Quantum limits of incoherent imaging and how to achieve them
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We solve the general problem of determining, through imaging, the three-dimensional positions of \( N \) weak incoherent point-like emitters in an arbitrary spatial configuration. We show that a structured measurement strategy in which a linear interferometer feeds into an array of photo-detectors is always optimal for this estimation problem, in the sense that it saturates the quantum Cramér-Rao bound. We provide a method for the explicit construction of the optimal interferometer. Further explicit results for the quantum Fisher information and the optimal interferometer design that attains it are obtained for the case of one and two incoherent emitters in the paraxial regime. This work provides insights into the phenomenon of super-resolution through incoherent imaging that has attracted much attention recently. Our results will find a wide range of applications over a broad spectrum of frequencies, from fluorescence microscopy to stellar interferometry.

Quantum imaging [1] is the science of exploiting quantum features of light to create an image of an object—or collection of objects—that emits or scatters light. Pioneered by Helstrom [2], this research field has grown considerably during last decades, in parallel with the rise of quantum information technology, and Helstrom’s initial work has become the basis for the theoretical framework of quantum metrology [3–7]. Advances in quantum imaging have followed several routes. Typically, the goal is to addresses the possibility of beating the limits of classical imaging [8, 9] by exploiting the unique properties of optical quantum states [10–16]. For example, ghost imaging [12, 14, 17], quantum lithography [18, 19], and quantum sensing [20, 21] exploit entanglement to enable sensitivity and precision beyond what is achievable classically, whilst fluorescence super-resolution microscopy [22–25] utilizes carefully engineered emitters and measurements to break the diffraction limit.

A renewed interest in the field was triggered recently by the work of Tsang, Nair, and Lu [26], who investigated the imaging of a pair of weak incoherent emitters in the far field paraxial regime, such as a binary star system or a pair of fluorescent emitters. They considered the problem of measuring, through imaging, the transverse angular separation between the two sources, and used the tools of quantum estimation theory, in particular the quantum Fisher information (QFI) and the Cramér-Rao bound [27, 28]. They showed that a structured measurement setup in which the light focused on the image plane is first passed through a linear interferometer and then measured by photo-detection is far superior to standard imaging, in which the light is detected directly on the image plane. The interferometer applies an effective sorting of the field into normal components by spatial-mode demultiplexing (SPADE). This in particular implies that, using SPADE, the estimation of the transverse angular separation between two sources is subject to the same statistical error as the estimation of the location of a single emitter. This statistical error is constant (it is independent of the value of the separation) and inverse proportional to the Rayleigh length that characterizes the imaging system. By contrast, direct detection sees the error in the estimation of the angular separation increase substantially when the separation between the sources falls below the Rayleigh length, a phenomenon dubbed the “Rayleigh curse”. The method for obtaining sub-Rayleigh super-resolution through coherent detection of incoherent light has been further developed and generalized in many works [29–37]. Several measurement strategies with different degrees of complexity have been proposed [38, 39], and some have been demonstrated experimentally [40–48]. In principle, these techniques can achieve or approximate the ultimate precision limit (see Ref. [49] for a comprehensive review on recent progress and related topics).

The problems considered so far have been limited, with a few exceptions [38, 50–52], to a pair of point-like emitters. There is still no general quantum theory that can be applied to a situation where an arbitrary number of emitters lay within a region of the size of the Rayleigh length. Furthermore, we still lack a general insight in why an interferometric measurement such as SPADE is optimal for this family of estimation problems. In this paper we answer both these questions: (i) we determine the QFI for the three-dimensional positions of an arbitrary number of point-like emitters in an arbitrary spatial configuration, (ii) we show that a structured measurement strategy where a linear interferometer feeds into an array of photo-detectors is always optimal for this general estimation problem, and (iii) we provide an explicit recipe for the interferometer, which then can be realized using standard techniques [53, 54]. Our theory is based on a very general model for the optical system that is used to collect and measure light. It includes as special cases the standard imaging model based on the definition of a point-spread function (as those used in previous works on super-resolution by coherent imaging, for example the thin lens model), as well as interferometric measurements as stellar interferometry [55, 56].

The Model:— Consider a system of \( N_S \) point-like objects that emit or scatter quasi-monochromatic, incoherent light. The system is measured optically by collecting
the light that impinges on a system of \(N_C\) collectors with accurately known positions. Schematically, these can be considered as pin holes on a light-collection plane (see Fig. 1), or they can be collectors coupled into optical fibres. The collected light is coherently processed in a general interferometer and measured using photodetection.

A single source \(s\) has coordinates \(x^s=(x^s_1,x^s_2,z+x^s_3)\), where the first two are the transverse coordinates and the third component is the one along the optical axis. For simplicity, we assume that the collectors lie in a single transverse plane, with collector \(u\) having coordinates \(u=(u_1,u_2,0)\), although this constraint may be relaxed. We assume that at most one photon arrives on the collection plane per measurement event.

The state of a photon emitted by source \(s\) impinging on the \(N_C\) collectors is described by

\[
|\psi(x^s)\rangle = \sum_u \gamma(u,x^s)|u\rangle,
\]

(1)

where \(|u\rangle\) denotes the state of a photon arriving at collector \(u\), and \(\gamma(u,x^s)\) is the corresponding complex amplitude. In general, the phase of \(\gamma(u,x^s)\) is expressed by the optical path length from the source at location \(x^s\) and the point-like collector at location \(u\):

\[
\arg \gamma = ik \sqrt{(x^s_1-u_1)^2+(x^s_2-u_2)^2+(z+x^s_3)^2},
\]

(2)

where \(k\) is the wave number, and the modulus of \(\gamma(u,x^s)\) is inversely proportional to the distance between the source and the collector. The normalization condition is \(\sum_u |\gamma(u,x^s)|^2=1\). The total state of a single photon coming from \(N_S\) weak incoherent sources is given by

\[
\rho(x) = \sum_s p(s)|\psi(x^s)\rangle \langle \psi(x^s)|,
\]

(3)

where \(x=(x^1,x^2,\ldots,x^{N_S})\) indicates the collective coordinates of the \(N_S\) emitters, and \(p(s)\) is the probability that the photon is emitted by source \(s\).

**Quantum Fisher Information:** We are interested in measuring one or more generalized coordinates of the system of \(N_S\) emitters. Consider a unit vector with \(3N_S\) components \(v=(v^1_1,v^1_2,v^1_3,\ldots,v^N_S_1,v^N_S_2,v^N_S_3)\). A generalized coordinate is defined as \(\vartheta := v \cdot x = \sum_{j,k=1}^{3N_S} v^j_k x^s_j\), i.e., the scalar product of a unit vector with the collective coordinates of the object. For a variation \(\delta \vartheta\) in the parameter \(\vartheta\), the collective coordinate changes from \(x\) to \(y=x+\delta \vartheta\), with \(\delta \vartheta = v \cdot (y-x)\). We first obtain a simple expression for the QFI of \(\vartheta\) in our model. Second, we compute the classical Fisher information (CFI) for the case where \(R\) is a linear interferometer and the measurement is implemented with photo-detectors. Third, we show that the CFI equals the QFI, proving that linear interferometry and photo-detection is optimal for the measurement of \(\vartheta\).

To compute the QFI, consider a purification of the mixed state \(\rho(x)\) in Eq. (3). We introduce an auxiliary \(N_S\)-dimensional Hilbert space spanned by a set of orthogonal unit vectors \(|s\rangle\) such that

\[
|\Psi(x)\rangle = \sum_{u,s} c(u,x^s)|u\rangle|s\rangle,
\]

(4)

with

\[
c(u,x^s) := \sqrt{p(s)} \gamma(u,x^s).
\]

(5)

The QFI \(I_Q(\vartheta)\) is given by the relation

\[
I_Q(\vartheta) = \lim_{\delta \vartheta \to 0} \frac{8(1-f_{x,y})}{\delta \vartheta^2},
\]

(6)

where

\[
f_{x,y} = \max_V \left| \langle \Psi(x) | (I \otimes V) | \Psi(y) \rangle \right|,
\]

(7)

is the Uhlmann fidelity [57], and the maximum is over unitary transformations \(V\) acting on the purifying system. By applying the expression for the purification in Eq. (5) we obtain an explicit expression for the fidelity:

\[
f_{x,y} = \max_V \left| \sum_{st} V_{st} \sum_u c(u,x^s)^*c(u,y^t) \right|,
\]

(8)

where the last equality follows from the trace norm [57], \(\|M\|_1 = \text{Tr}(\sqrt{M^TM})\), and we have defined the matrices

\[
V_{st} := \langle s | V | t \rangle,
\]

(10)

\[
M_{st} := \sum_u c(u,x^s)^*c(u,y^t).
\]

(11)
Therefore, we have shown that the QFI can be expressed as a function of the matrix $M$ that characterizes the geometry of the light sources and the collectors used to measure them.

Next, we obtain an expression for the CFI for $\vartheta$ from a measurement comprising a linear interferometer characterized by a $N_C \times N_C$ unitary matrix $R$ and an array of photo-detectors (shown in Fig. 1). Given the state $\rho(x)$ in Eq. (3), the probability of observing a photon at detector $w$ is

$$p_w = \sum_u \left|\sum_s c(u, x^s) R_{uw}\right|^2. \quad (12)$$

Given our assumption that no more than one photon arrives at the collector plane within one detection period, at most one detector will click. The classical fidelity between two probability distributions corresponding to source configurations $x$ and $y$ is

$$f_{x,y}^c = \sum_w \sqrt{\sum_u \left|\sum_s c(u, x^s) R_{uw}\right|^2 \left|\sum_u c(u', y^{s'}) R_{uw'}\right|^2}. \quad (13)$$

The CFI for $\vartheta$ is then given by the classical version of Eq. (6). To find the optimal interferometer, we minimize the classical fidelity in Eq. (A5) over the set of unitary matrices $R$. The classical fidelity is lower bounded by the quantum fidelity in Eq. (9):

$$f_{x,y}^c \geq f_{x,y}, \quad (14)$$

which is an instance of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. The optimality of the measurement based on interferometry and photo-detection then follows in from the fact that there exists a choice of $R$ that saturates the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. We show this explicitly in the appendix. Our proof is constructive as it also gives an explicit recipe for the interferometer matrix $R$. Note that this result has been obtained without invoking the paraxial approximation.

**Paraxial Regime:** Of particular interest to astrometry is the paraxial regime, where $x_1^2, x_3^2 \ll z$. We also enforce the $x_3^2 \ll z$. In the paraxial approximation the optical path length from a source at position $x^s$ to collector $u$ becomes

$$\arg \gamma(u, x^s) \simeq -k \frac{u_1 x_1^2 + u_2 x_2^2}{z} - k \frac{x_3^2 u_1^2 + u_2^2}{2 z}$$

$$=: \phi(u, x^s), \quad (15)$$

where we have kept only the terms that are linear in $x^s / z$. We neglected the global phases that depend only on $x^s$ since the sources are incoherent, and the terms that depend only on $u$ are absorbed in the definition of the single photon states $|u\rangle$. In this regime, we may assume that all sources have the same distance from the collection plane, such that

$$\gamma(u, x^s) = N_C^{-1/2} e^{i \phi(u, x^s)}. \quad (16)$$

We introduce the operators:

$$\hat{g}_1 = \frac{k \hat{u}_1}{z}, \quad \hat{g}_2 = \frac{k \hat{u}_2}{z}, \quad \hat{g}_3 = \frac{k(\hat{u}_1^2 + \hat{u}_2^2)}{2 z^2}, \quad (17)$$

where $\hat{u}_1, \hat{u}_2$ are operators that multiply by the corresponding coordinate of collector in the collector plane. Note that these operators are defined on the collector plane and do not act on the object coordinates. The operators $\hat{g}_j$ are the generators of an Abelian unitary group. For each source coordinate $x^s = (x_1^s, x_2^s, x_3^s)$ we define the unitary operator

$$U(x^s) = e^{-i \hat{g}_1 x_1^s - i \hat{g}_2 x_2^s - i \hat{g}_3 x_3^s} \cdot (18)$$

In the paraxial regime this unitary generates the single-photon wave function of Eq. (1):

$$|\psi(x^s)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_C}} \sum_u e^{i \phi(u, x^s)} |u\rangle$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_C}} \sum_u e^{-i k \frac{u_1 x_1^2 + u_2 x_2^2}{z} - i k \frac{x_3^2 u_1^2 + u_2^2}{2 z}} |u\rangle$$

$$= U(x^s) |\psi(0)\rangle, \quad (19)$$

with $|\psi(0)\rangle := N_C^{-1/2} \sum_u |u\rangle$ a reference state that does not depend on $x^s$. This representation is readily extended to $N_S$ incoherent sources via Eq. (3):

$$\rho(x) = p(s) \sum_s |\psi(x^s)\rangle \langle \psi(x^s)|$$

$$= p(s) \sum_s U(x^s) |\psi(0)\rangle \langle \psi(0)| U(x^s)^\dagger. \quad (20)$$

It allows us to compute directly the QFI matrix for the source coordinates, including the special case of one and two point-like sources of equal intensities in the paraxial approximation, which has been studied extensively in the literature.

For two emitters, we are interested in the coordinates of the centroid and in the relative coordinates. In all these cases we find that the QFI is proportional to the covariance matrix of the generators (see appendix):

$$\sigma_{ij} = \langle \hat{g}_i \hat{g}_j \rangle - \langle \hat{g}_i \rangle \langle \hat{g}_j \rangle, \quad (21)$$

where the average is over the dummy state $|\psi(0)\rangle$ introduced in Eq. (19). This covariance matrix is a function only of the distribution in space of the collectors. We can compute it explicitly, for example, for a continuous distribution of collectors that define a circular aperture. In this case our results reproduce those of previous works [49].

As an example, consider the estimation of a transverse separation $\Delta x_1$ between two point-like sources, say along the direction of $u_1$. Then we obtain the following expression for the QFI:

$$I_Q(\Delta x_1) = \langle \hat{g}_1^2 \rangle - \langle \hat{g}_1 \rangle^2 = \frac{k^2}{z^2} \left( \langle \hat{u}_1^2 \rangle - \langle \hat{u}_1 \rangle^2 \right). \quad (22)$$
Note that the variance \( \langle \hat{u}_1^2 \rangle - \langle \hat{u}_1 \rangle^2 \) is simply the variance of the spatial distribution of the collectors along the \( u_1 \) direction, i.e., \( \langle \hat{u}_1^2 \rangle - \langle \hat{u}_1 \rangle^2 = N_C^{-1} \sum_u u_1^2 - \left( N_C^{-1} \sum_u u_1 \right)^2 \), where the summations are over the collectors identifier \( u \).

For a continuous distribution of collectors that simulate the aperture of a microscope or telescope, the variance is proportional to the square of the aperture size \( r \), which yields \( I_Q(\Delta x_1) \sim \frac{k^2}{2z^2} \sim x_R^{-2} \), where \( x_R \) is the Rayleigh length of the optical imaging system. This result reproduces, extends, and explains the results of Ref. [26]. Similar results are obtained for the transverse coordinates of the centroid as well as for the coordinates of a single emitter.

**Physical Implementation:** Consider the simplest case of using two collectors to estimate the transverse angular separation \( \Delta x_1 \) of two sources. The collectors are placed at positions \( d_1, d_2 \), and the precision in \( \Delta x_1 \) is given by (see appendix):

\[
I_Q(\Delta x_1) = \frac{k^2}{4z^2} (d_1 - d_2)^2. \tag{23}
\]

A simple experimental scheme that can achieve this precision is given in Fig. 2, setting the phase shift \( \alpha = 0 \). It is worth noting that our expressions for the QFI and CFI are given for estimating actual value of \( \Delta x_1 \), instead of the angular separation, which would be \( \Delta x_1/z \). If we were to estimate the angular separation, the expression for the QFI would increase by a factor of \( z^2 \), i.e. \( I_Q(\Delta x_1/z) \approx (d_1 - d_2)^2/4 \). We thus reproduce the celebrated result of Ref. [26], using a simple scheme interferometry. Such a scheme is also optimal for other imaging applications [58, 59].

One may wish to also estimate the axial separation \( \Delta x_3 \) simultaneously, as considered in Refs. [36, 37]. However, using only two collectors, one cannot extract two parameters as there is only one variable that changes with the measurement. In order to simultaneously estimate the parameters \( \Delta x_i \) and \( \Delta x_j \), the QFI matrix must be diagonal, i.e., we must use a spatial distribution of the collectors such that for \( i \neq j \):

\[
\sigma_{i,j} = \langle \hat{g}_i \hat{g}_j \rangle - \langle \hat{g}_i \rangle \langle \hat{g}_j \rangle = 0. \tag{24}
\]

One such configuration is four evenly spaced collectors. We find that the optimal interferometer is simply a quantum Fourier transform on the four modes. Our results generalise and reproduce (if the collectors simulate a circular aperture) the work of Ref. [36].

**Discussion and conclusions:** Recent developments have shown that coherent detection schemes based on interferometry (e.g., SPADE) and photo-detection are optimal for estimating the transverse or longitudinal separation between two point-like weak incoherent sources. In particular, these schemes side step the so-called “Rayleigh curse” that limits the precision of direct detection in the sub-Rayleigh regime. Here, we have approached this problem in a more general way, by introducing a general optical estimation model where light is collected over a potentially large number of positions and allowed to interfere before a photon counting measurement. This setup includes stellar interferometry and imaging through a circular aperture in the limit of a continuous distribution of collectors.

Our analysis shows that a scheme where the light impinging on the collectors is first mixed at a linear interferometer and then fed into an array of photon-detectors is always optimal for estimating generalised coordinates of the sources. Furthermore, we provide a constructive recipe for the optimal interferometer, which then can be compiled using standard methods [53, 54]. Our results explain why coherent detection overcomes the Rayleigh curse by relating the imaging resolution to the generators of translation of the light collectors within the framework of interferometry. We have also shown that, for the case of two incoherent sources, the optimal interferometer can have relatively low complexity, for example, a single beam-splitter may be sufficient for two sources, and a quantum Fourier transform for the case of four collectors. We believe that the quantum Fourier transform may be optimal also for more general setups.

Whereas here we have discussed simple examples that have close analytical solutions, our results are completely general and provide a constructive recipe for the optimal interferometric measure to estimate the generalised spatial coordinates of an arbitrary number of point-like sources with varying intensities in an arbitrary spatial configuration. Finally, we expect that our approach can be generalized and applied to extended sources [38], non-weak or non-incoherent sources [30], and to estimate other parameters beyond generalised spatial coordinates, for example spatial moments [50], as well as time and frequency measurements [60, 61].
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Appendix A: Optimality of linear optics and photo-detection

In the main body of the paper, we have obtained expressions for the quantum Fisher information (QFI) and for the classical Fisher information (CFI) for an estimation strategy where the light at the collectors is first processed coherently by a linear interferometer and then measured by photo-detection. Here we show that, for a suitable choice of the interferometer matrix, the CFI equals the QFI, therefore showing the optimality of said measurement.

Before proceeding to the proof, we recall that the QFI is given by the following expression:

$$I_Q(\vartheta) = \lim_{\delta \vartheta \to 0} \frac{8(1 - f_{x,y})}{\delta \vartheta^2}, \quad (A1)$$

where the Uhlmann fidelity

$$f_{x,y} = \| M \|_1, \quad (A2)$$

is given by the trace norm of the matrix $M$ with components

$$M_{st} = \sum_u c(u, x^s)^* c(u, y^t). \quad (A3)$$

On the other hand, for a given interferometer characterized by a $N_C \times N_C$ unitary matrix $R$, the CFI reads

$$I(\vartheta) = \lim_{\delta \vartheta \to 0} \frac{8(1 - f^c_{x,y})}{\delta \vartheta^2}, \quad (A4)$$

where the classical fidelity is given by the following expression:

$$f^c_{x,y} = \sum_w \sqrt{\sum_s |\sum_u c(u, x^s)^* R_{uw} c(u', y^s)|^2 |\sum_u c(u', y^s)^* R_{uw'}|^2}. \quad (A5)$$

From the very definition of the QFI it follows that

$$f^c_{x,y} \geq f_{x,y}. \quad (A6)$$

We are now ready to present the optimality proof, which is divided into two parts. First, we show that inequality (A6) is a Cauchy–Schwarz inequality. Second, we show that there exists a choice of $R$ that saturates it.

1. Cauchy–Schwarz inequality

The matrix $M$ can be written as follows:

$$M = C(x)^\dagger C(y), \quad (A7)$$

where

$$C(x) := \begin{pmatrix}
  c(1, x^1) & c(1, x^2) & \ldots & c(1, x^{N_S}) \\
  c(2, x^1) & c(2, x^2) & \ldots & c(2, x^{N_S}) \\
  \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
  c(N_C, x^1) & c(N_C, x^2) & \ldots & c(N_C, x^{N_S})
\end{pmatrix}. \quad (A8)$$
and similarly

\[ C(y) := \begin{pmatrix}
(c(1, y^1) & c(1, y^2) & \cdots & c(1, y^{NS}) \\
(c(2, y^1) & c(2, y^2) & \cdots & c(2, y^{NS}) \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
(c(N_C, y^1) & c(N_C, y^2) & \cdots & c(N_C, y^{NS})
\end{pmatrix}, \quad (A9) \]

The trace norm \(\|M\|_1\) can be obtained from the singular value decomposition of \(M\), i.e. by finding the unitary transformations \(V\) and \(W\) that make \(M\) diagonal:

\[ V^\dagger MW = D, \quad (A10) \]

where \(D\) is a diagonal, non-negative matrix, yielding \(\|M\|_1 = \text{Tr}D\).

We then have, for any given unitary matrix \(R\),

\[ \|M\|_1 = \text{Tr}D \quad (A11) \]

\[ = \text{Tr}(V^\dagger MW) \quad (A12) \]

\[ = \text{Tr}(V^\dagger C(x)^\dagger C(y)W) \quad (A13) \]

\[ = \text{Tr}(V^\dagger C(x)^\dagger R^\dagger RC(y)W) \quad (A14) \]

\[ = \sum_{t,r,u,v,w,s} V_{rt}^* c(u,x^r)^* R_{vu} R_{vw} c(w,y^s) W_{st}. \quad (A15) \]

By applying the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality \(N_C\) times we obtain

\[ \|M\|_1 \leq \sum_v \left\{ \sum_t \left[ \sum_{u,r} R_{vu} c(u,x^r) V_{rt} \right]^* \left[ \sum_{w,s} R_{vw} c(w,y^s) W_{st} \right] \right\} \quad (A16) \]

\[ \leq \sum_v \sqrt{\sum_t \left[ \sum_{u,r} R_{vu} c(u,x^r) V_{rt} \right]^2} \sqrt{\sum_{w,s} \left[ \sum_{r'} R_{vw} c(w,y^{r'}) W_{st'} \right]^2}. \quad (A17) \]

The last step is to note that the quantity on the right-hand side is invariant under the unitary transformations \(V\) and \(W\). Therefore, putting \(V = W = I\) we finally obtain inequality (A6):

\[ f_{x,y} = \|M\|_1 \leq \sum_v \left\{ \sum_t \sum_{u,r} R_{vu} c(u,x^r) \right\}^2 \left\{ \sum_{w,s} \sum_{r'} R_{vw} c(w,y^{r'}) \right\} = f_{x,y}^c. \quad (A18) \]

In conclusions, we have shown that inequality (A6) is nothing but an instance of the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality.

2. Saturation of the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality

To conclude the optimality proof we will now show that there exists a choice of \(R\) that saturates inequality (A6).

Consider the matrix

\[ A(x) := C(x)V = \begin{pmatrix}
a(1,1) & a(1,2) & \cdots & a(1,N_S) \\
a(2,1) & a(2,2) & \cdots & a(2,N_S) \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
a(N_C,1) & a(N_C,2) & \cdots & a(N_C,N_S)
\end{pmatrix}, \quad (A19) \]

where \(V\), as well as \(W\) below, is the unitary matrix that appears in the singular value decomposition of \(M\) in Eq. (A10).

This matrix can be seen as a list of \(N_S\) vectors \(a(1), a(1), \ldots, a(N_S)\), where

\[ a(s) = \begin{pmatrix}
a(1,s) \\
a(2,s) \\
\vdots \\
a(N_C,s)
\end{pmatrix}. \quad (A20) \]
Similarly we define the matrix
\[ B(y) := C(y)W = \begin{pmatrix} b(1, 1) & b(1, 2) & \cdots & b(1, N) \\ b(2, 1) & b(2, 2) & \cdots & b(2, N) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b(N, 1) & b(N, 2) & \cdots & b(N, N) \end{pmatrix}. \] (A21)

Note that the condition \( V^tC(x)^tC(y)W = D \) determines the scalar products of the \( a \)'s vectors with the \( b \)'s vectors, i.e.,
\[ \sum_u a(u, s)^*b(u, t) = D_s \delta_{st}. \] (A22)

The matrix \( R \) transforms the matrix \( A \) into \( A' \):
\[ A'(x) = RA(x). \] (A23)

It follows from well-known results in linear algebra (QR decomposition) that there exists a choice of \( R \) that transforms \( A(x) \) into an upper-triangular matrix, i.e.,
\[ A'(x) = RA(x) = \begin{pmatrix} a'(1, 1) & a'(1, 2) & a'(1, 3) & \cdots & a'(1, N) \\ 0 & a'(2, 2) & a'(2, 3) & \cdots & a'(2, N) \\ 0 & 0 & a'(3, 3) & \cdots & a'(3, N) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & a'(4, N) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & a'(N, N) \end{pmatrix}. \] (A24)

Note that here we are implicitly using the assumption that the number of collectors \( N_R \) is at least equal to the number of sources \( N_S \).

Because \( R \) preserves the scalar product, the matrix \( B \) is necessarily transformed into a lower-triangular matrix, i.e.,
\[ B'(y) = RB(y) = \begin{pmatrix} b'(1, 1) & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ b'(1, 2) & b'(2, 2) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ b'(1, 3) & b'(2, 3) & b'(3, 3) & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b'(1, N) & b'(2, N) & b'(3, N) & \cdots & b'(N, N) \end{pmatrix}. \] (A25)

The scalar product then reads:
\[ D_s = \sum_u a(u, s)^*b(u, s) = \sum_u a'(u, s)^*b'(u, s) = a'(s, s)^*b'(s, s). \] (A26)

As the coefficients \( D_s \) are real and non-negative, we also have
\[ D_s = |a'(s, s)^*b'(s, s)| = |a'(s, s)||b'(s, s)|. \] (A27)

We can then write the quantum fidelity as follows:
\[ f_{x,y} = ||M||_1 = \sum_s D_s = \sum_s |a'(s, s)||b'(s, s)|. \] (A28)

On the other hand, we can write, for the same choice for the matrix \( R \), the classical fidelity:
\[ f'_{x,y} = \sum_v \sqrt{\sum_t \sum_{u,r} R_{vu}c(u, x) V_{tr}^* \left( \sum_{v'} \sum_{w,s} R_{vw}c(w, y^*) W_{sv'} \right)^2} \] (A29)
\[ = \sum_v \sqrt{\sum_t |a'(v, t)|^2} \sqrt{\sum_{v'} |b'(v, v')|^2} \] (A30)
\[ = \sum_v |a'(v, v)||b'(v, v)|. \] (A31)

In conclusion, a direct comparison of Eq. (A28) and Eq. (A31) verifies that \( f_{x,y} = f'_{x,y} \) for the above choice of \( R \).

Note that the proof is constructive as it also gives a recipe for \( R \).
Appendix B: Paraxial regime

In this section, we solve explicitly examples of estimation of one emitter and two incoherent emitters. We apply the theory developed in the main body of the paper, where we have shown that the wave function of a single emitter at location \( x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \) can be written as

\[
|\psi(x)\rangle = U(x)|\psi(0)\rangle,
\]

where

\[
U(x) = e^{-i\hat{g}_1 x_1 - i\hat{g}_2 x_2 - i\hat{g}_3 x_3},
\]

and

\[
|\psi(0)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{NC}} \sum_u |u\rangle.
\]

The unitary \( U(x) \) has generators

\[
\hat{g}_1 = \frac{k\hat{u}_1}{z}, \quad \hat{g}_2 = \frac{k\hat{u}_2}{z}, \quad \hat{g}_3 = \frac{k(\hat{u}_1^2 + \hat{u}_2^2)}{2z^2}.
\]

Similarly, the state of \( N_S \) incoherent source reads

\[
\rho(x) = \frac{1}{N_S} \sum_s |\psi(x^s)\rangle\langle \psi(x^s)| = \frac{1}{N_S} \sum_s U(x^s)|\psi(0)\rangle\langle \psi(0)|U(x^s)\dagger.
\]

1. One source

Consider first the case of a single point-like source. Our goal is to compute the QFI matrix for its three spatial coordinates.

According to Eq. (B1), the single-photon state depends on the source coordinates through a unitary transformation. Therefore, general results on quantum estimation theory yield that the QFI matrix is four times the covariance matrix of the generators. Therefore, the elements of the QFI matrix are:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{QFI}_{11} &= 4 \left( \langle \hat{g}_1^2 \rangle - \langle \hat{g}_1 \rangle^2 \right) = \frac{4k^2}{z^2} \left( \langle u_1^2 \rangle - \langle u_1 \rangle^2 \right), \\
\text{QFI}_{22} &= 4 \left( \langle \hat{g}_2^2 \rangle - \langle \hat{g}_2 \rangle^2 \right) = \frac{4k^2}{z^2} \left( \langle u_2^2 \rangle - \langle u_2 \rangle^2 \right), \\
\text{QFI}_{33} &= 4 \left( \langle \hat{g}_3^2 \rangle - \langle \hat{g}_3 \rangle^2 \right) = \frac{k^2}{z^2} \left( \langle u_1^2 + u_2^2 \rangle^2 - \langle u_1^2 + u_2^2 \rangle \right), \\
\text{QFI}_{12} &= \text{QFI}_{21} = 4 \left( \langle \hat{g}_1 \hat{g}_2 \rangle - \langle \hat{g}_1 \rangle \langle \hat{g}_2 \rangle \right) = \frac{4k^2}{z^2} \left( \langle u_1 u_2 \rangle - \langle u_1 \rangle \langle u_2 \rangle \right), \\
\text{QFI}_{13} &= \text{QFI}_{31} = 4 \left( \langle \hat{g}_1 \hat{g}_3 \rangle - \langle \hat{g}_1 \rangle \langle \hat{g}_3 \rangle \right) = \frac{2k^2}{z^2} \left( \langle u_1 (u_1^2 + u_2^2) \rangle - \langle u_1 \rangle \langle u_1^2 + u_2^2 \rangle \right), \\
\text{QFI}_{23} &= \text{QFI}_{32} = 4 \left( \langle \hat{g}_2 \hat{g}_3 \rangle - \langle \hat{g}_2 \rangle \langle \hat{g}_3 \rangle \right) = \frac{2k^2}{z^2} \left( \langle u_2 (u_1^2 + u_2^2) \rangle - \langle u_2 \rangle \langle u_1^2 + u_2^2 \rangle \right).
\end{align*}
\]

Here we have used the notation:

\[
(f(u_1, u_2)) := \langle \psi(0)|f(\hat{u}_1, \hat{u}_2)|\psi(0)\rangle = \frac{1}{NC} \sum_u f(u_1, u_2).
\]

2. Two sources

Consider a system of two point-like emitters. In this case \( M \) is a \( 2 \times 2 \) matrix. We have

\[
M = C(x)\dagger C(y)
\]
with

\[ C(x) = \begin{pmatrix} c(1, x^1) & c(1, x^2) \\ c(2, x^1) & c(2, x^2) \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ c(N_C, x^1) & c(N_C, x^2) \end{pmatrix}, \]  

(B14)

and

\[ C(y) = \begin{pmatrix} c(1, y^1) & c(1, y^2) \\ c(2, y^1) & c(2, y^2) \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ c(N_C, y^1) & c(N_C, y^2) \end{pmatrix}. \]  

(B15)

Using the Dirac notation, we identify each column as a vector, i.e.,

\[ C(x) = \left( |\psi(x^1)\rangle \quad |\psi(x^2)\rangle \right), \]  

(B16)

\[ C(y) = \left( |\psi(y^1)\rangle \quad |\psi(y^2)\rangle \right), \]  

(B17)

and the matrix \( M \) then reads

\[ M = \begin{pmatrix} \langle \psi(x^1)|\psi(y^1)\rangle & \langle \psi(x^1)|\psi(y^2)\rangle \\ \langle \psi(x^2)|\psi(y^1)\rangle & \langle \psi(x^2)|\psi(y^2)\rangle \end{pmatrix}. \]  

(B18)

\[ a. \text{ Estimating the separation between the sources} \]

Consider a symmetric setup in which the two sources have coordinates \( x^1 = -x^2 \). Our goal is to estimate the separation \( \Delta x_1 \) along one given direction, for example along the coordinate \( x_1 \). Below \( \delta \Delta x_1 \) denotes a small variation of this parameter.

We have:

\[ |\psi(y^1)\rangle = e^{-i\delta \frac{\Delta x_1}{x_1}} |\psi(x^1)\rangle, \]  

(B19)

\[ |\psi(y^2)\rangle = e^{i\delta \frac{\Delta x_1}{x_2}} |\psi(x^2)\rangle. \]  

(B20)

This implies

\[ \langle \psi(x^1)|\psi(y^1)\rangle = \langle \psi(x^1)|e^{-i\delta \frac{\Delta x_1}{x_1}}|\psi(x^1)\rangle = \sum_u e^{-i\frac{\delta}{x_1} \frac{\Delta x_1}{x_1}}, \]  

(B21)

and

\[ \langle \psi(x^2)|\psi(y^2)\rangle = \langle \psi(x^2)|e^{i\delta \frac{\Delta x_1}{x_2}}|\psi(x^2)\rangle = \sum_u e^{i\frac{\delta}{x_2} \frac{\Delta x_1}{x_1}}. \]  

(B22)

Therefore

\[ \langle \psi(x^2)|\psi(y^2)\rangle = \langle \psi(x^1)|\psi(y^1)\rangle^*. \]  

(B23)

Also note that

\[ \langle \psi(x^1)|\psi(y^2)\rangle = \langle \psi(x^1)|e^{i\delta \frac{\Delta x_1}{x_2}}|\psi(x^2)\rangle \]  

(B24)

\[ = \langle \psi(x^2)|e^{-i\delta \frac{\Delta x_1}{x_1}}|\psi(x^1)\rangle^* = \langle \psi(x^2)|\psi(y^1)\rangle^*. \]  

(B25)

The above implies that the matrix \( M \) has the general form:

\[ M = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \beta^* & \alpha^* \end{pmatrix}. \]  

(B26)

We can readily compute the trace norm for a matrix of this form (under the condition \(|\alpha| > |\beta|\)):

\[ \|M\|_1 = 2|\alpha|. \]  

(B27)
Since $\alpha = \sum_u e^{-ikx_1u_kx_1}$, we have
\[
\|M\|_1 = 2 \left| \sum_u e^{-ikx_1u_kx_1} \right|.
\] (B28)

It remains to expand this quantity up to the second order in $\delta \ell$:
\[
\|M\|_1 \approx 2 \left| N_C - \frac{ik\delta x_1}{2z} \sum_u u_1 - \frac{k^2 \delta x_1^2}{4z^2} \sum_u (u_1)^2 \right|
\] (B29)
\[
\approx 2N_C \left[ 1 - \frac{k^2 \delta x_1^2}{2N_C} \sum_u (u_1)^2 + \frac{k^2 \delta x_1^2}{4z^2} \left( \frac{1}{N_C} \sum_u u_1 \right)^2 \right],
\] (B30)
and finally
\[
\frac{1}{2N_C} \|M\|_1 = 1 - \frac{k^2 \delta x_1^2}{8z^2} \left[ \sum_u (u_1)^2 - \left( \frac{1}{N_C} \sum_u u_1 \right)^2 \right]
\] (B31)
\[
= 1 - \frac{k^2 \delta x_1^2}{8z^2} \left( \langle u_1^2 \rangle - \langle u_1 \rangle^2 \right).
\] (B32)

From this we directly obtain the quantum Fisher information for the estimate of $\Delta x_1$:
\[
I_Q(\Delta x_1) = \frac{8}{\delta \Delta x_1^2} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2N_C} \|M\|_1 \right) = \frac{k^2}{z^2} \left( \langle u_1^2 \rangle - \langle u_1 \rangle^2 \right).
\] (B33)

We can similarly obtain the quantum Fisher information for the separation in any direction. It follows that also, in this case, the quantum Fisher information matrix is proportional to the covariance matrix of the infinitesimal generators. The elements of the QFI matrix are therefore equal, up to a multiplicative factor 4, to the QFI matrix elements for the coordinates of a single emitter in Eqs. (B6)-(B11).

b. Transverse localization of the centroid

We assume a configuration of the collectors that is inversion-symmetric. This means that for each collector at location $u' \neq (0,0)$ there is another collector at location $-u'$. This in turn implies that the amplitude
\[
\langle \psi(0)|U(x)|\psi(0) \rangle = \sum_u e^{-ikx_1u_kx_1 + u_kx_2}
\] (B34)
is real for any $U(x)$. Explicitly we have:
\[
\langle \psi(0)|U(x)|\psi(0) \rangle = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
2 \sum_{u'} \cos \left( k\frac{u_1x_1 + u_2x_2}{z} \right) & \text{if } N_C \text{ is even}, \\
1 + 2 \sum_{u'} \cos \left( k\frac{u_1x_1 + u_2x_2}{z} \right) & \text{if } N_C \text{ is odd}.
\end{array} \right.
\] (B35)

Consider an infinitesimal transverse displacement, for example along the first coordinate direction $x_1$. We have
\[
\langle \psi(0)|U(x)e^{-ik_1\delta x_1}|\psi(0) \rangle \approx \langle \psi(0)|U(x) \left( 1 - i\delta_1 \delta x_1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\delta_2 \delta x_1^2}{2} \right)|\psi(0) \rangle
\] (B36)
\[
\approx \langle \psi(0)|U(x)|\psi(0) \rangle + \delta x_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} \langle \psi(0)|U(x)|\psi(0) \rangle + \frac{\delta x_1^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_1^2} \langle \psi(0)|U(x)|\psi(0) \rangle
\] (B37)
\[
= p + 2 \sum_{u'} \cos \left( k\frac{u_1x_1 + u_2x_2}{z} \right) - 2k \delta x_1 z \sum_{u'} u_1 \sin \left( k\frac{u_1x_1 + u_2x_2}{z} \right)
\]
\[
- k^2 \frac{\delta x_1^2}{z^2} \sum_{u_1} u_1^2 \cos \left( k\frac{u_1x_1 + u_2x_2}{z} \right),
\] (B38)
where \( p = 1 \) is odd, and \( p = 0 \) otherwise.

We will write this second order expansion of the amplitude as
\[
\langle \psi(0)|U(x)e^{-i\delta x^1}\langle \psi(0) \rangle \simeq A(x) - B(x)\delta x_1 - C(x)\delta x_1^2.
\] (B39)

Consider now the matrix \( M \) for a transverse displacement of both sources. We denote as \( x^1 \) the vector of coordinates of the first source, and as \( x^2 \) the coordinates of the second. The relative coordinate is \( \Delta x = x^1 - x^2 \). The matrix \( M \) then reads as (up to the second order in \( \delta x_1 \))
\[
M = \begin{pmatrix}
N_C - C(0)\delta x_1^2 & A(\Delta x) - B(\Delta x)\delta x_1 - C(\Delta x)\delta x_1^2 \\
A(\Delta x) + B(\Delta x)\delta x_1 - C(\Delta x)\delta x_1^2 & N_C - C(0)\delta x_1^2
\end{pmatrix}.
\] (B40)

For this matrix we can compute the trace norm directly:
\[
\frac{1}{2N_C} \| M \|_1 = 1 - \frac{1}{N_C} C(0)\delta x_1^2 + \frac{1}{2N_C^2} B(\Delta x)^2 \delta x_1^2
\]
\[= 1 - \frac{k^2\delta x_1^2}{z^2} \left[ \frac{1}{N_C} \sum_{u'} u_{1u'}^2 \right] - \frac{1}{2N_C^2} \frac{k^2\delta x_1^2}{z^2} \left[ \sum_{u'} u_{1u'} \sin \left( k\frac{u_1\Delta x_1 + u_2\Delta x_2}{z} \right) \right]^2.
\] (B42)

Note that the last term is proportional to \( \Delta x^2 \), therefore it can be neglected in the paraxial approximation. We then have
\[
\frac{1}{2N_C} \| M \|_1 \simeq 1 - \frac{k^2\delta x_1^2}{z^2} \left[ \frac{1}{N_C} \sum_{u'} u_{1u'}^2 \right]
\]
\[= 1 - \frac{k^2\delta x_1^2}{z^2} \left[ \frac{1}{2N_C} \sum_{u} u_{1u}^2 \right].
\] (B44)

Finally, we obtain an expression for the quantum Fisher information for the transverse coordinate of the centroid:
\[
I_Q(x_1) = \frac{8}{\delta x_1^2} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2N_C} \| M \|_1 \right)
\]
\[= \frac{4k^2}{z^2} \left( \frac{1}{N_C} \sum_{u} u_{1u}^2 \right) = \frac{4k^2}{z^2} \langle u_{1u}^2 \rangle.
\] (B46)

In conclusions, also, in this case, we obtain that the QFI for the coordinate of the centroid is proportional to the variance of the corresponding generators.

The analogous result is obtained for the coordinate of the centroid along any transverse direction. This implies that the QFI matrix for the transverse estimation of the centroid equals the corresponding sub-matrix of the single-emitter QFI matrix, whose elements are shown in Eqs. (B6)-(B11).

**Appendix C: Physical implementation**

1. **Two detectors**

Consider a schematic of the two sources and of the measurement scheme as depicted in Fig. 3. The two sources have coordinates \( \pm \Delta x_1/2, 0, \pm x_3/2 + z \).

Making the approximation that \( \Delta x_1, \Delta x_3, |d_1|, |d_2| \ll z \), the QFI’s for estimating the separation are
\[
\text{QFI}_{\Delta x_1} \approx k^2 \frac{(d_1 - d_2)^2}{4z^2}.
\] (C1)
\[
\text{QFI}_{\Delta x_3} \approx k^2 \frac{(d_1 - d_2)^2}{16z^4} \left( \Delta x_1^2 + (d_1 + d_2)^2 \right).
\] (C2)

The optimal measurement, also shown in Fig. 3, is a simple text-book example of interferometry.
FIG. 3. Schematic of the two sources, they have a separation of \( \Delta x_1 \) on the object plane, and the object planes are separated by a distance \( \Delta x_3 \) in the axial direction to the collectors. The collectors are separated by a distance \( |d_1 - d_2| \).

Assuming the operators transform as

\[
a^\dagger_{d_1} \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(a^\dagger_{d_1} + a^\dagger_{d_2})
\]

\[
a^\dagger_{d_2} \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(a^\dagger_{d_1} - a^\dagger_{d_2}),
\]

the probabilities of measuring a photon at modes 1 and 2 are respectively

\[
p_1 = \frac{1}{4} \left[ 2 + \cos \left( \frac{(d_1 - d_2)(\Delta x_3(\Delta x_1 - d_1 - d_2) + 2\Delta x_1 z)}{4z^2} + \alpha \right) \right.
\]

\[
+ \cos \left( \frac{(d_1 - d_2)(\Delta x_3(\Delta x_1 + d_1 + d_2) - 2\Delta x_1 z)}{4z^2} + \alpha \right) \right]
\]

\[
p_2 = \frac{1}{4} \left[ 2 - \cos \left( \frac{(d_1 - d_2)(\Delta x_3(\Delta x_1 - d_1 - d_2) + 2\Delta x_1 z)}{4z^2} + \alpha \right) \right.
\]

\[
- \cos \left( \frac{(d_1 - d_2)(\Delta x_3(\Delta x_1 + d_1 + d_2) - 2\Delta x_1 z)}{4z^2} + \alpha \right) \right]
\]

If \( \theta \) the unknown parameter to be estimated, given a set of measurement outcomes \( \{x\} \), each occurring with probability \( p(x|\theta) \), the CFI of \( \theta \) is

\[
F_{\theta} = \sum_x p(x|\theta) \left[ \frac{\partial \log p(x|\theta)}{\partial \theta} \right]^2,
\]

For the parameter \( \Delta x_1 \), applying a relative phase shift \( \alpha = \theta_s \), substituting Eq (C4) into Eq (C5), the CFI is

\[
F_{\Delta x_1} = k^2 \left( \frac{(d_1 - d_2) \sin \left( \frac{\theta_s \Delta x_3 + \Delta x_1 d_1 - \Delta x_1 d_2 + d^2 + \Delta x_3^2}{\Delta x_3^3 + \Delta x_3^2} \right)}{\Delta x_3 - 2z} \right)^2
\]

\[
+ \left( \frac{(d_1 - d_2) \sin \left( \frac{\theta_s \Delta x_3 + \Delta x_1 d_1 - \Delta x_1 d_2 - d^2 + \Delta x_3^2}{\Delta x_3^3 + \Delta x_3^2} \right)}{\Delta x_3 - 2z} \right)^2
\]

\[
+ \left( \frac{(d_1 - d_2) \sin \left( \frac{\theta_s \Delta x_3 + \Delta x_1 d_1 - \Delta x_1 d_2 + d^2 + \Delta x_3^2}{\Delta x_3^3 + \Delta x_3^2} \right)}{\Delta x_3 - 2z} \right)^2
\]

\[
+ \left( \frac{(d_1 - d_2) \sin \left( \frac{\theta_s \Delta x_3 + \Delta x_1 d_1 - \Delta x_1 d_2 - d^2 + \Delta x_3^2}{\Delta x_3^3 + \Delta x_3^2} \right)}{\Delta x_3 - 2z} \right)^2
\]

Given \( \Delta x_3, \ll z \) and \( |\Delta x_1(d_1 - d_2)|/(2z) \ll 1 \), setting \( \theta_s = 0 \) gives

\[
F_{\Delta x_1} \approx \frac{(d_1 - d_2)^2}{(4z^2)},
\]
which is equal to the QFI. It is worth noting that our expressions for the QFI and CFI are for estimating the actual value of $\Delta x_1$, instead of the angular separation, which would be $\Delta x_1/z$. If we were to estimate the angular separation, the expression for the QFI and CFI will increase by a factor of $z^2$, i.e

$$QFI_{\Delta x_1/z} \approx F_{\Delta x_1/z} \approx \frac{(d_1 - d_2)^2}{4}. \quad (C9)$$

We thus reproduce the result of Tsang, Nair in Lu, namely that the QFI is constant and only depends on the properties of the imaging system.

For the parameter $\Delta x_3$, applying a relative phase shift $\alpha = \theta_t$, CFI is

$$F_{\Delta x_3} = -k^2(d_1 - d_2)^2 \frac{(\Delta x_1 + d_1 + d_2) \sin \left( \frac{\theta_t \Delta x_3 + \Delta x_1 d_1 - \Delta x_1 d_2 - d_1^2 - d_2^2 + 2 \theta_t z}{\Delta x_3 + 2z} \right)}{(\Delta x_1 - d_1 - d_2) \sin \left( \frac{\theta_t \Delta x_3 + \Delta x_1 d_1 - \Delta x_1 d_2 - d_1^2 - d_2^2 - 2 \theta_t z}{\Delta x_3 + 2z} \right)} + \left\{ \left( \cos \left( \frac{\theta_t \Delta x_3 + \Delta x_1 d_1 - \Delta x_1 d_2 + d_1^2 - d_2^2 + 2 \theta_t z}{\Delta x_3 + 2z} \right) \right)^2 + \cos \left( \frac{\theta_t \Delta x_3 + \Delta x_1 d_1 - \Delta x_1 d_2 - d_1^2 + d_2^2 - 2 \theta_t z}{\Delta x_3 - 2z} \right)^2 \right\}^{-1} \quad (C10)$$

In general, $\theta_x \neq \theta_t$, which is logical because here there are 2 parameters to extract, but there is only one variable in the measurement outcome. The optimal phase for estimating $\Delta x_3$ is

$$\theta_t = \tan^{-1} \left[ \frac{\Delta x_1 \cos \left( \frac{\Delta x_1 d_1 - d_2}{2z} \right)}{\sqrt{\Delta x_1^2 \cos^2 \left( \frac{\Delta x_1 d_1 - d_2}{2z} \right) + (d_1 + d_2)^2 \sin^2 \left( \frac{\Delta x_1 d_1 - d_2}{2z} \right)}} \right], \quad \text{or} \quad \theta_t = \tan^{-1} \left[ \frac{\sqrt{2} (d_1 + d_2) \sin \left( \frac{\Delta x_1 d_1 - d_2}{2z} \right)}{\sqrt{(\Delta x_1^2 - (d_1 + d_2)^2) \cos \left( \frac{\Delta x_1 d_1 - d_2}{2z} \right) + \Delta x_1^2 + (d_1 + d_2)^2}} \right]. \quad (C11)$$

2. Four collectors - simultaneous estimation of transverse and axial separations

![FIG. 4. Schematic for estimating simultaneously $\Delta x_1$ and $\Delta x_3$ using 4 collectors which are evenly spaced, centered at position 0. The optimal linear optical transformation is a 4-mode quantum Fourier transform.](image)

We have seen in Sec. C 1 that using only two collectors, one cannot simultaneously optimally measure the transverse and axial separations. Intuitively, this is due to the fact that there are two parameters to extract and only one variable that changes with the measurement.

Since we know the commutators for the different parameters to be estimated (using Eqs. (B4)), we can configure the positions of the collectors such that the off-diagonal terms in the QFI matrix are zero. If such a condition is
satisfied, then there exists a measurement that can simultaneously. One such configuration is depicted in Fig 4, where the collectors are evenly spaced, with positions, where the centre is at 0.

For the parameter $\Delta x_1$, the QFI for putting the four collectors along the $u_1$ axis in generic positions $(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4)$ is

$$QFI_{\Delta x_1}(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4) = \frac{1}{16} (3d_1^2 - 2d_1(d_2 + d_3 + d_4) + 3d_2^2 - 2d_2(d_3 + d_4) + 3d_3^2 - 2d_3d_4 + 3d_4^2).$$  \hspace{1cm} (C12)

Now setting them evenly space, the coordinates are $(d_1, \frac{1}{3}d_1, -\frac{1}{3}d_1, -d_1)$, the QFI is

$$QFI_{\Delta x_1}\left(d_1, \frac{1}{3}d_1, -\frac{1}{3}d_1, -d_1\right) = \frac{5}{9z^2}d_1^2. \hspace{1cm} (C13)$$

We then apply a 4-mode quantum Fourier transform, which acts on the 4 modes as

$$\begin{pmatrix}
a_d^0 \\
a_d^1 \\
a_d^2 \\
a_d^3 \\
\end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
1 & i & -1 & -i \\
1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\
1 & -i & -1 & i \\
\end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix}
a_{d_1}^0 \\
a_{d_1}^1 \\
a_{d_2}^0 \\
a_{d_2}^1 \\
\end{pmatrix}. \hspace{1cm} (C14)$$

The probability of the photon exiting through the mode 1 is

$$p_1 = \frac{1}{16} \left[ \cos \left( \frac{1}{4}(d_1 - d_2)(\Delta x_3(d_1 + d_2) - (\Delta x_3 - 2)\Delta x_1) \right) + \cos \left( \frac{1}{4}(d_1 - d_2)((\Delta x_3 + 2)\Delta x_1 + \Delta x_3(d_1 + d_2)) \right) + \right.$$

$$\left. \cos \left( \frac{1}{4}(d_1 - d_3)(\Delta x_3(d_1 + d_3) - (\Delta x_3 - 2)\Delta x_1) \right) + \cos \left( \frac{1}{4}(d_1 - d_3)((\Delta x_3 + 2)\Delta x_1 + \Delta x_3(d_1 + d_3)) \right) + \right.$$

$$\left. \cos \left( \frac{1}{4}(d_2 - d_3)(\Delta x_3(d_2 + d_3) - (\Delta x_3 - 2)\Delta x_1) \right) + \cos \left( \frac{1}{4}(d_2 - d_3)((\Delta x_3 + 2)\Delta x_1 + \Delta x_3(d_2 + d_3)) \right) + \right.$$

$$\left. \cos \left( \frac{1}{4}(d_2 - d_4)(\Delta x_3(d_2 + d_4) - (\Delta x_3 - 2)\Delta x_1) \right) + \cos \left( \frac{1}{4}(d_2 - d_4)((\Delta x_3 + 2)\Delta x_1 + \Delta x_3(d_2 + d_4)) \right) + \right.$$

$$\left. \cos \left( \frac{1}{4}(d_3 - d_4)(\Delta x_3(d_3 + d_4) - (\Delta x_3 - 2)\Delta x_1) \right) + \cos \left( \frac{1}{4}(d_3 - d_4)((\Delta x_3 + 2)\Delta x_1 + \Delta x_3(d_3 + d_4)) \right) + 4 \right].$$

$$\hspace{1cm} (C15)$$

The rest of the probabilities take a similar form, which we omit for brevity. Once again, calculating the probabilities and using Eq. (C5), the Fisher information for photon counting at the output ports is

$$CFI_{\Delta x_1} = \frac{1}{18} d_1^2 \left[ \cos \left( \frac{2\Delta x_1 d_1}{3} \right) + 9 \right] \hspace{1cm} (C16)$$

$$\approx \frac{5}{9z^2}d_1^2, \hspace{1cm} (C17)$$

with Eq (C17) coinciding with the QFI.

In the same configuration, the QFI for $\Delta x_3$ is

$$QFI_{\Delta x_3} = \frac{1}{z^4} \left( \frac{5\Delta x_3^2 d_1^2}{36} + \frac{4d_1^4}{81} \right). \hspace{1cm} (C18)$$

The actual expression for the CFI of $\Delta x_3$ is large and un-illuminating. However, in the limit that $\Delta x_1 \rightarrow 0$, it reduces to

$$CFI_{\Delta x_3} = \frac{4}{81z^4} d_1^4 \hspace{1cm} (C19)$$

which coincides with the QFI. Note that both the parameters $\Delta x_1$ and $\Delta x_3$ can be extracted here optimally simultaneously.