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Modular values are quantities that described by pre- and postselected states of quantum systems like weak values but are different from them: The associated interaction is not necessary to be weak. We discuss an optimal modular-value-based measurement with a spin coherent pointer: A quantum system is exposed to a field in which strength is to be estimated through its modular value. We consider two cases, with a two-dimensional and a higher-dimensional pointer, and evaluate the quantum Fisher information. The modular-value-based measurement has no merit in the former case, while its sensitivity can be enhanced in the latter case. We also consider the pointer under a phase-flip error. Our study should motivate researchers to apply the modular-value-based measurements for quantum metrology.

Introduction.—In the concept of quantum sensing, a physical quantity on a small scale can be measured indirectly via a quantum system, a quantum property, or a quantum phenomenon\textsuperscript{1}. The principle of measurements is (i) preparing quantum systems, hereafter called sensors, of which number is \(L\), (ii) exposing to a field of which strength is to be measured for a period of \(t\), and (iii) obtaining a state change before and after the exposure. The change is a measure of the strength of the field. This procedure is repeated \(T/t\) times in a total measurement time \(T\). If the sensors are independent, the effective total measurement number \(N\) is given as \(N = LT/t\). For fixed \(T\) and \(t\), the uncertainty of the estimation is proportional to \(1/\sqrt{L}\), which is known as the standard quantum limit or the shot noise limit\textsuperscript{2,3}. However, if the uncertainty scales as \(1/L\) then it is called the Heisenberg limit\textsuperscript{4}, which is a fundamental limit.

There have been a number of attempts to improve measurement protocols to overcome the standard quantum limit. One of the pioneering attempts is to employ squeezed states to reduce noises\textsuperscript{4,5}. The entanglement is also a resource for defeating the standard quantum limit\textsuperscript{6,7,8,9}. For example, Jones \textit{et al.} have used NOON states\textsuperscript{11,12}. Zaiser \textit{et al.} have claimed that the sensitivity can be significantly enhanced by using a quantum memory\textsuperscript{13}. Matsuzaki \textit{et al.} have proposed a protocol with a teleportation\textsuperscript{14}.

These studies focused on sensors exposed to a field. We, here, draw attention a method how the sensors are measured. One approach in this direction is employing a weak value\textsuperscript{15,16,17}. Measurements with weak values had been expected to enhance the sensitivity\textsuperscript{18,19,20}, but it turned out that they can only reach the standard quantum limit\textsuperscript{13,24}. The measurements with weak values, however, can be dramatically improved when sensors are entangled\textsuperscript{22,23}. Furthermore, by employing non-classical pointer states, the sensitivity can reach the Heisenberg limit\textsuperscript{20,21,22}.

In this Letter, we discuss modular-value-based measurements\textsuperscript{20,23} with spin-\(j\) coherent pointers\textsuperscript{34,35}. They are different from the weak-value-based ones and can allow arbitrary strength interactions between the pointers and sensors. The pointer may be considered as a measurement device for extracting the field information from the sensors. In order to evaluate the sensitivity, we focus on the quantum Fisher information contained in the Cramér-Rao inequality\textsuperscript{6,36–38}. Its maximum provides the lower bound on the sensitivity for measuring the field. In this Letter, \(L\) is fixed and we compare the Fisher information of the measurements under various conditions. We first examine a measurement with a \(j = \frac{1}{2}\) (qubit) pointer and then move our attention to that with \(j \geq 1\) pointer. We also consider the case when the qubit pointer is under a phase-flip error\textsuperscript{39}.

Modular-value-based measurement.— We assume that the sensor exposed to a field is a qubit and that its initial state is \(|\psi_i\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)\) which evolves to \(|\psi_t(\omega)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + \mathrm{e}^{-i\omega t}|1\rangle)\) during a period \(t\). \(\omega\) is a measure of the field strength to be estimated. We prepare the pointer in a spin-\(j\) coherent state

\[
|\xi\rangle = \sum_{m=-j}^{j} \sqrt{\binom{2j}{j+m}} \cos \left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{j+m} \sin \left(\frac{\theta}{2}\mathrm{e}^{-i\varphi}\right)^{j-m} |j, m\rangle
\]

in spherical representation\textsuperscript{34,35}, where \(\theta \in [0, \pi]\) and \(\varphi \in [0, 2\pi]\). \(|j, m\rangle\) is the standard angular momentum basis for a fixed \(j, m \in [-j, +j]\).

The interaction Hamiltonian between the sensor and the pointer is assumed to be \(\hat{H} = g(\tau)\sigma_{z} \otimes |j, +j\rangle \langle j, +j|\). After the interaction during \(\tau \sim \tau_0\), the joint state of the sensor-pointer yields

\[
|\Psi(\omega)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(|0\rangle \otimes |\xi_+\rangle + \mathrm{e}^{-i\omega t}|1\rangle \otimes |\xi_-\rangle\right),
\]
where $|\xi_{\pm}\rangle = \exp(\mp ig|j, +j\rangle\langle j, +j|)\xi$ and $g = \int_0^\infty g(\tau) d\tau$ is the coupling strength. After postselecting the sensor onto a final state $|\psi_f\rangle = \cos \frac{\phi}{2}|0\rangle + \sin \frac{\phi}{2}|1\rangle$, the normalized pointer state becomes

$$
|\eta\rangle = \langle\psi_f|\hat{U}|\psi_i(\omega)\rangle \otimes |\xi\rangle/\sqrt{p(\omega)}
$$

$$
= \langle\psi_f|\psi_i(\omega)\rangle \left[ \sum_{m=-j}^{j-1} c_{jm}|j, m\rangle + \left( \cos \frac{\phi}{2} \right)^2 (\sigma_z)_m|j, j\rangle \right]/\sqrt{p(\omega)}.
$$

Here, $p(\omega) = ||\langle\psi_f|\hat{U}|\psi_i(\omega)\rangle\otimes|\xi\rangle||^2$ is the probability of successful postselection, where $||\ast||$ is the norm of $\ast$,

$$
c_{jm} = \sqrt{\left( \cos \frac{\phi}{2} \right)^2 \left( \sin \frac{\phi}{2} e^{-i\phi} \right)^{j-m}}, \quad (\sigma_z)_m = \frac{\langle\psi_f|e^{-i\sigma_z}|\psi_i(\omega)\rangle}{\langle\psi_f|\psi_i(\omega)\rangle},
$$

is $\omega$ dependent modular value of the observable $\sigma_z$. Note that $(\sigma_z)_m$ is independent of the choice of the initial pointer state $|\xi\rangle$. Throughout this Letter, we fix $g = \pi/2$. Under this condition, the modulus of the modular value, $||\sigma_z\rangle_m\rangle$, becomes the minimum when $|\psi_f\rangle = |\psi_i\rangle$ ($\phi = \pi/2$) and does the maximum when $|\psi_f\rangle$ is orthogonal to $|\psi_i\rangle$ ($\phi = 3\pi/2$).

The uncertainty $\delta \omega$ in the estimation of $\omega$ after $N$ independent measurements is defined by $\delta \omega = \sqrt{\text{var}(\omega; \psi)}$, where $\text{var}(\omega; \psi)$ is the average of the measured $\omega$'s. Its minimum is determined by the Cramér-Rao lower bound as $\delta \omega \geq 1/\sqrt{NF}$ [28, 32, 33]. $F$ is the Fisher information and is defined by $F = \sum_k [1/p_k(\omega)]^2 |dp_k(\omega)/d\omega|^2$, where $p_k(\omega)$ is the probability distribution for obtaining the $k$'th experimental result. The maximization of $F$ over all possible measurements leads to the quantum Fisher information $Q$ [38, 40, 41, 11]. For a pure quantum state $|\psi(\omega)\rangle$, $Q$ is given by [10]

$$
Q = 4\left[ \frac{d^2|\psi(\omega)\rangle}{d\omega^2} \frac{d|\psi(\omega)\rangle}{d\omega} - \frac{d^2|\psi(\omega)\rangle}{d\omega^2} \frac{d|\psi(\omega)\rangle}{d\omega} \right]^2.
$$

In order to obtain the best sensitivity, we have to maximize $Q$ when $N$ is fixed.

We define the quantum Fisher information of the sensor of which state is $|\psi_i(\omega)\rangle$ as $Q_\omega$. By following Eq. (1), we obtain $Q_\omega = t^2$. $Q_\omega$ is also obtained in the case of Ramsey sensing [2, 4]. Therefore, we call these measurement protocols which give $Q = t^2$ as the conventional measurement. $Q_\omega$ is employed as the reference when comparing the Fisher information in various measurements in this Letter.

In measurement protocols with postselection, $Q$ is given by the sum of $Q_m$ and $F_p$ [13, 21]. $Q_m$ is called the measured quantum Fisher information which is a product of the Fisher information of the final pointer state and the probability of successful postselection $p(\omega)$.

$F_p$ is called the postselected classical Fisher information defined as [13, 21]

$$
F_p = \frac{1}{p(\omega)[1 - p(\omega)]} \left[ \frac{dp(\omega)}{d\omega} \right]^2.
$$

As shown in the Supplementary Material [43], $F_p = O(\omega^2)$ at $\omega t \ll 1$ for all $j$. Therefore, we can ignore $F_p$ and we have to consider only $Q_m$. We rewrite the final pointer state Eq. (3) as

$$
|\eta\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[ \cos \frac{\phi}{2} |\xi_+\rangle + \sin \frac{\phi}{2} e^{-i\omega t} |\xi_-\rangle \right]/\sqrt{p(\omega)}
$$

and then substitute it into Eq. (1). We will evaluate $Q_m$ in two cases of $j = 1/2$ and $j \geq 1$. We introduce $Q_m^{(j)}$ which denotes the measured quantum Fisher information with the spin-$j$ coherent pointer in our measurement protocol.

**Two-dimensional pointer.**—We evaluate $Q_m^{(1/2)}$. According to the definition of $Q_m$, we substitute Eq. (1) into Eq. (4) and make a product with $p(\omega)$ [43], we obtain

$$
Q_m^{(1/2)} = \frac{t^2}{2(1 - \cos^2 \theta \sin^2 \phi)} + O(\omega^2).
$$

Note that $Q_m^{(1/2)}$ depends on both the postselected state (via $\phi$) and the initial pointer state (via $\theta$), as shown in Fig. 1. We can immediately observe $Q_m^{(1/2)} / Q_\omega \leq 1$. The equality is satisfied when $(\phi, \theta) = (\pi/2, 0)$ and $(3\pi/2, \pi)$. This implies that modular-value-based measurements, like weak-value-based ones [19–24], cannot overcome the standard quantum limit. There is no advantage of the modular-value amplification in the qubit-pointer case.

![FIG. 1.](image_url) (Color online) $Q_m^{(1/2)}/Q_\omega$ as a function of $\theta$ and $\phi$.

**Higher-dimensional pointer.**—We consider $Q_m^{(j)}$ for $j \geq 1$. Detailed calculations are shown in the Supplementary Material [43]. We obtain $Q_m^{(j)}/Q_m^{(1/2)} \leq 2j$. The equality is satisfied when $(\phi, \theta) = (3\pi/2, 0)$. In Fig. 2 $Q_m^{(j)}/Q_m^{(1/2)}$ is shown as a function of $\theta$ for $j = 1, 3/2,$ and 2. When
We may employ them as one qubit sensor and a modular-value amplification in the case of \( j = 3/2 \) (\( \phi = \pi/2 \)) and can be achieved at \( \theta = 0 \). Inset: the same as the main figure at \( \phi = \pi/2 \) where \( |(\sigma_z)_m| \) is minimum.

Suppose that we have \( L + 1 \) qubits as a resource for measurement. We may employ them as \( L \) independent sensors and one qubit pointer. In this case, \( \delta \omega \) scales \( 1/\sqrt{L} \) which corresponds to the standard quantum limit. In order to measure all sensors, we have to repeat measurements \( L \) times. On the other hand, we can employ them as one qubit sensor and a \( j \geq 1 \) pointer formed with \( L \) qubits. Note that \( j = L/2 \) [44]. Therefore, we expect the enhancement of the Fisher information as \( Q_m^{(j)}/Q_m^{(1/2)} = L \) according to the above discussion. If we are allowed to measure \( L \) times as in the previous case, we may be able to expect another \( L \) enhancement in the Fisher information. In total, the enhancement of the Fisher information can scale \( L^2 \). It implies \( \delta \omega \) scales \( 1/L \). We can claim that our modular-value-based measurement with a spin-\( j \) coherent pointer can approach the Heisenberg limit.

Measurements under noise.—So far, we assumed the ideal noiseless environments. Let us consider measurements under noisy environments where phase-flip errors occur on the pointer. The influence of the noise is described by the operator-sum representation as [36, 43],

\[
\rho' = (1 - \nu)\rho + \nu \sigma_z \rho \sigma_z,
\]

where \( \rho' \) is the density matrix of the pointer under the noise, \( \rho \) is that in the noiseless environment, and \( 0 < \nu < 1 \) is the probability of the phase-flip. When \( \nu = 1/2 \), we totally lose the information of \( \omega \) [43]. Hereafter, we only discuss a modular-value-based measurement with a qubit-pointer \( (j = 1/2) \) as a concrete example of noisy measurements.

By using the symmetric logarithmic derivative (SLD) operators defined by \( L_\lambda \rho + \rho L_\lambda = 2\lambda \rho \) [38, 40], the quantum Fisher information matrix \( H_{\alpha,\beta} \) is defined by [46, 40]

\[
H_{\alpha,\beta} = p(\omega) \text{Tr} \left[ \frac{\hat{L}_\alpha \hat{L}_\beta + \hat{L}_\beta \hat{L}_\alpha}{2} \right],
\]

where \( \alpha, \beta = \omega \) or \( \nu \). \( H_{\nu,\omega} \) is the quantum Fisher information associated with the estimation of \( \omega \) and named as \( \omega Q_m^{(1/2)} \), while \( H_{\nu,\nu} \) is that with the estimation of \( \nu \) and named as \( \nu Q_m^{(1/2)} \). For \( j = 1/2 \), the final density matrix of the pointer is given by \( \rho = |\eta\rangle \langle \eta| \), where \( |\eta\rangle \) is given by Eq. (8). Then, we obtain

\[
H = \begin{pmatrix}
(1 - 2\nu)^2 \sin^2 \theta \sin^2 \phi & 0 \\
0 & \frac{\sin^2 \theta \cos^2 \phi}{2(\nu - \nu^2)(1 - \cos \theta \sin \phi)}
\end{pmatrix} + O(\omega^2).
\]

We observe \( \nu Q_{m}^{(1/2)} = (1 - 2\nu)^2 Q_{m}^{(1/2)} \): This fact clearly illustrates that the noise degrades the measurements and that the \( \theta \)– and \( \phi \)–dependencies are inherited from \( Q_{m}^{(1/2)} \) to \( \nu Q_m^{(1/2)} \). It is in agreement with the general discussion under noise [28], too.

We show \( (\nu - \nu^2) \nu Q_{m}^{(1/2)} \) as a function of \( \theta \) and \( \phi \) in Fig. 3. It is interesting to note that \( \nu Q_{m}^{(1/2)} = 0 \) when \( \phi = \pi/2 \) and \( 3\pi/2 \) and that these \( \phi \)'s give the maxima of \( \nu Q_m^{(1/2)} \). Even more interesting, the parameter combinations of \( \theta = \pi/2 \) and \( \phi = n\pi \) (\( n \): integer) give the maxima of \( \nu Q_m^{(1/2)} \) at the cost of \( \omega Q_m^{(1/2)} = 0 \). It implies that we can optimize the measurement of \( \nu \), or noise, by selecting \( \theta \) and \( \phi \) properly. It is very important to measure noise since noise often causes relaxation of quantum systems.

Conclusions.—We have investigated the modular-value-based measurements with spin-\( j \) coherent pointers. We discussed two cases with \( j = 1/2 \) and \( j \geq 1 \). From the viewpoint of quantum Fisher information, we first showed the modular-value-based measurements with a qubit pointer \( (j = 1/2) \) has no merit in the sensitivity enhancement as in a weak-value-based measurement with...
a zero-mean Gaussian pointer. In contrast, the measurements with $j \geq 1$, the quantum Fisher information can become $2^j$ times that of the qubit pointer. If $L$ qubits consist a spin coherent pointer, the Fisher information in one measurement scales as $L$. By taking into account the time required for measurements, we claimed that the total Fisher information scales as $L^2$ and thus we have a chance to approach the Heisenberg limit. Our study in the presence of phase-flip errors shows that we can optimize a measurement for detecting noise.
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[43] See supplementary material for the detailed calculation of the measured quantum Fisher information.
**Quantum Fisher information in the case of \( j = 1/2 \): \( Q_m^{(1/2)} \)**

We show the detailed calculation of the measured quantum Fisher information in the case of modular-value-based measurement with the spin-\( j \) coherent state when \( j = 1/2 \). Let remind us the final pointer state

\[
|\eta\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( \cos \frac{\phi}{2} |\xi_+\rangle + \sin \frac{\phi}{2} e^{-i\omega t} |\xi_-\rangle \right) / \sqrt{p(\omega)},
\]

where,

\[
|\xi_\pm\rangle = e^{-i\pi/4} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2} \right] \mp i \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{2}, +\frac{1}{2} \right],
\]

\[
p(\omega) = \frac{1 - \cos \theta \sin \phi \cos \omega t}{2},
\]

\[
\langle \xi_\pm | \xi_\pm \rangle = 1, \quad \langle \xi_- | \xi_+ \rangle = \langle \xi_+ | \xi_- \rangle = -\cos \theta.
\]

Taking the derivative of the final pointer state, we obtain

\[
\frac{d|\eta\rangle}{d\omega} = \frac{-it}{\sqrt{2p(\omega)}} \left( \sin \frac{\phi}{2} e^{-i\omega t} |\xi_-\rangle \right).
\]

Then, we have

\[
\frac{d\langle \eta | d\eta \rangle}{d\omega} = \frac{t^2}{2p(\omega)} \sin^2 \frac{\phi}{2}, \quad \text{and}
\]

\[
\frac{d\langle \eta | \eta \rangle}{d\omega} = \frac{it}{2p(\omega)} \left[ \sin^2 \frac{\phi}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \cos \theta \sin \phi \cos \omega t \right].
\]

And thus, the measured quantum Fisher information yields

\[
Q_m^{(1/2)} = 4p(\omega) \left[ \frac{d\langle \eta | d\eta \rangle}{d\omega} \frac{d\langle \eta | \eta \rangle}{d\omega} - \left| \frac{d\langle \eta | \eta \rangle}{d\omega} \right|^2 \right]
\]

\[
= \frac{t^2 \sin^2 \theta \sin^2 \phi}{2(1 - \cos \theta \sin \phi)} + O(\omega^2).
\]

Equation (7) in the main text is obtained.

To calculate the postselected classical Fisher information \( F_p \), we substitute

\[
\frac{dp(\omega)}{d\omega} = \frac{t}{2} \cos \theta \sin \phi \sin \omega t
\]

to Eq. (5), then we obtain \( F_p = O(\omega^2) \).

**Quantum Fisher information in the case of \( j \geq 1 \): \( Q_m^{(j)} \)**

The final pointer state is the same as Eq. (11), where

\[
|\xi_\pm\rangle = \exp \left( \mp i \frac{\pi}{2} j \right) (j, +j) \langle j, +j | \xi \rangle
\]

\[
= \sum_{m=-j,j \geq 1} c_{jm} |j, m\rangle \mp i \left( \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \right)^{2j} |j, +j\rangle,
\]

and

\[
c_{jm} = \sqrt{\binom{2j}{j+m} \left( \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \right)^{j+m} \left( \sin \frac{\theta}{2} e^{-i\phi} \right)^{j-m}}, \quad -j \leq m \leq j - 1.
\]
Then, we obtain
\[
\langle \xi_\pm | \xi_\pm \rangle = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \xi_- | \xi_+ \rangle = \langle \xi_+ | \xi_- \rangle = \sum_{m=-j}^{j-1} c_m^2 - (\cos \frac{\theta}{2})^{4j},
\]
(12)
as in the main text. Similar to the case of \( j = 1/2 \), we calculate the derivative of the final pointer state as
\[
\frac{d|\eta\rangle}{d\omega} = \frac{-it}{\sqrt{2p(\omega)}} \left( \sin \frac{\phi}{2} e^{-i\omega t} |\xi_-\rangle \right).
\]
(13)
Then, we have
\[
\frac{d\langle \eta | d\eta \rangle}{d\omega} = \frac{t^2}{2p(\omega)} \sin^2 \frac{\phi}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d\langle \eta | d\eta \rangle}{d\omega} = \frac{it}{2p(\omega)} \left\{ \sin^2 \frac{\phi}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \sum_{m=-j}^{j-1} c_m^2 - (\cos \frac{\theta}{2})^{4j} \right] \sin \phi e^{i\omega t} \right\}.
\]
(14)
The measured quantum Fisher information yields
\[
Q_m^{(j)} = 4p(\omega) \left[ \frac{\langle \eta | d\eta \rangle}{d\omega} - \left| \frac{d\langle \eta | d\eta \rangle}{d\omega} \right|^2 \right]
\]
\[
= t^2 \left\{ 2 \sin^2 \frac{\phi}{2} - \frac{1}{p(\omega)} \left[ \sin^2 \frac{\phi}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{m=-j}^{j-1} c_m^2 - (\cos \frac{\theta}{2})^{4j} \right) \sin \phi e^{i\omega t} \right]^2 \right\} + O(\omega^2),
\]
(15)
where
\[
p(\omega) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \left( \sum_{m=-j}^{j-1} c_m^2 - (\cos \frac{\theta}{2})^{4j} \right) \cos \phi \cos \omega t \right].
\]
(16)
From this result, we can easily calculate the measured quantum Fisher information for any given \( j \).