The Holevo Cramér-Rao bound is at most thrice the Helstrom version

Mankei Tsang*

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, National University of Singapore, 4 Engineering Drive 3, Singapore 117583 and

Department of Physics, National University of Singapore, 2 Science Drive 3, Singapore 117551

(Dated: April 8, 2024)

In quantum metrology, the Holevo Cramér-Rao bound has attracted renewed interest in recent years due to its superiority over the Helstrom Cramér-Rao bound and its asymptotic attainability for multiparameter estimation. Its evaluation, however, is often much more difficult than that of the Helstrom version, calling into question the actual improvement offered by the Holevo bound and whether it is worth the trouble. Here I prove that the Holevo bound is at most thrice the Helstrom version, so the improvement must be limited and the role of incompatibility in quantum estimation turns out to be modest. The result also shows that the Helstrom version remains a pretty good bound even for multiple parameters, as it can be approached asymptotically to within a factor of 3.

Update: References [1–3] supersede this work by proving that the Holevo Cramér-Rao bound is, in fact, at most twice the Helstrom version and the factor-of-2 bound can be tight.

For any measurement of a quantum system and any unbiased estimator, a quantum generalization of the Cramér-Rao bound (CRB)—first proposed by Helstrom in 1967 [4]—can be expressed as [5]

$$\operatorname{tr} G\Sigma \ge C^S \equiv \min_{X \in \mathcal{X}} \operatorname{tr} \operatorname{Re} Q(X), \tag{1}$$

$$Q(X) \equiv \sqrt{G}Z(X)\sqrt{G}, \quad Z_{\mu\nu}(X) \equiv \operatorname{tr} \rho X_{\mu}X_{\nu}, \qquad (2)$$

where Σ is the error covariance matrix, G is a real and positive-semidefinite cost matrix, ρ is the density operator of the quantum system that depends on n real unknown parameters $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \ldots, \theta_n)$, \mathcal{X} is the set of all vectoral Hermitian operators $X = (X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n)$ that satisfy $\operatorname{tr} X_\mu \partial \rho / \partial \theta_\nu = \delta_{\mu\nu}$, and the real part of a matrix is defined by $(\operatorname{Re} Q)_{\mu\nu} = \operatorname{Re}(Q_{\mu\nu}) = [Q_{\mu\nu} + (Q_{\mu\nu})^*]/2$. The original form of C^S in terms of the symmetric logarithmic derivatives of ρ [4, 5] is a closed-form solution of Eq. (1). The Helstrom CRB serves as a fundamental limit to quantum estimation and has found many applications in quantum metrology [6–10].

Despite the popularity of the Helstrom CRB, better bounds exist [11-22]. In particular, Holevo proposed a bound that can be expressed as [5, 11, 23, 24]

$$\operatorname{tr} G\Sigma \ge C^H \ge \max\left\{C^S, C^R\right\},\tag{3}$$

$$C^{H} \equiv \min_{X \in \mathcal{X}} \left[\operatorname{tr} \operatorname{Re} Q(X) + \|\operatorname{Im} Q(X)\|_{1} \right], \qquad (4)$$

where C^R is another CRB due to Yuen and Lax [13] that is not elaborated here, the imaginary part of a matrix is defined by $(\text{Im }Q)_{\mu\nu} = \text{Im}(Q_{\mu\nu}) = [Q_{\mu\nu} - (Q_{\mu\nu})^*]/(2i)$, the trace norm is defined as $||A||_1 \equiv \text{tr }\sqrt{A^{\dagger}A}$, and \dagger denotes the conjugate transpose. When there are multiple parameters, the Holevo CRB C^H is not only tighter but also attainable asymptotically [23–25], as it accounts properly for any incompatibility of the observables that should be measured. The bound has attracted renewed interest in recent years [5, 23–32], as many applications involve multiple unknown parameters and the effect of incompatibility is of both fundamental and practical interest. Despite the fundamental importance of the Holevo CRB, its evaluation is difficult and daunting numerics is often needed. This is in contrast to the more amenable Helstrom CRB, for which many fruitful computation techniques have been devised over the years [4–10, 33–44]. For researchers who are reluctant to undertake the endeavor, this raises the questions how much improvement the Holevo CRB can actually offer and whether it is worth the trouble after all. The following theorem gives a concrete answer.

Theorem 1. $C^H \leq 3C^S$.

Proof. For any X, it can be shown that \sqrt{G} , Z, Q, and Re Q are positive-semidefinite, \sqrt{G} , Re Q, and Im Q are real, $i \operatorname{Im} Q$ is Hermitian, and Im Q is skew-symmetric. With

$$Q = \operatorname{Re} Q + i \operatorname{Im} Q, \qquad i \operatorname{Im} Q = Q - \operatorname{Re} Q, \quad (5)$$

one can derive an uncertainty relation given by

$$\|\operatorname{Im} Q\|_{1} = \|i \operatorname{Im} Q\|_{1} = \|Q - \operatorname{Re} Q\|_{1} \le \|Q\|_{1} + \|\operatorname{Re} Q\|_{1}$$

= tr Q + tr Re Q = 2 tr Re Q, (6)

where the triangle inequality is used, $||Q||_1 = \operatorname{tr} Q$ and $||\operatorname{Re} Q||_1 = \operatorname{tr} \operatorname{Re} Q$ because Q and $\operatorname{Re} Q$ are positivesemidefinite, and $\operatorname{tr} Q = \operatorname{tr} \operatorname{Re} Q + i \operatorname{tr} \operatorname{Im} Q = \operatorname{tr} \operatorname{Re} Q$ because $\operatorname{Im} Q$ is skew-symmetric. Now write the Helstrom CRB as

$$C^S = \operatorname{tr} \operatorname{Re} Q(X^S),\tag{7}$$

where X^S is the element in \mathcal{X} that minimizes tr $\operatorname{Re} Q(X)$ in Eq. (1). Combining Eqs. (4), (6), and (7), one obtains

$$C^{H} \le \operatorname{tr} \operatorname{Re} Q(X^{S}) + \|\operatorname{Im} Q(X^{S})\|_{1}$$
(8)

$$\leq 3 \operatorname{tr} \operatorname{Re} Q(X^S) = 3C^S.$$
(9)

Theorem 1 puts the Holevo CRB in the sandwich

$$\max\left\{C^S, C^R\right\} \le C^H \le 3C^S,\tag{10}$$

and researchers can now decide for themselves whether an improvement by at most a factor of 3 warrants the extra effort of evaluating C^H . The theorem may even be on the generous side, as numerical results often show that the improvement is less than a factor of 2 [29–31]. On the flip side, Theorem 1, together with the asymptotic attainability of C^H [23–25], implies that C^S is asymptotically approachable to within a factor of 3, so the Helstrom CRB turns out to be a pretty good bound after all, even for multiple parameters.

The bound in Theorem 1 can be further tightened in special cases. Here I consider the cases where G is rank-one or rank-two.

Proposition 1. If G is rank-one, $C^H = C^S$.

Proof. A rank-one G can be expressed as $G = gee^{\top}$, where g is its real and positive eigenvalue, e is the real unit eigenvector, and \top denotes the transpose. Then

$$\sqrt{G} = \sqrt{g}ee^{\top}, \quad Q = \sqrt{G}Z\sqrt{G} = g(e^{\top}Ze)ee^{\top}.$$
 (11)

Since $Z \ge 0$, $e^{\top}Ze$ is real and nonnegative, meaning that Q is real and Im Q = 0. The C^H given by Eq. (4) is hence equal to the C^S given by Eq. (1).

Note that a rank-one G is not the same as the case of n = 1unknown parameter. To be specific, let $\beta(\theta)$ be a scalar parameter of interest that depends on the n unknown parameters θ . For example, if $\beta(\theta) = \theta_1$, then the rest $(\theta_2, \ldots, \theta_n)$ are nuisance parameters, which may hamper the estimation. A bound on the error of estimating β in the presence of the many unknowns can be obtained by assuming

$$G_{\mu\nu} = \frac{\partial\beta}{\partial\theta_{\mu}} \frac{\partial\beta}{\partial\theta_{\nu}}.$$
 (12)

It follows that

$$Q = (\operatorname{tr} \rho Y^2) e e^{\top}, \quad Y = \sum_{\mu=1}^n \frac{\partial \beta}{\partial \theta_{\mu}} X_{\mu}, \qquad (13)$$

$$C^{H} = C^{S} = \min_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}} \operatorname{tr} \rho Y^{2}, \qquad (14)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{Y}}$ is the set of all Hermitian operators that satisfy the constraints

$$\operatorname{tr} Y \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \theta_{\mu}} = \frac{\partial \beta}{\partial \theta_{\mu}}, \quad \mu = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$
(15)

This formulation of C^S is then equivalent to the one in Ref. [44] for semiparametric estimation. For the problems studied in Ref. [44], Proposition 1 implies that the Holevo CRB offers no improvement and the Helstrom CRBs computed there are asymptotically attainable, at least when n is finite.

Proposition 2. If G is rank-two, $C^H \leq 2C^S$.

Proof. Let the positive eigenvalues of a rank-r G be $\{g_j : j = 1, 2, ..., r\}$ and the corresponding real unit eigenvectors be $\{e^j : j = 1, 2, ..., r\}$. Then

$$Q = \sum_{j=1}^{r} \sum_{k=1}^{r} (\operatorname{tr} \rho Y_j Y_k) e^j e^{k\top}, \quad Y_j = \sqrt{g_j} \sum_{\mu=1}^{n} e^j_{\mu} X_{\mu}.$$
(16)

If r = 2,

Im
$$Q = (\text{Im tr } \rho Y_1 Y_2) \left(e^1 e^{2+} - e^2 e^{1+} \right),$$
 (17)

$$\|\operatorname{Im} Q\|_{1} = 2 \,|\operatorname{Im} \operatorname{tr} \rho Y_{1} Y_{2}| = |i \operatorname{tr} \rho [Y_{1}, Y_{2}]| \tag{18}$$

$$\leq \operatorname{tr} \rho Y_1^2 + \operatorname{tr} \rho Y_2^2 = \operatorname{tr} \operatorname{Re} Q, \tag{19}$$

where the inequality comes from Ref. [11, Proposition 2.8.3]. Hence

$$C^{H} \le \operatorname{tr} \operatorname{Re} Q(X^{S}) + \|\operatorname{Im} Q(X^{S})\|_{1}$$
(20)

$$\leq 2\operatorname{tr}\operatorname{Re}Q(X^S) = 2C^S.$$
(21)

Considering only the propositions, one might suspect that C^H could become significantly higher for a G with a higher rank, but Theorem 1 settles the general case by imposing a hard limit for any rank, revealing the surprisingly modest role of incompatibility in asymptotic quantum estimation. It remains an open question whether Theorem 1 can be improved further and a tighter upper bound on C^H can be found.

Discussions with Francesco Albarelli, Richard Gill, and Madalin Guta are gratefully acknowledged. This work is supported by the Singapore National Research Foundation under Project No. QEP-P7.

* mankei@nus.edu.sg; https://blog.nus.edu.sg/mankei/

- Angelo Carollo, Bernardo Spagnolo, Alexander A. Dubkov, and Davide Valenti, "On quantumness in multi-parameter quantum estimation," Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment 2019, 094010 (2019).
- [2] Angelo Carollo, Bernardo Spagnolo, Alexander A. Dubkov, and Davide Valenti, "Erratum: On quantumness in multiparameter quantum estimation (2019 J. Stat. Mech. 094010)," Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment 2020, 029902 (2020).
- [3] Mankei Tsang, Francesco Albarelli, and Animesh Datta, "Quantum Semiparametric Estimation," Physical Review X 10, 031023 (2020).
- [4] Carl W. Helstrom, *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory* (Academic Press, New York, 1976).
- [5] Masahito Hayashi, ed., Asymptotic Theory of Quantum Statistical Inference: Selected Papers (World Scientific, Singapore, 2005).
- [6] Vittorio Giovannetti, Seth Lloyd, and Lorenzo Maccone, "Advances in quantum metrology," Nature Photonics 5, 222–229 (2011).

- [7] Rafał Demkowicz-Dobrzański, Marcin Jarzyna, and Jan Kołodyński, "Quantum Limits in Optical Interferometry," in *Progress in Optics*, Vol. 60, edited by E. Wolf (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2015) Chap. 4, pp. 345–435.
- [8] S. Pirandola, B. R. Bardhan, T. Gehring, C. Weedbrook, and S. Lloyd, "Advances in photonic quantum sensing," Nature Photonics 12, 724 (2018).
- [9] Luca Pezzé, Augusto Smerzi, Markus K. Oberthaler, Roman Schmied, and Philipp Treutlein, "Quantum metrology with nonclassical states of atomic ensembles," Reviews of Modern Physics 90, 035005 (2018).
- [10] Mankei Tsang, "Resolving starlight: a quantum perspective," Contemporary Physics 60, 279–298 (2019).
- [11] Alexander S. Holevo, Probabilistic and Statistical Aspects of Quantum Theory (Edizioni della Normale, Pisa, Italy, 2011).
- [12] S. Personick, "Application of quantum estimation theory to analog communication over quantum channels," IEEE Transactions on Information Theory 17, 240–246 (1971).
- [13] Horace P. Yuen and Melvin Lax, "Multiple-parameter quantum estimation and measurement of nonselfadjoint observables," IEEE Transactions on Information Theory 19, 740–750 (1973).
- [14] Yoshiyuki Tsuda and Keiji Matsumoto, "Quantum estimation for non-differentiable models," Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General 38, 1593 (2005).
- [15] Mankei Tsang, "Ziv-Zakai Error Bounds for Quantum Parameter Estimation," Physical Review Letters 108, 230401 (2012).
- [16] Vittorio Giovannetti, Seth Lloyd, and Lorenzo Maccone, "Quantum measurement bounds beyond the uncertainty relations," Physical Review Letters 108, 260405 (2012).
- [17] Michael J. W. Hall and Howard M. Wiseman, "Does Nonlinear Metrology Offer Improved Resolution? Answers from Quantum Information Theory," Physical Review X 2, 041006 (2012).
- [18] Dominic W. Berry, Mankei Tsang, Michael J. W. Hall, and Howard M. Wiseman, "Quantum Bell-Ziv-Zakai Bounds and Heisenberg Limits for Waveform Estimation," Physical Review X 5, 031018 (2015).
- [19] Xiao-Ming Lu and Mankei Tsang, "Quantum Weiss-Weinstein bounds for quantum metrology," Quantum Science and Technology 1, 015002 (2016).
- [20] Ranjith Nair, "Fundamental quantum limits in optical metrology from rate-distortion theory," Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical 51, 434001 (2018).
- [21] Jesús Rubio and Jacob Dunningham, "Quantum metrology in the presence of limited data," New Journal of Physics 21, 043037 (2019).
- [22] Jesús Rubio and Jacob Dunningham, "Bayesian multiparameter quantum metrology with limited data," Physical Review A 101, 032114 (2020).
- [23] Richard D. Gill and Mădălin Guță, "On asymptotic quantum statistical inference," in *From Probability to Statistics and Back: High-Dimensional Models and Processes – A Festschrift in Honor of Jon A. Wellner*, Collections, Vol. 9, edited by M. Banerjee, F. Bunea, J. Huang, V. Koltchinskii, and M. H. Maathuis (Institute of Mathematical Statistics, Beachwood, Ohio, USA, 2013) pp. 105–127.
- [24] Koichi Yamagata, Akio Fujiwara, and Richard D. Gill, "Quantum local asymptotic normality based on a new quantum likelihood ratio," The Annals of Statistics 41, 2197–2217 (2013).
- [25] Yuxiang Yang, Giulio Chiribella, and Masahito Hayashi, "Attaining the Ultimate Precision Limit in Quantum State Estima-

tion," Communications in Mathematical Physics **368**, 223–293 (2019).

- [26] K. Matsumoto, "A new approach to the Cramér-Rao-type bound of the pure-state model," Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General 35, 3111–3123 (2002).
- [27] Sammy Ragy, Marcin Jarzyna, and Rafał Demkowicz-Dobrzański, "Compatibility in multiparameter quantum metrology," Physical Review A 94, 052108 (2016).
- [28] Magdalena Szczykulska, Tillmann Baumgratz, and Animesh Datta, "Multi-parameter quantum metrology," Advances in Physics: X 1, 621–639 (2016).
- [29] Mark Bradshaw, Syed M. Assad, and Ping Koy Lam, "A tight Cramér–Rao bound for joint parameter estimation with a pure two-mode squeezed probe," Physics Letters A 381, 2598–2607 (2017).
- [30] Mark Bradshaw, Ping Koy Lam, and Syed M. Assad, "Ultimate precision of joint quadrature parameter estimation with a Gaussian probe," Physical Review A 97, 012106 (2018).
- [31] Francesco Albarelli, Jamie F. Friel, and Animesh Datta, "Evaluating the Holevo Cramér-Rao Bound for Multiparameter Quantum Metrology," Physical Review Letters 123, 200503 (2019).
- [32] Jun Suzuki, Yuxiang Yang, and Masahito Hayashi, "Quantum state estimation with nuisance parameters," arXiv:1911.02790 [quant-ph] (2020).
- [33] Masahito Hayashi, *Quantum Information Theory: Mathematical Foundation*, 2nd ed. (Springer, Berlin, 2017).
- [34] Matteo G. A. Paris, "Quantum estimation for quantum technology," International Journal of Quantum Information 07, 125–137 (2009).
- [35] B. M. Escher, R. L. de Matos Filho, and L. Davidovich, "General framework for estimating the ultimate precision limit in noisy quantum-enhanced metrology," Nature Physics 7, 406–411 (2011).
- [36] Mankei Tsang, Howard M. Wiseman, and Carlton M. Caves, "Fundamental quantum limit to waveform estimation," Physical Review Letters 106, 090401 (2011).
- [37] Mădălin Guţă, "Fisher information and asymptotic normality in system identification for quantum Markov chains," Physical Review A 83, 062324 (2011).
- [38] Mankei Tsang, "Quantum metrology with open dynamical systems," New Journal of Physics 15, 073005 (2013).
- [39] S. Alipour and A. T. Rezakhani, "Extended convexity of quantum fisher information in quantum metrology," Physical Review A 91, 042104 (2015).
- [40] Shilin Ng, Shan Zheng Ang, Trevor A. Wheatley, Hidehiro Yonezawa, Akira Furusawa, Elanor H. Huntington, and Mankei Tsang, "Spectrum analysis with quantum dynamical systems," Physical Review A 93, 042121 (2016).
- [41] Haidong Yuan and Chi-Hang Fred Fung, "Quantum metrology matrix," Physical Review A 96, 012310 (2017).
- [42] Jasminder S. Sidhu and Pieter Kok, "Geometric perspective on quantum parameter estimation," AVS Quantum Science 2, 014701 (2020).
- [43] Marco G. Genoni and Tommaso Tufarelli, "Non-orthogonal bases for quantum metrology," Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical 52, 434002 (2019).
- [44] Mankei Tsang, "Quantum analogs of the conditional expectation for retrodiction and smoothing: a unified view," arXiv:1912.02711 [quant-ph] (2019).