity condition, the matrix representation of the symmetric logarithmic derivative, the proofs of Theorems 3-4, the recovery of the results by Pezzè et al [45], calculation details of applying the saturation conditions to the imaging of two point incoherent sources, the proofs of Corollaries 1-2, the construction of the optimal measurements.

I. PROOF OF THE MATRIX BOUND EQ. (1) IN THE MAIN TEXT AND ITS RELATION TO THE SCALAR BOUND

A. For regular POVM operators

Proof. For regular POVM operators, we prove Eq. (1) in the main text by generalizing the technique by Braunstein and Caves [27]. The Classical Fisher Information Matrix (QFIM) element corresponding to a regular POVM \( \Pi_k \) is defined as

\[
F^k_{ij}(\lambda) = \partial_i \text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda \Pi_k) \partial_j \text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda \Pi_k)/\text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda \Pi_k). \tag{S1}
\]

Using the definition of Symmetric Logarithmic Derivative (SLD)

\[
[L_i \rho_\lambda + \rho_\lambda L_i \rho_\lambda]/2 = \partial_i \rho_\lambda, \tag{S2}
\]

and the cyclic property of trace, i.e.,

\[
\text{Tr}(L_i \rho_\lambda \Pi_k) = \text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda \Pi_k L_i \rho_\lambda) = [\text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda L_i \Pi_k)]^*, \tag{S3}
\]

we obtain [27, 56]

\[
\partial_i \text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda \Pi_k) = \text{Tr}(\partial_i \rho_\lambda \Pi_k) = \frac{1}{2} [\text{Tr}(L_i \rho_\lambda \Pi_k) + \text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda L_i \Pi_k)] = \text{Re}[\text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda \Pi_k L_i \rho_\lambda)]. \tag{S4}
\]

Therefore for a real and nonzero vector \( u \), we obtain

\[
\sum_{ij} u_i F^k_{ij} u_j = \frac{\text{Re}[\text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda \Pi_k \sum_i u_i L_i \rho_\lambda)]^2}{\text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda \Pi_k)} \leq \frac{|\text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda \Pi_k \sum_i u_i L_i \rho_\lambda)|^2}{\text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda \Pi_k)} \leq \sum_{ij} u_i u_j \text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda L_i \Pi_k L_j \rho_\lambda) \\
= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} u_i u_j (\text{Tr}[\rho_\lambda (L_i \Pi_k L_j \rho_\lambda + L_j \Pi_k L_i \rho_\lambda)]) \\
= \sum_{ij} u_i u_j \text{Re}[\text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda L_i \Pi_k L_j \rho_\lambda)], \tag{S5}
\]

we have in the second inequality applied the Cauchy-Swartz inequality \(|\text{Tr}(A^\dagger B)|^2 \leq \text{Tr}(A^\dagger A)\text{Tr}(B^\dagger B)\), with \( A \equiv \sqrt{\Pi_k \rho_\lambda} \) and \( B \equiv \sum_i \sqrt{\Pi_k} u_i L_i \rho_\lambda \sqrt{\rho_\lambda} \). Due to the fact \( u_i u_j \) is symmetric in indices \( i, j \), we have symmetrized \( \text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda L_i \Pi_k L_j \rho_\lambda) \) in the second last equality to obtain the last equality.


B. For null POVM operators

Proof. Introducing short hand notation

\[
g^k_{ij}(\lambda') \equiv \text{Tr}(\partial_i \rho_\lambda \Pi_k) \text{Tr}(\partial_j \rho_\lambda \Pi_k), \tag{S6}
\]

we obtain the following relations:

\[
\sum_{ij} u_i g^k_{ij}(\lambda') \leq \sum_{ij} u_i u_j \text{Re}[\text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda L_i \Pi_k L_j \rho_\lambda)],
\]

These results then lead to the proof of Eq. (1) in the main text for both regular and null POVM operators.
the CFIM element $F_{ij}^k$ corresponding to a null projector $\Pi_k$ defined in the main text can be rewritten as

$$F_{ij}^k(\lambda) = \lim_{\lambda' \to \lambda} \frac{g_{ij}^k(\lambda')}{h^k(\lambda')}.$$  \hfill (S8)

Since the right hand side of Eq. (S8) is of the type $0/0$, we need to Taylor expand both the numerator and denominator, which will involve the derivatives of $\rho_\lambda$. It is straightforward to show that the first order derivatives of $g_{ij}^k(\lambda')$ and $h^k(\lambda')$ vanish at $\lambda$, i.e.,

$$\partial_p g_{ij}^k(\lambda) = \text{Tr}(\partial_p \partial_i \rho_\lambda \Pi_k) \text{Tr}(\partial_j \rho_\lambda \Pi_k) + \text{Tr}(\partial_j \partial_i \rho_\lambda \Pi_k) \text{Tr}(\partial_p \partial_j \rho_\lambda \Pi_k) = 0,$$  \hfill (S9)

$$\partial_p h^k(\lambda) = \text{Tr}(\partial_p \rho_\lambda \Pi_k) = 0,$$  \hfill (S10)

due to the fact that $\rho_\lambda \Pi_k = 0$. Therefore we need to expand $g_{ij}^k(\lambda')$ and $h^k(\lambda')$ to the second order in $\delta \lambda \equiv \lambda' - \lambda$ and calculate their second derivatives at $\lambda$, i.e.,

$$\partial_p \partial_q g_{ij}^k(\lambda) = \text{Tr}(\partial_p \partial_i \rho_\lambda \Pi_k) \text{Tr}(\partial_q \partial_j \rho_\lambda \Pi_k) + \text{Tr}(\partial_q \partial_i \rho_\lambda \Pi_k) \text{Tr}(\partial_p \partial_j \rho_\lambda \Pi_k),$$  \hfill (S11)

$$\partial_p \partial_q h^k(\lambda) = \text{Tr}(\partial_p \partial_q \rho_\lambda \Pi_k).$$  \hfill (S12)

If we define

$$T_{ij}^k = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\partial_i \partial_j \rho_\lambda \Pi_k).$$  \hfill (S13)

Substitution of Eq. (S13) into Eqs. (S11, S12) gives

$$\partial_p \partial_q g_{ij}^k(\lambda) = 4(T_{pi}^k T_{qj}^k + T_{qi}^k T_{pj}^k),$$  \hfill (S14)

$$\partial_p \partial_q h^k(\lambda) = 2T_{pq}^k.$$  \hfill (S15)

Substituting $g_{ij}^k(\lambda') = \sum_{p, q} \partial_p \partial_q g_{ij}^k(\lambda) \delta \lambda_p \delta \lambda_q$ and $h^k(\lambda') = \sum_{p, q} \partial_p \partial_q h^k(\lambda) \delta \lambda_p \delta \lambda_q$ into Eq. (S8), with notice of Eqs. (S14, S15), we arrive at

$$F_{ij}^k(\lambda) = \frac{2 \sum_{p, q} (T_{pi}^k T_{qj}^k + T_{qi}^k T_{pj}^k) \delta \lambda_p \delta \lambda_q}{\sum_{pq} T_{pq}^k \delta \lambda_p \delta \lambda_q}.$$  \hfill (S16)

According to Eq. (S2) we find

$$\text{ReTr}(\rho_\lambda L_{i\lambda} \Pi_k L_{j\lambda}) = \frac{1}{2} [\text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda L_{i\lambda} \Pi_k L_{j\lambda}) + \text{c.c.}]$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} [\text{Tr}(L_{j\lambda} \rho_\lambda L_{i\lambda} \Pi_k) + \text{Tr}(L_{i\lambda} \rho_\lambda L_{j\lambda} \Pi_k)]$$

$$= \text{Tr}(L_{j\lambda} \partial_i \rho_\lambda \Pi_k) + \text{Tr}(\partial_i \rho_\lambda L_{j\lambda} \Pi_k) - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\partial_i L_{j\lambda} \rho_\lambda \Pi_k) - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda \partial_i L_{j\lambda} \Pi_k)$$

$$= \text{Tr}(\partial_i L_{j\lambda} \rho_\lambda \Pi_k) + \text{Tr}(\partial_i \rho_\lambda L_{j\lambda} \Pi_k) - \text{Tr}(\partial_i L_{j\lambda} \rho_\lambda \Pi_k) - \text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda \partial_i L_{j\lambda} \Pi_k)$$

$$= 2 \text{Tr}(\partial_i \rho_\lambda L_{j\lambda} \Pi_k),$$  \hfill (S17)

where the cancellations of the terms are due to the fact that $\rho_\lambda \Pi_k = 0$. In view of Eq. (S13), we arrive at

$$T_{ij}^k = \frac{1}{4} \text{ReTr}(\rho_\lambda L_{i\lambda} \Pi_k L_{j\lambda}) = \frac{1}{4} T_{ij}^k.$$  \hfill (S18)
We first derive the following inequality for later use. For real and non-zero $\delta \lambda$ and $u$, we obtain

$$
(\sum_{ij} \delta \lambda_i T_{ij}^k u_j)^2 = \frac{1}{16} \left( \text{Re} \left[ \sum_{ij} \delta \lambda_i \text{Tr}(\rho \lambda L_i \lambda L_j \lambda) u_j \right] \right)^2
$$

$$
\leq \frac{1}{16} \left| \sum_{ij} \delta \lambda_i \text{Tr}(\rho \lambda L_i \lambda L_j \lambda) u_j \right|^2
$$

$$
= \frac{1}{16} \left| \text{Tr} \left( \sum_i \delta \lambda_i \sqrt{\rho \lambda} L_i \lambda \sqrt{\Pi_k} \sum_j u_j \sqrt{\Pi_k} L_j \lambda \sqrt{\rho \lambda} \right) \right|^2
$$

$$
\leq \frac{1}{16} \left[ \sum_{ij} \delta \lambda_i \delta \lambda_j \text{Tr}(\sqrt{\rho \lambda} L_i \lambda \sqrt{\Pi_k} \sqrt{\Pi_k} L_j \lambda \sqrt{\rho \lambda}) \right] \left[ \sum_{ij} u_i u_j \text{Tr}(\sqrt{\rho \lambda} L_i \lambda \sqrt{\Pi_k} \sqrt{\Pi_k} L_j \lambda \sqrt{\rho \lambda}) \right]
$$

$$
= \left( \sum_{ij} T_{ij}^k \delta \lambda_i \delta \lambda_j \right) \left( \sum_{ij} T_{ij}^k u_i u_j \right)
$$

(S19)

where we have used the Cauchy-Swartz inequality $|\text{Tr}(A^1 B)|^2 \leq \text{Tr}(A^1 A) \text{Tr}(B^1 B)$, with $A \equiv \sum_i \delta \lambda_i \sqrt{\Pi_k} L_i \lambda \sqrt{\rho \lambda}$ and $B \equiv \sum_j \sqrt{\Pi_k} u_j L_j \lambda \sqrt{\rho \lambda}$ in the second inequality and performed symmetrization to obtain the last equality. Note that the denominator of Eq. (S16) can be rewritten as, upon substitution of Eq. (S18),

$$
\sum_{pq} T_{pq}^k \delta \lambda_p \delta \lambda_q = \text{Re} \text{Tr}[\rho \lambda \delta \Lambda \Pi_k \delta \Lambda] = \text{Tr}[\sqrt{\Pi_k} \delta \Lambda \rho \lambda (\sqrt{\Pi_k} \delta \Lambda)] \geq 0,
$$

(S20)

where $\delta \Lambda \equiv \sum_{pq} L_{pq} \delta \lambda_p$. Therefore for any $\delta \lambda$ the denominator of Eq. (S16) is non-negative. With these observations, next we find

$$
\sum_{ij} u_i F_{ij}^k u_j = \frac{4}{\sum_{pq} T_{pq}^k \delta \lambda_p \delta \lambda_q} \sum_{ij} u_i u_j \sum_{pq} T_{pq}^k \delta \lambda_p \delta \lambda_q
$$

$$
= \frac{4(\sum_{i} \delta \lambda_i T_{pi}^k u_i)^2}{\sum_{pq} T_{pq}^k \delta \lambda_p \delta \lambda_q}
$$

$$
\leq \frac{4(\sum_{pq} T_{pq}^k \delta \lambda_p \delta \lambda_q) \sum_{ij} u_i u_j T_{ij}^k}{\sum_{pq} T_{pq}^k \delta \lambda_p \delta \lambda_q}
$$

$$
= \sum_{ij} u_i u_j T_{ij}^k,
$$

(S21)

where we have used Eq. (S19) in the inequality to get the upper bound.

\[\square\]

C. Equivalence between the saturations of the scalar and matrix Helstrom Cramér-Rao (CR) bounds

**Lemma 5.** Given two positive semi-definite matrices $A$, $B$ and a positive definite weight matrix $G$ called weight matrix, if $A \preceq B$, i.e., $B - A$ is positive semi-definite, then the following statements are equivalent

(i) $\exists$ a positive definite weight matrix $G_0$ such that $\text{Tr}(G_0 A) = \text{Tr}(G_0 B)$

(ii) $A = B$

(iii) $\forall$ positive definite weight matrix $G$, $\text{Tr}(G A) = \text{Tr}(G B)$ holds

(iv) $\exists$ a positive definite weight matrix $G_0$ such that $\text{Tr}(G_0 A^{-1}) = \text{Tr}(G_0 B^{-1})$

(v) $\forall$ positive definite weight matrix $G$, $\text{Tr}(G A^{-1}) = \text{Tr}(G B^{-1})$ holds

**Proof.** We notice that once the (i) $\iff$ (ii) is justified, proof of the equivalence between any statements becomes straightforward. To prove (i) $\iff$ (ii), it is sufficient to show that (i) $\implies$ (ii) as the opposite direction is trivial. Condition (i) implies that $\text{Tr}[G_0(B - A)] = 0$. Now moving to the basis that diagonalizes the matrix $B - A$, i.e., $B - A = U^1 D U$, where $D$ is diagonal, we find

$$
\text{Tr}[G_0(B - A)] = \text{Tr}(U^1 G_0 U D) = \sum_n \tilde{G}_{0nn} D_{nn} = 0
$$

(S22)
where $\tilde{G}_0 \equiv U^\dagger G_0 U$ is representation of $G_0$ in the basis that diagonalizes $B - A$. Since $A \preceq B$, $B - A$ is also semi-positive definite and therefore $D_{nn} \succeq 0$. On the other hand $G_0$ is positive definite, which indicates diagonal matrix element of its representation in every basis is positive. Then we know $\tilde{G}_{0nn} > 0$. The only way to satisfy Eq. (S22) is $D_{nn} = 0$ for all $n$. Therefore we conclude that $A = B$. \hfill \Box

One the basis of the above lemma and the Eq. (1) in the main text, one immediately concludes that the saturation of the matrix Helstrom CR bound is equivalent to the saturation of the scalar Helstrom CR bound with respect to any chosen positive definite weight matrix $G$.

\section{Proofs of Theorem 1-2 in the Main Text and the Partial Commutativity Condition}

\subsection{Proof of Theorem 1}

\textit{Proof.} The saturation of the first inequality of Eq. (S5) requires that $\text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda \Pi_k \sum_i u_i L_i \lambda)$ must be real for any arbitrary real and nonzero vector $u$. Therefore $\text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda \Pi_k L_i \lambda)$ must be real for each $i$. The saturation of the second inequality of Eq. (S5) requires that $\sqrt{\Pi_k} \sqrt{\rho_\lambda}$ must be proportional to $\sqrt{\Pi_k} \sum_i u_i L_i \lambda \sqrt{\rho_\lambda}$ for any arbitrary, non-zero and real $u$. Thus $\sqrt{\Pi_k} \sqrt{\rho_\lambda}$ must be proportional to $\sqrt{\Pi_k} L_i \lambda \sqrt{\rho_\lambda}$ for each $i$, i.e.,

$$\xi_i^k \sqrt{\Pi_k} \sqrt{\rho_\lambda} = \sqrt{\Pi_k} L_i \lambda \sqrt{\rho_\lambda}, \forall i.$$  \hfill (S23)

Eq. (S23) can be rewritten as

$$\sqrt{\Pi_k} (L_i \lambda - \xi_i^k) \sqrt{\rho_\lambda} = 0, \forall i.$$  \hfill (S24)

Since $\rho_\lambda$ and $\sqrt{\rho_\lambda}$ has the same kernel, Eq. (S24) is equivalent as $\sqrt{\Pi_k} (L_i \lambda - \xi_i^k) \rho_\lambda = 0$, which is equivalent to

$$\Pi_k L_i \lambda \rho_\lambda = \xi_i^k \Pi_k \rho_\lambda$$  \hfill (S25)

due to the same reason. With the spectral decomposition $\rho_\lambda = \sum_n p_{n\lambda} |\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle \langle \psi_{n\lambda}|$, we arrive at

$$\Pi_k L_i \lambda |\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle = \xi_i^k \Pi_k |\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle, \forall i, k, n.$$  \hfill (S26)

The proportionality constant $\xi_i^k$ can be found by taking the trace inner product with $\sqrt{\Pi_k} \sqrt{\rho_\lambda}$ on both sides of Eq. (S23), i.e.,

$$\xi_i^k = \text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda \Pi_k L_i \lambda)/\text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda \Pi_k), \forall i.$$  \hfill (S27)

Therefore, the condition of $\text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda \Pi_k L_i \lambda)$ being real is equivalent to that $\xi_i^k$ is real, which concludes the proof. \hfill \Box

\subsection{Proof of Theorem 2}

\textit{Proof.} Since the saturation of Eq. (S21) is equivalent as the saturation of the two inequalities in Eq. (S19), we will work with Eq. (S19) subsequently. The saturation of the first inequality in Eq. (S19) requires $\sum_i \delta_{ij} \text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda \Pi_k L_i \lambda \Pi_k L_j \lambda) u_j$ is real for any $\delta \lambda, u$. This indicates that $\text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda \Pi_k L_i \lambda \Pi_k L_j \lambda)$ must be real for any pair $i, j$. The saturation of the second inequality in Eq. (S19) requires $\sum_i \delta_{ij} \sqrt{\Pi_k} L_i \lambda \sqrt{\rho_\lambda}$ be proportional to $\sum_j u_j \sqrt{\Pi_k} L_j \lambda \sqrt{\rho_\lambda}$ for any $\delta \lambda, u$. Thus $\sqrt{\Pi_k} L_i \lambda \sqrt{\rho_\lambda}$ must be proportional to $\sqrt{\Pi_k} L_j \lambda \sqrt{\rho_\lambda}$ for each pair $(i, j)$, i.e.,

$$\sqrt{\Pi_k} L_i \lambda \sqrt{\rho_\lambda} = \eta_{ij}^k \sqrt{\Pi_k} L_j \lambda \sqrt{\rho_\lambda}, \forall i, j, k.$$  \hfill (S28)

Since $\rho_\lambda$ and $\sqrt{\rho_\lambda}$ has the same kernel, Eq. (S28) is equivalent as $\sqrt{\Pi_k} (L_i \lambda - \eta_{ij}^k L_j \lambda) \rho_\lambda = 0$, which is equivalent to

$$\Pi_k L_i \lambda \rho_\lambda = \eta_{ij}^k \Pi_k L_j \lambda \rho_\lambda$$  \hfill (S29)

due to the same reason. With the spectral decomposition $\rho_\lambda = \sum_n p_{n\lambda} |\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle \langle \psi_{n\lambda}|$, we arrive at

$$\Pi_k L_i \lambda |\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle = \eta_{ij}^k \Pi_k L_j \lambda |\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle, \forall i, j, k, n.$$  \hfill (S30)
The proportionality constant $\eta^k_{ij}$ can be found by taking the trace inner product with $\sqrt{\Pi_k L_{ij} \lambda} \sqrt{\rho_\lambda}$ on both sides of Eq. (S23), i.e.,

$$\eta^k_{ij} = \frac{\trace(\rho_\lambda L_{ij} \lambda \Pi_k \lambda)}{\trace(\rho_\lambda L_{ij} \lambda \Pi_k \lambda)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (S31)

Since $\trace(\rho_\lambda L_{ij} \lambda \Pi_k \lambda)$ is real, the condition that $\trace(\rho_\lambda L_{ij} \lambda \Pi_k \lambda)$ must be real is equivalent to that $\eta^k_{ij}$ must be real, which concludes the proof.

C. The partial commutativity condition

Below we show that for the exact saturation of the Quantum Fisher Information Matrix (QFIM), which quantifies the Helstrom CR bound, it is necessary to have the partial commutativity condition discussed in the main text.

**Proof.** If $\Pi_k$ is regular, according to Eq. (S26), we obtain

$$\langle \psi_m | L_{ij} \Pi_k L_{ij} | \psi_n \rangle = \xi^{jk} \langle \psi_m | L_{ij} \Pi_k | \psi_n \rangle = \xi^{jk} \langle \psi_m | L_{ij} \Pi_k L_{ij} | \psi_n \rangle = \langle \psi_m | L_{ij} \Pi_k L_{ij} | \psi_n \rangle$$  \hspace{1cm} (S32)

If $\Pi_k$ is null, according to Eq. (S30), we obtain

$$\langle \psi_m | L_{ij} \Pi_k L_{ij} | \psi_n \rangle = \eta^{jk} \langle \psi_m | L_{ij} \Pi_k L_{ij} | \psi_n \rangle = \langle \psi_m | L_{ij} \Pi_k L_{ij} | \psi_n \rangle = \langle \psi_m | L_{ij} \Pi_k L_{ij} | \psi_n \rangle$$  \hspace{1cm} (S33)

Thus we can see that the optimal measurement mediates the commutativity between $L_{ij}$ and $L_{ij}$ on the support of $\rho_\lambda$, i.e.,

$$\langle \psi_m | [L_{ij}, L_{ij}] | \psi_n \rangle = \sum_k \langle \psi_m | L_{ij} \Pi_k L_{ij} | \psi_n \rangle - \sum_k \langle \psi_m | L_{ij} \Pi_k L_{ij} | \psi_n \rangle = 0, \forall m, n.$$  \hspace{1cm} (S34)

\[ \square \]

III. THE MATRIX REPRESENTATION OF THE SLD AND PROOFS OF THEOREMS 3-4 IN THE MAIN TEXT

A. Matrix representation of the SLD

We denote the orthonormal basis vectors of the support and the kernel of $\rho_\lambda$ as $|\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle$ and $|e_{n\lambda}\rangle$ respectively. Then Eq. (S2), the defining equation of the SLD, in the basis formed by $\{ |\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle, |e_{n\lambda}\rangle \}$ becomes

$$[L_{ij}]_{mn} \vartheta_{n\lambda} + [L_{ij}]_{mn} \vartheta_{m\lambda} = 2 \partial_i \rho_\lambda [L_{ij}]_{mn},$$  \hspace{1cm} (S35)

where $[L_{ij}]_{mn} \equiv \langle m | L_{ij} | n \rangle$. $|n\rangle$ is the eigenvector of $\rho_\lambda$ which could be either $|\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle$ or $|e_{n\lambda}\rangle$.

$$\partial_i \rho_\lambda = \sum_n \partial_i p_{n\lambda} |\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle \langle \psi_{n\lambda}| + \sum_n |e_{n\lambda}\rangle \langle e_{n\lambda}| + \sum_n |e_{n\lambda}\rangle \langle e_{n\lambda}|$$  \hspace{1cm} (S36)

and $\vartheta_{n\lambda}$ is the corresponding eigenvalue which could be either the positive eigenvalue $p_{n\lambda}$ or zero. From Eq. (S36), we know that for $|m\rangle = |e_{m\lambda}\rangle$ and $|n\rangle = |e_{n\lambda}\rangle$, where $\vartheta_m = \vartheta_n = 0$,

$$\langle e_{m\lambda}| \partial_i \rho_\lambda |e_{n\lambda}\rangle = 0, \forall m, n.$$  \hspace{1cm} (S37)

Thus we can choose

$$\langle e_{m\lambda}| L_{ij} |e_{n\lambda}\rangle = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (S38)

Therefore the following choice of the SLD

$$[L_{ij}]_{mn} = \begin{cases} 0 & |m\rangle = |e_{m\lambda}\rangle \text{ and } |n\rangle = |e_{n\lambda}\rangle \\ \frac{2 |\partial_i \rho_\lambda|_{mn}}{\vartheta_{m\lambda} \vartheta_{n\lambda}} & \text{else} \end{cases}$$  \hspace{1cm} (S39)
can satisfy its matrix definition Eq. (S35). Based on Eqs. (S36, S39), a matrix representation of the SLD,

$$L_{i\lambda} = \sum_n \frac{\partial_i p_{n,\lambda}}{p_{n,\lambda}} |\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle \langle \psi_{n\lambda}| + 2 \sum_{m,n} \frac{p_{m\lambda} - p_{n\lambda}}{p_{m\lambda} + p_{n\lambda}} \langle \partial_i \psi_{m\lambda}| \psi_{n\lambda}\rangle \langle \psi_{m\lambda} |\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle$$

$$+ \left[ 2 \sum_{m,n} \langle \partial_i \psi_{n\lambda}| e_{m\lambda}\rangle |\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle \langle e_{m\lambda}| + c.c. \right],$$

(S40)
can be found [56]. With Eq. (S40), it is straightforward to calculate, for a state $|\psi\rangle = |\psi^0\rangle + |\psi^\perp\rangle$,

$$L_{i\lambda} |\psi\rangle = L_{i\lambda}^\perp |\psi\rangle + 2 \sum_{m,n} \langle \partial_i \psi_{n\lambda}| e_{m\lambda}\rangle |\psi\rangle + 2 \sum_{m,n} \langle e_{m\lambda}| \partial_i \psi_{n\lambda}\rangle |\psi_{n\lambda}| \psi^\perp \rangle |e_{m,\lambda}\rangle,$$

where

$$L_{i\lambda}^\perp = \sum_n \frac{\partial_i p_{n,\lambda}}{p_{n,\lambda}} |\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle \langle \psi_{n\lambda}| + 2 \sum_{m,n} \frac{p_{m\lambda} - p_{n\lambda}}{p_{m\lambda} + p_{n\lambda}} \langle \partial_i \psi_{m\lambda}| \psi_{n\lambda}\rangle \langle \psi_{m\lambda} |\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle,$$

(S42)
is the projection of the SLD on the subspace $\text{supp}(\rho_{\lambda})$. Upon noting the following identities

$$\langle \partial_i \psi_{n\lambda}| e_{m\lambda}\rangle = \langle \partial_i^0 \psi_{n\lambda}| e_{m\lambda}\rangle,$$

(S43)

$$\sum_m \langle \partial_i^0 \psi_{n\lambda}| e_{m\lambda}\rangle \langle e_{m\lambda}| \psi\rangle = \langle \partial_i^0 \psi_{n\lambda}| \psi^0\rangle = \langle \partial_i^0 \psi_{n\lambda}| \psi\rangle,$$

(S44)

we obtain

$$\langle \psi_{n\lambda}| L_{i\lambda} |\psi\rangle = \langle \psi_{n\lambda}| L_{i\lambda}^\perp |\psi\rangle + 2 \langle \partial_i^0 \psi_{n\lambda}| \psi\rangle.$$

(S45)

**B. Proof of Theorem 3**

*Proof.* For a regular POVM operator $\Pi_k$ with a spectral decomposition $\Pi_k = \sum_{\alpha} q_{k\alpha} |\pi_{k\alpha}\rangle \langle \pi_{k\alpha}|$ where $q_{k\alpha}$ is strictly positive, Eq. (S26) becomes

$$\sum_{\alpha} q_{k\alpha} |\pi_{k\alpha}\rangle \langle \pi_{k\alpha}| L_{i\lambda} |\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle = \sum_{\alpha} q_{k\alpha} \xi_{i\lambda}^k |\pi_{k\alpha}\rangle \langle \pi_{k\alpha}| \psi_{n\lambda}\rangle, \forall i, n.$$

(S46)

Since $|\pi_{k\alpha}\rangle$’s are linearly independent, the above equation is equivalent to

$$\langle \pi_{k\alpha}| L_{i\lambda} |\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle = \xi_{i\lambda}^k \langle \pi_{k\alpha}| \psi_{n\lambda}\rangle, \forall i, \alpha, n.$$

(S47)

with $\xi_{i\lambda}^k$ being real and independent of $n$. According to Eq. (S45), we have

$$\langle \psi_{n\lambda}| L_{i\lambda} |\pi_{k\alpha}\rangle = \langle \psi_{n\lambda}| L_{i\lambda}^\perp |\pi_{k\alpha}\rangle + 2 \langle \partial_i^0 \psi_{n\lambda}| \pi_{k\alpha}\rangle$$

(S48)

which concludes the proof. 

**C. Proof of Theorem 4**

*Proof.* For a null POVM operator $\Pi_k = \sum_{\alpha} q_{k\alpha} |\pi_{k\alpha}\rangle \langle \pi_{k\alpha}|$, according to Eq. (S45), Eq. (S30) becomes

$$\sum_{\alpha} q_{k\alpha} |\pi_{k\alpha}\rangle \langle \pi_{k\alpha}| L_{i\lambda} |\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle = \sum_{\alpha} \eta_{ij} q_{k\alpha} |\pi_{k\alpha}\rangle \langle \pi_{k\alpha}| L_{j\lambda} |\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle$$

(S49)

Since $|\pi_{k\alpha}\rangle$’s are linearly independent, the above equation is equivalent to

$$\langle \pi_{k\alpha}| L_{i\lambda} |\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle = \eta_{ij}^k \langle \pi_{k\alpha}| L_{j\lambda} |\psi_{n\lambda}\rangle, \forall i, \alpha, n.$$

(S50)
with $\eta_{ij}^k$ being real and independent of $n$. Since $\Pi_k$ is null, $\langle \pi_{k\alpha} | \psi_{n\lambda} \rangle = 0$, $\forall n, \alpha$. Therefore, according to Eq. (S45), we have

$$\langle \psi_{n\lambda} | L_{i\lambda} | \pi_{k\alpha} \rangle = 2 \langle \partial_i' \psi_{n\lambda} | \pi_{k\alpha} \rangle.$$  \hspace{1cm} (S51)

Therefore according to Eq. (S49), we arrive at

$$\langle \partial_i' \psi_{n\lambda} | \pi_{k\alpha} \rangle = \eta_{ij}^k \langle \partial_j \psi_{n\lambda} | \pi_{k\alpha} \rangle$$  \hspace{1cm} (S52)

Recall that for a null operator $\Pi_k = \sum_{\alpha} g_{k\alpha} | \pi_{k\alpha} \rangle \langle \pi_{k\alpha} |$, we have $\langle \psi_{n\lambda} | \pi_{k\alpha} \rangle = 0$, $\forall n, \alpha$. This implies we obtain

$$\langle \partial_i' \psi_{n\lambda} | \pi_{k\alpha} \rangle = \langle \partial_i \psi_{n\lambda} | \pi_{k\alpha} \rangle$$  \hspace{1cm} (S53)

$$\langle \partial_i \tilde{\psi}_{n\lambda} | \pi_{k\alpha} \rangle = \langle \partial_i \psi_{n\lambda} | \pi_{k\alpha} \rangle \langle \tilde{\psi}_{n\lambda} | \psi_{n\lambda} \rangle,$$  \hspace{1cm} (S54)

where $| \tilde{\psi}_{n\lambda} \rangle$ is an unnormalized state. Upon substituting the above two equations into Eq. (S52), one can conclude the proof easily.

\section*{IV. RECOVERING THE RESULTS BY PEZZÈ ET AL. [45]}

Pezzè et al. [45] obtained the necessary and sufficient conditions for a projective measurement consisting of rank one projectors to saturate the Helstrom CR bound for pure states. Here we recover their results through Theorems 3 and 4 in the main text. For a pure state $\rho_{\lambda} = | \psi_{\lambda} \rangle \langle \psi_{\lambda} |$, the dimension of $\text{supp}(\rho_{\lambda})$ is one. Therefore $\xi^k_i$'s naturally do not depend on the index $n$. Furthermore, for a rank one projector, we suppress the subscript $\alpha$ in the basis vector $| \pi_{k\alpha} \rangle$ and observe that $\xi^k_i$'s naturally do not depend either. To satisfy Theorem 3 in the main text, we only require the coefficients $\xi^k_i$ be real. The SLD for a pure state is $L_{i\lambda} = 2(\langle \partial_i \psi_{\lambda} | \psi_{\lambda} \rangle + | \psi_{\lambda} \rangle \langle \partial_i | \psi_{\lambda} \rangle)$ [27, 56], from which we find $L_{i\lambda} = 0$. Multiplying both sides of Eq. (4) in the main text by $\langle \pi_{k} | \psi_{\lambda} \rangle$, the only requirement that $\xi^k_i$ be real gives

$$\text{Im}[\langle \partial_i' \psi_{\lambda} | \pi_{k} \rangle \langle \pi_{k} | \psi_{\lambda} \rangle] = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (S55)

This equation is equivalent as the Eq. (8) in Pezzè et al. [45] and is a generalization of Eq. (29) in Braunstein and Caves [27]. Similarly, multiplying both sides of Eq. (5) in the main text by $\langle \pi_{k} | \partial_j \psi_{\lambda} \rangle$, the only requirement that $\eta^k_{ij}$ be real gives

$$\text{Im}[\langle \partial_i \psi_{\lambda} | \pi_{k} \rangle \langle \pi_{k} | \partial_j \psi_{\lambda} \rangle] = 0,$$  \hspace{1cm} (S56)

which recovers Eq. (7) of Pezzè et al. [45].

\section*{V. OPTIMAL MEASUREMENTS IN ESTIMATING THE SEPARATIONS OF TWO POINT INCOHERENT SOURCES OF LIGHT}

\subsection*{A. Properties of $| \psi_{1,2s} \rangle$}

We mention in the main text that $\theta_s$ is chosen such that

$$\Delta_s \equiv e^{2i\theta_s} \int dr \Phi_s^2(r).$$  \hspace{1cm} (S57)

is real. Defining

$$v_s \equiv \text{Re}[\int dr \Phi_s^2(r)] = A^2 \int dr \text{circ}(r/a) \cos(2ks_{s} \cdot r) \cos(k s_{s} r^2),$$  \hspace{1cm} (S58)

$$w_s \equiv \text{Im}[\int dr \Phi_s^2(r)] = -A^2 \int dr \text{circ}(r/a) \cos(2ks_{s} \cdot r) \sin(k s_{s} r^2),$$  \hspace{1cm} (S59)
we can express $\theta_s$ and $\Delta_s$ as
\begin{align}
\tan 2\theta_s &= -\frac{w_s}{v_s}, \\
\Delta_s &= \sqrt{v_s^2 + w_s^2}.
\end{align}

As is clear from Eqs. (S58, S59), $v_s$ is even in $s$ while $w_s$ is odd in $s$. Thus according to Eq. (S60), we know $\theta_s$ is odd in $s$, i.e.,
\begin{equation}
\theta_s = -\theta_{-s}.
\end{equation}

With these observations, the one photon state defined in the main text can be diagonalized by the following state:
\begin{align}
\psi_{1s}(r) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2(1 + \Delta_s)}}[\Psi_{+s}(r) + \Psi_{-s}(r)] = \frac{\tilde{\psi}_{1s}(r)}{\sqrt{4p_{1s}}}, \\
\psi_{2s}(r) &= \frac{-i}{\sqrt{2(1 - \Delta_s)}}[\Psi_{+s}(r) - \Psi_{-s}(r)] = \frac{\tilde{\psi}_{2s}(r)}{\sqrt{4p_{2s}}},
\end{align}

where
\begin{equation}
\Psi_{\pm s}(r) = e^{\pm i\theta_s}\Phi_{\pm s}(r),
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\Phi_s(r) = A_{\text{circ}}(r/a) \exp[ik(s_{\perp} \cdot r - s_3r^2/2)].
\end{equation}

We can write the explicit forms of $\psi_{\pm s}(r) \equiv \langle r | \psi_{\pm s} \rangle$ as
\begin{align}
\psi_{1s}(r) &= \frac{\tilde{\psi}_{1s}(r)}{\sqrt{4p_{1s}}} = \frac{2A_{\text{circ}}(r/a)\cos(\theta_s + ks_{\perp} \cdot r - ks_3r^2/2)}{\sqrt{4p_{1s}}}, \\
\psi_{2s}(r) &= \frac{\tilde{\psi}_{2s}(r)}{\sqrt{4p_{2s}}} = \frac{2A_{\text{circ}}(r/a)\sin(\theta_s + ks_{\perp} \cdot r - ks_3r^2/2)}{\sqrt{4p_{2s}}}.
\end{align}

Eqs. (S65, S66) immediately tell us
\begin{equation}
\langle \partial_i \psi_{+s} | \psi_{+s} \rangle = -\langle \partial_i \psi_{-s} | \psi_{-s} \rangle = -i\partial_i \theta_s + i\delta_{s3}ka^2/4,
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\langle \partial_i \psi_{-s} | \psi_{+s} \rangle = \langle \partial_i \psi_{+s} | \psi_{-s} \rangle = -\partial_i \Delta_s/2,
\end{equation}

where $\delta_{s3}$ is the Kronecker delta.

From Eqs. (S63, S64) we know that $\psi_{1,2s}(r)$ are real. Therefore we conclude $\langle \partial_i \psi_{1s} | \psi_{1s} \rangle$ and $\langle \partial_i \psi_{2s} | \psi_{2s} \rangle$ must be real. On the other hand, they must be purely imaginary due to the fact that $\langle \partial_i \psi_{1s} | \psi_{1s} \rangle + \langle \psi_{1s} | \partial_i \psi_{1s} \rangle = 0$ for $n = 1, 2$. So we end up with
\begin{equation}
\langle \partial_i \psi_{1s} | \psi_{1s} \rangle = \langle \partial_i \psi_{2s} | \psi_{2s} \rangle = 0.
\end{equation}

Furthermore $\langle \partial_i \psi_{1s} | \psi_{2s} \rangle$ is also real since, upon application of Eqs. (S69, S70),
\begin{align}
\langle \partial_i \psi_{1s} | \psi_{2s} \rangle &= \frac{-i}{2\sqrt{1 - \Delta_s^2}}((\langle \partial_i \psi_{+s} | + \langle \partial_i \psi_{-s} |)(\langle \psi_{+s} | - | \psi_{-s} \rangle) \\
&= \frac{-i}{2\sqrt{1 - \Delta_s^2}}((\langle \partial_i \psi_{+s} | + \langle \partial_i \psi_{-s} |)(\langle \psi_{+s} | - \langle \psi_{-s} | \psi_{-s} \rangle) \\
&= \frac{-i}{\sqrt{1 - \Delta_s^2}} = -\partial_i \theta_s + \delta_{s3}ka^2/4.
\end{align}

The fact that $\partial_i \langle \psi_{2s} | \psi_{1s} \rangle = 0$ gives $\langle \partial_i \psi_{2s} | \psi_{1s} \rangle = -\langle \psi_{2s} | \partial_i \psi_{1s} \rangle$. On the other hand Eq. (S72) tells us $\langle \psi_{2s} | \partial_i \psi_{1s} \rangle = \langle \partial_i \psi_{1s} | \psi_{2s} \rangle$. Thus we know
\begin{equation}
\langle \partial_i \psi_{2s} | \psi_{1s} \rangle = -\langle \partial_i \psi_{1s} | \psi_{2s} \rangle.
\end{equation}
B. The case $s = 0$

We first apply Theorem 3 in the main text to obtain the following Lemmas, which will be useful subsequently.

**Lemma 6.** For the mixed state $\rho_s$, the matrix bound of the CFIM due to a regular projector $\Pi_k = \sum_\alpha |\pi_{\alpha}\rangle \langle \pi_{\alpha}|$ is saturated if and only if

\[
\frac{\partial_i p_{1s}}{p_{1s}} \langle \psi_{1s} | \pi_{\alpha} \rangle - 4p_{2s} \langle \partial_i \psi_{1s} | \psi_{2s} \rangle \langle \psi_{2s} | \pi_{\alpha} \rangle + 2 \langle \partial_i \psi_{1s} | \pi_{\alpha} \rangle = \xi_i^k \langle \psi_{1s} | \pi_{\alpha} \rangle ,
\]  

(S74)

\[
\frac{\partial_i p_{2s}}{p_{2s}} \langle \psi_{2s} | \pi_{\alpha} \rangle - 4p_{1s} \langle \partial_i \psi_{2s} | \psi_{1s} \rangle \langle \psi_{1s} | \pi_{\alpha} \rangle + 2 \langle \partial_i \psi_{2s} | \pi_{\alpha} \rangle = \xi_i^k \langle \psi_{2s} | \pi_{\alpha} \rangle ,
\]  

(S75)

holds $\forall i$, $\alpha$, where $p_{1,2s} = (1 \pm \Delta_s)/2$ and $\xi_i^k$ is real and independent of $n$ and $\alpha$.

**Proof.** According to Eqs. (S42, S71), we find

\[
L_{1s}^\perp = \frac{\partial_i \Delta_s}{1 + \Delta_s} |\psi_{1s}\rangle \langle \psi_{1s}| - \frac{\partial_i \Delta_s}{1 - \Delta_s} |\psi_{2s}\rangle \langle \psi_{2s}| + 2\Delta_s \langle \partial_i \psi_{1s} | \psi_{2s} \rangle |\psi_{1s}\rangle \langle \psi_{2s}| = 2\Delta_s \langle \partial_i \psi_{2s} | \psi_{1s} \rangle |\psi_{2s}\rangle \langle \psi_{1s}| .
\]  

(S76)

Thus

\[
L_{1s}^\perp |\pi_{\alpha}\rangle = |\psi_{1s}\rangle \left[ \frac{\partial_i \Delta_s}{1 + \Delta_s} \langle \psi_{1s} | \pi_{\alpha} \rangle + 2\Delta_s \langle \partial_i \psi_{1s} | \pi_{\alpha} \rangle \right] + |\psi_{2s}\rangle \left[ -\frac{\partial_i \Delta_s}{1 - \Delta_s} \langle \psi_{2s} | \pi_{\alpha} \rangle - 2\Delta_s \langle \partial_i \psi_{2s} | \pi_{\alpha} \rangle \right] ,
\]  

(S77)

which can be rewritten as upon noting Eq. (S71),

\[
L_{1s}^\perp |\pi_{\alpha}\rangle = |\psi_{1s}\rangle \left[ \frac{\partial_i \Delta_s}{1 + \Delta_s} \langle \psi_{1s} | \pi_{\alpha} \rangle + 2\Delta_s \langle \partial_i \psi_{1s} | \pi_{\alpha} \rangle \right] + |\psi_{2s}\rangle \left[ -\frac{\partial_i \Delta_s}{1 - \Delta_s} \langle \psi_{2s} | \pi_{\alpha} \rangle - 2\Delta_s \langle \partial_i \psi_{2s} | \pi_{\alpha} \rangle \right] .
\]  

(S78)

In order to saturate the MQCRB, according to Theorem 3 in the main text, every regular projector $\Pi_k = \sum_\alpha |\pi_{\alpha}\rangle \langle \pi_{\alpha}|$ must satisfy

\[
\frac{\partial_i \Delta_s}{1 + \Delta_s} \langle \psi_{1s} | \pi_{\alpha} \rangle + 2\Delta_s \langle \partial_i \psi_{1s} | \pi_{\alpha} \rangle + 2 \langle \partial_i \psi_{1s} | \pi_{\alpha} \rangle = \xi_i^k \langle \psi_{1s} | \pi_{\alpha} \rangle ,
\]  

(S79)

\[
-\frac{\partial_i \Delta_s}{1 - \Delta_s} \langle \psi_{2s} | \pi_{\alpha} \rangle - 2\Delta_s \langle \partial_i \psi_{2s} | \pi_{\alpha} \rangle + 2 \langle \partial_i \psi_{2s} | \pi_{\alpha} \rangle = \xi_i^k \langle \psi_{2s} | \pi_{\alpha} \rangle ,
\]  

(S80)

where $\xi_i^k$ is real. With the facts that $\langle \partial_i \psi_{1,2s} | \pi_{\alpha} \rangle + \langle \partial_i \psi_{1,2s} | \pi_{\alpha} \rangle = \langle \partial_i \psi_{1,2s} | \pi_{\alpha} \rangle$ and $p_{1,2s} = (1 \pm \Delta_s)/2$, one can easily concludes the proof.

1. Proof of Corollary 1 in the main text

**Proof.** We find at $s = 0$

\[
\Delta_s = 1
\]  

(S81)

and $p_{1s}|_{s=0} = 1$ and $p_{2s}|_{s=0} = 0$. Therefore $p_{1s}$ and $p_{2s}$ attain their local maximum and minimum respectively at $s = 0$, i.e., $\partial_i p_{1s} = \partial_i p_{2s} = 0$, which indicates

\[
\partial_i \Delta_s = 0, \ i = 1, 2, 3.
\]  

(S82)

We recognize that $s = 0$ is the critical point of the change of the rank of $\rho_s$. In this case, both the normalized vector $|\psi_{2s}\rangle$ and the first term on the left hand side of Eq. (S75) is not well-defined. Therefore Eqs. (S74, S75) should be understood in the sense of the limit $s \to 0$. It can be also shown that

\[
|\psi_{2s}\rangle \big|_{s=0} = 0
\]  

(S83)
\[ \partial_t \tilde{\psi}_s (r) \big|_{s=0} = \partial_t \psi_1 (r) \big|_{s=0} = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \]  

(S84)

With these facts, the second term of the left hand side of Eq. (S74) reads

\[ 4p \langle \partial_t \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle \langle \psi_2 | \pi_{k\alpha} \rangle = \langle \partial_t \psi_1 | \tilde{\psi}_2 \rangle \langle \tilde{\psi}_2 | \pi_{k\alpha} \rangle = 0, \]  

(S85)

which immediately tells us that for a regular projector \( \Pi_k \) that saturates its matrix bound \( \xi_k = 0 \) \( \forall i = 1, 2, 3 \). In order to saturate the matrix bound, it remains to show Eq. (S75) is consistent with the result \( \xi_k = 0 \). It is readily checked that

\[ \langle \partial_t \psi_2 | \pi_{k\alpha} \rangle = \frac{\langle \partial_t \tilde{\psi}_2 | \pi_{k\alpha} \rangle}{\sqrt{4p}} - \frac{\partial_p \langle \tilde{\psi}_2 | \pi_{k\alpha} \rangle}{2p} \]  

(S86)

\[ \lim_{s \to 0} p \langle \partial_t \psi_2 | \psi_1 \rangle \langle \psi_1 | \pi_{k\alpha} \rangle = - \lim_{s \to 0} \langle \tilde{\psi}_2 | \partial_t \psi_1 \rangle \langle \psi_1 | \pi_{k\alpha} \rangle \]  

(S87)

the left hand and right hand sides of Eq. (S75) can be written as

\[ \text{LHS} = \lim_{s \to 0} 2 \left( \frac{\langle \tilde{\psi}_2 | \partial_t \psi_1 \rangle}{\sqrt{p}} \langle \psi_1 | \pi_{k\alpha} \rangle + \frac{\langle \partial_t \tilde{\psi}_2 | \pi_{k\alpha} \rangle}{\sqrt{4p}} \right) \]  

(S88)

\[ \text{RHS} = \xi_k \lim_{s \to 0} \langle \psi_2 | \pi_{k\alpha} \rangle = \xi_k \lim_{s \to 0} \frac{\langle \tilde{\psi}_2 | \pi_{k\alpha} \rangle}{\sqrt{4p}} \]  

(S89)

Upon eliminating the factor \( 1/\sqrt{P} \) in both equations and noting that \( \lim_{s \to 0} \langle \tilde{\psi}_2 | \partial_t \psi_1 \rangle = \lim_{s \to 0} \langle \tilde{\psi}_2 | \pi_{k\alpha} \rangle = 0 \), we find that LHS = RHS is the consistent with the result \( \xi_k = 0 \) if and only if

\[ \lim_{s \to 0} \langle \partial_t \tilde{\psi}_2 | \pi_{k\alpha} \rangle = \langle \partial_t \tilde{\psi}_2 | \pi_{k\alpha} \rangle \big|_{s=0} = 0, \quad \forall i, \alpha. \]  

(S90)

It is straightforward to calculate

\[ \partial_t \tilde{\psi}_2 (r) \big|_{s=0} = -i(\partial_t \Psi_+ (r) - \partial_t \Psi_- (r)) \big|_{s=0} = [2\partial_t \theta_s \Phi_s (r) - 2i\partial_t \Phi_s (r)] \big|_{s=0}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3. \]  

(S91)

On the other hand, at \( s = 0 \), according to Eqs. (S58, S59), the explicit forms of \( v_s \) and \( w_s \) can be expressed as

\[ v_s \big|_{s=0} = \pi \alpha^2 a^2, \]  

(S92)

\[ w_s \big|_{s=0} = 0, \]  

(S93)

According to Eq. (S60), we obtain

\[ \theta_s \big|_{s=0} = 0. \]  

(S94)

Differentiating both sides of Eq. (S57), we obtain

\[ \partial_t \Delta_s = 2i\partial_t \theta_s \int dr \Phi_s^2 (r) + 2e^{2i\theta_s} \int dr \Phi_s (r) \partial_t \Phi_s (r) \]  

(S95)

So at \( s = 0 \), \( \int dr \Phi_s^2 (r) \big|_{s=0} = 1 \) and \( \Phi_s (r) \big|_{s=0} \) is real and therefor

\[ \partial_t \theta_s \big|_{s=0} = i \int dr \Phi_s (r) \partial_t \Phi_s (r) \big|_{s=0} = i \langle \Phi_s | \partial_t \Phi_s \rangle \big|_{s=0} \]  

(S96)

According to Eqs. (S91, S96), we know

\[ \big| \partial_t \tilde{\psi}_2 \big| \big|_{s=0} = 2i(\langle \Phi_s | \partial_t \Phi_s \rangle - \langle \partial_t \Phi_s \rangle) \big|_{s=0} = -2i \partial_t^2 \Phi_s \]  

(S97)
where $|\partial^i \Phi_s\rangle$ is the projection of $|\partial_i \Phi_s\rangle$ onto the kernel of $|\Phi_s\rangle \langle \Phi_s|$. Therefore the satisfaction of Eq. (S90) is equivalent as

$$\langle \partial^0_i \Phi_s | \pi_{\kappa \alpha} \rangle |_{s=0} = 0, \forall i, \alpha$$

(S98)

The saturation of the matrix bound associated with a null projector requires that

$$\langle \partial_i \tilde{\psi}_1 s | \pi_{\kappa \alpha} \rangle |_{s=0} = \eta_{ij} \langle \partial_j \tilde{\psi}_1 s | \pi_{\kappa \alpha} \rangle |_{s=0}, \forall i, j, \alpha,$$

(S99)

Due to Eq. (S84), Eq. (S99) is trivially satisfied. Note that for null projectors $|\Phi_s\rangle \langle \Phi_s| |_{s=0} = 0$ and therefore according to Eq. (S97), we find

$$\langle \partial_i \tilde{\psi}_2 s | \pi_{\kappa \alpha} \rangle |_{s=0} = 2 \eta_{ij} \langle \partial_j \tilde{\psi}_2 s | \pi_{\kappa \alpha} \rangle |_{s=0}, \forall i, j, \alpha.$$  

(S101)

Now the satisfaction of Eq. (S90) is equivalent as

$$\langle \partial_i \Phi_s | \pi_{\kappa \alpha} \rangle |_{s=0} = \eta_{ij} \langle \partial_j \Phi_s | \pi_{\kappa \alpha} \rangle |_{s=0}, \forall i, j, \alpha.$$  

(S102)

2. Details of constructing the optimal measurement in the main text

It is easily calculated that

$$|\Phi_s\rangle |_{s=0} = |Z_0^0\rangle,$$

(S103)

$$|\partial_1 \Phi_s\rangle |_{s=0} = i k |Z_1^1\rangle / 2,$$

(S104)

$$|\partial_2 \Phi_s\rangle |_{s=0} = i k |Z_1^{-1}\rangle / 2,$$

(S105)

$$|\partial_3 \Phi_s\rangle |_{s=0} = -i k (|Z_2^0\rangle / 3 + |Z_0^0\rangle) / 2.$$  

(S106)

With Eqs. (S103-S106), one can easily understand the details in the construction recipes in the main text. For example, the following facts can be obtained:

$$\langle \partial^0_i \Phi_s | Z_0^0\rangle |_{s=0} = \langle \partial_i \Phi_s | Z_0^0\rangle |_{s=0} = 0, i = 1, 2,$$

(S107)

$$\langle \partial^0_3 \Phi_s | Z_0^0\rangle |_{s=0} = \langle \partial_3 \Phi_s | Z_0^0\rangle |_{s=0} - \langle \partial_3 \Phi_s | \Phi_s\rangle |_{s=0} \langle \Phi_s | Z_0^0\rangle |_{s=0} = 0.$$  

(S108)

C. The case $s_{\perp} = 0$

1. Proof of Corollary 2 in the main text for the case of $s_{\perp} = 0$

Proof. We assume $s_{\perp} = 0$ and $s_3 \neq 0$, where the rank of the state is strictly two. In this case, according to Eqs. (S58, S59), the explicit forms of $v_s$ and $w_s$ can be expressed as

$$v_s |_{s_{\perp}=0} = \frac{\pi A^2}{ks_3} \sin(ks_3a^2),$$

(S109)
\[ w_s|_{s_\perp=0} = -\frac{\pi A^2}{ks_3}[1 - \cos(ks_3a^2)], \quad (S110) \]

\[ \partial_i v_s|_{s_\perp=0} = \partial_i w_s|_{s_\perp=0} = 0, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (S111) \]

According to Eqs. (S60, S61), we obtain

\[ \theta_s|_{s_\perp=0} = \frac{ks_3a^2}{4}, \quad (S112) \]

\[ \Delta_s|_{s_\perp=0} = \left[ \frac{2}{ks_3a^2} \sin \left(\frac{ks_3a^2}{2}\right) \right]^2, \quad (S113) \]

\[ \left. \frac{2\partial_i \theta_s}{1 + 4\theta_s^2} \right|_{s_\perp=0} = \left. \frac{-\partial_i w_s v_s - w_s \partial_i v_s}{\theta_s^2} \right|_{s_\perp=0}, \quad (S114) \]

\[ \left. \partial_i \Delta_s \right|_{s_\perp=0} = \left. \frac{v_s \partial_i v_s + w_s \partial_i w_s}{\Delta_s} \right|_{s_\perp=0}. \quad (S115) \]

Therefore, we arrive at

\[ \partial_i \theta_s|_{s_\perp=0} = \partial_i \Delta_s|_{s_\perp=0} = 0, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (S116) \]

According to Eqs. (S63, S64), we know

\[ |\partial_i \psi_n\rangle = |\partial_i \tilde{\psi}_n\rangle/\sqrt{4^n}, \quad n, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (S117) \]

Substituting Eqs. (S72, S73, S116) into Eqs. (S74, S75), one obtains the saturation condition for regular projectors.

Furthermore, if near the critical point \( s = 0 \) the QFIM is saturated, then by taking the limit \( s \rightarrow 0 \), it is also saturated at \( s = 0 \).

\[ \square \]

2. Details of constructing the optimal measurement in the main text

It can be calculated that according to Eqs. (S67, S68, S112, S116),

\[ \tilde{\psi}_{1s}(r)|_{s_\perp=0} = 2A_{\text{circ}}(r/a) \cos[ks_3(a^2 - 2r^2)/4], \quad (S118) \]

\[ \tilde{\psi}_{2s}(r)|_{s_\perp=0} = 2A_{\text{circ}}(r/a) \sin[ks_3(a^2 - 2r^2)/4], \quad (S119) \]

\[ \partial_i \tilde{\psi}_{1s}(r)|_{s_\perp=0} = -kx_i \tilde{\psi}_{2s}(r)|_{s_\perp=0} i = 1, 2, \quad (S120) \]

\[ \partial_i \tilde{\psi}_{2s}(r)|_{s_\perp=0} = kx_i \tilde{\psi}_{1s}(r)|_{s_\perp=0} i = 1, 2. \quad (S121) \]

We see that both \( \tilde{\psi}_{1s}(r)|_{s_\perp=0} \) and \( \tilde{\psi}_{2s}(r)|_{s_\perp=0} \) are even while both \( \partial_i \tilde{\psi}_{1s}(r)|_{s_\perp=0} \) and \( \partial_i \tilde{\psi}_{2s}(r)|_{s_\perp=0} \) for \( i = 1, 2 \) are odd. Therefore,

\[ \langle \tilde{\psi}_{1s}| Z_{2n+1}^{2m+1} \rangle |_{s_\perp=0} = \langle \tilde{\psi}_{2s}| Z_{2n+1}^{2m+1} \rangle |_{s_\perp=0} = 0, \quad (S122) \]
\[\langle \partial_z \hat{\psi}_1 | Z_{2n}^{2m} | s_\perp = 0 \rangle = \langle \partial_z \hat{\psi}_{2s} | Z_{2n}^{2m} | s_\perp = 0 \rangle = 0,\]  
(S123)

where \(Z_{2n+1}^m(r)\) is of odd parity and \(Z_{2n}^m(r)\) is of even parity. Furthermore, since

\[\partial_1 \hat{\psi}_{k\alpha}(r) |_{s_\perp = 0} \propto f(r) \cos \phi, \quad k = 1, 2,\]  
(S124)

\[\partial_2 \hat{\psi}_{k\alpha}(r) |_{s_\perp = 0} \propto f(r) \sin \phi, \quad k = 1, 2,\]  
(S125)

we obtain for \(m \neq \pm 1\)

\[\langle \partial_1 \hat{\psi}_{k\alpha} | Z_{2n+1}^m | s_\perp = 0 \rangle = 0, \quad k = 1, 2,\]  
(S126)

while

\[\langle \partial_1 \hat{\psi}_{k\alpha} | Z_{2n+1}^{\pm 1} | s_\perp = 0 \rangle \neq 0, \quad k = 1, 2.\]  
(S127)

### D. The case \(s_3 = 0\)

1. The saturation conditions for the case of \(s_3 = 0\)

Let us focus on the case where \(s_3 = 0\) and \(s_\perp \neq 0\). According to Eqs. (S58, S59), it is easily calculated that

\[v_\alpha |_{s_3 = 0} = A^2 \int dr \text{circ}(r/a) \cos(2k s_\perp \cdot r),\]  
(S128)

\[\partial_1 v_\alpha |_{s_3 = 0} = -2kA^2 \int dr x \text{circ}(r/a) \sin(2k s_\perp \cdot r), \quad i = 1, 2,\]  
(S129)

\[w_\alpha |_{s_3 = 0} = 0,\]  
(S130)

\[\partial_i w_\alpha |_{s_3 = 0} = 0, \quad i = 1, 2.\]  
(S131)

According to Eqs. (S60, S61), we obtain

\[\theta_\alpha |_{s_3 = 0} = 0,\]  
(S132)

\[\partial_i \theta_\alpha |_{s_3 = 0} = 0, \quad i = 1, 2.\]  
(S133)

Substituting Eq. (S72, S73, S133) into Eqs. (S74, S75), one obtains the following saturation condition for a regular projector \(\Pi_k = \sum_\alpha |\pi_{k\alpha}\rangle \langle \pi_{k\alpha}|\) where \(\text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda \Pi_k) > 0\) and the estimation of the transverse separation \(s_1\) and \(s_2\),

\[\frac{\partial_1 p_{1s}}{p_{1s}} \langle \psi_{1s} | \pi_{k\alpha}\rangle + 2 \langle \partial_1 \psi_{1s} | \pi_{k\alpha}\rangle = \xi_1^k \langle \psi_{1s} | \pi_{k\alpha}\rangle,\]  
(S134)

\[\frac{\partial_1 p_{2s}}{p_{2s}} \langle \psi_{2s} | \pi_{k\alpha}\rangle + 2 \langle \partial_2 \psi_{2s} | \pi_{k\alpha}\rangle = \xi_2^k \langle \psi_{2s} | \pi_{k\alpha}\rangle.\]  
(S135)

One can directly apply Theorem 4 in the main text to obtain the following saturation condition for a null projector \(\Pi_k = \sum_\alpha |\pi_{k\alpha}\rangle \langle \pi_{k\alpha}|\) where \(\text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda \Pi_k) = 0\),

\[\langle \partial_1 \hat{\psi}_{ns} | \pi_{k\alpha}\rangle = \eta_{ij} \langle \partial_j \hat{\psi}_{ns} | \pi_{k\alpha}\rangle, \quad i, j = 1, 2, \forall n, \alpha.\]  
(S136)

Note that if near the critical point \(s = 0\) the QFIM is saturated by some optimal measurement, then by taking the limit \(s \to 0\), it is also saturated at \(s = 0\). □
2. Details of constructing the optimal measurement in the main text

It can be calculated according to Eqs. (S67, S68, S132, S133) that,

\[ \tilde{\psi}_1(r) \mid_{s_3=0} = 2A_{\text{circ}}(r/a) \cos(ks_\perp \cdot r), \]  
\[ (S137) \]

\[ \tilde{\psi}_2(r) \mid_{s_3=0} = 2A_{\text{circ}}(r/a) \sin(ks_\perp \cdot r), \]  
\[ (S138) \]

\[ \partial_i \tilde{\psi}_1(r) \mid_{s_3=0} = -kx_i \tilde{\psi}_2(r) \mid_{s_3=0}, \quad i = 1, 2, \]  
\[ (S139) \]

\[ \partial_i \tilde{\psi}_2(r) \mid_{s_3=0} = kx_i \tilde{\psi}_1(r) \mid_{s_3=0}, \quad i = 1, 2. \]  
\[ (S140) \]

We see that for \( i = 1, 2 \), both \( \tilde{\psi}_1(r) \mid_{s_3=0} \) and \( \partial_i \tilde{\psi}_1(r) \mid_{s_3=0} \) are even while both \( \tilde{\psi}_2(r) \mid_{s_3=0} \) and \( \partial_i \tilde{\psi}_2(r) \mid_{s_3=0} \) are odd. We choose real basis with definite parity where the real even and basis functions are denoted as \( \pi_{\pm \alpha}(r) = \langle r \mid \pi_{\pm \alpha} \rangle \) respectively. For an even and regular basis vector \( |\pi_{+\alpha}\rangle \), we can obtain \( \langle \tilde{\psi}_2 | \pi_{k\alpha} \rangle = 0 \) and \( \langle \partial_i \tilde{\psi}_2 | \pi_{k\alpha} \rangle = 0 \) by the parities of these functions. Thus both sides of Eq. (S135) vanish and set no constraint on the constant \( \xi_i^k \). From Eq. (S134) we find

\[ \xi_i^{+\alpha} = \left( \frac{\langle \partial_i \tilde{\psi}_1 | \pi_{+\alpha} \rangle}{\langle \tilde{\psi}_1 | \pi_{+\alpha} \rangle} + \frac{\partial_i p_{1s}}{p_{1s}} \right) \mid_{s_3=0} \]  
\[ (S141) \]

is also real. For different regular even basis vectors, the coefficients \( \xi_i^{+\alpha} \) are not necessarily equal. Thus according to the recipe in the main text, we obtain one regular projector \( \Pi_{+\alpha} = |\pi_{+\alpha}\rangle \langle \pi_{+\alpha}| \) corresponding to each of these vectors for the optimal measurement. If an even basis vector \( |\pi_{+\alpha}\rangle \) is null, then we see that \( \langle \partial_1 \tilde{\psi}_2 | \pi_{+\alpha} \rangle = \langle \partial_2 \tilde{\psi}_2 | \pi_{+\alpha} \rangle = 0 \) and

\[ \eta_{21}^{+\alpha} = \frac{\langle \partial_2 \tilde{\psi}_1 | \pi_{+\alpha} \rangle}{\langle \partial_1 \tilde{\psi}_1 | \pi_{+\alpha} \rangle} \mid_{s_3=0} \]  
\[ (S142) \]

is real. Again for different null even basis vectors, the coefficients \( \eta_{21}^{+\alpha} \) are not necessarily equal. We obtain one null projector \( \Pi_{-\alpha} = |\pi_{-\alpha}\rangle \langle \pi_{-\alpha}| \) for each of these vectors for the optimal measurement. Similar analysis can be done for odd basis functions, either regular or null. Therefore one can construct the optimal projectors \( \Pi_{-\alpha} = |\pi_{-\alpha}\rangle \langle \pi_{-\alpha}| \). So we conclude that rank one projectors formed by real and parity definite basis vectors are optimal on the plane \( s_3 = 0 \).