We propose a measurement framework with postselection for the simultaneous estimation of multiple parameters. In this measurement framework, a system that is characterized by a set of parameters interacts with a measurement apparatus (MA) and be postselected onto a final state. The measurements on the final state of the MA yield an estimation of the parameters. We then discuss the tradeoffs in attainable precision associated with these lower bounds. As an example of our proposal, we illustrate the framework on the estimation of the phase and phase fluctuation with two different MA’s: a continuous Gaussian MA and a discrete qubit MA. Our results thus provide a reliable method for development of multiple-parameter estimations based on postselection measurements.

I. INTRODUCTION

The limit of the precision of a parameter estimation is imposed by quantum mechanics. Or, quantum mechanically optimized measurements enable to achieve this ultimate precision. The estimation of a single parameter has been established [1–16]. Therein, several studies have demonstrated the quantum-enhanced metrology by using entangled resources [1–8], quantum memory [9], or teleportation [10]. Furthermore, weak value amplifications with postselection techniques also enhance the sensitivities of the estimations of parameters [11–15], including modular-value-based approach [16].

It is often demanded to estimate multiple parameters simultaneously. For example, estimations of phases are always invariably affected by environmental noise. And thus, a simultaneous measurement of the phase and its fluctuation is demanded. Such joint estimations have been discussed recently, focusing on the joint estimation of phase and phase diffusion (loss) [17–24]. Furthermore, some other interesting multiple-parameter estimations were also investigated: damping and temperature [25], two-phase spin rotation [26], waveform [27], operators [28, 29], phase-space displacements [30, 31], multiple phases [32, 33], and parameters in multidimensional fields [34].

Most of studies, so far, focused on the role of a sensor, or a probe system that characterized by the parameters of interest: general-state sensors [32, 35], spinor sensors [36], entangled sensors [28, 29], phase-space displacements [30, 31], multiple phases [32, 33], and parameters in multidimensional fields [34].

In the parameters estimations, the sensitivities are bounded by the quantum Cramér-Rao bounds (QCRB). For a single-parameter estimation, the QCRB can be achieved by projecting the states of the sensor on the basis determined by eigenvectors of symmetric logarithmic derivative (SLD) operator [17, 22, 40]. However, for a multiple-parameter estimation, SLD operators of different parameters may not commute and thus the basis determined by the SLD operators may not be orthogonal. Such a case leads to a tradeoff in the estimation of different parameters [17, 18, 20, 22]. This tradeoff is a kind of “competition” among parameter estimations [41]. Several theoretical and numerical studies of the optimal measurements that saturate the QCRB as well as the tradeoff relations have been reported [20, 35, 42].

In this work, we discuss the multiple-parameter estimations under postselection measurements. Therein, a sensor after passing through a multiple-parameter generator will interact with an MA and then postselected onto a final state. After the postselection, the MA state will be measured yielding the estimation of parameters. Then we discuss the QCRBs and tradeoff relations in our framework. We also discuss the simultaneous estimation of a phase and its fluctuation, as an example.

This paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces a measurement framework with postselection and formulates the QCRBs and tradeoff relations. The application to the estimation of a phase and its fluctuation is presented in Sec. III. We summarize the results in Sec. IV.

II. POSTSELECTED ESTIMATION PROCESS

A. Measurement process

We consider a quantum channel \( \Lambda_\Phi \) that is characterized by a set of \( d \) parameters given as a vector \( \Phi = \)
\{\phi_1, \phi_2, ..., \phi_d\} that we want to estimate. We perform the following process: (i) A state \(\rho_{s,i}\) of the sensor is prepared. (ii) It evolves to \(\rho_{s,ii}(\phi) = \Lambda_{\phi}(\rho_{s,i})\) after passing through the quantum channel \(\Lambda_{\phi}\). (iii) The sensor interacts with the MA whose state is \(|\xi\rangle\), leading to a joint state \(\rho_{sm}(\phi) = \hat{U}_{sm}(\rho_{s,i}(\phi) \otimes |\xi\rangle\langle\xi|)\hat{U}_{sm}^\dagger\). Here, \(\hat{U}_{sm} = \exp(-i g A_s \otimes M_m)\) is the unitary evolution caused by the sensor-MA interaction and \(g\) is the interaction strength. \(A_s\) and \(M_m\) are operators on the sensor and the MA, respectively. (iv) The sensor is postselected onto a final state \(\rho_{s,f}\). The MA state after the postselection is

\[
\rho_{\text{m}}(\phi) = \frac{\text{Tr}_s[\rho_{s,f} \otimes \hat{I}_m \rho_{\text{m}}(\phi) \hat{I}_m \rho_{\text{m}}(\phi)]]}{P_{\text{ps}}(\phi)},
\]

where \(P_{\text{ps}}(\phi) = \text{Tr}[\rho_{s,f} \otimes \hat{I}_m \rho_{\text{m}}(\phi)]\) and \(\hat{I}_m\) is the identity operator on the MA. \(P_{\text{ps}}(\phi)\) is the probability of successful postselection. Assume that we employ a POVM measurement \(\hat{\Pi}_k\) on the final MA state for getting a measurement result \(k\), the corresponding probability distribution is given as

\[
P(k|\phi) = \text{Tr}_m[\rho_{\text{m}}(\phi) \hat{\Pi}_k],
\]

from which \(\phi\) is estimated.

### B. Cramér-Rao bounds and tradeoff relations

The precision of the estimation of \(\phi\) is evaluated by its covariance matrix, \([C(\phi)]_{\alpha, \beta} = \langle \phi_\alpha \phi_\beta \rangle - \langle \phi_\alpha \rangle \langle \phi_\beta \rangle\). The diagonal element \([C(\phi)]_{\alpha, \alpha}\) is the variance \((\delta \phi_\alpha)^2\). We define a postselected classical Fisher information matrix (PCFIM) as

\[
[F(\phi)]_{\alpha, \beta} = P_{\text{ps}}(\phi) \sum_k \frac{1}{P(k|\phi)} \frac{\partial P(k|\phi)}{\partial \phi_\alpha} \frac{\partial P(k|\phi)}{\partial \phi_\beta}.
\]

and a postselected quantum Fisher information matrix (PQFIM) as

\[
[Q(\phi)]_{\alpha, \beta} = P_{\text{ps}}(\phi) \text{Tr}_m[\rho_{\text{m}}(\phi) \frac{\hat{L}_\alpha \hat{L}_\beta + \hat{L}_\beta \hat{L}_\alpha}{2}],
\]

where \(\hat{L}\) is given in the symmetric logarithmic derivative (SLD) as \(\hat{L}_k \rho + \rho \hat{L}_k = 2 \partial_k \rho\) for an arbitrary \(\rho\). We emphasize that both PCFIM and PQFIM depend on the probability of successful postselection \(P_{\text{ps}}(\phi)\).

In this work, we obtain the lower bounds for the covariance matrix as

\[
N \cdot C(\phi) \geq [F(\phi)]^{-1} \geq [Q(\phi)]^{-1},
\]

where \(N\) is the number of repeated measurements. See the proof in Appendix A. The first inequality is a postselected classical Cramér-Rao bound (PCCRB), while the second one is referred to a postselected quantum Cramér-Rao bound (PQCRB). The PCCRB may be saturated by using a maximum likelihood estimator [43], but the PQCRB is not easy to attain. Optimal POVM measurements to achieve the PQFIM for multiple-parameter estimations still remain an open question. However, \(Q(\phi)\) can be achieved if \(\text{Tr}_m[\rho_{s,i}(\phi) [\hat{L}_\alpha, \hat{L}_\beta]] = 0\), or much stronger condition of \([\hat{L}_\alpha, \hat{L}_\beta] = 0\), is satisfied [44].

It is worth mentioning that the quantum Fisher information matrix (QFIM), given as

\[
[H(\phi)]_{\alpha, \beta} = \text{Tr}_s[\rho_{s,i}(\phi) \frac{\hat{L}_\alpha \hat{L}_\beta + \hat{L}_\beta \hat{L}_\alpha}{2}],
\]

is associated with the direct estimation of \(\phi\) hidden in the state \(\rho_{s,i}(\phi)\) of the sensor. The diagonal elements of QFIM provide the ultimate achievable precision of the estimations, which are the quantum limits on the separate estimations of each of the parameters [45]. In this work, we discuss how our measurement framework can achieve this limit.

For single-parameter estimations, Tanaka and Yamamoto [46] also found \(Q \leq H\). This means that postselections cannot offer a better precision for the parameter estimations. We successfully extend \(Q \leq H\) in the case of multiple-parameter estimations, or

\[
Q(\phi) \leq H(\phi).
\]

See the proof in Appendix B. This inequality leads to a tradeoff \(\text{Tr}[QH^{-1}]\), which we refer as a “quantum” tradeoff. For a diagonal matrix of \(H(\phi)\), we obtain a tradeoff relation

\[
\text{Tr}[QH^{-1}] = \sum_{k=1}^d \frac{Q_{kk}}{H_{kk}} \leq d.
\]

See the proof in Appendix C. We sometimes omit “(\phi)”s of \(H(\phi), Q(\phi), \) and \(F(\phi)\). The meaning of the tradeoff relation can be understood as follows. If the tradeoff is less than \(d\), then there is one possibility that the estimation of one parameter reaches the quantum-limit precision but the others are not. Another possibility is that none of the parameters can reach the quantum-limit precision. This tradeoff is a kind of “competition” between the estimations of parameters. If the equality is achieved, all the estimations attain the quantum-limit precision simultaneously.

We have derived the Cramér-Rao lower bounds and the tradeoff relation in our model. We will investigate the tradeoff relation in more concrete examples.

### III. SIMULTANEOUS ESTIMATION OF PHASE AND FLUCTUATION

A phase fluctuation is inevitable in the phase estimation and can be a parameter of interest. The phase fluctuation provides the dynamical information of environment surrounding the sensor. Therefore, we consider the simultaneous phase and phase fluctuation estimations under
the postselected process with two common MA’s: a continuous Gaussian MA and a discrete qubit MA. We investigate the quantum tradeoff \( \text{Tr}[QH^{-1}] \) and find that the equality can occur with a practical choice of the sensor and MA initial states. For comparison, we also analyze the “classical” tradeoff \( \text{Tr}[F^{-1}] \) for these two cases.

We assume the preselected sensor state is \( \rho_{s,t} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \begin{array}{cc} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{array} \right) \). After passing through the phase and phase fluctuation channels, it evolves to

\[
\rho_{s,i}(\phi) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \begin{array}{cc} 1 & e^{-i\phi - \Gamma^2} \\ e^{i\phi - \Gamma^2} & 1 \end{array} \right),
\]

where \( \phi \) and \( \Gamma \) are the phase and phase fluctuation. In this case, \( \phi = \{\phi, \Gamma\} \). The QFIM, \( H \), related to this state is a diagonal matrix and can be calculated from Eq. (6) by using the SLD, as follows

\[
H_{\phi\phi} = e^{-2\pi^2} \text{ and } H_{\Gamma\Gamma} = \frac{4\Gamma^2}{e^{2\pi^2} - 1}. \tag{10}
\]

**A. Continuous Gaussian MA**

We first consider the continuous Gaussian MA with a zero-mean in position \( x \),

\[
|\xi\rangle = \int dx \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{1/4}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{4\sigma^2}\right) |x\rangle,
\]

where we assume \( \hbar = 1 \). This \( |\xi\rangle \) is widely used in weak measurements [47–53]. This is a good example for discussing the postselection measurements. \( |\xi\rangle \) is equivalently given by

\[
|\xi\rangle = \int dp \frac{2\sigma^2}{\pi}^{1/4} \exp(-p^2\sigma^2) |p\rangle,
\]

where \( p \) is a momentum.

We consider the unitary evolution \( \hat{U}_{sm} = \exp(-ig\sigma_z \otimes \hat{p}) \) of the sensor-MA interaction. Throughout this paper, we pick \( g = \pi/2 \) for simplicity. The postselected state is chosen to be \( \rho_{s,t} = |\psi_{s,t}\rangle \langle \psi_{s,t}| \), where \( |\psi_{s,t}\rangle = \sin(\gamma/2)|0\rangle + \cos(\gamma/2)|1\rangle \). The probability of successful postselection reads

\[
P_{sp}(\phi) = \frac{1}{4} e^{-\pi^2 - \frac{\pi^2}{\sigma^2}} \left( 2e^{\Gamma^2 + \frac{\pi^2}{\sigma^2}} + 1 + e^{2\pi^2} \sin\gamma \right).
\]

To calculate the MA state after the postselection, we first decompose the sensor state \( \rho_{s,i}(\phi) \) into its eigenvalues and eigenstates, such that \( \rho_{s,i}(\phi) = \sum_k \lambda_k |\psi_k\rangle \langle \psi_k| \). Substituting this into Eq. (7), we have

\[
\rho_{s,i}(\phi) = \sum_k \lambda_k \frac{\hat{B}_k|\xi\rangle \langle \xi| \hat{B}_k^\dagger}{P_{sp}(\phi)} = \sum_k \lambda_k |\xi_k\rangle \langle \xi_k|,
\]

where \( \hat{B}_k = \langle \psi_k, f| \otimes \hat{I}_m \rangle \hat{U}_{sm} (|\psi_k\rangle \otimes \hat{I}_m) \) and \( |\xi_k\rangle \equiv \hat{B}_k|\xi\rangle \sqrt{P_{ps}(\phi)} \). We emphasize that \( \{|\xi_k\rangle\} \) are not orthogonal, and thus, the PQFIM, \( Q \), cannot be calculated in general.

We consider the case of \( \gamma = \pi/2 \) and \( \phi \rightarrow 0 \). In this limit, \( \{|\xi_k\rangle\} \) become orthogonal and the PQFIM, \( Q \), is analytically calculated as

\[
\begin{align*}
Q_{\alpha\beta}(\phi) &= 4 \sum_{kl} \frac{\lambda_k \lambda_l}{N_i} \frac{\langle \xi_k | \partial_{\alpha} \rho_{lm}(\phi) | \xi_l \rangle \langle \xi_l | \partial_{\beta} \rho_{lm}(\phi) | \xi_k \rangle}{(\lambda_k N_k + \lambda_l N_l)^2}, \\
N_i &= |\xi_i\rangle \langle \xi_i|,
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \phi = \frac{1}{2} H \). This result is disappointing in terms of optimal multiple-parameter estimations. We observe that \( Q_{\phi\phi} = Q_{\Gamma\Gamma} \), which means they can always attain the same precision and is known as a Fisher-symmetric informationally complete (FSIC) [54].

Let us measure the momentum of the final MA state.
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We no need to assume $\gamma = \pi/2$ in this case. The probability distribution yields
\[
P(p|\phi) = \frac{\sqrt{2\pi^2 e^{-2p^2\sigma^2}} (e^{1 - e^{-2p^2\sigma^2}} + \cos(\pi p + \phi) \sin \gamma)}{e^{\Gamma^2} + e^{-\frac{2}{\sigma^2} \cos \phi \sin \gamma}}. \tag{18}
\]

It can be checked that $\int P(p|\phi)dp = 1$. The PCFIM, $F_\phi$, related to this probability can be calculated numerically from Eq. (3), where $\sum_\mu$ is replaced by $\int dp$. After that, we can evaluate the classical tradeoff, $\text{Tr}[F H^{-1}]$, in the simultaneous estimation of $\phi$ and $\Gamma$. The result is shown in Fig. 1(b). Here we choose $\gamma = \pi/2$ and plot the classical tradeoff, $\text{Tr}[F H^{-1}]$, as a function of $\sigma$ and $\Gamma$. The result shows that the maximum value of the classical tradeoff is 1/2 at small $\sigma$ regardless of $\Gamma$. The ratios $F_{\phi}/H_{\phi}$ and $F_{\Gamma}/H_{\Gamma}$, however, vary with $\Gamma$, as shown in the inset of Fig. 1. In the small phase fluctuation ($\Gamma$) region, the ratio $F_{\phi}/H_{\phi}$ reaches the maximum, which implies that the $\phi$-estimation is optimal while $\Gamma$ is not accurately estimated. In the large $\Gamma$ region, the precision of both the estimates are equal.

B. Qubit MA

We now consider a qubit MA [55]. In this case, we choose the initial MA state as $|\xi\rangle = \sin(\theta/2)|0\rangle + \cos(\theta/2)|1\rangle$. The pre- and postselected state of the sensor are the same in Sec. III A. We choose the evolution of $\gamma$ shown in Fig. 1(b). Here we choose $\gamma = \pi/2$ and evaluate the classical tradeoff, $\text{Tr}[F H^{-1}]$, as functions of $\theta$ and $\Gamma$ are shown at $\gamma = \pi/2$. Inset shows the ratios $F_{\phi}/H_{\phi}$, $F_{\Gamma}/H_{\Gamma}$, and their sum.

Since $\partial_\Gamma \text{Tr}[Q H^{-1}]|_{\gamma=\pi/2} = 0$, the quantum tradeoff, $\text{Tr}[Q H^{-1}]$, reaches the maximum at $\gamma = \pi/2$. $\text{Tr}[Q H^{-1}]$ is shown as functions of $\theta$ and $\Gamma$ at $\gamma = \pi/2$ in Fig. 2(a). When $\Gamma$ is small, $\text{Tr}[Q H^{-1}]$ can approach 2 (the number of parameters). It implies that $Q$ approaches $H$: we can simultaneously estimate both the phase and its fluctuation with the quantum-limit precision. A Fisher-symmetric informationally complete (FSIC), or $Q_{\phi}/H_{\phi} = Q_{\Gamma}/H_{\Gamma}$, is seen, too. When $\Gamma$ is finite, the optimal $\theta$, which gives the maximum $\text{Tr}[Q H^{-1}]$, varies as a function of $\Gamma$.

Let us measure the final MA state. We choose a set of projective measurements onto the bases $|\xi\rangle = \cos(\theta/2)|0\rangle + \sin(\theta/2)|1\rangle$ and $|\xi^\perp\rangle$, where $|\xi^\perp\rangle = 0$. For simplicity, we fix $\gamma = \pi/2$. The probabilities $P(\xi^\perp)$ and $P(\xi^\perp\langle\phi)$ can be derived from Eq. (2). The PCFIM, $F_\phi$, related to these probabilities can be calculated analytically from Eq. (3). Then, we calculate the classical tradeoff, $\text{Tr}[F H^{-1}]$, as
\[
\text{Tr} \left[ F H^{-1} \right] = \frac{\sin^2 \theta}{2\sin^2 \theta e^{-\Gamma^2}}. \tag{25}
\]

We show $\text{Tr}[F H^{-1}]$ as functions of $\theta$ and $\Gamma$ in Fig. 2(b). The maximum of $\text{Tr}[F H^{-1}]$ is 1: when the estimation precision of one parameter reaches the quantum limit, that of the other parameter should reduce to zero. We illustrate this competition in the inset of Fig. 2 at $\Gamma = 0.01$ and $\theta = 0.05\pi$. This result is in agreement with previous studies [17, 18].

IV. CONCLUSION

We considered a measurement framework with postselection for simultaneous estimation of multiple parameters. We derived Cramér-Rao bounds and discussed the
tradeoff relations in the estimation. We applied our proposal to the estimation of an unknown phase and phase fluctuation with two measurement apparatus (MA): a continuous Gaussian MA and a discrete qubit MA. In the case of continuous Gaussian MA, the precision for the parameter estimations cannot simultaneously reach the quantum limits. In the case of discrete qubit MA, all the parameters can attain the quantum-limit precision simultaneously in the optimal measurement condition. This result is an advantage of postselection measurements in the multiple-parameter estimations. Our study will provide a feasible protocol for multiple-parameter estimations.
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Appendix A: Proof of $F(\phi) \leq Q(\phi)$

We will first prove $F(\phi) \leq Q(\phi)$ in Eq. (5) in the main text. To do this, we need to prove that $u^T F(\phi) u \leq u^T Q(\phi) u$ for arbitrary $d$-dimensional real vectors $u$ [42]. We first rewrite the CMFIM as $[F(\phi)]_{\alpha\beta} = P_{ps}(\phi) \sum_{\mu} [F(\mu|\phi)]_{\alpha\beta}$, where $[F(\mu|\phi)]_{\alpha\beta}$ is the element of the CMFIM and is defined by

$$[F(\mu|\phi)]_{\alpha\beta} \equiv \frac{1}{P(k|\phi)} \frac{\partial p(\mu|\phi)}{\partial \phi_{\alpha}} \frac{\partial P(\mu|\phi)}{\partial \phi_{\beta}}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\text{Tr}_{m}[\rho_{m}(\phi)\hat{\Pi}_{\mu}]} \frac{\partial \text{Tr}_{m}[\rho_{m}(\phi)\hat{\Pi}_{\mu}]}{\partial \phi_{\alpha}} \frac{\partial \text{Tr}_{m}[\rho_{m}(\phi)\hat{\Pi}_{\mu}]}{\partial \phi_{\beta}}, \quad (A1)$$

where we have used $P(\mu|\phi) = \text{Tr}_{m}[\rho_{m}(\phi)\hat{\Pi}_{\mu}]$. Using SLD, $\partial_{\kappa}\rho_{m}(\phi) = (\hat{L}_{k}\rho_{m}(\phi) + \rho_{m}(\phi)\hat{L}_{k})/2$, where $\kappa = \partial/\partial \phi_{k}$ and $k = \alpha, \beta$, we have

$$\frac{\partial \text{Tr}_{m}[\rho_{m}(\phi)\hat{\Pi}_{\mu}]}{\partial \phi_{k}} = \text{Tr}_{m} \left[ \frac{\partial p(\phi|\Pi_{\mu})}{\partial \phi_{k}} \right] = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \text{Tr}_{m}[\hat{L}_{k}\rho_{m}(\phi)\hat{\Pi}_{k}] + \text{Tr}_{m}[\rho_{m}(\phi)\hat{L}_{k}\hat{\Pi}_{k}] \right\} = \text{Re} \left[ \text{Tr}_{m}[\rho_{m}(\phi)\hat{L}_{k}\hat{\Pi}_{k}] \right], \quad (A2)$$

wherein the last equality, we have used the cyclic property of trace, such that

$$\text{Tr}_{m}[\rho_{m}(\phi)\hat{L}_{k}\hat{\Pi}_{k}] = \text{Tr}_{m}[\hat{L}_{k}\hat{\Pi}_{k}\rho_{m}(\phi)] = \left[ \text{Tr}_{m}[\rho_{m}(\phi)\hat{L}_{k}\hat{\Pi}_{k}] \right]^{*} \quad (A3)$$

Following [35], we calculate

$$\sum_{\alpha,\beta} u_{\alpha}[F(\mu|\phi)]_{\alpha\beta} u_{\beta} = \frac{\text{Re} \left[ \text{Tr}_{m}[\rho_{m}(\phi)\hat{L}_{k}\sum_{\alpha} u_{\alpha}\hat{L}_{\alpha}] \right]^{2}}{\text{Tr}_{m}[\rho_{m}(\phi)\hat{\Pi}_{\mu}]} \quad (a)$$

$$\leq \frac{\left[ \text{Tr}_{m}[\rho_{m}(\phi)\sum_{\alpha} u_{\alpha}\hat{L}_{\alpha}] \right]^{2}}{\text{Tr}_{m}[\rho_{m}(\phi)\hat{\Pi}_{\mu}]} \quad (b)$$

$$\leq \sum_{\alpha,\beta} u_{\alpha} u_{\beta} \text{Tr}_{m}[\rho_{m}(\phi)\hat{L}_{\alpha}\hat{\Pi}_{\mu}\hat{L}_{\beta}] \quad (c)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta} u_{\alpha} \text{Tr}_{m}[\rho_{m}(\phi)(\hat{L}_{\alpha}\hat{\Pi}_{\mu}\hat{L}_{\beta} + \hat{L}_{\beta}\hat{\Pi}_{\mu}\hat{L}_{\alpha})] u_{\beta} \quad (d)$$

$$= \sum_{\alpha,\beta} u_{\alpha}[Q(\mu|\phi)]_{\alpha\beta} u_{\beta}, \quad (A4)$$

(a) We have used the modulus relation, such that $|\text{Re}(z)|^2 + |\text{Im}(z)|^2 = |z|^2$, for a complex number $z$ then it leads to an inequality $|\text{Re}(z)|^2 \leq |z|^2$. (b) We have applied the Cauchy-Swartz inequality $|\text{Tr}(\hat{A}^\dagger \hat{B})|^2 \leq \text{Tr}(\hat{A}^\dagger \hat{A})\text{Tr}(\hat{B}^\dagger \hat{B})$, where $\hat{A} \equiv \sqrt{\hat{\Pi}_{\mu}}\sqrt{\rho_{m}(\phi)}$ and $\hat{B} \equiv \sum_{\alpha} \sqrt{\hat{\Pi}_{\mu}} u_{\alpha} \hat{L}_{\alpha} \sqrt{\rho_{m}(\phi)}$. (c) We have used the symmetry of the indices $\alpha$ and $\beta$. 

(d) We have defined the element of QMFIM as \( Q(\mu|\phi) \) as \( \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}_{m} \left[ \rho_{m}(\phi) \hat{L}_{\alpha} \hat{L}_{\beta} + \hat{L}_{\beta} \hat{L}_{\alpha} \right] \). Now if we take the sum over \( \mu \) and multiply by \( P_{ps} (\phi) \) both sides of Eq. (A4) we obtain

\[
\sum_{\alpha,\beta} u_{\alpha} [Q(\phi)]_{\alpha,\beta} u_{\beta} \leq \sum_{\alpha,\beta} u_{\alpha} [Q(\phi)]_{\alpha,\beta} u_{\beta},
\]

in other words, we have \( F(\phi) \leq Q(\phi) \). □

**Appendix B: Proof of \( Q(\phi) \leq H(\phi) \)**

We next prove the inequality \( Q(\phi) \leq H(\phi) \). Because they are both “quantum,” we can prove directly, starting from \( [Q(\phi)]_{\alpha,\beta} \) as follows:

\[
[Q(\phi)]_{\alpha,\beta} = P_{ps} (\phi) \text{Tr}_{m} \left[ \rho_{m}(\phi) \hat{L}_{\alpha} \hat{L}_{\beta} + \hat{L}_{\beta} \hat{L}_{\alpha} \right]
\]

\( \overset{(a)}{=} \text{Tr}_{m} \left[ \text{Tr}_{s} \left[ (\rho_{s,I} \otimes \hat{I}_{m}) \rho_{sm}(\phi) \right] \hat{L}_{\alpha} \hat{L}_{\beta} + \hat{L}_{\beta} \hat{L}_{\alpha} \right] \)

\( \overset{(b)}{=} \text{Tr} \left[ \rho_{sm}(\phi) \hat{L}_{\alpha} \hat{L}_{\beta} + \hat{L}_{\beta} \hat{L}_{\alpha} \right] \)

\( \overset{(c)}{=} \text{Tr} \left[ \rho_{s,I} (\phi) \hat{L}_{\alpha} \hat{L}_{\beta} + \hat{L}_{\beta} \hat{L}_{\alpha} \right] \)

\( = [H(\phi)]_{\alpha,\beta} \), □

(a) We have substituted \( \rho_{m}(\phi) = \text{Tr}_{s} \left[ (\rho_{s,I} \otimes \hat{I}_{m}) \rho_{sm}(\phi) \right] / P_{ps}(\phi) \). (b) We have used the fact that the postselection will discard most of the results in comparison to non-postselection [11, 62], or in other words, \( (\rho_{s,I} \otimes \hat{I}_{m}) \leq (\hat{I}_{k} \otimes \hat{I}_{m}) \). (c) There is no difference between the quantum FI of \( \rho_{sm} \) and \( \rho_{s,I} \) and they are known as Ramsay-type sensing [2, 16, 63].

**Appendix C: Proof of the tradeoff relation \( \text{Tr}[Q(\phi)[H(\phi)]^{-1}] \)**

We consider the case that \( H(\phi) \) is a diagonal matrix, i.e., \( H(\phi) = \text{diag}([H(\phi)]_{1,1}, [H(\phi)]_{2,2}, \ldots, [H(\phi)]_{d,d}) \). Then, we have

\[
\text{Tr}[Q(\phi)[H(\phi)]^{-1}] = \frac{[Q(\phi)]_{1,1}}{[H(\phi)]_{1,1}} + \frac{[Q(\phi)]_{2,2}}{[H(\phi)]_{2,2}} + \ldots + \frac{[Q(\phi)]_{d,d}}{[H(\phi)]_{d,d}} \leq d, \quad □
\]

where we have used the above results that \( [Q(\phi)]_{k,k} /[H(\phi)]_{k,k} \leq 1 \) for all \( k \in [1, d] \).

**Appendix D: Derivation of PQFIM in the case of Gaussian MA state**

We will derive Eq. (14) in the main text. Let us start by considering the SLD operator [64]

\[
\hat{L}_{\alpha} = 2 \int_{0}^{\infty} dt e^{-t \rho_{m}(\phi)} \partial_{\alpha} \rho_{m}(\phi) e^{-t \rho_{m}(\phi)},
\]

where \( \rho_{m}(\phi) = \sum_{k} \lambda_{k} |\xi_{k}\rangle \langle \xi_{k}| \), where \( |\xi_{k}\rangle \langle \xi_{l}| = 0 \) for \( k \neq l \), and \( \langle \xi_{k}| \xi_{l}| = N_{k} \) for \( l = k \), as we discussed in the main text. Evaluating the exponential \( e^{-t \rho_{m}(\phi)} \), we have

\[
e^{-t \rho_{m}(\phi)} = \sum_{k} e^{-t \lambda_{k} N_{k}} N_{k} |\xi_{k}\rangle \langle \xi_{k}|.
\]

Substituting Eq. (D2) into Eq. (D1), we obtain

\[
\hat{L}_{\alpha} = 2 \sum_{kl} \frac{1}{N_{k} N_{l}} \frac{\langle \xi_{k}| \partial_{\alpha} \rho_{m}(\phi) |\xi_{l}| }{\lambda_{k} N_{k} + \lambda_{l} N_{l}} |\xi_{k}\rangle \langle \xi_{l}|.
\]
Then $\hat{L}_\alpha \hat{L}_\beta$ can be evaluated as

$$\hat{L}_\alpha \hat{L}_\beta = 4 \sum_{klt} \frac{\langle \xi_k | \partial_\alpha \rho_m(\phi) | \xi_l \rangle \langle \xi_l | \partial_\beta \rho_m(\phi) | \xi_t \rangle}{\lambda_k N_k + \lambda_t N_t}.$$  

(D4)

Using $\rho_m(\phi) = \sum_n \lambda_n |\xi_n\rangle \langle \xi_n|$, we have

$$\rho_m(\phi) \hat{L}_\alpha \hat{L}_\beta = 4 \sum_{klt} \frac{\lambda_k}{N_l N_t} \langle \xi_k | \partial_\alpha \rho_m(\phi) | \xi_l \rangle \langle \xi_l | \partial_\beta \rho_m(\phi) | \xi_t \rangle |\xi_k\rangle \langle \xi_l | \xi_t\rangle.$$  

(D5)

Taking the trace we obtain

$$\text{Tr}_m[\rho_m(\phi) \hat{L}_\alpha \hat{L}_\beta] = 4 \sum_{klt} \frac{\lambda_k}{N_l N_t} \langle \xi_k | \partial_\alpha \rho_m(\phi) | \xi_l \rangle \langle \xi_l | \partial_\beta \rho_m(\phi) | \xi_t \rangle.$$  

(D6)

Substituting Eq. (D6) into the definition of PQFIM (4), where [multiply by $P_{ps}(\phi)$]

$$[Q(\phi)]_{\alpha \beta} = \text{Tr}_m \left[ \rho_m(\phi) \frac{\hat{L}_\alpha \hat{L}_\beta + \hat{L}_\beta \hat{L}_\alpha}{2} \right] = \text{Re} \left[ \text{Tr}_m[\rho_m(\phi) \hat{L}_\alpha \hat{L}_\beta] \right],$$  

(D7)

then we obtain the result as shown in Eq. (14) in the main text.