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Von Neumann measurements can be described naturally in terms of the Keldysh quasi-probability distribution (KQPD), and the imprecision and backaction exerted by the measurement apparatus.

Introduction.— The theory of quantum mechanics contains ingredients that are absent in classical theories, such as entanglement, wave-function collapse, and superposition of arbitrary states. In some scenarios, these ingredients are beneficial (e.g., in quantum information), while in other scenarios, they provide limitations (e.g., quantum noise in measurement and amplification). The realm of possibilities that are enabled or prohibited by quantum mechanics is therefore a highly non-trivial subject of current research.

At the heart of this problem lies the question: “which observations cannot be explained by classical theories?” A strong result in this direction is provided by Bell inequalities. With the help of such inequalities, observed data alone can rule out any theory that fulfills a natural definition of locality. While this is an extremely powerful result, local is not equal to classical (Newton’s theory of gravity is, for instance, non-local). Ruling out all classical theories (i.e., all theories which do not rely on ingredients associated to quantum theory) from a finite number of observations is usually a hopeless task. Neither is it desirable, as highly constructed theories with little predictive power beyond the observations at hand can be disregarded on general grounds in the spirit of Occam’s razor.

The above question is thus often replaced by its attenuated form: “which observations cannot be explained by the appropriate classical theories?” An example illustrating this approach is given by the Glauber-Sudarshan $P$-function in quantum optics. If a state is described by a $P$-function that cannot be interpreted as a probability distribution, then some measurable intensity correlators resulting from this state cannot be described by classical electrodynamics. While classical electrodynamics provides the appropriate classical theory for quantum optics, other branches of physics (e.g., quantum thermodynamics) do not have a universally agreed-upon theory that provides the classical limit for quantitative predictions.

In this letter, we consider von Neumann type measurements, where observables of interest are measured by coupling them to detectors which are subsequently measured projectively. In quantum mechanics, these measurements have a natural description in terms of a quasi-probability distribution that is reminiscent of the Keldysh path-integral formulation and that we therefore abbreviate with KQPD. The KQPD depends on the observables of interest and can reduce to the well known Wigner function or the full counting statistics. Other applications of the KQPD include quantum thermodynamics, quantum optics, generalized Wigner functions, weak values (see also [27, 28]), and the general study of non-equilibrium phenomena in quantum systems. Importantly, the KQPD can become negative, indicating non-classical behavior of the system. Here we put this non-classical feature on a firmer footing by taking an operational approach. To this end, we put forward a classical model for von Neumann type measurements that is based on a few natural assumptions on the detectors.

FIG. 1. (a) Sketch of the setup. Two observables are measured by detectors ($D_j$) coupled to the system ($S$). The detectors come with a knob ($χ_j$) and disturb the system ($γ_j$). (b) Illustration of von Neumann measurements. Detectors are quantum mechanical systems that couple to the system of interest at times $t_j$ via the Hamiltonian $H_j$. The interaction shifts the probability distribution $ρ_j$ of the detectors by an amount depending on the system state $ρ$. After the interaction, a projective position measurement is performed on the detectors resulting in the outcome $A_j$.
rules out an explanation by classical electrodynamics, negativity in the KQPD rules out an explanation based on our classical detector model which we argue is the *appropriate classical theory* for von Neumann type measurements. Importantly, our classical model allows for measurement imprecision and backaction. The model is not necessarily non-contextual [36–38] and the proposed experimental test of non-classical behavior is not subject to a *clumsiness* loophole [39] or a *finite precision* loophole [40, 41].

The KQPD.—The KQPD is discussed in detail in Ref. [16]. It encodes the joint fluctuations of multiple observables of interest. For simplicity, we consider the situation where we are interested in the two observables $A_1$ and $A_2$ at times $t_1$ and $t_2$ respectively. The generalization to more observables is straightforward. Let us further consider the situation where $t_2$ either comes immediately after $t_1$ (subsequent measurements) or where $t_1 = t_2$ (simultaneous measurements). The KQPD is then given by ($\hbar = 1$)

$$P(A | \gamma) = \int \frac{d\lambda}{(2\pi)^2} e^{iA \cdot A} \text{Tr} \left\{ \hat{Q}(\lambda, \gamma) \hat{\rho} \hat{Q}^\dagger(\lambda, \gamma) \right\},$$

where $\hat{Q} = \exp[-i (\frac{A_1}{2} + \gamma_2) \hat{A}_2] \exp[-i (\frac{A_2}{2} + \gamma_1) \hat{A}_1]$ for subsequent measurements and $Q = \exp[-i \sum_{j=1,2} (\lambda_j/2 + \gamma_j) \hat{A}_j]$ for simultaneous measurements. Furthermore, $\hat{\rho}$ denotes the density matrix of the system before the measurement. For ease of notation, we grouped the observables into a vector $A = (A_1, A_2)$ and similarly for $\lambda$ and $\gamma$. The KQPD encodes the fluctuations of the observables of interest. As shown below, the variables $\gamma_j$ are necessary to take into account the backaction that the measurement exerts on the system and can be seen as random variables determined by the detectors. If $[A_1, A_2] \neq 0$, the measurement of $A_1$ may influence the measurement of $A_2$ and a description of the system in terms of pre-determined values of $A_1$ and $A_2$ is not generally possible. In this case, the KQPD may become negative. It has been shown that such negativity requires the system to be in a superposition of states that correspond to different values for the observable $A_1$ [34]. Negativity in the KQPD can thus be seen as an indicator for non-classical behavior. However, in an experiment, the negativity of the KQPD is masked by measurement imprecision and backaction, rendering the measured probability distribution strictly non-negative. The inequality that we introduce below relies on a way to unmask the KQPD experimentally.

The QM-model.—We first give the quantum mechanical description of the scenario under investigation, sketched in Fig. 1(a). While we assume this to be the correct description, we stress that our test for non-classicality does not rely on the QM-model. We consider a system described by a density matrix $\hat{\rho}$. Two detectors, one for each observable to be measured, are coupled to the system. We assume that the detectors can be described by canonically conjugate observables $\hat{r}_j$ and $\hat{\pi}_j$ and that they are coupled to the system through the Hamiltonian [12]

$$\hat{H}_j = \delta(t - t_j) \chi_j \hat{A}_j \hat{\pi}_j,$$

where $j = 1, 2$, and $\chi_j$ denotes the measurement strength. Throughout this letter, we assume that the time-evolution induced by any Hamiltonian other than Eq. [2] can be neglected during (and between) the measurements, noting that it is straightforward to include time-evolution between the measurements (for an investigation on detector memory effects, see Ref. [42]). Equation [2] induces a displacement in the detector coordinates $\hat{r}_j$ which depends on the state of the system. After the interaction, a projective measurement of the detectors is performed to complete the measurement of the system observables $\hat{A}_j$. The measured distribution reads [14] (see also [13, 14])

$$P(A | \chi) = \int dA' d\gamma P(A' | \gamma) \prod_{j=1,2} W_j(\bar{A}_j - \hat{A}_j, \bar{\gamma}_j),$$

where $W_j(r, \pi)$ denotes the Wigner function of detector $j$ and we introduced the rescaled variables $\bar{A}_j = \chi_j A_j$ and $\bar{\gamma}_j = \gamma_j / \chi_j$. The measurement distribution is thus equal to the KQPD, distorted by the measurement process. The uncertainties in the position coordinates induce a fuzziness in the measurement (measurement imprecision) and the uncertainty in the momentum coordinates introduce a random kick in the measured observable through Eq. [2] (measurement backaction). Due to the Heisenberg uncertainty relation, there exists a trade-off between precision and backaction [5] which ensures that the measured distribution is always positive, even when the KQPD exhibits negativity. Equation [3] shows that the KQPD provides a natural description of von Neumann type measurements since all the information of the system is encoded in the KQPD alone. For an investigation of the classical limit of von Neumann type measurements, see Ref. [15].

The classical model.—We now introduce a classical hidden-variable model that describes the situation sketched in Fig. 1(a). To this end, we assume that the system is described by a positive probability distribution $S(A | \gamma)$. This distribution encodes the (hidden) values of the observables ($A$) and takes into account that the presence of the detectors may modify the system behavior ($\gamma$). The measured distribution can then be written in the very general form

$$P_{cl}(A | \chi) = \int dA' d\gamma M(A, A', \gamma | \chi) S(A' | \gamma),$$

where $\chi$ describes the (changeable) detector settings. The function $M$ describes the effect of the detectors. Equation [4] is sufficiently general that it can essentially describe any observations. We thus make some assumptions on the detectors:
1. Uncorrelated detectors:

\[ M(A, A', \gamma | \chi) = \prod_j M_j(A_j, A'_j, \gamma_j | \chi_j). \]  

(5)

2. Uncorrelated imprecision and backaction:

\[ M_j(A_j, A'_j, \gamma_j | \chi_j) = p_j(\gamma_j | \chi_j) D_j(A_j, A'_j | \chi_j). \]  

(6)

3. Backaction only affects the other observable:

\[ \int dA_k S(A | \gamma_j, \gamma_k = 0) \equiv S(A_j | \gamma_j) = S(A_j). \]  

(7)

4. Translational invariance:

\[ D_j(A_j, A'_j | \chi_j) = D_j(A_j - A'_j | \chi_j). \]  

(8)

5. Detectors can be detached:

\[ \lim_{\gamma_j \rightarrow 0} p_j(\gamma_j | \chi_j) D_j(A_j - A'_j | \chi_j) = \delta(\gamma_j) U(A_j). \]  

(9)

The first assumption allows us to treat the detectors as individual objects that do not influence each other (except through the system). Assumptions 2 and 3 ensure that the backaction of a detector does not interfere with its own measurement, i.e., a detectors output is independent of its backaction on the system. In Eq. (7), we introduced the distribution relevant for measuring a single variable, \( S(A_j) \), which is assumed to be independent of the backaction of its own detector. In assumption 5, \( U \) denotes the uniform distribution and we defined \( \gamma_j = 0 \) to denote the absence of any backaction of detector \( j \). We note that our assumptions only include the effect of the detectors. On a qualitative level, one can thus replace our assumptions with the notion of having control over measurements of single observables and preventing any cross-talk between the detectors. Since one usually has some degree of trust on what the measurement apparatus displays, we believe that our model can be seen as the appropriate classical model for von Neumann type measurements.

Certifying non-classicality.— We denote by \( P(A_j | \chi_j) \) the distribution that describes a measurement of a single observable. We further denote the Fourier transform of any distribution with a tilde \( \tilde{P}(\lambda) = \int dA \exp(-i\lambda A)P(A) \). We then consider the quantity

\[ K = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int d\lambda e^{i\lambda A} \tilde{P}(\lambda | \chi) \prod_{j=1,2} \frac{\tilde{P}(\lambda_j | \chi_j)}{\tilde{P}(\lambda_j | \chi_j)}, \]  

(10)

where we note that the right-hand side only contains Fourier transforms of measurable probability distributions. If the measurement is described by our classical model, we can write this quantity as

\[ K_{cl} = \int dA'd\gamma S(A'|\gamma) \prod_{j=1,2} p_j(\gamma_j | \chi_j) D_j(A_j - A'_j | \chi_j). \]  

(11)

This equation is very similar to Eq. (4) (under our assumptions) with the only difference that \( \chi_j \) is replaced by \( \chi_j' \) in the measurement imprecision term \( D_j \). The reason for this is that within our assumptions, the measurement imprecision of the detectors can be corrected for. This is the purpose of the product on the right-hand side of Eq. (10). We end up with a distribution where the backaction is determined by \( \gamma_j \) and the imprecision by \( \chi_j' \). In our classical model, this still results in a positive distribution and we have

\[ K_{cl} \geq 0. \]  

(12)

In quantum mechanics however, the delicate interplay between backaction and imprecision is what masks the negativity of the KQPD. Using detectors with positive Wigner functions that factorize in a position and a momentum part, \( K \) is given by an expression analogous to Eq. (11), with \( S \) replaced by the KQPD \( P \). A positive KQPD then immediately ensures \( K \geq 0 \). In the limit where \( \chi_j \rightarrow 0 \) and \( \chi_j' \rightarrow \infty \), we find \( K \rightarrow P \). Whenever the KQPD exhibits negativity, we can thus find \( K < 0 \), violating the inequality in Eq. (12). Negativity in the KQPD is therefore a necessary and sufficient condition for certifying non-classicality as long as our assumptions 1-5 are fulfilled (implying positive and factorizing Wigner functions for the detectors).

Examples.— We now illustrate how our classical model can be ruled out from experimental (in our case, simulated) data by violating the inequality in Eq. (12). We consider two examples: The simultaneous measurement of position and momentum, and two subsequent, non-commuting Stern-Gerlach type spin measurements. For both examples, we consider identical detectors that are described by the Wigner function (throughout, we consider dimensionless units for position and momentum)

\[ W_j(r_j, p_j) = \frac{1}{\pi} e^{-(r_j^2 + p_j^2)}/, \]  

(13)

corresponding to unsqueezed Gaussian states of minimal uncertainty. As demanded by assumption 2, they factorize into distributions for position (imprecision) and momentum (backaction).

We first consider a simultaneous measurement of position and momentum on a single-photon Fock state described by the Wigner function

\[ W(x, p) = \frac{1}{\pi} \left[ 2(x^2 + p^2) - 1 \right] e^{-(x^2 + p^2)}. \]  

(14)

In this case, our quantum mechanical model reduces to the Arthurs-Kelly model \[16\]. As discussed in detail in Ref. \[16\], the KQPD for the simultaneous position and momentum measurement is given by \( \mathcal{V}(x - \gamma_p/2, p + \gamma_x/2) \). Choosing equal measurement strengths \( \gamma_x = \gamma_p = \chi \) and \( \chi_x = \chi'_p = \chi' \) we then find (see supplemental information for details)

\[ K = \frac{1}{\pi(1 + g^2)} e^{-\frac{(x^2 + p^2)}{1 + g^2}} \left[ 2(x^2 + p^2) - 1 + g^2 \right], \]  

(15)
where \( g = (\chi/2)^2 + 1/(\chi')^2 \). We note that in the limit \( \chi \to 0 \) and \( \chi' \to \infty \), we have \( g \to 0 \) and Eq. (15) reduces to Eq. (14). As long as \( g < 1 \), we find \( K < 0 \) at the origin. This is illustrated in Fig. 2(a). We stress that \( K \) is fully determined by measurable probability distributions. From experimental data alone, it is thus possible to rule out our classical model.

Equation (15) implies that the smaller \( \chi \), the stronger the negativity in the measurable quantity \( K \). Weaker measurements thus always seem to be preferable. However, this is only true under the assumption that \( K \) can be estimated precisely. Strictly speaking, this is only true if infinite measurements are performed. For a finite and fixed number of measurements, we will find a trade-off between having large negative values in \( K \) (requiring small \( \chi \)) and being able to reliably estimate \( K \) (requiring large \( \chi \)). To estimate \( K \), we introduce the estimate of the characteristic function (Fourier transform) of a probability distribution. Considering an experiment with \( N \) measurements resulting in outcomes \( x_j \), we define the empirical characteristic function

\[
Y_\chi = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} e^{-i\lambda x_j}.
\]

(16)

While it reduces to the true characteristic function in the limit \( N \to \infty \) (it is an unbiased estimator), it is imprecise for large values of \( \lambda \), where the characteristic function is a small number.

We can now introduce our estimator for \( K \)

\[
K_{\text{est}} = \begin{cases} \sum_{\lambda} \frac{\lambda e}{(2\pi)^2} e^{i\lambda x} Y_{\lambda x} Y_{\lambda p}^* & \text{for } |Y_{\lambda x/p}| > c_o, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}
\]

(17)

where \( \lambda \cdot A = \lambda_x x + \lambda_p p \). Here the different empirical characteristic functions are labeled by \( \lambda \) for the joint measurement and by a prime for the measurements with strength \( \chi' \). The estimator contains two empirical cutoffs. The first, \( c_o \), ensures that values of \( \lambda \) where we divide by a very small number are not taken into account. These are usually highly unreliable and the estimator becomes more stable for a finite \( c_o \). The second, \( \lambda_c \), allows us to integrate over a finite domain. It is especially important because the empirical characteristic function is a quasi-periodic function and thus shows recurrences at very high values of \( \lambda \) \([17]\). The estimator in Eq. (17) is illustrated in Fig. 2(a) for simulated data. For large values of \( \chi \), it is both accurate and precise. As \( \chi \) becomes smaller, the spread of the estimates increases (the precision is reduced). Eventually, the cut-off \( c_o \) prevents an accurate estimation because the true characteristic function becomes very small for almost all values of \( \lambda_{x/p} \). As expected, we thus find a trade-off between large \( \chi \), where the negativity in \( K \) is not very pronounced, and small \( \chi \), where it is hard to estimate \( K \).

Our second example is provided by subsequent, non-commuting measurements on a two-level system (for a detailed discussion on simultaneous measurements of two different spin components, see Ref. [18]). To this end, we consider the system to be in a pure state \( |+\rangle \), which is an eigenstate of the Pauli matrix \( \sigma_z \). We then make a measurement of \( \sigma_z \) with strength \( \chi_1 = \chi \), followed by a projective measurement of \( \sigma_x \). The KQPD for this system is discussed in Ref. [10] and given in the supplementary information. Because it is unavoidable that the first measurement influences the second one, the KQPD exhibits negativity. Since the second measurement is projective, we only correct for the measurement imprecision of the first measurement in \( K \), choosing \( \chi_2 = \chi_1' \to \infty \) in Eq. (10). All distributions can then be given as densities in the continuous variable \( \sigma_1 \) and probabilities in the discrete variable \( \sigma_2 = \pm 1 \). Certifying non-classicality of this system is illustrated in Fig. 2(b), where we show both \( K \) as well as \( K_{\text{est}} \). We find the same qualitative

\[\text{FIG. 2. Certifying non-classicality. (a) Simultaneous measurement of both quadratures in a single-mode Fock state containing one photon. (b) Two subsequent spin measurements in different directions on a spin one-half particle. The large panels show}}
\[\text{K for values of A that maximize the negativity}} \ [\text{for (a), } \sigma_1 = 0, \sigma_2 = -1 \text{ for (b)}. \] The solid line corresponds to the exact value of K [Eq. (10)], the triangles to the estimate K_{\text{est}} based on numerical simulations [Eq. (17)]. The side panels show the full estimate of K for a single data point. In (a), the small side-panel shows the exact distribution K. In (b), the dashed lines correspond to the exact K. As the measurement strength \chi increases, the estimate becomes more reliable but the backaction decreases the negativity in K. The simulations are based on 15’000 individual measurements of the the observables and 30’000 joint measurements. Other parameters: (a) c_o = 0.01, \chi' = 5, \lambda_c = 10. (b) \chi' = 3, c_o = 0.1, \lambda_c = 12.}
results as for the simultaneous position and momentum measurement. The weaker the first spin measurement, the more pronounced the negativity but the less reliable is the estimate $K_{\text{est}}$ for a fixed number of measurements. Detailed calculations can be found in the supplemental information.

Conclusions.— In this letter, we have shown that negativity in the KQPD is a sufficient and necessary condition to rule out classical explanations of experiments that measure the corresponding observables. To this end, we introduced a classical model for von Neumann type measurements which is based on five rather natural assumptions. Under these assumptions, we find the inequality $K \geq 0$. In scenarios which are well described by quantum mechanical von Neumann measurements, we find that $K$ can become negative if and only if the KQPD exhibits negative values. The reason for this is that $K$ essentially provides a way of approximating the KQPD from measurable probability distributions. This is possible because measurement imprecision is a property of the detector alone and can thus be inferred and corrected for. In weak measurements, where backaction becomes small, correcting for the measurement imprecision “unnacks” the KQPD, exposing its negativity.

Our results put the non-classical nature of the negative values in the KQPD on a firmer footing. This is of broad relevance, as the KQPD has been employed in a variety of contexts. The operational procedure for certifying non-classicality introduced here provides an experimental tool to investigate quantum behavior and will hopefully inspire further research on quantum fluctuations and their relevance in near-future technologies.
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Supplemental information: Certifying Non-Classical Behavior for Negative Keldysh Quasi-Probabilities

Here we provide supplementary calculations and expressions for the examples discussed in the main text.

A. SIMULTANEOUS POSITION AND MOMENTUM MEASUREMENTS

From Eqs. (3), (13), and (14), we find the probability distribution describing the outcomes of a joint position and momentum measurement

\[ P(x, p|\chi) = \frac{4\chi^2}{\pi(2 + \chi^2)^6} e^{-\frac{\chi^2(x^2 + p^2)}{(2 + \chi^2)^2}} \left[ 32\chi^4(x^2 + p^2) + (4 - \chi^4)^2 \right], \]  

(S1)

where we assumed the measurement strengths to be equal, i.e., \( \chi_x = \chi_p = \chi \). The corresponding characteristic function reads

\[ \tilde{P}(\lambda_x, \lambda_p|\chi) = \int dx dp e^{-i\lambda_x x - i\lambda_p p} P(x, p|\chi) = \frac{1}{2} e^{-\frac{\lambda_x^2 x^2 + \lambda_p^2 p^2}{2(1 + \chi^2)}} (2 - \lambda_x^2 - \lambda_p^2). \]  

(S2)

Analogously, we find the probability distribution that describes a measurement of \( \hat{x} \) alone

\[ P(x|\chi) = \frac{\chi}{\sqrt{\pi(1 + \chi^2)^5}} (1 + \chi^2 + 2x^2\chi^4) e^{-\frac{x^2}{1 + \chi^2}}, \]  

(S3)

with the characteristic function

\[ \tilde{P}(\lambda_x|\chi) = \frac{1}{2} e^{-\frac{x^2}{4\chi^2}} \lambda_x^2 (2 - \lambda_x^2). \]  

(S4)

Due to the rotational invariance of the Wigner function of a single-photon Fock state [cf. Eq. (14)], the distributions for a measurement of momentum alone are equivalent. From the last equation, we find

\[ \frac{\tilde{P}(\lambda_x|\chi)}{\tilde{P}(\lambda_x|\chi')} = e^{-\frac{x^2}{\alpha^2}(1 - (\chi/\chi')^2)} = \frac{\tilde{D}(\lambda_x|\chi)}{\tilde{D}(\lambda_x|\chi')}, \]  

(S5)

where for the last equality, we used the Wigner function of the detectors [cf. Eq. (13)], and the fact that they can be written as

\[ W_j(\chi_j A_j, \gamma_j/\chi_j) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi} \chi_j} e^{-\frac{\gamma_j^2}{\chi_j^2} X_j} e^{-\frac{x^2}{\chi_j^2} A_j^2} = p(\gamma_j|\chi_j) D(A_j|\chi_j), \]  

(S6)

where, as discussed in the main text, \( p(\gamma_j|\chi_j) \) encodes the backaction (arising from the momentum distribution of the detector) and \( D(A_j|\chi_j) \) encodes the imprecision (arising from the position distribution). Equation (S5) thus shows that the measurement imprecision of a detector can be isolated by measuring a single observable with different measurement strengths. Importantly, this works because backaction is irrelevant when measuring a single observable (we are not interested in the post-measured state). We can now write

\[ K(x, p) = \int dx' dp' d\gamma_x d\gamma_p P(x, p|\gamma_x, \gamma_p) [p(\gamma_x|\chi) D(x - x'|\chi') | p(\gamma_p|\chi) D(p - p'|\chi')], \]  

(S7)

where \( P(x, p|\gamma_x, \gamma_p) = W(x - \gamma_p/2, p + \gamma_x/2) \). Note the close similarity between Eq. (11) in the main text and Eq. (S7). From Eqs. (S2) and (S5), we recover \( K \) given in Eq. (15) in the main text.

B. SUBSEQUENT MEASUREMENTS ON A TWO-LEVEL SYSTEM

In the second example, we consider a two level system in a pure state

\[ \hat{\rho} = |+\rangle, \quad \hat{\sigma}_z |+\rangle = |+\rangle, \]  

(S8)
where $\hat{\sigma}_x$ denotes a Pauli matrix. We are then interested in a weak measurement of $\hat{\sigma}_1$, followed by a projective measurement of $\hat{\sigma}_2$. We denote the eigenvector of those Pauli matrices by $\hat{\sigma}_j | \pm_j \rangle = | \pm_j \rangle$. It is convenient to express all states in the basis that diagonalizes $\hat{\sigma}_1$.

$$|+\rangle = \alpha |+1\rangle + \beta |-1\rangle \quad |+2\rangle = \gamma |+1\rangle + \delta |-1\rangle,$$

(S9)

where we consider $\alpha = \beta = \gamma = \delta = 1/\sqrt{2}$ in the main text. The KQPD can then be written as [16]

$$P_\epsilon(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int d\lambda_1 d\lambda_2 e^{i\lambda_1 \Sigma_1 + i\lambda_2 \Sigma_2} \text{Tr} \left\{ e^{-i\frac{\lambda}{2}\hat{\sigma}_2} e^{-i\left(\frac{\lambda}{2} + \gamma\right)\hat{\sigma}_1} |+\rangle \langle +| + e^{-i\left(\frac{\lambda}{2} - \gamma\right)\hat{\sigma}_1} e^{-i\frac{\lambda}{2}\hat{\sigma}_2} \right\}$$

$$= \sum_{\sigma_1 = 0, \pm 1} \sum_{\sigma_2 = 0, \pm 1} P(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \delta(\Sigma_1 - \sigma_1) \delta(\Sigma_2 - \sigma_2),$$

(S10)

with the discrete distribution

$$P(+1, +1) = |\alpha|^2 |\gamma|^2, \quad P(-1, +1) = |\beta|^2 |\delta|^2, \quad P(0, +1) = 2 \text{Re} \left\{ e^{-2i\gamma} \alpha \beta^* \gamma^* \delta \right\},$$

$$P(+1, -1) = |\alpha|^2 |\delta|^2, \quad P(-1, -1) = |\beta|^2 |\gamma|^2, \quad P(0, -1) = -2 \text{Re} \left\{ e^{-2i\gamma} \alpha \beta^* \gamma^* \delta \right\}.$$  

(S11)

Measuring $\hat{\sigma}_1$ with strength $\chi$, followed by measuring $\hat{\sigma}_2$ projectively (i.e., $\chi_2 \to \infty$) results in the distribution

$$P(\sigma_1, \sigma_2 | \chi) = \frac{\chi}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sum_{\sigma_1' = 0, \pm 1} e^{-\chi^2 (\sigma_1 - \sigma_1')^2} e^{-\chi^2 \delta_{\sigma_1', 0} \sigma_1} P(\sigma_1', \sigma_2) \mid_{\gamma_1 = 0},$$

where $\sigma_1$ is a continuous variable while $\sigma_2 = \pm 1$ is a discrete variable.

Because the second measurement is strong, there is no need to consider characteristic functions with respect to $\sigma_2$. We thus introduce

$$\hat{P}(\lambda_1, \sigma_2 | \chi) = \int d\sigma_1 e^{-i\lambda_1 \sigma_1} P(\sigma_1, \sigma_2 | \chi) = e^{-\frac{\lambda^2}{4\chi^2}} \sum_{\sigma_1' = 0, \pm 1} e^{-i\lambda_1 \sigma_1'} e^{-\chi^2 \delta_{\sigma_1', 0} \sigma_1} \sigma_1 P(\sigma_1', \sigma_2) \mid_{\gamma_1 = 0}.$$  

(S13)

A measurement of $\hat{\sigma}_1$ alone is described by

$$P(\sigma_1 | \chi) = \frac{\chi}{\sqrt{\pi}} \left[ |\alpha|^2 e^{-\chi^2 (\sigma_1 - 1)^2} + |\beta|^2 e^{-\chi^2 (\sigma_1 + 1)^2} \right],$$

(S14)

with the characteristic function

$$\hat{P}(\lambda_1 | \chi) = e^{-\frac{\lambda^2}{4\chi^2}} \left[ \cos(\lambda_1) + (|\beta|^2 - |\alpha|^2)i \sin(\lambda_1) \right].$$

(S15)

This equation again fulfills Eq. 55, ensuring that measurement imprecision can be isolated. We can then write

$$K(\sigma_1, \sigma_2 | \chi) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\lambda_1 e^{i\lambda_1 \sigma_1} \hat{P}(\lambda_1, \sigma_2 | \chi) \frac{\hat{P}(\lambda_1 | \chi')}{\hat{P}(\lambda_1 | \chi)} = \frac{\chi'}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sum_{\sigma_1' = 0, \pm 1} e^{-\chi^2 \delta_{\sigma_1', 0} \sigma_1} e^{-\chi^2 \delta_{\sigma_1', 0} \sigma_1} \sigma_1 P(\sigma_1', \sigma_2) \mid_{\gamma_1 = 0}.$$  

(S16)

We note that in the limit $\chi' \to \infty$, this distribution contains well separated peaks with weights that are given by $e^{-\chi^2 \delta_{\sigma_1', 0} \sigma_1} P(\sigma_1', \sigma_2) \mid_{\gamma_1 = 0}$.

To estimate $K$ from experimental data, we consider $N$ joint measurements, which result in outcomes $\sigma_1^j$ and $\sigma_2^j = \pm 1$. We then introduce the estimate of Eq. 53 as

$$Y_{\lambda_1, \sigma_2} = \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{\sigma_1^j, \sigma_1} e^{-i\lambda_1 \sigma_1^j}.$$  

(S17)

We can then write

$$K_{\text{est}} = \begin{cases} \int_{-\lambda_c}^{\lambda_c} \frac{d\lambda_1}{2\pi} e^{i\lambda_1 \sigma_1} Y_{\lambda_1, \sigma_2} \frac{Y_{\lambda_1}^*}{Y_{\lambda_1}} & \text{for } |Y_{\lambda_1}| > \epsilon_0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

(S18)

where $Y_{\lambda_1}$ and $Y_{\lambda_1}'$ denote the estimate of $\hat{P}(\lambda_1 | \chi)$ and $\hat{P}(\lambda_1 | \chi')$ respectively, following Eq. 56.