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The derivation of precision bounds in metrology typically assumes access to full control over all particles that are involved in the protocol. Here we relax this assumption and study metrological performance in scenarios where only limited control is available. As an example, we consider the measurement of a static magnetic field when a fully controlled quantum sensor is supplemented by particles over which only global control is possible. We show that even in the case where the quantum sensor is subject to significant noise, by adopting a protocol that maps the magnetic field to a precession frequency first, it becomes possible to achieve transient super-Heisenberg scaling and an uncertainty that approaches that of the scenario with full control to within a factor independent of the number of particles. Remarkably, this protocol is initialised in a product state and the entanglement that emerges during the protocol is not a resource but results in a deterioration of metrological scaling.

Introduction – The use of quantum resources in sensing and metrology has a longstanding history which originated in ideas for the use of single-mode squeezed states [1] and multi-particle spin-squeezing [2, 3], i.e., entanglement, to enhance precision in interferometry and atomic spectroscopy.

The goal of quantum metrology is the optimisation of the scaling of metrological precision with the available physical resources [4, 5]. Notably, in a noiseless setting, independent preparation and measurement of \( M \) particles in parallel results in a \( 1/\sqrt{M} \) scaling of the uncertainty, the so-called standard quantum limit (SQL), while the collective preparation of the particles in an entangled state leads to a \( 1/M \)-scaling, commonly referred to as Heisenberg scaling [2, 3] (see [6, 7] for more general upper bounds obtained via the quantum Fisher information). The use of entangled states is necessary to achieve the optimal precision and exact Heisenberg scaling of metrological precision with the available physical resources [4, 5]. Notably, in a noiseless setting, independent preparation and measurement of \( M \) particles in parallel results in a \( 1/\sqrt{M} \) scaling of the uncertainty, the so-called standard quantum limit (SQL), while the collective preparation of the particles in an entangled state leads to a \( 1/M \)-scaling, commonly referred to as Heisenberg scaling [2, 3] (see [6, 7] for more general upper bounds obtained via the quantum Fisher information). The use of entangled states is necessary to achieve the optimal precision and exact Heisenberg scaling but sequences of probe states with an asymptotically vanishing amount of entanglement can reach a scaling arbitrarily close to the Heisenberg limit (HL) [8]. Environmental noise is known to have a non-trivial impact on metrology [9] and a meaningful comparison of different schemes needs to specify carefully the conditions under which the metrological protocol is carried out, such as the number of particles or the total amount of time available [9, 10]. A wide variety of setting has been analysed [9–12] and noise models have been found to result in metrological scaling intermediate between SQL and the HL [11, 13–16]. However, these results depend on access to perfect and fast control and feedback operations [17, 18].

In practice, however, only limited control is possible over experimental resources and the asymptotic regime of a large numbers of fully controlled particles is not accessible. This suggests the question as to what can be achieved in metrology under limited control, e.g., due to the inability to address particles individually, the inability to carry out multi-particle quantum gates, limitations on the rate of measurements and feedback and on the number of accessible particles.

In order to initiate investigations of this type in a concrete setting, we allow ourselves to be motivated by the recently developed concept of quantum-hybrid sensors [19, 20]. These are devices that integrate at least two components, one being the actual quantum sensor and another, typically an assemblage of quantum particles, mutually interacting or not, that are coupled to the quantum sensor but over which there is no individual control. This second component acts as a transducer of a signal to a form that is then detected by the quantum sensor. An example of such a device is a force sensor composed of a piezo-magnetic material deposited on the surface of diamond that translates a force into a magnetic stray field which is then detected by an atomic scale magnetic field quantum sensor realised by nitrogen-vacancy (NV) center shallowly implanted under the surface of diamond [21–23]. As the piezo-magnetic material is a complex many-body system we will investigate a related but simpler hybrid device to make its metrological performance amenable to analytical and numerical study.

To this end we consider the measurement of the magnitude of a static magnetic field of known orientation using a hybrid device composed of a single quantum sensor which we assume to have full quantum control over and a large number \( M \) of auxiliary spins over which we can exert only global control via radio-frequency fields and whose global polarisation we can measure via the weakly coupled quantum sensor. More specifically, we assume that the quantum sensor, which itself may be subject to noise, cannot exert individual control over the noise-free auxiliary spins e.g., for the purposes of the generation of arbitrary entangled states. Note that this setting also describes the problem of nanoscale NMR where the task is the determination of the Larmor frequency of the \( M \) spins by measurement via the NV center [24–26].

In the remainder of this work we will analyse the achievable uncertainty in determining the strength of the applied magnetic field or, equivalently, the Larmor frequency of the auxiliary spins, as a function of their number \( M \) and the total experiment time \( T \) both in the transient and in the asymptotic regime. We will compare this uncertainty and its scaling with that of a device which admits full control over all the particles, the quantum sensor and the \( M \) auxiliary spins, and with a device composed of just the quantum sensor. In a transient regime we find super-Heisenberg scaling of the uncertainty in the number of particles and the total available measurement time. This super-Heisenberg scaling is found to cease to hold once the measurement back-action of the quantum sensor on the auxiliary particles becomes non-negligible. Hence, in the
non-asymptotic regime, additional particles achieve sensitivity gains that exceed those expected from an asymptotic analysis. It should be stressed that unlike the case of interaction-based quantum metrology [27] this super-Heisenberg scaling is not due to interactions between the auxiliary spins.

Furthermore, we find that our protocol reaches an uncertainty that approaches to within a factor independent of $M$ and $T$ that achievable under full control and the use of large scale entanglement. While it is generally assumed that the preparation of an entangled state is needed to provide the resource for metrological scaling that exceeds the shot-noise limit, we stress here that the present scheme requires only the initial preparation of a product state or even a maximally mixed state. We demonstrate numerically that the entanglement content in the $M$ auxiliary spins grows with time due to the measurement backaction but plays a destructive role rather than that of a useful resource as the loss of super-Heisenberg scaling coincides with the emergence of a significant amount of entanglement in the auxiliary spins. A comparison to the case of a single nucleus $M = 1$ suggests that entanglement rather plays a detrimental role in our considered scheme.

While we have in mind an NV center and nuclear spins for an actual implementation, the analysis in this work yield more compact expressions, without affecting the scaling properties, by assuming that all involved spins have the same magnetic moment. Furthermore, all the following considerations will neglect direct interactions between the auxiliary spins.

The ideal case of full quantum control – Consider a quantum sensor and $M$ auxiliary spins, all with the same magnetic moment $\mu_e$, over which we can exert arbitrary and fast control. Then the optimal uncertainty for the estimation of the magnetic field in a time $T$ in the absence of noise is obtained via Ramsey spectroscopy using the $M + 1$ accessible particles prepared in a highly entangled state of the form $(|0\ldots0⟩ + |1\ldots1⟩)/\sqrt{2}$ and is given by [9]

$$\Delta B = \frac{\hbar}{\mu_e(M + 1)T}. \quad (1)$$

We observe a linear decrease in the uncertainty, i.e. Heisenberg scaling, both in the total measurement time $T$ and the number of available spins $M$.

The case of limited control setting – We consider a perfectly controlled quantum sensor supplemented by $M$ auxiliary spins all having the same magnetic moment. These $M$ auxiliary spins can be controlled by a global field and interact weakly with the quantum sensor, i.e. the product of sensor-auxiliary spin interaction strength and interaction time is much smaller than unity. For simplicity we assume that each auxiliary particle is interacting with the same strength and phase with the quantum sensor, however the basic findings remain the same in the more general case (see SI for details).

We now determine a static external magnetic field $B$ with the help of this hybrid sensor and the smallest possible uncertainty $\Delta B$. To this end we initialise the nuclei in a fully polarised state [28] and then subject the auxiliary spins to a $\pi/2$-pulse. As a result, these $M$ spins will precess in the magnetic field. We determine the rate of precession by measuring the time-dependent magnetic field generated by the precessing nuclei in regular time intervals using the quantum sensor and compare the precession frequency of the auxiliary spins to that of a local oscillator [24, 25] as sketched in figure 1.

Assuming that the length $T_n$ of each instance of a magnetic field measurement is short and that we apply these measurements every $\tau_m$, in leading order, the probability of finding the internal state of a spin-$1/2$ quantum sensor in the spin-down state in the n-th measurement is given by [29]

$$p_n = \cos^2 \left( \frac{2MkT_s}{\pi} \cos (\phi_n) - \frac{\pi}{4} \right) \quad (2)$$

where $\phi = \delta \tau_m, \delta = 2\pi(\nu - \nu_{loc})$ is the difference of precession frequency $\nu$ and local oscillator frequency $\nu_{loc}$. We use $k = \mu_eB_s/\hbar$ where $B_s$ is the field generated by one of the $M$ auxiliary spins at the position of the NV center and we assume that $MkT_s \ll 1$. Imperfect polarisation $P$ of the auxiliary spins can be incorporated via $k = k_{loc}PMB_s/\hbar$.

With eq. (2), we can estimate the frequency $2\pi\nu = \mu_eB/\hbar$ and hence the magnitude of the magnetic field $B$. For $N$ measurements, the achievable uncertainty in the estimate of $\nu$ is obtained via the classical Fisher information

$$I_N = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{1}{p_n(1 - p_n)} \left( \frac{\partial p_n}{\partial \phi} \right)^2 \left( \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \delta} \right)^2. \quad (3)$$

We can describe decoherence processes in terms of a decay rate $\gamma = \gamma_2 + \gamma_b$ (see SI [29]), where $\gamma_2$ refers to $T_2$ processes on the nuclear spins and $\gamma_b$ refers to measurement backaction from the quantum sensor. Then the effective coupling after $n$ measurements is $k_n = k_0e^{-\gamma n}$ and we find

$$I_N(\gamma) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left( \frac{4\tau_mMkT_s}{\pi} \right)^2 \sin^2 \phi_n. \quad (4)$$

Under the assumptions $\max[\gamma, \frac{1}{\tau_m}] \ll 2\pi\phi$ and $Mk_0T_s \ll 1$, i.e. when we sample at least one full oscillation of the signal of frequency $\delta$, eq. (4) is well approximated by

$$I_N(\gamma) \approx \frac{16M^2\tau_m^2k^2\tau_s^2}{\pi^2} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{n^2}{2} e^{-2\gamma n} (1 - \cos 2\phi n) \quad (5)$$

$$\approx \frac{2M^2\tau_m^2k^2\tau_s^2}{\pi^2} \frac{1 - e^{-2\gamma N} (1 + 2\gamma N(1 + \gamma N))}{\gamma^3}.$$
For $\gamma N < 0.6$ we find

$$I_N(\gamma) \approx \frac{2M^2r_m^2k_0^2T_s^2}{\pi^2} \left( \frac{4N^3}{3} - 2\gamma N^4 + \frac{6\gamma^2 N^5}{5} \right) \tag{6}$$

and hence

$$\Delta B \leq \frac{3\pi^2r^2}{8\mu^2M^2r_m^2k_0^2T_s^2} \frac{1}{N^3} \tag{7}$$

As a result, for small $\gamma N$ our limited control procedure exhibits a scaling in the number of measurements $N$ or, equivalently, the total measurement time $T = N\tau_m$ that exceeds the standard Heisenberg scaling of eq. (1) while the scaling in the number of particles $M$ achieves the Heisenberg limit. However, this scaling has to be transient and cannot persist for arbitrarily long times even in the absence of external noise sources as this would lead to a violation of the fundamental limit of sensitivity that is imposed by the full control scheme in the absence of any noise.

In this case, $\gamma_2 = 0$, the remaining contribution to the decay rate $\gamma$ is due to the measurement backaction of the quantum sensor on the auxiliary spins which is negligible only for $\gamma N \ll 1$. Under the present measurement scheme we then find (see SI for the derivation [29])

$$\gamma_b = \frac{4k_0^2T_s^2}{\pi^2}. \tag{8}$$

Due to the measurement backaction, the signal weakens with increasing number of measurements $N$ and hence the rate of increase of the Fisher information slows down. When determining the scaling in this regime, a note of caution is in order as the calculation of the measurement backaction presented in eq. (5) determines the Fisher information of the averaged density matrix of the auxiliary spins. However, as we have access to and use all the intermediate measurements, the maximally available information is given by the Fisher information averaged over measurement trajectories. For $\gamma N \gg 1$ this results in a scaling linear in $N$ (see also [30, 31]), as indicated analytically in the supplementary information [29] and numerically in figure 2. For $M = 100$ nuclei in an initial product state (red data) the transient super-Heisenberg $I_N \propto N^1 \propto T^1$ scaling evolves into the shot noise scaling (SQL) of $I_N \propto N \propto T$ (blue asymptote) while eq. (5) would yield a constant. Remarkably, this linear scaling is independent of the initial state and we can achieve the same scaling using a completely mixed initial state (orange triangles) [32], which allows to remove the condition of all nuclei interacting with the same phase. In the limit of small interaction strength $k_0T_s$ and decay, the asymptotic value of the Fisher information can be estimated to be

$$I_N = \frac{\sin^4(4k_0T_s/\pi)M^2}{16(\gamma_b + \gamma)^3} \frac{2}{\tau_m} M N \tag{9}$$

The quadratic scaling in the number of nuclei $M$ is confirmed in Fig. 3 (see SI-Fig. 4 and the related discussion for details).

**Achievable precision and the Heisenberg limit** – In the limit of large nuclear coherence times $0 \approx \gamma_2 \ll \gamma_b$ the Fisher information approaches the Heisenberg limit achievable under full control for $N_{opt} \approx (2k_0T_s/\pi)^{-2} = 1/\gamma_b$ measurements after which the $N^3$-scaling turns into a scaling $\propto N$. It is remarkable that at this point the ratio of ultimate sensitivity under global control and the limited control scheme used here only depends on the interaction strength and therefore can be tuned to approach the Heisenberg limit for $N_{opt}$ measurements to within a factor independent of $T$, see figure 2. Furthermore it is natural to assume that this holds independently of $M$ as the Fisher information of both the Heisenberg limit and the asymptote for $\gamma N \gg 1$ exhibit the same quadratic in $M$ scaling. This was confirmed numerically (see supplementary information [29]).

**The role of entanglement as a resource** – It is surprising
that the limited control scheme can approach the optimum achievable under full control to within a constant factor as the implementation of the full control scheme involves the preparation of a macroscopically entangled state of the form \((|0\rangle \langle 1| + |1\rangle \langle 0|)/\sqrt{2}\) including the quantum sensor and the auxiliary spins with one ebit of entanglement [33, 34]. This entanglement is destroyed with the final measurement and it is commonly considered to be the resource that is required to achieve Heisenberg scaling. In our limited control scenario, however, the system is initiated in a pure product state and entanglement between the auxiliary spins is generated only as the result of the measurement backaction.

In order to obtain some insights into the entanglement buildup and its potential role as a resource in the metrology scheme, we use the logarithmic negativity [34] as a quantifier of the entanglement between one of the auxiliary spins with the remaining \(M - 1\) spins and between equal bi-partitions of the auxiliary spins. While the entanglement between the nuclei builds up to a steady state after a time \(\tau_b\) (see SI [29] for details), it does not appear to play a constructive role. Indeed, it does not contribute to the quadratic scaling with the number of auxiliary spins as a simply extrapolation of the \(M^2\)-scaling from a single spin to larger numbers (effectively assuming no correlations between these spins) exceeds the Fisher information obtained for \(M\) spins (see figure 3), nor does it appear to support the \(N^3\) super-Heisenberg scaling as this scaling begins to turn into a \(N\)-scaling once sizeable entanglement is building up in the auxiliary spins (compare to Fig 3 of [29]). In fact, entanglement appears to be detrimental to the metrological scaling.

Discussion – Metrology schemes that are assisted by environmental spins have been considered before, see e.g. [35, 36]. There, however, the emphasis was placed on spins that are strongly interacting with the quantum sensor and the measurement protocol creates a joint entangled state of the quantum sensor and the auxiliary spins which then evolves for some time followed by an inversion of the entangling operation and the subsequent measurement of the state of the quantum sensor. In this approach Heisenberg scaling is achieved in the number of strongly coupled auxiliary spins while we assume no such spins in our set-up. Furthermore, compared to our approach, this protocol suffers from the drawback that it is fundamentally limited by the coherence time of the quantum sensor and hence does not take full advantage of the long coherence time of the auxiliary spins. In contrast, the measurements in our protocol can be made shorter than the coherence time without adversely affecting the achievable sensitivity.

Besides the theoretical interest in the novel scaling regimes, we would like to stress that the proposed scheme employing auxiliary spins under limited control may also be of practical importance as a hybrid quantum sensor that provides enhanced sensitivity as compared to the quantum sensor alone. This advantage is the result of two processes. First, the transduction of the static magnetic field to a time-dependent Larmor precession which is then detected by the quantum sensor facilitates the use of dynamical decoupling schemes to filter out noise without adversely affecting the signal. Secondly, as each auxiliary spin contributes to the signal, the overall signal strength scales with the number of spins and hence leads to a considerable signal enhancement. Indeed, for an NV center as quantum sensor, even when considering nuclei with their small magnetic moment as auxiliary spins, we may obtain an increased sensitivity. To this end, let us consider the \(|m = 0\rangle \leftrightarrow |m = +1\rangle\) transition of an NV center in an external magnetic field \(B\) and assume that the NV center is dominated by pure dephasing which results in a coherence time \(\tau_{NV}\). For perfect readout efficiency, the optimal interrogation scheme yields \(\Delta B = \sqrt{\frac{2e\hbar^2}{\mu^2_{NV}T}} = \sqrt{\frac{4e\hbar^2}{\mu^2_{NV}\tau_{NV}}}\) [9] where \(N = 2T/\tau_{NV}\). By comparison with our indirect measurement scheme using \(M\) hydrogen nuclear spins and assuming \(\left(\frac{\mu_\mu}{\mu_{nuc}}\right)^2 \approx 10^3\) we find that for \(M > 50\) the auxiliary spin assisted sensor outperforms the bare NV center. While our protocol makes use of a far smaller magnetic moment compared to even a single electron spin \(\mu_n \ll \mu_e\), this is compensated by the longer coherence time and the possibility to measure during the signal accumulation.

Finally, we would like to stress that our analysis also covers the case, \(M = 1\) corresponding to the detection of the Larmor frequency of a single nuclear spin via an NV center. Super-Heisenberg scaling applies for as long as the measurement backaction is weak. This applies for distant nuclear spins or for measurements that are designed to be weak, i.e. not obtaining a full bit of information in each single measurement.

Conclusions – We have examined metrology in a realistic setting of limited control and found transient super-Heisenberg scaling in the total measurement time and a metrological precision approaching that of the same number of particles under full experimental control. This is despite the absence of initial entanglement in the system. In fact, in this...
scheme entanglement emerges only with increasing number of measurements and adversely affects the metrological scaling. Furthermore, the proposed set-up, which employs auxiliary spin under limited control, also represents an hybrid sensor that may outperform a bare quantum sensor thus providing new design principles for quantum sensors.
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[28] Our considerations are easily extended to the case of an arbitrary polarisation as the signal and hence the sensitivity are directly proportional to the polarisation level.
[29] See supplementary material.
[32] See also [37] for the related observation that for metrology in non-markovian environments the zeno-scaling can be achieved
with a mixed initial state.
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Appendix A: Effective XY-8 Hamiltonian

In the interaction picture a NV center coupled to $M$ nuclear spins is described by

$$H = \frac{\Omega(t)}{2} \sigma_x + \sum_{m=1}^{M} \frac{\omega_L}{2} \sigma_z^{(m)} + A^{(m)}_{\perp} \sigma_\perp \otimes \left( \sigma_z^{(m)} \cos(\phi_{0m}) + \sigma_y^{(m)} \sin(\phi_{0m}) \right)$$

(A1)

where $\Omega(t)$ is the Rabi frequency with $\Omega(t) = 0$ during the free evolution, $\omega_L$ is the nuclear Larmor frequency, $A^{(m)}_{\perp}$ is the perpendicular coupling of the nuclear spins and $\phi_{0m}$ the corresponding phase.

The operators $\sigma_i$ act on the electron spin (NV center), $\sigma_i^{(m)}$ act on the nuclear spins.

When we fulfil $\tau = \pi/\omega_L$ in the Dynamical Decoupling (e.g. XY-8) sequence, the sequence produces a modulation function

$$f(t) = \frac{4}{\pi} \cos(\omega_L t) + \text{rot.}$$

(A2)

Using

$$\cos^2(\omega_L t) = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \cos(2\omega_L t) \right),$$

(A3)

the effective interaction Hamiltonian is

$$H_{\text{eff}} = \sum_{m} \frac{2A^{(m)}_{\perp}}{\pi} \sigma_\perp \otimes \left( \sigma_z^{(m)} \cos(\phi_{0m}) + \sigma_y^{(m)} \sin(\phi_{0m}) \right).$$

(A4)

Appendix B: Derivation of the signal for few measurements

For a nuclear spin (initial state described by polarisation $P$) with an already accumulated phase from $n$ cycles $\phi_{1m} = \delta \tau_m n + \phi_0$ the readout probability is (NV measurement in basis $Xc_\alpha + Ys_\alpha$ and NV preparation in $X$)

$$p_n - \frac{1}{2} = \text{Tr}[\hat{O}_{\text{measurement}} U \rho_n U^\dagger]$$

(B1)

$$= \text{Tr} \left[ \left( \sigma_x \cos \alpha + \sigma_y \sin \alpha \right) \otimes 1 \bigotimes_{m=1}^{M} \left( 1 + \sigma_x \otimes \prod_{m=1}^{M} \left( 1 + P \cos \phi_{1m} \sigma_y^{(m)} + P \sin \phi_{1m} \sigma_y^{(m)} \right) \right) U \right]$$

(B2)

$$= \frac{1}{4} \cos \alpha \left( \prod_{m=1}^{M} \left( \cos \frac{4A^{(m)}_{\perp} T_s}{\pi} - i \sin \frac{4A^{(m)}_{\perp} T_s}{\pi} P \cos \phi_m \right) + \prod_{m=1}^{M} \left( \cos \frac{4A^{(m)}_{\perp} T_s}{\pi} + i \sin \frac{4A^{(m)}_{\perp} T_s}{\pi} P \cos \phi_m \right) \right)$$

$$+ i \sin \alpha \left( \prod_{m=1}^{M} \left( \cos \frac{4A^{(m)}_{\perp} T_s}{\pi} - i \sin \frac{4A^{(m)}_{\perp} T_s}{\pi} P \cos \phi_m \right) - \prod_{m=1}^{M} \left( \cos \frac{4A^{(m)}_{\perp} T_s}{\pi} + i \sin \frac{4A^{(m)}_{\perp} T_s}{\pi} P \cos \phi_m \right) \right)$$

(B3)

where $\phi_m = \phi_{1m} - \phi_{0m}$.

For $\sum_{m=1}^{M} 4A^{(m)}_{\perp} T_s / \pi \ll 1$ we can approximate

$$\prod_{m=1}^{M} \left( \cos \frac{4A^{(m)}_{\perp} T_s}{\pi} \pm i \sin \frac{4A^{(m)}_{\perp} T_s}{\pi} P \cos \phi_m \right) = \prod_{m=1}^{M} \exp \left( \pm i \sin \frac{4A^{(m)}_{\perp} T_s}{\pi} P \cos \phi_m + O \left( \frac{4A^{(m)}_{\perp} T_s}{\pi} \right)^2 \right)$$

(B5)

$$\approx \exp \left( \pm i \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sin \frac{4A^{(m)}_{\perp} T_s}{\pi} P \cos \phi_m \right)$$

(B6)
to derive the signal

\[ p_n = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \cos \left( \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sin \frac{4A^{(m)}_1 T_s}{\pi} \beta \phi_m - \alpha \right) = \cos^2 \left( \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sin \frac{2A^{(m)}_1 T_s}{\pi} \beta \phi_m - \frac{\alpha}{2} \right). \]  \hspace{1cm} (B7)

This is equation (2) from the main text when all couplings \( A^{(m)}_1 \) and all phases \( \beta \phi_m \) are equal and \( \phi \) and \( \alpha = \pi/2 \) are inserted.

The generalisation of this case described in the main text to different coupling \( A^{(m)}_1 \neq A^{(m)}_1 \) can be described by an effective coupling. Different phases \( \beta \phi_m \neq \beta \phi_m \) can produce additional features, but in the asymptotic case these effects are irrelevant as the initial state becomes less important, see next section.

**Appendix C: Derivation of the Fisher Information from the probabilities for a full measurement record**

The outcome of the kth measurement is denoted by every individual \( X_k \in \{0 = +, 1 = -\} \), \( X^k \) is a measurement record of the form \( \{1, 0, 1, 0, 1, ...\} \) with k components, \( X_l \) is the lth component of it and \( \beta \equiv 2A_x T_s/\pi \) is the coupling achieved by the XY-sequence. Furthermore \( U_\phi = \exp (-i \phi \sum \sigma_z^{(m)}/2) \) and

\[ U_\pm = (\pm y) U \pm = \frac{e^{-i\beta \sum \sigma_z^{(m)}} + i e^{i\beta \sum \sigma_z^{(m)}}}{2} \] \hspace{1cm} (C1)

with the coupling from the first section \( U = \exp(-i \beta \alpha N \sum \sigma_z^{(m)}) \). Here we assumed all coupling constants to be equal, however different \( \beta_m \) don’t change the structure of the result.

Each measurement probability can be described by

\[ p_\pm = \text{Tr} \left[ (|\pm y\rangle \langle |\pm y\rangle \otimes \mathbb{1}) U \phi \rho_0 U_\phi \rho_0 U_\phi U_\phi^{\dagger} \right] = \text{Tr} \left[ U_{X1} U_{\phi} \rho_0 U_{\phi} U_{X1}^{\dagger} \right] \] \hspace{1cm} (C2)

and evolves the nuclear state to

\[ \rho_\pm = \frac{1}{p_\pm} \text{Tr}_{NV} \left[ U_{X1} U_{\phi} \rho_0 U_{\phi} U_{X1}^{\dagger} \right]. \] \hspace{1cm} (C3)

The probability for a measurement record \( X^k \) can be described as

\[ p_{X^k} = p_{X_1} p_{X_2|X_1} ... p_{X_{N-1}|X_{N-2}...X_1} p_{X_N|X_{N-1}} \] \hspace{1cm} (C4)

\[ = \text{Tr} \left[ U_{X1} U_{\phi} \rho_0 U_{\phi} U_{X1}^{\dagger} \right] \text{Tr} \left[ U_{X2} U_{\phi} U_{X1} U_{\phi} \rho_0 U_{\phi} U_{X2}^{\dagger} U_{X1}^{\dagger} \right] \text{Tr} \left[ U_{X3} U_{\phi} \rho_0 U_{\phi} U_{X2}^{\dagger} U_{X1}^{\dagger} \right] \text{Tr} \left[ U_{X4} U_{\phi} \rho_0 U_{\phi} U_{X3}^{\dagger} U_{X2}^{\dagger} U_{X1}^{\dagger} \right] \text{...} \] \hspace{1cm} (C5)

\[ = \text{Tr} \left[ \prod_{k=1}^{N} (U_{Xk} U_{\phi}) \rho_0 \left( \prod_{k=1}^{N} (U_{Xk} U_{\phi}) \right)^{\dagger} \right]. \] \hspace{1cm} (C6)

Each part of the sum contributes roughly \( 2^{-N} \), sum over all contributions is 1. To analyse the effect of these operators, we apply them on a permutation-invariant product state

\[ U_{\phi} \left( \frac{a \mathbb{1} + b \sigma_x + c \sigma_y + d \sigma_z}{2} \right)^{\otimes M} U_{\phi}^{\dagger} = \left( \frac{a \mathbb{1} + (bc_\phi - cs_\phi) \sigma_x + (cc_\phi + bs_\phi) \sigma_y + ds_\phi}{2} \right)^{\otimes M} \] \hspace{1cm} (C7)
4U_{\pm} \left( \frac{aI + b\sigma_x + c\sigma_y + d\sigma_z}{2} \right)^\otimes M U_{\pm}^\dagger = \left( \frac{aI + b\sigma_x + (cc_2 + ds_2) \sigma_y + (ac_2 - cs_2) \sigma_z}{2} \right)^\otimes M + \left( \frac{aI + b\sigma_x + (cc_2 - ds_2) \sigma_y + (ac_2 + cs_2) \sigma_z}{2} \right)^\otimes M \pm i \left[ \left( \frac{(ac_2 + ibs_2) \sigma_x + (bc_2 - ias_2) \sigma_y + c\sigma_y + d\sigma_z}{2} \right)^\otimes M - \left( \frac{(ac_2 - ibs_2) \sigma_x + (bc_2 + ias_2) \sigma_y + c\sigma_y + d\sigma_z}{2} \right)^\otimes M \right]. \tag{C8}

(C9)

(C10)

(C11)

It is very difficult to calculate the full expression because every measurement multiplies the number of terms by 4. So we want to find the relevant terms for the Fisher Information for different limits. For a single nucleus M=1, only two terms are created every measurement and d\sigma_z can be neglected. Therefore we simplify to

\[ 4U_{\pm} \left( \frac{aI + b\sigma_x + c\sigma_y}{2} \right) U_{\pm}^\dagger = 2 \left( \frac{aI + b\sigma_x + cc_2 \sigma_y}{2} \right) \pm 2 \left( \frac{-hs_2 \sigma_x - as_2 \sigma_y + c\sigma_y}{2} \right) \approx 2A[\rho] + 2B[\rho]. \tag{C12} \]

The \cos(2\beta) for the c coefficient produces the backaction-induced decay \gamma_b. We can approximate

\[ A[\rho] = \left( \frac{aI + b\sigma_x + cc_2 \sigma_y}{2} \right) \approx \left( \frac{aI + (1 + c_2) \beta}{2} \right). \tag{C14} \]

which reduces the bloch vector according to

\[ \left( \frac{1 + c_2 \beta}{2} \right)^k \exp \left( k \log \left( \frac{1 + c_2 \beta}{2} \right) \right) = \exp \left( k \log \left( 1 + \beta^2 \right) \right) \approx \exp \left( -k\beta^2 \right). \tag{C15} \]

This is valid because the higher orders will be negligible in the further calculation. T2 processes have a similar effect, why we define the decay of population in the x-y-plane with

\[ \gamma = -\log \frac{1 + c_2 \beta}{2} + \frac{\tau_m}{T_2^{\text{nuc}}} \approx \beta^2 + \frac{\tau_m}{T_2^{\text{nuc}}}. \tag{C16} \]

where \tau_m is the time for each of the N repetitions.

When starting with \rho_0 = (I + \sigma_z)/2 can expand the probability for a N measurement record \chi^N as

\[ 2^N p_{\chi^N} \approx 1 + s_{2\beta} \sum_{l=1}^N (-1)^X \exp(-\gamma l) \cos(l\phi) \tag{C17} \]

\[ + s_{2\beta}^2 \sum_{1 \leq l_1 < l_2 \leq N} (-1)^{X_1} (-1)^{X_2} \exp(-\gamma(l_2 - l_1)) \cos((l_2 - l_1)\phi) \tag{C18} \]

\[ + s_{2\beta}^3 \sum_{1 \leq l_1 < l_2 < l_3 \leq N} (-1)^{X_1} (-1)^{X_2} (-1)^{X_3} \exp(-\gamma(l_3 - l_2 + l_1)) \cos((l_3 - l_2 + l_1)\phi) \tag{C19} \]

\[ + \ldots \]  

In a first step we calculate the Fisher Information

\[ I_N = \sum_{\chi^N} \frac{1}{p_{\chi^N}} \left( \frac{\partial p_{\chi^N}}{\partial \phi} \right)^2 \left( \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \delta} \right)^2 \]  

in the limit \gamma N \ll 1 using a geometric series
\[
\frac{1}{\tau_m} I_N = 2^{-N} \sum_{X} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left( -s_{2\beta} \sum_{l=1}^{N} (-1)^{X_l} \exp(-\gamma l) \cos(l\phi) - s_{2\beta}^2 \ldots \right)^k \left( -s_{2\beta} \sum_{l=1}^{N} (-1)^{X_l} \exp(-\gamma l) \sin(l\phi) - \ldots \right)^2.
\]

(C22)

As we average over all \((-1)^{X_l} = \pm 1\), only terms with an even number of all \((-1)^{X_l}\) contribute. The first order \((\gamma N \ll 1, k = 0)\) results in the \(N^3\) scaling that is discussed in the main text.

\[
\frac{1}{\tau_m} I_N = s_{2\beta} \sum_{l=1}^{N} \exp(-2\gamma l) l^2 \sin^2(l\phi)
\]

(C23)

\[
\approx \frac{s_{2\beta}}{2} \int_0^N dl \exp(-2\gamma l) l^2 (1 - \cos(2l\phi))
\]

(C24)

\[
\approx \frac{s_{2\beta}}{2} \int_0^N dl \exp(-2\gamma l) l^2
\]

(C25)

\[
= \frac{s_{2\beta}}{2} e^{-2\gamma N} \left( -2\gamma N(\gamma N + 1) - 1 + 1 \right) \approx \frac{s_{2\beta}}{2} \left[ \frac{N^3}{3} - \frac{\gamma N^4}{2} \right].
\]

(C26)

For \(\gamma N > 1\) the geometric series is not valid anymore and many higher orders in \(l\) need to be considered. To show that terms linear in \(N\) exist, we consider the approximated second order \((1/p_N^X \approx 2^N)\)

\[
\frac{1}{\tau_m} I_N = s_{2\beta} \sum_{1 \leq l_2 < l_2 \leq N} \exp(-2\gamma(l_2 - l_1)) \sin^2((l_2 - l_1)\phi)(l_2 - l_1)^2
\]

(C27)

\[
\approx \frac{s_{2\beta}}{2} \int_0^N dl (N - l) \exp(-2\gamma l) l^2 (1 - \cos(2l\phi))
\]

(C29)

\[
\approx \frac{s_{2\beta}}{2} \int_0^N dl (N - l) \exp(-2\gamma l) l^2
\]

(C30)

\[
= \frac{s_{2\beta}}{2} e^{-2\gamma N} (2\gamma N(\gamma N + 2) + 3) + 2\gamma N - 3 \approx \frac{s_{2\beta}}{2} \frac{N^3}{4\gamma^3}.
\]

(C31)

The numerically obtained prefactor from the main text is smaller by a factor 2 in case of \(M = 1\) and a factor \(\left( c_{2\beta}^{-1} \right)^2 M^2/4\) for \(M > 1\). While the first factor 2 is likely to originate from higher order contributions (the dominant order in \(l\) depends on \(N\)), the difference for higher \(M\) can be explained by the additional terms that arise in the calculation. Many terms like in

\[
2^N p_X \approx 1 + \frac{i}{2} \sum_{l=1}^{N} (-1)^{X_l} \left[ (c_{2\beta} - i s_{2\beta} \exp(-\gamma l) \cos(l\phi))^M - (c_{2\beta} + i s_{2\beta} \exp(-\gamma l) \cos(l\phi))^M \right]
\]

(C32)

\[
+ \frac{i^2}{4} \sum_{1 \leq l_2 < l_2 \leq N} (-1)^{X_{l_1}} (-1)^{X_{l_2}} \left[ (c_{2\beta}^2 - s_{2\beta}^2 \exp(-\gamma(l_2 - l_1)) \cos((l_2 - l_1)\phi) + i \alpha)^M + \ldots \right]
\]

(C33)

will produce roughly the same Fisher information, in particular the first order scales as expected. The derivative gives a factor \(M^2\), and the leading order has a factor \(\left( c_{2\beta}^{-1} \right)^2 \). The additional factor 1/2 will arise from averaging random phases \(\alpha\).
Figure 4. For $M=10$ nuclei: Fisher information after $2^{24}$ measurements for $\beta = 0.01 \times 2/\pi$ for different $\gamma_2$ averaged over 192 runs compared to a $\gamma^{-3}$ curve with the numerically obtained prefactor.

Figure 5. Left: Maximum of the ratio between the Fisher information of our protocol and the Heisenberg limit for different coupling strength. The results do not depend on the number of nuclei $M$, but are dominated by variations originating from the 9600 averages in the monte carlo simulation. Right: Curves for $M = 100$ nuclei: The highest value is reached at $N \approx \beta^{-2}$ as expected. Artefacts of the simulation are clearly visible as for an infinite number of repetitions smooth curves are expected.

The scaling $\propto \gamma^{-3}$ was tested numerically in figure 4. The simulation results seem to deviate in a regime $\gamma_2 \approx \gamma_b$ by a factor of 2. This can be explained by higher order terms being affected more by $\gamma_2$. As a result, lower order terms with the expected scaling dominate.

Remarkably these asymptotic results are independent of the initial state of the nuclei. Therefore different phases $\cos \phi_{m_1} \neq \cos \phi_{m_2}$ can be transformed to a basis with equal phases and a different initial state, which yields the same result as for $\cos \phi_{m_1} = \cos \phi_{m_2} \forall m_1, m_2$.

Appendix D: Relation to the Heisenberg limit

We numerically investigated the minimum difference between our protocol and the Heisenberg limit, which can only be achieved given full control over the nuclei in absence of decoherence $\gamma_2 = 0$.

Figure 5 shows the maximum ratio between the Fisher Information of the investigated protocol and the Heisenberg limit. For different coupling strength the ratio is independent of the number of nuclei. Note that the peaks are due to the monte carlo simulation. This is confirmed by the curves on the right hand side of figure 5, where the maxima are found at $N \approx \beta^{-2}$ as expected.
Appendix E: Simulation

The normal simulation (without making use of the permutation invariance) repeats the following steps (after initializing the nuclear spins to \(|\psi_0\rangle = |+\rangle^\otimes M\), \(\rho_0 = |\psi_0\rangle \langle \psi_0|\))

1. Simulate nuclear spin evolution with the operator

\[
U_{\text{free}} = \exp \left( -i \delta \tau_m \sum_m \sigma_z^{(m)} / 2 \right) \tag{E1}
\]

where \(\tau_m\) is the time between two measurements.

2. Determine probability to measure the NV in \(|+_y\rangle\) after preparing it in \(|+\rangle\) and evolving it with the nuclear spins according to (A4) by

\[
p = \text{Tr} \left[ |+_y\rangle \langle +_y| \otimes 1^\otimes M \ U \ |+_y\rangle \langle +_y| \rho \ U^\dagger \right] = \text{Tr} \left[ U \rho \ U^\dagger \right] \tag{E2}
\]

\[
= \langle \psi_n| \ U^\dagger \ U |\psi_n\rangle \quad \text{(for pure states)} \tag{E3}
\]

where \(U = \langle +_y| \ U \otimes 1^\otimes M \ |+_y\rangle\)

3. Probabilistically choose result according to \(p\), save result and evolve accordingly including normalisation \(\rho_{n+1} = NU_{+/−} \rho \ U_{+/−}^\dagger\).

By using the subspace resulting from the symmetry in the case of many spins with equal coupling strength, many spins can be simulated efficiently, as this subspace has dimension \(M + 1\) instead of \(2^M\).

The Fisher Information

\[
I_N = \sum_X p_X \left( \frac{\partial p_X}{\partial \delta} \right)^2 \tag{E4}
\]

was calculated numerically for many different runs evolving \(\rho\) following the recipe above to determine \(p_X\) Evolving \(\rho_{2/3}\) according to the same measurement outcomes as \(\rho\), but with a different evolution parameter \(\delta \pm d\delta\) allows to determine

\[
\left( \frac{\partial p_X}{\partial \delta} \right) = \frac{p_X(\delta + d\delta) - p_X(\delta - d\delta)}{2d\delta} \tag{E5}
\]

for many measurement records. After calculating the Fisher Information for every measurement record, the average and standard deviation can be obtained.

The accuracy is limited by the Fisher Information due to the Cramer-Rao bound

\[
\delta \omega_N \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{I_N}} \tag{E6}
\]

For pure states, the Logarithmic negativity can be simplified to an expression depending on the Schmidt coefficients \(\alpha_i\):

\[
\text{LN}(|\Psi\rangle \langle \Psi|) = 2 \log \left( \sum_i \alpha_i \right), \tag{E7}
\]

which can be calculated for considerably larger systems than the partial trace. Figure 6 shows the buildup of entanglement of a scale of \(N_{\text{opt}} \approx (2k_0 T_s / \pi)^2 = 1 / \gamma_b\) as described in the main text.
Figure 6. Logarithmic negativity for $M$ spins, each spin coupled with $\beta = 0.01 \times 2/\pi$ with negligible decay $\gamma_2 = 0$. The left graph shows the entanglement of one of the auxiliary spins with the remaining $M-1$ spins and the right graph shows entanglement in an equal bi-partition of the auxiliary spins. The results are averaged over 2000 runs.