Estimation of Gaussian random displacement using non-Gaussian states
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It has been shown that some non-Gaussian states are useful in quantum metrology. In this paper, we consider an estimation problem which is not well studied in previous researches—an estimation of displacement that follows an isotropic Gaussian distribution when post-selection of the measurement outcome is allowed. We derive a lower bound for the estimation error when only Gaussian states and Gaussian operations are used. We show that this bound can be beaten for some range of the prior variance, using only linear optics and simple non-Gaussian states such as single photon states. We also obtain a lower bound for the estimation error when the maximum photon number of the sensor state is given, using a variant of Van Trees inequality. Our result further reveals the limit of methods using Gaussian states and the role of non-Gaussianity in quantum metrology.

I. INTRODUCTION

Continuous variable (CV) quantum technology provides us advantages beyond classical limits in a wide range of fields including computation, communication, and metrology [1–3]. One of its most important elements is the class of Gaussian states. For example, single-mode squeezed states enable measurements beyond the standard quantum limit [2], and two-mode squeezed states are resources of entanglement, thus essential in quantum communication [1,2].

Gaussian states, however, do not capture all aspects of quantum mechanics. A prominent example is the Gottesman-Knill theorem [4] in quantum computation theory, which states that the quantum supremacy [4] cannot be achieved using only Gaussian states and Gaussian operations. Another example is a no-go theorem in quantum error correction [5], which states that Gaussian errors imposed on Gaussian states cannot be corrected using only Gaussian operations [6,7]. Therefore, non-Gaussianity is essential for drawing out the true advantage in quantum information processing.

Quantum parameter estimation [9–14] is a field of estimating unknown parameters of quantum processes from the outcomes of quantum measurements, and has wide applications including gravitational-wave detection [15], clock synchronisation [16], and microscopy [17]. Although historically the enhancement in estimation precision has been achieved mostly using Gaussian states, recently it has been shown that some non-Gaussian states can be used for quantum estimation [18–20]. For example, Ref. [18] studies estimation of phase-space displacements with no prior information, using a highly non-Gaussian Gottesman-Kitaev-Preskill (GKP) state [21], which has been originally proposed for an error correcting code.

In this paper, we consider the “Gaussian displacement estimation problem”, which is a problem to simultaneously estimate two parameters of a phase space displacement using a single-mode state as a probe, with a Gaussian prior distribution of the parameters. Estimation of displacement using non-Gaussian states has not been well studied compared to the estimation using Gaussian states [22–24]. In quantum estimation theory, two types of averages of the estimation errors are often considered. One is the average with respect to the measurement outcome probability distribution, with the true value of the parameter is fixed, and the other is the average with respect to the joint probability distribution of both the true values of parameters and the measurement outcomes (Bayesian estimation). However, in this work, we consider another evaluation method of the estimation error, which is the average with respect to the posterior distribution with the measurement outcome fixed. This quantity corresponds to the expected estimation error after obtaining a particular measurement outcome, and evaluating this quantity corresponds to the situation where one can post-select only "good" measurement outcomes to achieve higher estimation accuracy. We assume an isotropic Gaussian prior distribution of parameters, which corresponds to a common type of noise in bosonic systems called Gaussian quantum channel [25], or additive Gaussian noise. We derive a lower bound for the estimation error when only Gaussian states and Gaussian operations are used, and show that this bound can be beaten using heterodyne measurement and simple non-Gaussian states such as single photon states.

In Sec. [I], we formulate the Gaussian displacement estimation problem. In Sec. [II], we derive lower bounds for the estimation error when only Gaussian (classical) states and Gaussian operations are used. In Sec. [IV] we show that the bounds derived in Sec. [III] can be beaten using non-Gaussian states. In Sec. [V] a statistical lower bound on the estimation error which depends on the maximum photon number and the post-selection probability is obtained, based on a variant of Van Trees inequality including the effect of post-selection.
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II. GAUSSIAN DISPLACEMENT ESTIMATION PROBLEM

\[ \hat{D}(\xi, \eta) \]
\[ \hat{E}_y \to \hat{\xi}(y), \hat{\eta}(y) \]

**Figure 1.** A schematic representation of Gaussian displacement estimation problem. One estimates the amount of displacement \( \xi, \eta \) using the measurement outcome \( y \), which corresponds to a POVM element \( \hat{E}_y \). One can use prior information that \( \xi, \eta \) follow an isotropic Gaussian distribution. The problem is type of noise in bosonic systems called Gaussian quantum.

The isotropic Gaussian distribution corresponds to a common distribution and represents a displacement (called sensor state, as in Ref. [18]) represented by \( \hat{\rho} \) (\( \hat{\rho} \)). The phase space displacement operator \( \hat{D}(\xi, \eta) \) acts on \( \hat{\rho} \), then a measurement is performed, and the measurement outcome \( y \) is obtained. This measurement corresponds to some POVM (positive operator valued measure) \( \{ \hat{E}_y \} \) satisfying \( \int \hat{E}_y dy = I \), where \( I \) is an identity operator. We assume that \( \xi, \eta \) are random variables following an isotropic Gaussian distribution with known variance and mean 0:

\[ p(\xi, \eta) = \frac{1}{\pi v} \exp\left(-\frac{\xi^2 + \eta^2}{v}\right). \]  

Note that the mean square distance with respect to this distribution is \( \langle \xi'^2 \rangle + \langle \eta'^2 \rangle = v \). Displacement following an isotropic Gaussian distribution corresponds to a common type of noise in bosonic systems called Gaussian quantum channel [25], or additive Gaussian noise. The problem is to estimate \( \hat{\xi}(\eta) \) from the value of \( y \). We assume that one performs a Bayesian estimation using the \( a \) priori information Eq. (2). The conditional probability density of obtaining \( y \), when the values of \( \xi, \eta \) are fixed, is given by

\[ p(y|\xi, \eta) = \text{Tr}\left\{ \hat{D}(\xi, \eta) \hat{\rho} \hat{D}^\dagger(\xi, \eta) \hat{E}_y \right\}, \]  

where \( \text{Tr}\{\cdot\} \) denotes the trace operation. Defining the Wigner function \( W_A \) of an operator \( \hat{A} \) by

\[ W_A(x, p) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int \exp(ipx') \langle x - \frac{x'}{2} | \hat{A} | x + \frac{x'}{2} \rangle dx', \]

Equation (3) can be expressed in terms of Wigner functions of \( \hat{\rho} \) and \( \hat{E}_y \) [26]:

\[ p(y|\xi, \eta) = 2\pi \int W_\rho(x - \xi, p - \eta) W_{\hat{E}_y}(x, p) dx dp. \]  

Once the value of \( y \) is known, one gets the corresponding posterior distribution of \( \xi, \eta \):

\[ p(\xi, \eta|y) = \frac{p(y|\xi, \eta)p(\xi, \eta)}{p(y)}. \]

Suppose one estimates the values of \( \xi, \eta \) as \( \hat{\xi}(y), \hat{\eta}(y) \), corresponding to the value of \( y \). To evaluate the accuracy of the estimation, the mean square error with respect to the joint probability distribution is the standard choice in Bayesian quantum estimation:

\[ v'_\text{Bayes} := \int p(\xi, \eta, y) \left\{ (\xi - \hat{\xi}(y))^2 + (\eta - \hat{\eta}(y))^2 \right\} d\xi d\eta dy. \]

However, here we consider the post-selection of a specific measurement outcome \( y \), and take average only with respect to the true value \( \xi, \eta \), obtaining

\[ v' := \int p(\xi, \eta|y) \left\{ (\xi - \hat{\xi}(y))^2 + (\eta - \hat{\eta}(y))^2 \right\} d\xi d\eta. \]

The meaning of this quantity can be considered as the expected amount of error after obtaining the outcome \( y \). We consider the case \( \hat{\xi}(y), \hat{\eta}(y) \) are chosen as the averages with respect to the posterior distribution:

\[ \hat{\xi}(y) = \int p(\xi, \eta|y) \xi d\xi d\eta, \]
\[ \hat{\eta}(y) = \int p(\xi, \eta|y) \eta d\xi d\eta. \]

which is the optimal choice to minimize \( v' \). For any probability density function \( g(\xi, \eta) \) satisfying \( \int g(\xi, \eta) d\xi d\eta = 1 \) and \( g(\xi, \eta) > 0 \), we define \( \Sigma[g(\xi, \eta)] \) as the covariance matrix of \( (\xi, \eta) \) with respect to \( g(\xi, \eta) \). Then, \( v' \) can also be expressed as

\[ v' = \text{Tr}\left\{ \Sigma[p(\xi, \eta|y)] \right\}. \]

Note that \( v' \) depends on the measurement outcome \( y \). Usually, in Bayesian quantum estimation, one evaluates the error of estimation by averaging over the measurement outcomes [12]. However, in this paper, we allow post-selection of \( y \) to get smaller \( v' \). In Sec. [11] we see that one can still obtain lower bounds on \( v' \) with this assumption.

We also assume that there exists no initial entanglement between the sensor state and the measurement system. The case where entanglements exist is studied in e.g. Ref. [24], and it is shown that the amount of displacement can be estimated in arbitrary high precision if one uses two-mode squeezed vacuum with high squeezing level.

III. CLASSICAL AND GAUSSIAN BOUNDS

In this section, we derive lower bounds on the estimation error \( v' \) (Eq. (5)), when only Gaussian states and
Gaussian operations are allowed. One can easily see that \( v' \) is convex in \( \hat{\rho} \) because the variance is convex with respect to the average of probability distributions. Note that in Eq. (9), the denominator \( p(y) \) is just a normalization factor, and the numerator is linear in \( \hat{\rho} \). In the same way, one can show that \( v' \) is also convex in \( \hat{E}_y \).

Therefore, we only have to consider the case where \( \hat{\rho} \) is a pure Gaussian state and \( \hat{E}_y \propto |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \) for some pure Gaussian state \( |\psi\rangle \). Wigner functions of pure Gaussian states can be written as

\[
W(x,p) = \frac{1}{\pi} \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} (q - \mu)^T \Sigma (q - \mu) \right).
\]

where \( q := (x,p)^T \), and \( \mu \) and \( \Sigma \) are parameters representing the mean and the covariance matrix of the Gaussian function, and \( \Sigma \) satisfies \( \det(\Sigma) = \frac{1}{2} \). Note that this constraint means that the Heisenberg’s uncertainty is saturated by pure Gaussian states \[27\]. Thus, Wigner functions of \( \hat{\rho} \) and \( \hat{E}_y \) are both Gaussian functions, and satisfy

\[
\det(\Sigma_\hat{W}(\xi, \eta)) = \det(\Sigma_{\hat{E}_y}(\xi, \eta)) = \frac{1}{4}.
\]

Here we extend our definition of \( \Sigma \) in the last section to unnormalized distribution functions by defining \( \Sigma[g(\xi, \eta)] := \Sigma[\hat{g}(\xi, \eta)] \) for any unnormalized distribution function \( g(\xi, \eta) \) satisfying \( \int g(\xi, \eta) d\xi d\eta < \infty \) and \( g(\xi, \eta) > 0 \), where \( \hat{g}(\xi, \eta) = Ng(\xi, \eta) \) is the normalization of \( g \) which satisfies \( \int \hat{g}(\xi, \eta) d\xi d\eta = 1 \). Note that although generally Wigner functions can have negative parts, Gaussian Wigner functions are positive and thus can be regarded as probability distributions. Using Eq. (5) and a property of convolution, \( p(y|\xi, \eta) \) is also Gaussian with respect to \( (\xi, \eta) \), and its covariance matrix is

\[
\Sigma[p(y|\xi, \eta)] = \Sigma[\hat{W}(\xi, \eta)] + \Sigma[\hat{E}_y(\xi, \eta)].
\]

Furthermore, from Eq. (6), \( p(\xi, \eta|y) \) is also Gaussian, and

\[
\Sigma[p(\xi, \eta|y)]^{-1} = \Sigma[p(y|\xi, \eta)]^{-1} + \Sigma[p(\xi, \eta)]^{-1}
\]

holds.

### A. Classical bound

First we consider the case when only classical states, \( i.e. \) coherent states, are available as \( \hat{\rho} \). In this case, we have \( \Sigma[\hat{W}(\xi, \eta)] = \frac{1}{2} I \), where \( I \) is the identity matrix. From Eq. (13), two eigenvalues of \( \Sigma[\hat{E}_y(\xi, \eta)] \) can be written as \( a/2, 1/(2a) \) for \( a > 0 \). Then, from Eqs. (11), (14) and (15), one obtains

\[
v' = \frac{1}{2v + 2/(1 + a)} + \frac{1}{2v + 2a/(1 + a)}.
\]

This is minimized when \( a = 1 \), regardless of the value of \( v \). Therefore, in this case, optimal \( \hat{E}_y \) is a projection to a classical state, and the classical lower bound of \( v' \) is given by

\[
v'_C = \frac{2v}{v + 2}.
\]

### B. Gaussian bound

Next we consider the case where arbitrary Gaussian states and operations can be used. For positive definite \( 2 \times 2 \) matrices \( A, B \),

\[
det(A + B) \geq det A + det B + 2\sqrt{det A det B}
\]

holds (See Appendix \[B\] for the derivation). Using this fact and Eqs. (13) and (14), one can show that

\[
det(\Sigma[p(y|\xi, \eta)]) \geq 1.
\]

Conversely, any Gaussian \( p(y|\xi, \eta) \) satisfying Eq. (19) is possible by taking \( \Sigma[\hat{W}(\xi, \eta)] = \Sigma[\hat{E}_y(\xi, \eta)] = \Sigma[p(y|\xi, \eta)]/2 \). Because \( p(y|\xi, \eta) \) minimizing \( v' \) must saturate Eq. (19), its two eigenvalues can be written as \( a, 1/a \) for some \( a > 0 \), and

\[
v' = \frac{1}{2v + a} + \frac{1}{2v + 1/a}
\]

holds. The value of \( a \) which minimizes \( v' \) depends on the value of \( v \). When \( v > 2 \), \( a = 1 \) minimizes \( v' \). This means that choosing vacuum (or coherent) states for both of \( \hat{\rho} \) and \( \hat{E}_y \) is optimal, hence the minimum of \( v' \) coincides with the classical bound, \( \frac{v}{v + 2} \). On the other hand, when \( v < 2 \), by taking \( a \rightarrow 0 \) or \( a \rightarrow \infty \), \( i.e. \) taking both \( \hat{\rho} \) and \( \hat{E}_y \) to be infinitely squeezed states, \( v' \) approaches to the lower bound \( v/2 \). It is precisely half of the original variance \( v \), because variance along the squeezed direction is made 0, and the variance along the antisqueezed direction remains \( v/2 \). To summarize, the Gaussian lower bound of \( v' \) is given by

\[
v'_G = \begin{cases} 
\frac{v}{2} & (v < 2) \\
\frac{2v}{v + 2} & (v > 2) 
\end{cases}
\]

Note that the lower bounds of the Bayesian estimation error \( v'_{Bayes} \) (Eq. (7)) in these settings are also given by \( v'_C \) and \( v'_G \) in Eqs. (17) and (21), because these bounds are independent of the measurement outcome \( y \) (The classical bound \( v'_C \) matches with the result in Ref. \[24\], which is derived as the Bayesian RLD (right logarithmic derivative) quantum Cramér-Rao bound). This means that post-selection does not improve the estimation accuracy in these settings, which we will show is not true for non-Gaussian cases.
IV. ESTIMATION USING NON-GAUSSIAN STATES

In this section, we show that the bounds introduced in Sec. III can be beaten using non-Gaussian states, and a heterodyne measurement, which is widely used for simultaneous measurements of both quadratures [28, 31]. As examples of non-Gaussian states, we consider GKP state [21], which is expected to give high estimation accuracy as in Ref. [18], and Fock states, which are experimentally quite feasible.

A. Heterodyne measurement
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At: the case when one uses heterodyne measurement as the measurement in Fig. 1. The state to be measured is first combined with an ancillary state by a half beam splitter, then \( \sqrt{2 \hat{\rho}} \) and \( \sqrt{2 \hat{x}} \) are measured on each mode. The corresponding POVM is expressed by Eq. (22).

As the measurement \( \{ \hat{E}_y \} \) for the system in Fig. 1, we consider a setup called heterodyne measurement shown in Fig. 2 which consists of two of beam splitter, an ancillary state \( \hat{\rho}' \), and two homodyne measurements. The sensor state after the displacement is combined with \( \hat{\rho}' \) by the half beam splitter, then \( \sqrt{2 \hat{x}} \) and \( \sqrt{2 \hat{\rho}} \) are measured on each mode. The case when \( \hat{\rho}' \) is a vacuum state can be seen as a sampling from Husimi Q function and has wide applications, e.g. state verifications [28, 29]. Here we consider a more general case where any single-mode state can be used as \( \hat{\rho}' \) [30, 31]. Denoting two measurement outcomes as \( y = (y_x, y_p) \), the corresponding POVM element is [26]

\[
\hat{E}_{y_x, y_p} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \hat{D}(y_x, y_p)\hat{\rho}'^* \hat{D}^\dagger(y_x, y_p), \tag{22}
\]

where \( \hat{\rho}'^* \) is the operator whose matrix elements are the complex conjugate of those of \( \hat{\rho}' \). Because taking the complex conjugate corresponds to the time reversal operation, the Wigner function of \( \hat{\rho}'^* \) is given by

\[
W_{\hat{\rho}'^*}(x, p) = W_{\hat{\rho}'}(x, -p). \tag{23}
\]

Therefore, substituting Eq. (22) into Eq. (23), one can see that the conditional probability density \( p(y_x, y_p|\xi, \eta) \) only depends on \( (\xi - y_x, \eta - y_p) \):

\[
p(y_x, y_p|\xi, \eta) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \text{Tr}\left\{ \hat{D}(\xi - y_x, \eta - y_p)\hat{\rho}\hat{D}^\dagger(\xi - y_x, \eta - y_p)\hat{\rho}'^* \right\} \tag{24}
\]

where the “filter function” \( f \) is determined by \( \hat{\rho} \) and \( \hat{\rho}' \), as

\[
f(x, p) := \int W_{\hat{\rho}}(x', p)W_{\hat{\rho}'}(x', -p')dx'dp' \tag{25}
\]

using Eq. (5). From Eq. (6), the posterior distribution of \( x, y \) is obtained by multiplying the prior distribution by the filter function displaced by the measurement outcome \( y_x = y_p = 0 \) in this heterodyne setting.

B. Estimation using GKP state

GKP state, or grid state, is a non-Gaussian state originally proposed for an error correcting code [21], and is defined as

\[
|\text{GKP} \rangle \propto \sum_{s = -\infty}^{\infty} |x = \sqrt{2\pi}s \rangle. \tag{26}
\]

Note that this state is not normalizable, therefore an unphysical state. The Wigner function of GKP state is a sum of Dirac delta functions:

\[
W_{\text{GKP}}(x, p) \propto \sum_{s = -\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{b = -\infty}^{\infty} (-1)^{s+b} \delta(x - \sqrt{\pi/2s})\delta(p - \sqrt{\pi/2b}) \tag{27}
\]

If one takes \( \hat{\rho} = \hat{\rho}' = |\text{GKP}\rangle\langle\text{GKP}| \), the filter function Eq. (24) becomes

\[
f(x, p) = \sum_{s = -\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{t = -\infty}^{\infty} \delta(x - \sqrt{2\pi}s)\delta(p - \sqrt{2\pi}t) \tag{28}
\]

Reference [18] points out that this (unphysical) GKP state can achieve 0 estimation error in the non-Bayesian setting with the local unbiased condition. It is expected to achieve good estimation accuracy also in our setting, where we consider Bayesian estimation with post-selection. The line labeled ‘GKP’ in Fig. 2 shows the relation between \( v \) and \( v' \), when one takes \( \rho = \hat{\rho}' =
$(\text{GKP})^\dagger\text{(GKP)}$ and $(y_x, y_p) = (0, 0)$ is post-selected. One can see that $v'$ is largely reduced compared to the Gaussian and classical bounds for small $v$. Note also the similarity of this setting with the error syndrome measurement for the GKP code [21], where the SUM gate is used instead of the beam splitter.

C. Estimation using Fock states

While the GKP state is obviously useful for the estimation of displacement, experimental generation of (an approximation with physical state of) it has not been realized in optics. We now discuss whether the Gaussian bound can be beaten using experimentally feasible non-Gaussian states. Fock states $|n\rangle$ are the most simple examples of non-Gaussian states, and also experimentally quite feasible especially when $n$ is small [32]. If one takes $\hat{\rho} = \hat{\rho}' = |n\rangle\langle n|$, the filter function Eq. (24) becomes

$$f(x, p) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \left[ L_n \left( \frac{x^2 + p^2}{2} \right) \right]^2 \exp \left( -\frac{x^2 + p^2}{2} \right), \quad (29)$$

where $L_n(\cdot)$ is the Laguerre polynomial. $f(x, 0)$ for $n = 0, 1, 2, 3$ is shown in Fig. 4. The distance from the origin to the first zero of $f$ scales as $n^{-1/2}$. Thus, roughly speaking, for sufficiently small $v$ and when $(y_x, y_p) = (0, 0)$ is post-selected, $f$ acts like a Gaussian function of variance $\sim n^{-1}$, therefore Fock states are candidates for good sensor states. Note that when $\hat{\rho} = \hat{\rho}^*$, $f(x, p)$ always has a maximum value $1/(2\pi)$ at the origin.

Figure 3 shows the relation between $v$ and $v'$, when one takes $\hat{\rho} = \hat{\rho}' = |n\rangle\langle n|$ for $n = 1, 2, 3$ and $(y_x, y_p) = (0, 0)$ is post-selected. For comparison, the Bayesian estimation error $\hat{\nu}_{\text{Bayes}}$ without post-selection (Eq. (7)) for $n = 1$ is also shown. One can see that the estimation accuracy is improved by post-selection, and even when $n = 1$, the Gaussian bound is beaten in some range of $v$. We also calculated the effect of photon losses on both input states for the case $\hat{\rho} = \hat{\rho}' = |1\rangle\langle 1|$, as is important for an actual experimental realization (Fig. 5). We assumed the same amount of losses for $\hat{\rho}$ and $\hat{\rho}'$. Losses up to 8.9% and 50% are allowed for beating the Gaussian bound and the classical bound, respectively.

Note that practically post-selecting a single value of $(y_x, y_p)$ is impossible, and one has to select events in some range of $(y_x, y_p)$ to have sufficiently high post-selection probability. In Appendix C we included an analysis of the case selecting finite range of outcomes with finite probability, in the single-photon case.
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**FIG. 3.** The relation between $v$ and $v'$. ‘$n = 1$’, ‘$n = 2$’, ‘$n = 3$’ when $\hat{\rho} = \hat{\rho}' = |n\rangle\langle n|$, and $(y_x, y_p) = (0, 0)$ is post-selected. ‘GKP’: when $\hat{\rho} = \hat{\rho}' = (\text{GKP})^\dagger\text{(GKP)}$, and $(y_x, y_p) = (0, 0)$ is post-selected. ‘$v_{\text{Bayes}}(n = 1)$’: when $\hat{\rho} = \hat{\rho}' = |1\rangle\langle 1|$, and without post-selection. $v_C$ and $v_G$ are the classical and Gaussian bounds derived in Sec. III respectively.
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**FIG. 4.** The filter function $f(x, 0)$ when $\hat{\rho} = \hat{\rho}' = |n\rangle\langle n|$ for $n = 0, 1, 2, 3$ (Eq. (29)).
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**FIG. 5.** The relation between $v$ and $v'$, when $\hat{\rho} = \hat{\rho}' = (1 - l) |1\rangle\langle 1| + l |0\rangle\langle 0|$, where $l$ corresponds to the photon loss rate.

V. ANALYSIS ON LOWER BOUNDS FOR NON-GAUSSIAN STATES

We return to the general setting in Sec. II. One natural matter of interest is to find better sensor states, and find the limit of estimation using non-Gaussian states. Generally, preparation of non-Gaussian states with large
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V. ANALYSIS ON LOWER BOUNDS FOR NON-GAUSSIAN STATES

We return to the general setting in Sec. II. One natural matter of interest is to find better sensor states, and find the limit of estimation using non-Gaussian states. Generally, preparation of non-Gaussian states with large
maximum photon number of $\hat{n}$. In this section, we discuss lower bounds on $\nu'$, when $\hat{\rho}$ is a superposition of Fock states up to the maximum photon number $n$.

In quantum estimation theory, the Cramér-Rao bound [12,14,33,34] is often used to obtain a lower bound on the estimation error. When some a priori information is used, a similar inequality called Van Trees inequality is used instead [12,35,36]. However, those inequalities cannot be directly applied to our case, because we consider post-selection of the measurement outcome. We derived a variant of Van Trees inequality, including the effect of post-selection, for our displacement estimation problem. See Appendix A for the detailed derivation. According to our inequality, a lower bound for $\nu'$, when the measurement outcome is $y$, is given by

\[ \nu' \geq \frac{4}{F_0(y) + F(y)}, \tag{30} \]

where $F_0(y)$ and $F(y)$ are defined as:

\[
F_0(y) := \sum_i \int p(\theta | y) \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_i^2} \log p(\theta) \right) d\theta, \tag{31}
\]

\[
F(y) := \sum_i \int p(\theta | y) \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_i^2} \log p(y | \theta) \right) d\theta. \tag{32}
\]

Here we write $\theta := (\theta_1, \theta_2) := (\xi, \eta)$, $\hat{q}_1, \hat{q}_2) := (\hat{x}, \hat{p})$, and $d\theta := d\theta_1 d\theta_2$. The quantities $F(y)$ and $F_0(y)$ can be considered as variants of Fisher information. There is an upper bound on $F(y)$:

\[ F(y) \leq \sum_i \int d\theta \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_i^2} \frac{p(\theta)}{p(y)} \right) \text{Tr} \left\{ (2\hat{q}_i \hat{\rho} \hat{q}_i + \hat{q}_i^2 \hat{\rho} + \hat{\rho} \hat{q}_i^2) \hat{E}_{y|\theta} \right\}, \tag{33}\]

where

\[ \hat{E}_{y|\theta} := \hat{D}^\dagger(\theta) \hat{E}_y \hat{D}(\theta) \tag{34} \]

(see Appendix A for the derivation). For the Gaussian prior distribution Eq. (2), $F_0(y)$ is simply a constant:

\[ F_0(y) = \frac{4}{\nu}. \tag{35} \]

Therefore, inequality Eq. (30) can be transformed as

\[ \frac{1}{\nu'} \leq \frac{1}{\nu} + \frac{F(y)}{4}. \tag{36} \]

A rough upper bound for $F(y)$, in the case when the maximum photon number of $\hat{\rho}$ is $n$, can be obtained using the Schwarz inequality. For pure $\hat{\rho} = |\psi\rangle \langle \psi|$, we have

\[
\sum_i \text{Tr} \left\{ \hat{q}_i \hat{\rho} \hat{q}_i \hat{E}_{y|\theta} \right\} \leq \sqrt{\sum_i \text{Tr} \left\{ \hat{q}_i^2 \hat{\rho} \hat{q}_i^2 \hat{E}_{y|\theta} \right\}^2} \sqrt{2 \text{Tr} \hat{E}_y^2}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{\sum_i \langle \psi | \hat{q}_i^2 | \psi \rangle^2} \sqrt{2 \text{Tr} \hat{E}_y^2}
\]

\[
\leq \sqrt{\sum_i \langle \psi | \hat{q}_i^2 | \psi \rangle} \sqrt{2 \text{Tr} \hat{E}_y^2}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{\nu (2n+1) |\psi\rangle \langle \psi|} \sqrt{2 \text{Tr} \hat{E}_y^2}
\]

\[
\leq \sqrt{2 (2n+1)} \sqrt{\nu} \sqrt{2 \text{Tr} \hat{E}_y^2}.
\]

Here we used the Schwarz inequality with respect to the inner product $\langle A, B \rangle := \sum_i \text{Tr} \left\{ \hat{A}_i \hat{B}^\dagger \right\}$ in the first inequality, taking $\hat{A}_i = \hat{q}_i \hat{\rho} \hat{q}_i$, $\hat{B}_i = \hat{E}^{\dagger}_{y|\theta}$. The second inequality follows from the fact that $x^2 + y^2 \leq (x+y)^2$ for $x, y > 0$. In the same way, considering an inner product $\langle A, B \rangle := \text{Tr} \left\{ \hat{A} \hat{B}^\dagger \right\}$ and taking $\hat{A} = \sum_i \hat{q}_i^2 \hat{\rho}$ and $\hat{B} = \hat{E}_{y|\theta}$, we get

\[
\sum_i \text{Tr} \left\{ \hat{q}_i^2 \hat{\rho} \hat{E}_{y|\theta} \right\} \leq \sqrt{\text{Tr} \left\{ \sum_i \hat{q}_i^2 \hat{\rho} \right\} \text{Tr} \hat{E}_y^2}
\]

\[
\leq \sqrt{\nu (\sum_i \hat{q}_i^2 \hat{\rho})} \sqrt{\text{Tr} \hat{E}_y^2}
\]

\[
\leq \sqrt{\nu (2n+1)^2} \sqrt{\nu} \sqrt{\text{Tr} \hat{E}_y^2}
\]

\[
\leq \sqrt{(2n+1) \text{Tr} \hat{E}_y^2}.
\]

Therefore, from Eq. (33), we obtain

\[ F(y) \leq \frac{(2\nu + 2)(2n+1)}{\nu} \frac{\sqrt{\text{Tr} \hat{E}_y^2}}{p(y)}. \tag{39} \]

Since the left-hand sides of Eqs. (37) and (38) are linear in $\hat{\rho}$, the bound Eq. (39) also holds for arbitrary mixed $\hat{\rho}$. Eqs. (37) and (38) give a lower bound of $\nu'$.

The $O(n)$ upper bound of $F(y)$ is similar to the result in Ref. [18], which studies the case with no prior information, and derives a $O(n)$ upper bound for the Fisher information.

VI. CONCLUSION

We have considered the problem of estimating the amount of displacement following a Gaussian distribution of variance $\nu/2$, and shown that there is a lower bound on the estimation error $\nu'$, as long as only Gaussian states and Gaussian operations are used. This bound can be beaten for some range of $\nu$, using linear optics and simple non-Gaussian states such as single-photon states,
while it can be reduced more drastically using the GKP state. When the maximum photon number of the sensor state is $n$, $1/v' - 1/v$ has an $O(n)$ upper bound.

One possible future work is to find the best sensor state and POVM for a given constraint, e.g. maximum photon number. The bound Eqs. (39) and (36) derived in this paper is not necessarily tight, but for quantum estimation of displacement, many kinds of lower bounds for the estimation error are known [37,39], and some of them have been shown to be efficiently solvable [40,41]. They can be extended to our setting with post-selection.

Our work is also related to quantum error correction [6], because the random displacement following an isotropic Gaussian distribution can be considered as a Gaussian quantum channel [22], which is a common type of noise in bosonic systems, and the problem of estimating the displacement is similar to the error syndrome measurement in CV quantum error correcting codes such as the GKP code [21], or the two-mode squeezing code [42]. Since the Gaussian limit derived in this paper is considered to correspond to the impossibility of correcting Gaussian errors using Gaussian states [8], extending the method proposed in this paper may lead to a Gaussian error correction protocol using only experimentally feasible non-Gaussian states such as single photon states, which is important from a practical point of view.
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Appendix A: Derivation of a variant of Van Trees inequality with post-selection

We consider the estimation problem described in Sec. [11] We write $\xi, \eta$ as $\theta_1, \theta_2$, and $\hat{x}, \hat{p}$ as $\hat{q}_1, \hat{q}_2$ in this section, for convenience. We also just write $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$ as $\theta$, and $d\theta_1, d\theta_2$ as $d\theta$.

Let us denote the estimated value of $\theta_i$ by $\hat{\theta}_i(y)$. The Van Trees inequality [12,35,36], also called Bayesian Cramér-Rao inequality gives a lower bound for the Bayesian estimation error. In a weaker form than the original matrix inequality, it can be written as

$$\sum_i \int d\theta \left( \hat{\theta}_i(y) - \theta_i \right)^2 p(y, \theta) \geq \frac{4}{F_{0}^{(VT)} + F^{(VT)}},$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{(A1)}$$

where

$$F_{0}^{(VT)} := \sum_i \int d\theta p(\theta) \left( -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_i^2} \log p(\theta) \right),$$

$$F^{(VT)} := \sum_i \int dy \int d\theta p(y, \theta) \left( -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_i^2} \log p(y|\theta) \right).$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{(A2)}$$

$F_{0}^{(VT)}$ is the $a$ priori Fisher information of the prior distribution $p(\theta)$, and $F^{(VT)}$ is the expectation value of the Fisher information with respect to the prior distribution of $\theta$, which can be considered as the average information obtained by the measurement. Eq. (A1) can be used to evaluate the mean square error of the estimator, averaged over the measurement outcome $y$ and the parameter $\theta$. However, the Van Trees inequality cannot be directly applied to our case, because we allow post-selection of $y$. To generalize the Van Trees inequality for the case including post-selection, consider the following equation

$$\sum_i \int (\hat{\theta}_i(y) - \theta_i) \frac{\partial p(\theta|y)}{\partial \theta_i} d\theta = 2,$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{(A3)}$$

which can be shown using a partial integration. Using the Schwarz inequality, one obtains

$$\sum_i \int (\hat{\theta}_i(y) - \theta_i)^2 p(\theta|y) d\theta \geq \frac{4}{\tilde{F}(y)},$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{(A4)}$$

where $\tilde{F}(y)$ is

$$\tilde{F}(y) := \sum_i \int \frac{1}{p(\theta|y)} \left( \frac{\partial p(\theta|y)}{\partial \theta_i} \right)^2 d\theta = \sum_i \int \left( \frac{\partial p(\theta|y)}{\partial \theta_i} \right) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} \log p(\theta|y) \right) d\theta \hspace{1cm} \text{(A5)}$$

$\tilde{F}(y)$ can be further decomposed as

$$\tilde{F}(y) = F_{0}(y) + F(y),$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{(A6)}$$

$$F_{0}(y) := \sum_i \int p(\theta|y) \left( -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_i^2} \log p(\theta) \right) d\theta,$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{(A7)}$$

$$F(y) := \sum_i \int p(\theta|y) \left( -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_i^2} \log p(y|\theta) \right) d\theta.$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{(A8)}$$

Equation (A4), together with Eqs. (A6), (A7), and (A8) gives the generalized Van Trees inequality with post-selection. $F_{0}^{(VT)}$ and $F^{(VT)}$ can be obtained as the expectation values of $F_{0}(y)$ and $F(y)$ with respect to $p(y)$. Therefore, if one takes the expectation values of both
sides of Eq. \((A4)\) with respect to \(p(y)\), and uses the concavity of the function \(1/t\), one obtains
\[
\sum_i \int dy \int d\theta \left( \theta_i(y) - \theta_i \right)^2 p(y, \theta) \geq \frac{4}{\int p(F(y)) dy},
\]
which reproduces Eq. \((A1)\). To find an expression for \(F(y)\) in our case, one transforms Eq. \((A8)\) as
\[
F(y) = \sum_i \int p(\theta(y)) \left( \frac{-\partial^2}{\partial \theta_i^2} \log p(\theta) \right) d\theta
= \sum_i \int \frac{p(\theta)}{p(y)} \left( \frac{1}{p(y)} \frac{\partial p(y)}{\partial \theta_i} \right)^2 - \frac{\partial^2 p(y)}{\partial \theta_i^2} d\theta.
\]
Using that from Eq. \((3)\),
\[
p(y|\theta) = \text{Tr} \hat{D}_y \hat{E}_y \hat{D}(\theta),
\]
one can explicitly calculate terms in Eq. \((A10)\) as
\[
\sum_i \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} \text{Tr} \left( \hat{D}_y \hat{E}_y \hat{D}(\theta) \right) \right)^2 = - \sum_i \text{Tr} \left( \hat{q}_i \hat{\rho} - \hat{\rho} \hat{q}_i \right)^2,
\]
resulting in
\[
F(y) = \sum_i \int d\theta \frac{p(\theta)}{p(y)} \left[ \text{Tr} \left( \hat{q}_i \hat{\rho} - \hat{\rho} \hat{q}_i \right) \hat{E}_y \right]^2 \text{Tr} \left( \hat{D}_y \hat{E}_y \hat{D}(\theta) \right)
+ \text{Tr} \left( \left( 2 \hat{q}_i \hat{\rho} \hat{q}_i - \hat{\rho} \hat{q}_i \hat{\rho} \hat{q}_i \right) \hat{E}_y \right).
\]
An upper bound of \(F(y)\), with a slightly simpler form can be obtained by applying the Schwarz inequality to
\[
\text{Tr} \left( \hat{q}_i \hat{\rho} \hat{E}_y \right) = \text{Tr} \left( \hat{E}_y^{1/2} \hat{q}_i \hat{\rho}^{1/2} \hat{E}_y^{1/2} \right),
\]
resulting in
\[
F(y) \leq \sum_i \int d\theta \frac{p(\theta)}{p(y)} \text{Tr} \left( \left( 2 \hat{q}_i \hat{\rho} \hat{q}_i + \hat{\rho} \hat{q}_i \hat{\rho} \hat{q}_i \right) \hat{E}_y \right).
\]

**Appendix B: Derivation of Eq. \((18)\)**

Suppose \(A, B\) are positive definite \(2 \times 2\) matrices. Then, we have
\[
\det(A + B) = \det(A) \det \left( I + A^{-1/2}BA^{-1/2} \right),
\]
where \(I\) is the identity matrix. Since \(A^{-1/2}BA^{-1/2}\) is positive definite and \(\det(A^{-1/2}BA^{-1/2}) = \det B / \det A\), we can denote 2 eigenvalues of \(A^{-1/2}BA^{-1/2}\) as \(x\) and \(1 / \det A\). Then, we get
\[
\det \left( I + A^{-1/2}BA^{-1/2} \right) = (1 + x) \left( 1 + \frac{1}{x} \frac{\det B}{\det A} \right)
= 1 + \frac{\det B}{\det A} + x + \frac{\det B}{\det A} \
\geq 1 + \frac{\det B}{\det A} + 2 \sqrt{\frac{\det B}{\det A}},
\]
From Eqs. \((B1)\) and \((B2)\), Eq. \((18)\) is obtained.

**Appendix C: Analysis of the case with a finite post-selection probability**

We consider the setup in Sec. \[IV\] and take \(\hat{\rho} = |1\rangle \langle 1|\). Rather than post-selecting a single point \((y_x, y_p) = (0, 0)\), we post-select a range \(y_x^2 + y_p^2 \leq r^2\) for \(r > 0\). By increasing \(r \to \infty\), the post-selection probability converges to 1. We define the estimation error \((v')\) as the average of \(v'\) within the selected range of \(y\):
\[
\langle v' \rangle = \int_{y_x^2 + y_p^2 \leq r^2} v'(y_x, y_p) p(y_x, y_p) dy_x dy_p / p(y_x^2 + y_p^2 \leq r^2),
\]
where \(p(y_x^2 + y_p^2 \leq r^2)\) is the post-selection probability:
\[
p(y_x^2 + y_p^2 \leq r^2) = \int_{y_x^2 + y_p^2 \leq r^2} p(y_x, y_p) dy_x dy_p
\]
In Fig. \[6\] the relation between the post-selection probability and \(\langle v' \rangle\) is plotted, for \(v = 0.5, 1.0, 1.5\) (See also Fig. \[3\].)
FIG. 6. The relation between the post-selection probability (Eq. (C2)) and $\langle \psi' \rangle$ (Eq. (C1)) for $v = 0.5, 1.0, 1.5$, when we take $\hat{\rho} = \hat{\psi} = |1\rangle \langle 1|$ in the setup in Sec. IV and post-select a range $y_c^2 + y_p^2 \leq r^2$ for $r > 0$. 

