Continuous real-time tracking of a quantum phase below the standard quantum limit
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We propose a scheme for continuously measuring an evolving quantum phase with precision beyond the standard quantum limit of $\Delta \phi_{\text{SQL}} = 1/\sqrt{N}$ radians, where $N$ is the number of pseudospins. Quantum non-demolition measurements of a lossy cavity mode interacting with an atomic ensemble are used to directly probe the phase of the collective atomic spin without converting it into a population difference. Unlike traditional Ramsey measurement sequences, our scheme allows for real-time tracking of time-varying signals. As a bonus, spin-squeezed states develop naturally, providing real-time phase estimation significantly more precise than $\Delta \phi_{\text{SQL}}$.

Quantum systems have become robust platforms for metrology and tests of fundamental physics. Many applications rely on the dynamics of pseudospin-$1/2$ systems with two long-lived quantum states, $|\uparrow\rangle$ and $|\downarrow\rangle$. After preparing an equal superposition of these two states, a physical interaction is studied by investigating its effect on the relative phase $\phi(t)$, with the state of each spin evolving in time as $|\psi(t)\rangle = (|\downarrow\rangle + e^{i\phi(t)}|\uparrow\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. In this Letter, we propose a novel scheme that enables continuous tracking of this relative phase. Our scheme continuously and directly measures the real-time phase $\phi(t)$ unlike the widely used Ramsey sequence which indirectly measures the net accumulated phase $\phi(T)$ during an interrogation time $T$ by converting it into a population difference. A single run of our protocol yields a continuous time series of phase measurements. In contrast, the typically destructive readout in a Ramsey sequence requires multiple state resets and repetitions of the sequence to measure the phase at different times. Therefore, our scheme enables real-time tracking of time-varying signals that cannot be replicated over and over again.

As an added benefit, our scheme yields continuous phase estimates with precision well beyond the standard quantum limit (SQL) of $\Delta \phi_{\text{SQL}} = 1/\sqrt{N}$ radians that limits readout precision with $N$ unentangled spins. Although several proposals and experiments [13][19] have demonstrated squeezed states with precision beyond the SQL, all of these schemes rely on measuring state populations for phase readout, necessitating state rotations that interfere with phase accumulation. In comparison, our scheme enjoys the advantage that the squeezing is produced, the phase accumulated, and the readout is performed, all in the same spin quadrature.

To motivate our design, we represent the collective angular momentum of $N$ atomic spins by a classical Bloch vector of length $N/2$ with components $J_x$, $J_y$, $J_z$ (Fig. 1(d, left)). With all spins initially in the same equal superposition state, the Bloch vector lies in the equatorial plane along the $y$-axis. As the phase evolves, the Bloch vector acquires a small $x$-component, $J_x = \frac{N}{2} \sin \phi(t) \approx \frac{N}{2} \phi(t)$, for small deflections. We therefore arrange for atom-cavity interactions wherein a cavity field quadrature is sourced by $J_x$. Continuous homodyne detection of this quadrature amounts to real-time, continuous, quantum non-demolition (QND) measurement of $\phi(t)$.

We consider $N$ atoms trapped at the antinodes of a cavity with resonance frequency $\omega_c$ and decay rate $\kappa$, as shown in Fig. 1(a). The states $|\downarrow\rangle$ and $|\uparrow\rangle$ have an
energy separation $\hbar \omega_0 \gg \hbar \kappa$ and form a pseudospin-1/2 system described by the usual Pauli spin operators $\hat{\sigma}_i$, $i = x, y, z$, with raising (lowering) operators $\hat{\sigma}_+ (\hat{\sigma}_-)$. Quantum mechanically, the $N$ atoms form a collective spin with total angular momentum components $\hat{J}_x, \hat{J}_y, \hat{J}_z$, with $\hat{J}_i = 1/2 \sum_{j=1}^N \hat{\sigma}_i^j$. The dipole-allowed transitions $|\downarrow\rangle \leftrightarrow |\epsilon\rangle$ and $|\uparrow\rangle \leftrightarrow |\epsilon\rangle$ with frequencies $\omega_{\epsilon x}$ and $\omega_{\epsilon y}$ are respectively driven using lasers with frequencies $\omega_1$ and $\omega_2$ in a far-detuned regime with detuning $\Delta \gg \omega_0, \kappa$, allowing for the adiabatic elimination [1] of $|\epsilon\rangle$. The two drive lasers differ by a frequency $2 \omega_0$ (Fig. [1](c)) and do not by themselves drive $|\downarrow\rangle \leftrightarrow |\uparrow\rangle$ Raman transitions; however, they are symmetrically detuned by $\omega_0$ from the cavity resonance $\omega_c$ and participate in cavity-assisted Raman transitions as illustrated in Fig. [1](b). When the Rabi frequencies of the two drive lasers are balanced, i.e. $\Omega_1 = \Omega_2 = \Omega_0$, the atom-cavity Hamiltonian, to leading order in $1/\Delta$, is simply the sum of a Jaynes-Cummings and an anti-Jaynes-Cummings interaction and is given by [21]

$$\hat{H}_{\text{QND}} = \frac{\hbar \Omega_{\text{QND}}}{2} \hat{X} \hat{J}_z. \quad (1)$$

Here $\hat{X} = (\hat{a} + \hat{a}^\dagger)/\sqrt{2}$ is the amplitude quadrature, with $\hat{a}, \hat{a}^\dagger$ the annihilation and creation operators for the cavity mode, and $\hat{Y} = (\hat{a} - \hat{a}^\dagger)/\sqrt{2} i$ is the conjugate phase quadrature such that $[\hat{X}, \hat{Y}] = i$. The atom-cavity interaction strength is $\Omega_{\text{QND}} = \sqrt{2 \Omega_0 g_0}/\Delta$ with $g_0$ the single atom-cavity vacuum Rabi frequency. If the two drive lasers have initial phases $\psi_1$ and $\psi_2$, the cavity quadrature $(\hat{a}^\dagger e^{i(\psi_1 + \psi_2)/2} + \text{H.c.})$ is coupled to the spin component $(\hat{J}_+ e^{i(\psi_1 - \psi_2)/2} + \text{H.c.})$, where $\hat{J}_+ = \hat{J}_x + i\hat{J}_y$. Here we assume $\psi_1 = \psi_2 = 0$ without loss of generality. Balanced cavity-assisted Raman transitions have been considered previously for deterministic squeezing schemes [22] and quantum simulations of the Dicke model [23, 24]. Further, the frequency arrangement of our drive lasers (Fig. [1](c)) is related to twotoned drive schemes considered for back-action evading measurements of mechanical oscillators [25] and for measuring the state of individual superconducting qubits [26, 27].

Classically, the intracavity fields established by the two balanced drives exactly cancel when $\hat{J}_x = 0$ (Fig. [1](d)). However, even with $\langle \hat{J}_x \rangle = 0$, quantum fluctuations in $\hat{J}_x$, i.e., $\langle \hat{J}_x^2 \rangle \neq 0$, source the $Y$ quadrature of the cavity field. In the regime where $\kappa^2 \gg N \Omega_{\text{QND}}^2$, $Y$ is slaved to $\hat{J}_x$ as

$$\hat{Y} \approx -\frac{\Omega_{\text{QND}}}{\kappa} \hat{J}_x + \text{noise}, \quad (2)$$

where the noise arises from coupling of the cavity mode to external modes through the lossy cavity mirror (Fig. [1](a)). The field leaking out is subject to balanced homodyne detection using a strong local oscillator at frequency $(\omega_1 + \omega_2)/2$ whose phase is tuned to detect the output field quadrature that is sourced by the intracavity $Y$ quadrature. The photocurrent thus recorded is a measure of the $Y$ quadrature which, from Eq. [2], amounts to measuring $J_x$.

Measurement back-action in the $J_z$ quadrature arises because of the indistinguishability of the two pathways that give rise to the intracavity field (Fig. [1](b)): The field leaking out is consistent with equal probability amplitudes for tipping the Bloch vector above or below the equator and therefore increases the spread in $J_z$ without affecting its mean value.

Coupling to $|\epsilon\rangle$ through the drive lasers also leads to undesirable, off-resonant free-space scattering (FSS) processes with total rate $\gamma_{\text{FSS}}$ that degrade atomic coherence. We consider three FSS effects on the state of individual atoms (Eq. [1]): (a) dephasing with branching ratio (BR) $r_D$: random rotation about the $z$-axis, (b) spontaneous Raman spin flips: $|\downarrow\rangle \rightarrow |\uparrow\rangle$ with BR $r_F$, and (c) atom loss with BR $r_L$: the atom decays to an auxiliary state $|e\rangle$ outside the $|\downarrow\rangle - |\uparrow\rangle$ manifold and no longer interacts with the cavity mode.

Under continuous measurement, the dynamics of the density matrix $\rho$ of the atom-cavity system is governed by the stochastic master equation [28, 31]:

$$\dot{\rho} = -i/\hbar [\hat{H}_{\text{QND}}, \rho] + \kappa D[\hat{a}] \rho + \gamma_{\text{FSS}} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{L}_j \rho$$

$$+ \sqrt{\eta \kappa} \xi(t) \left( i \rho \hat{a}^\dagger - i \hat{a} \rho - \sqrt{2} \langle \hat{Y} \rangle \rho \right), \quad (3)$$

where FSS losses are bundled in the term $\mathcal{L}_j \rho$ given by

$$\mathcal{L}_j \rho = r_{F_j} \mathcal{D}[\hat{a}^\dagger] \rho + r_{F_j} \mathcal{D}[\hat{a}] \rho + \frac{r_{L_j}}{4} \mathcal{D}[\hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a}] \rho$$

$$+ \frac{r_{L_j}}{2} \left( \mathcal{D} \left[ |\downarrow\rangle \langle \downarrow| \right] + \mathcal{D} \left[ |\uparrow\rangle \langle \uparrow| \right] \right) \rho \quad (4)$$

with $\mathcal{D}[\hat{O}] \rho = \hat{O} \rho \hat{O}^\dagger - \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{O} \rho/2 - \rho \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{O}/2$, the Lindblad dissipator. In Eq. [3], $\eta$ is the detection efficiency, and $\xi(t)$ is a white-noise process satisfying $\xi(t) = 0$ and $\langle \xi(t) \xi(t') \rangle = \delta(t - t')$. The measured photocurrent $i(t)$ is

$$i(t) = G e |\alpha_{LO}| \left( \eta \sqrt{2 \kappa} \langle \hat{Y} \rangle + \sqrt{\eta \kappa} \xi(t) \right), \quad (5)$$

with detector gain $G$, electronic charge $e$, and local oscillator photon flux $|\alpha_{LO}|^2$ with units of photons/time.

With no FSS, measuring for very long times will result in preparing states arbitrarily close to eigenstates of $\hat{J}_z$, i.e. Dicke states in the $J_z$ basis. However, FSS restricts the maximum achievable squeezing well before the state begins to wrap around the Bloch sphere. This enables a Gaussian approximation where we only keep track of the dynamics of the means and covariances of all operators and pairs of operators of the atom-cavity system. The 5 operators $\hat{X}, \hat{Y}, \hat{J}_x, \hat{J}_y$ and $\hat{J}_z$ result in a total of 20 dynamical equations.
We simply average the simulated photocurrent (Eq. [3]) in a window \([T_i, T_f]\) to obtain an estimate as

\[
J^m_z = -\frac{\kappa}{\Omega_{\text{QND}}} Y^m_\ell = \frac{-(G_\ell \alpha_\ell \tilde{O}_\ell)^{-1}}{\eta \sqrt{C_{\gamma\ell c} (T_f - T_i)}} \int_{T_i}^{T_f} i(t) dt,
\]

where \(C = 2\Omega^2_{\text{QND}} / \kappa_{\gamma c}\) is the dimensionless single-atom cooperativity, a cavity-dependent parameter. The cavity field leaks information about \(J_z\) to the universe at a rate \(C_{\gamma\ell c} = 2\Omega^2_{\text{QND}} / \kappa\) and \(\eta C_{\gamma\ell c}\), as will be explained shortly, is a characteristic measurement rate. The phase \(\phi\) is a characteristic measurement rate. The cavity cooperativity, a cavity-dependent parameter. The cavity occurs with equal probability. This implies coherence at equal rates, and spin-flips in either direction wherein the three FSS processes degrade the atomic cooperativity. For our numerical experiments, we use \(N = 10^5\) atoms identically coupled to a single mode of a cavity with cooperativity \(C = 0.1\). We work in a bad-cavity regime such that \(NC_{\gamma c} = 0.2\kappa\), achievable by arranging for \(\Omega_{\text{QND}} = 10^{-3}\kappa\). We adopt a “symmetric loss” model wherein the three FSS processes degrade the atomic coherence at equal rates, and spin-flips in either direction occur with equal probability. This implies \(r_d = 1 / 3\), \(r_{\uparrow\downarrow} = r_{\downarrow\uparrow} = 1 / 6\) and \(r_i = 1 / 3\). The detection efficiency is \(\eta = 0.4\).

We now demonstrate the ability of our scheme to track, in real-time, an applied phase modulation \(\phi^{(a)}(t)\) (Fig. 2a, black solid line). The collective spin is initialized to a coherent spin state (CSS) along the \(y\)-axis at time \(t = -50T_0\). The characteristic time \(T_0 = (\eta C_{\gamma c})^{-1} / (N/4)\) is the time taken to average down the photon shot-noise \((\xi(t)\) term, Eq. [3]) in estimating \(J^m_z\) (Eq. [6]) to the standard quantum limit \(\Delta J^2_{z,\text{SQL}} = N / 4\).

First, measuring the photocurrent in the state preparation window \([-50T_0, 0]\) leads, as demonstrated shortly, to a spin squeezed state (SSS) with reduced variance in \(J_z\) and an estimated phase \(\phi_0^{(m)}\) (blue triangle). During the time \([0, 200T_0]\), we use the photocurrent measured over windows of duration \(8T_0\) to estimate the phase at the window centers in two different ways. The average photocurrent in each window results in continuous estimates \(\phi_0^{(m)}\) (hollow red squares) in a single experimental run. Further subtracting the initial phase reference \(\phi_0^{(m)}\) in this run (blue triangle) results in more precise estimates \(\phi_0^{(m)} - \phi_0^{(m)} = \phi_0^{(m)} - \phi_0^{(m)}\) (filled blue squares), which mostly fall within the SQL. To determine the single-run precision of these estimates, we run 2048 experimental trials and histogram the error \(\phi^{(m)} - \phi^{(a)}\) at the window centers, an example of which is shown in Fig. 2b) for the window \([48T_0, 56T_0]\). The estimates \(\phi_0^{(m)}\) do not account for \(\phi_0^{(m)}\) and approximately amount to phase estimation using the imprecise zero phase reference \((\Delta \phi_{\text{SSS}} = 1 / \sqrt{N})\) of the initial CSS, resulting in a broad error histogram (red). We simply average the simulated photocurrent (Eq. [3]) in a window \([T_i, T_f]\) to obtain an estimate as

\[
J^m_z = -\frac{\kappa}{\Omega_{\text{QND}}} Y^m_\ell = \frac{-(G_\ell \alpha_\ell \tilde{O}_\ell)^{-1}}{\eta \sqrt{C_{\gamma\ell c} (T_f - T_i)}} \int_{T_i}^{T_f} i(t) dt,
\]

where \(C = 2\Omega^2_{\text{QND}} / \kappa_{\gamma c}\) is the dimensionless single-atom cooperativity, a cavity-dependent parameter. The cavity field leaks information about \(J_z\) to the universe at a rate \(C_{\gamma\ell c} = 2\Omega^2_{\text{QND}} / \kappa\) and \(\eta C_{\gamma\ell c}\), as will be explained shortly, is a characteristic measurement rate. The phase \(\phi\) is a characteristic measurement rate. The cavity occurs with equal probability. This implies coherence at equal rates, and spin-flips in either direction wherein the three FSS processes degrade the atomic cooperativity. For our numerical experiments, we use \(N = 10^5\) atoms identically coupled to a single mode of a cavity with cooperativity \(C = 0.1\). We work in a bad-cavity regime such that \(NC_{\gamma c} = 0.2\kappa\), achievable by arranging for \(\Omega_{\text{QND}} = 10^{-3}\kappa\). We adopt a “symmetric loss” model wherein the three FSS processes degrade the atomic coherence at equal rates, and spin-flips in either direction occur with equal probability. This implies \(r_d = 1 / 3\), \(r_{\uparrow\downarrow} = r_{\downarrow\uparrow} = 1 / 6\) and \(r_i = 1 / 3\). The detection efficiency is \(\eta = 0.4\).

We now demonstrate the ability of our scheme to track, in real-time, an applied phase modulation \(\phi^{(a)}(t)\) (Fig. 2a, black solid line). The collective spin is initialized to a coherent spin state (CSS) along the \(y\)-axis at time \(t = -50T_0\). The characteristic time \(T_0 = (\eta C_{\gamma c})^{-1} / (N/4)\) is the time taken to average down the photon shot-noise \((\xi(t)\) term, Eq. [3]) in estimating \(J^m_z\) (Eq. [6]) to the standard quantum limit \(\Delta J^2_{z,\text{SQL}} = N / 4\).

First, measuring the photocurrent in the state preparation window \([-50T_0, 0]\) leads, as demonstrated shortly, to a spin squeezed state (SSS) with reduced variance in \(J_z\) and an estimated phase \(\phi_0^{(m)}\) (blue triangle). During the time \([0, 200T_0]\), we use the photocurrent measured over windows of duration \(8T_0\) to estimate the phase at the window centers in two different ways. The average photocurrent in each window results in continuous estimates \(\phi_0^{(m)}\) (hollow red squares) in a single experimental run. Further subtracting the initial phase reference \(\phi_0^{(m)}\) in this run (blue triangle) results in more precise estimates \(\phi_0^{(m)} - \phi_0^{(m)} = \phi_0^{(m)} - \phi_0^{(m)}\) (filled blue squares), which mostly fall within the SQL. To determine the single-run precision of these estimates, we run 2048 experimental trials and histogram the error \(\phi^{(m)} - \phi^{(a)}\) at the window centers, an example of which is shown in Fig. 2b) for the window \([48T_0, 56T_0]\). The estimates \(\phi_0^{(m)}\) do not account for \(\phi_0^{(m)}\) and approximately amount to phase estimation using the imprecise zero phase reference \((\Delta \phi_{\text{SSS}} = 1 / \sqrt{N})\) of the initial CSS, resulting in a broad error histogram (red). We simply average the simulated photocurrent (Eq. [3]) in a window \([T_i, T_f]\) to obtain an estimate as

\[
J^m_z = -\frac{\kappa}{\Omega_{\text{QND}}} Y^m_\ell = \frac{-(G_\ell \alpha_\ell \tilde{O}_\ell)^{-1}}{\eta \sqrt{C_{\gamma\ell c} (T_f - T_i)}} \int_{T_i}^{T_f} i(t) dt,
\]

ever, the long state preparation window ensures strong averaging down of the photon shot-noise, leading to high precision for this initial phase reference in each run, i.e. squeezing. The narrow error histogram (blue) for the estimates \(\phi_0^{(m)}\) reflects the improved precision of \(\phi_0^{(m)}\) over the zero phase reference of the initial CSS. In Fig. 2c) we show that the precision \(\Delta \phi_{\text{SSS}}^{(m)}\) of the estimates \(\phi_0^{(m)}\) is significantly less than \(\Delta \phi_{\text{SQL}}^{(m)}\) in all windows over the time we consider here, demonstrating the potential for real-time continuous tracking of an evolving quantum phase below the SQL.
To estimate the amplitude of the phase jump and two windows $W$, compute the difference precision over a CSS in Ramsey mode, for fixed $C\gamma\kappa$ allowing transients on timescales of $T_d$. For $T_\phi$ to extract precise timing information or to extract precise that abut the jump time $\phi$ the estimates such as the one at $J_3 = 50T_0$ in Fig. 3(a). Starting with an initial CSS at $t = 0$, we continuously estimate the phase by averaging the same photocurrent over moving windows of two different durations $T_W = 2T_0$ (red) and $T_W = 20T_0$ (blue). Clearly, the shorter window reproduces the time variation of the phase more precisely. To estimate the amplitude of the phase jump $\phi_J$, we compute the difference $\phi_J^{(m)}$ in the estimates $\phi_W^{(m)}$ and $\phi_W^{(m)}$ in the two windows $W_1 \equiv [T_3 - T_W, T_3]$ and $W_2 \equiv [T_3, T_3 + T_W]$ that abut the jump time $T_3$, as shown in Fig. 3(b). In Fig. 3(c), we run 2048 experimental trials and histogram the estimates $\phi_J^{(m)}$ for the two window durations. While the shorter window results in faster response, the longer window gives a more precise estimate of the jump amplitude as evidenced by the narrow blue histogram. An advantage of our scheme is that the same photocurrent data from a single run can be analyzed with varying $T_W$, to extract precise timing information or to extract precise amplitude information.

Alternatively, the phase jump in the protocol in Fig. 3(b) can be replaced with a “dark” phase accumulation time of duration $T_D$ when no measurements are performed. Then, this scheme can instead be identified as a Ramsey-like sequence, where a squeezed state is prepared in $W_1$, phase accumulates in an interrogation time $T_D$, and finally, phase is read out in $W_2$, without at any point converting the phase into a population difference or vice-versa. In this Ramsey mode, the observable gain in phase resolution using the squeezed state we prepare over that of a CSS is

$$\frac{\Delta\phi_{\text{SQL}}}{\phi^2} = \frac{\Delta J_{x,\text{SQL}}^2}{(\Delta J_{x,\text{diff.}}^2)^2} V^2,$$

where $J_{x,\text{diff.}} = J_{x,W_2}^{(m)} - J_{x,W_1}^{(m)}$ and $V$ is the visibility at the end of the first window. Fig. 3(d) plots the numerically extracted gain (markers) versus the window duration $T_W$ for different values of the cooperativity $C$. Gaussian fits to histograms of $J_{x,\text{diff.}}^{(m)}$, were used to extract values for $(\Delta J_{x,\text{diff.}}^2)^2$. We find analytically that the normalized variance in the difference measurement varies with $T_W$ as

$$\frac{(\Delta J_{x,\text{diff.}}^2)^2(T_W)}{\Delta J_{x,\text{SQL}}^2} = 2 \frac{T_0}{T_W} \frac{8 \beta}{3\eta NC} \frac{T_W}{T_0},$$

where $\beta = r_d + r_d + r_d + r_d + r_d/2$, giving a minimum normalized variance of $8 \sqrt{\beta/3\eta NC}$ at $T_W = 0.3\eta NC/4\beta$. The solid lines in Fig. 3(d) show the excellent agreement between the gain extracted from simulations and that calculated using Eq. (4). For typical values of $C \sim 0.1$ and $N \sim 10^5$, Fig. 3(d) shows that gain upwards of 11 dB can be achieved. The $(NC)^{-1/2}$ scaling of the minimum normalized variance in $J_{x,\text{diff.}}^{(m)^2}$ leads to an optimal phase resolution scaling as $\Delta \phi_{\text{diff}} \sim N^{-3/4}$ compared to $\Delta \phi_{\text{SQL}} = N^{-1/2}$ radians.

In conclusion, we have proposed and analyzed a scheme for continuous real-time tracking of a quantum phase with precision beyond the standard quantum limit. Further, unlike Ramsey sequences which can only track phase changes in the range 0 to $\pi$, our scheme can be extended to track large excursions $\phi(t) \gg \pi$; by continuously feeding back the measured phase to adjust the differential phase offset $\psi_1 - \psi_2$ of the drive lasers, the cavity mode always probes the spin component perpendicular to the mean spin direction. This way, phase measurements are continuously performed in the small angle limit. It will be interesting to see if a similar scheme can be employed to continuously track the relative phase of an optical clock transition, perhaps in $^{87}$Sr.
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[32] The length of the Bloch vector is reduced by a factor $V(t) = e^{-\gamma_{sc} t/2}e^{-\left(C\gamma_{sc}/4\right)t/2}$. For $C \ll 1$, the primary cause for the shortening is FSS (first exponential), whereas for $C \gg 1$, the Bloch vector is primarily shortened because of the squeezing generated by the measurement process (second exponential).

[33] We note that, in any single run, the estimates $\phi_{SSS}$ differ from the estimates $\phi_{CSS}$ by only a constant phase error arising from the random result of the state preparation step. Therefore, if only the form, and not the precise value, of an unknown AC signal is to be tracked in a single run, this phase error is irrelevant, making the state preparation step unnecessary.
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We refer to the equations in the Main Text using regular arabic numerals and prefix the equations introduced in the Supplemental Material with the letter ‘S’.

ADIABATIC ELIMINATION OF THE EXCITED STATE

The Hamiltonian for the interaction of the atoms with the drive lasers and cavity mode is ($\hbar = 1$)

$$\hat{H} = \omega_c \hat{a} \hat{a} - \omega_c \sum_j |j\rangle \langle j | - \omega_{te} \sum_j |\uparrow\rangle \langle \uparrow |$$

$$+ \sum_j \left( \Omega_j^2 |e\rangle \langle \downarrow | e^{-i\omega t} + \Omega_j^2 |e\rangle \langle \uparrow | e^{-i\omega t} + \text{H.c.} \right)$$

$$+ \sum_j \left( \frac{g_j^2}{2} |e\rangle \langle \downarrow | + \frac{g_j^2}{2} \hat{a} |e\rangle \langle \uparrow | + \text{H.c.} \right). \quad \text{(S1)}$$

The drive laser frequencies are arranged such that $\omega_1 = \omega_c + \omega_0$ and $\omega_2 = \omega_c - \omega_0$. We assume that the splitting $\omega_{te} - \omega_{te}$ between the spin states, nominally $\omega_0$, can be slightly modified, e.g. by a weak external magnetic field that we wish to sense, i.e. $\omega_{te} - \omega_{te} = \omega_0 + 2\delta$, where $\delta$ is the shift of the $|\uparrow\rangle$ ($|\downarrow\rangle$) state.

The detunings of the drive lasers from the atomic transitions are given by $\Delta_1 = \omega_1 - \omega_{te} = -\Delta + \omega_0/2 - \delta$ and $\Delta_2 = \omega_2 - \omega_{te} = -\Delta - \omega_0/2 + \delta$. Similarly, the detunings of the cavity mode from the atomic transitions are $\Delta_1 = \omega_c - \omega_{te} = -\Delta - \omega_0/2 - \delta$ and $\Delta_2 = \omega_c - \omega_{te} = -\Delta + \omega_0/2 + \delta$.

We write the interaction Hamiltonian expressing the energy requirements in Eq. (S1) using complex exponentials involving these detunings as

$$\hat{H}_I(t) =$$

$$\sum_j \left( \frac{\Omega_j^2}{2} |e\rangle \langle \downarrow | e^{-i\Delta_1 t} + \frac{\Omega_j^2}{2} |e\rangle \langle \uparrow | e^{-i\Delta_2 t} + \text{H.c.} \right)$$

$$+ \sum_j \left( \frac{g_j^2}{2} \hat{a} |e\rangle \langle \downarrow | e^{-i\Delta_1 t} + \frac{g_j^2}{2} \hat{a} |e\rangle \langle \uparrow | e^{-i\Delta_2 t} + \text{H.c.} \right). \quad \text{(S2)}$$

We use the effective Hamiltonian theory of Ref. [1] to derive the effective Hamiltonian in the limit where the detunings are all much greater than the Rabi frequencies. This effective Hamiltonian has three parts

$$\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}(t) = \hat{H}_{\text{Stark}}(t) + \hat{H}_{\text{atom-atom}}(t) + \hat{H}_{\text{Raman}}(t), \quad \text{(S3)}$$

where

$$\hat{H}_{\text{Stark}}(t) = \sum_j \frac{\Omega_j^2 g_j}{4\Delta_1} \left( |\downarrow\rangle \langle \downarrow | - |e\rangle \langle e | \right)$$

$$+ \sum_j \frac{g_j^2}{4\Delta_1} \left( \hat{a} \hat{a} |\downarrow\rangle \langle \downarrow | - |e\rangle \langle e | \right) - |e\rangle \langle e | \right)$$

$$+ \sum_j \frac{\Omega_j g_j}{4\Delta_1 \Delta_2} \hat{a} |\downarrow\rangle \langle \downarrow | - |e\rangle \langle e | \right) e^{i(\Delta_1^2 - \Delta_1) t} + \text{H.c.}$$

$$+ \downarrow \rightarrow \uparrow (1 \rightarrow 2), \quad \text{(S4)}$$

$$\hat{H}_{\text{atom-atom}}(t) =$$

$$- \sum_{j,k \neq j} \frac{g_j^2 g_k}{4\Delta_1^2} (|\downarrow\rangle \langle \downarrow |) \delta_k (1 \rightarrow 2)$$

$$- \sum_{j,k \neq j} \frac{g_j g_k}{4\Delta_1 \Delta_2} (|\uparrow\rangle \langle \uparrow | \delta_k) e^{i(\Delta_1^2 - \Delta_1) t} + \text{H.c.}, \quad \text{(S5)}$$

and

$$\hat{H}_{\text{Raman}}(t) = \sum_j \frac{\Omega_j^2 g_j^2}{4\Delta_1 \Delta_2} \hat{a} |\downarrow\rangle \langle \downarrow | e^{i(\Delta_1^2 - \Delta_1) t} + \text{H.c.}$$

$$+ \sum_j \frac{g_j^2 g_k}{4\Delta_1 \Delta_2} \hat{a} |\downarrow\rangle \langle \downarrow | e^{i(\Delta_2^2 - \Delta_2) t} + \text{H.c.}$$

$$+ \sum_j \frac{\Omega_j g_j^2}{4\Delta_1 \Delta_2} \hat{a} |\downarrow\rangle \langle \downarrow | e^{i(\Delta_1^2 - \Delta_1) t} + \text{H.c.}$$

$$\quad \text{(S6)}$$

In the above expressions, $h(a, b) = 2/(a^{-1} + b^{-1})$ is the harmonic mean of $a$ and $b$. All terms in the effective Hamiltonian conserve the number of excitations in $|e\rangle$. This means that if the atoms are initially in the $|\downarrow\rangle \downarrow \rangle \rangle$ manifold, then the state $|e\rangle$ is negligibly populated and all interactions involving this level, and consequently, $\hat{H}_{\text{atom-atom}}(t)$, can be dropped. Expressing the difference detunings in the complex exponentials in terms of $\Delta, \omega_0, \delta$ shows the presence of rapidly oscillating terms with frequency $\sim \omega_0$ and slowly varying terms with zero frequency or a small frequency $\delta$. For $\Omega_1 \approx \Omega_2 \approx \Omega$, the rapidly oscillating terms can be neglected since we
operate in the regime where $\Omega^2/\Delta \ll \omega_0$. The resulting Hamiltonian consists of

$$
\hat{H}_{\text{Stark}}(t) = \sum_j \frac{g_0^2}{4\Delta_1} \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} \hat{j}_j \langle \downarrow | + \sum_j \frac{g_1^2}{4\Delta_1} \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} \hat{j}_j \langle \uparrow |
+ \downarrow \rightarrow \uparrow \ (1 \rightarrow 2)
$$

and

$$
\hat{H}_{\text{Raman}}(t) = \sum_j \frac{\Omega_1 g_2}{4\hbar(\Delta_1, \Delta_2)} \hat{a}^\dagger | \uparrow \rangle \langle \uparrow | e^{2i\delta t} + \text{H.c.}
+ \sum_j \frac{\Omega_2 g_1}{4\hbar(\Delta_2, \Delta_1)} \hat{a}^\dagger | \downarrow \rangle \langle \downarrow | e^{-2i\delta t} \ + \text{H.c.}
$$

(S7)

(S8)

Simple picture

For $\Delta \gg \omega_0$, we can make the substitution $\Delta_1, \Delta_2, \Delta_1^\prime, \Delta_2^\prime \rightarrow -\Delta$. Then, with $\Omega_1 = \Omega_2 = \Omega_0$, the Stark shifts from the drive lasers shift the two spin states identically and therefore lead to an overall energy shift of $-N\Omega_0^2/4\Delta$, where we assume $\Omega_0$ is real. Similarly, with $g_1 = g_2 = g_0$, the frequency of the cavity mode is shifted by an amount $-N\omega_0^2/4\Delta$ on account of the atom-cavity interaction. This can be compensated for by shifting the frequency of the drive lasers by the same amount. Introducing the collective angular momentum operators $\hat{J}_+ = \sum_j | \uparrow \rangle \langle \uparrow |$, $\hat{J}_- = \hat{J}_+^\dagger$, and $\hat{J}_z = \sum_j (| \uparrow \rangle \langle \uparrow | - | \downarrow \rangle \langle \downarrow | )/2$, we can express the effective Hamiltonian as

$$
\hat{H}_{\text{eff}} = 2\delta \hat{J}_z + \frac{\Omega_0 g_0}{4\Delta} (\hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} + \hat{a} \hat{a}^\dagger ) \left( \hat{J}_+ + \hat{J}_- \right),
$$

(S9)

where we have let $\Omega_0 \rightarrow -\Omega_0$. The second term on the RHS is precisely the QND Hamiltonian described in Eq. (1) of the Main Text. This coarse-grained Hamiltonian is valid over time intervals $\Delta t \gg T_{\omega_0} \equiv 2\pi/\omega_0$, and therefore, we require $\delta \ll \omega_0$ and that $\delta$ is approximately constant over the interval $\Delta t$. Mathematically, the latter implies $d\ln \delta/dt \ll 1/\Delta t \ll \omega_0/2\pi$.

Accounting for $\omega_0/\Delta$

For $\delta \approx 0$, $h(\Delta_1, \Delta_2^\prime) = \Delta_1$ and $h(\Delta_2, \Delta_1^\prime) = \Delta_2$. To isolate the balanced cavity-assisted Raman transitions, three requirements have to be satisfied [S2]:

1. Equal drive laser Stark shifts on both spin states: $\Omega_1^2/4\Delta_1 = \Omega_2^2/4\Delta_2$.
2. Equal frequency shift of cavity mode per atom in either spin state: $g_1^2/4\Delta_1 = g_2^2/4\Delta_2$.
3. Balanced Raman transitions: $\Omega_1 g_2/4\Delta_1 = \Omega_2 g_1/4\Delta_2$.

We note that arranging $\Omega_1/\Omega_2$ and $g_1/g_2$ to satisfy [1] and [2] above results in satisfying requirement [3].

Case when $g_1 = g_2$ is a constraint

In general, $g_1/g_2$ cannot be tuned, so requirement [2] cannot be met and $\Omega_1/\Omega_2$ can be tuned to satisfy either [1] or [3]. Arranging $\Omega_1/\Omega_2$ to meet [3] results in a residual differential Stark shift between the two spin states, $\delta_{AC} \sim (\Omega_0^2/4\Delta)(\omega_0/\Delta)$. If $| \downarrow \rangle$ and $| \uparrow \rangle$ are, e.g., Zeeman sublevels, then $\delta_{AC}$ can be counterbalanced by applying a weak, constant magnetic field. We note that if $\delta_{AC}$ is not compensated, then the time variation of the phase is superposed on a steady linear increase which is irrelevant if only the form of an AC signal is to be tracked.

The result of not satisfying [2] is a residual term in the Hamiltonian of the form $(g_0^2/4\Delta)(\omega_0/\Delta)\hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} \hat{J}_z$. Measuring until time $T_{\text{opt}}$ results in a typical spread in $J_z \sim \sqrt{(N/4)\eta T_{\text{opt}}/\bar{\gamma} T_0}$. For the cavity mode to follow the collective spin at right angles as in Fig. 1(d), we require the resulting frequency shift of the cavity mode to be small compared to the cavity linewidth, i.e.

$$
\frac{1}{\kappa T_0} \frac{\omega_0}{4\Delta} \sqrt{NT_{\text{opt}}} \ll 1.
$$

(S10)

For the parameters used in the Main Text, $\eta = 0.4$, $\beta = 5/6$, and the lifetime of the excited state $\Gamma \sim \omega_0$, we get

$$
\frac{\omega_0}{\Delta} \ll \sqrt{\frac{7}{N^5/8C^5/8}}.
$$

(S11)

With $N = 10^5$, $C = 0.1$, the above requirement implies $\omega_0/\Delta \ll 0.15$.

The residual term, having the form $(g_0^2/4\Delta)(\omega_0/\Delta)\hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} \hat{J}_z$, can also be interpreted as a photon number dependent differential Stark shift of the spin states. From the Hamiltonian, Eq. (S9) or Eq. (1), the complex intracavity amplitude is $a \sim -i(\Omega_{\text{QND}}/\sqrt{2}\kappa)J_x$, with the intracavity intensity

$$
|\langle \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} \rangle| \approx |a|^2 \sim \frac{\Omega^2_{\text{QND}}}{2\kappa^2} J_x^2.
$$

(S12)

With an initial CSS, the typical value of $J_x \sim \sqrt{N/4}$ in each run. We require the additional rotation of the collective spin resulting from this differential Stark shift to be small compared to the reduced phase variance resulting from the measurement after a typical time, say $T_{\text{opt}}$. With the intracavity photon number scaling as in Eq. (S12) and using $C\gamma_{\text{sc}} = 2\Omega_{\text{QND}}/\kappa$, this requirement implies

$$
\frac{g^2}{4\Delta} \frac{\omega_0}{\Gamma} \frac{N C \gamma_{\text{sc}} T_{\text{opt}}}{16\kappa} \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left( \frac{8\beta}{3\eta NC} \right)^{1/4}.
$$

(S13)
where the RHS is estimated using the minimum normalized variance in $J_{x,\text{diff}}^{(m)}$, discussed following Eq. (8). With $\eta = 0.4$, $\beta = 5/6$, and $\Gamma \sim \omega_0$, the above inequality implies

$$\left(\frac{\omega_0}{\Delta}\right) \ll \sqrt{\frac{2N}{N^7 8C^{7/8}}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (S14)

For $N = 10^5$, $C = 0.1$, the above inequality imposes a more stringent requirement $\omega_0/\Delta \ll 0.03$.

**ANALYTIC EXPRESSION FOR VARIANCE IN THE DIFFERENCE MEASUREMENT**

We use the notation $\langle \ldots \rangle$ to denote means and $\langle \ldots \rangle_c$ to denote (co)variances evaluated using the stochastic master equation Eq. (3). The time evolution of the conditional variance $\langle \hat{J}_x^2 \rangle_c$ satisfies the Riccati equation

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle \hat{J}_x^2 \rangle_c = -\gamma_{sc} \left( \langle \hat{J}_x^2 \rangle_c - \beta \frac{N}{4} \right) - \eta C \gamma_{sc} \langle \hat{J}_x^2 \rangle_c,$$  \hspace{1cm} (S15)

where we have used the bad-cavity limit to adiabatically eliminate the coherence $\langle Y J_x \rangle_c \approx -(\Omega_{\text{QND}}/\kappa)\langle \hat{J}_x^2 \rangle_c$. In the regime where $\sqrt{NC} \gg 1$ and $\beta \eta NC \gg 1$, the solution to Eq. (S15) simplifies to

$$\langle \hat{J}_x^2(t) \rangle_c = \frac{N}{4} \sqrt{\frac{4\beta}{NC\eta}} \coth \left[ \sqrt{\frac{\beta NC}{4\eta}} \gamma_{sc} t + \sqrt{\frac{4\beta}{NC\eta}} \right].$$  \hspace{1cm} (S16)

The conditional mean $\langle \hat{J}_x \rangle_c$ is given by

$$\langle \hat{J}_x(t) \rangle = -\sqrt{\gamma_{sc} C} \int_0^t \langle \hat{J}_x^2(t') \rangle_c e^{-\frac{\omega_0}{2}(t-t')} \xi(t').$$  \hspace{1cm} (S17)

From Eq. (5) and the bad-cavity relation $\langle Y \rangle = -(\Omega_{\text{QND}}/\kappa)\langle \hat{J}_x \rangle$, the instantaneous photocurrent $i(t)$ carries information about $\langle \hat{J}_x \rangle$ but is corrupted by photon shot noise. Using Eq. (6), the estimate $J_{x,\text{diff}}^{(m)}$ from the photocurrent measured in an interval $[T_i, T_f]$ is related to the conditional mean $\langle \hat{J}_x \rangle$ as

$$J_{x,\text{diff}}^{(m)} = \frac{1}{T_f - T_i} \int_{T_i}^{T_f} dt \left( \langle \hat{J}_x(t) \rangle - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma_{sc} C}} \xi(t) \right),$$  \hspace{1cm} (S18)

where $\langle \hat{J}_x \rangle$ satisfies Eq. [S17]. In deriving Eq. (8), we perform the first measurement $J_{x,1}^{(m)}(T_W)$ over the window $[0,T_W]$, and the second measurement $J_{x,2}^{(m)}(T_W)$ over the window $[T_W, 2T_W]$. The variance in the difference measurement $(\Delta J_{x,\text{diff}}^{(m)})^2(T_W)$ is given by

$$(\Delta J_{x,\text{diff}}^{(m)})^2(T_W) = \left( J_{x,2}^{(m)}(T_W) - J_{x,1}^{(m)}(T_W) \right)^2,$$  \hspace{1cm} (S19)

where the overbar indicates averaging over all possible realizations of the noise $\xi(t)$, which has the properties $\xi(t) = 0$ and $\xi(t)\xi(t') = \delta(t-t')$. We use the approximation that $\omega_{sc} T_W \ll 1$ for the measurement windows we consider, so that the exponential factor in Eq. [S17] can be set to unity. The resulting integrals can be evaluated analytically, resulting in

$$(\Delta J_{x,1}^{(m)})^2(T_W) = \frac{N}{4} \left( 1 + \frac{T_0}{T_W} + \frac{4\beta}{3\eta NC} \frac{T_W}{T_0} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (S20)

for the variance in the first measurement, and

$$(\Delta J_{x,2}^{(m)})^2(T_W) = \frac{N}{4} \left( 1 + \frac{T_0}{T_W} + \frac{16\beta}{3\eta NC} \frac{T_W}{T_0} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (S21)

for the variance in the second measurement, and the expression, Eq. (8), for the variance in the difference measurement.

**Physical explanation for optimum measurement window**

Although the photon shot noise is averaged down as the measurement window $T_W$ is increased, undetected photons emitted via FSS lead to increased ignorance about the actual state of the collective spin. The photocurrent measurements in the initial parts of the measurement window are no longer as reliable in estimating the current value of $J_x$ as those in the latter parts, since FSS has significantly affected the collective spin state. Since $J_{x,\text{diff}}^{(m)}$ is the difference of measurements in two such windows, for very large $T_W$, the correlation in these two measurements decreases as a result of FSS. The upshot: The measurement window has an optimum $T_{\text{opt}}$ below which the measurement suffers from photon shot-noise, and above which it is affected by FSS.
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