On the properties of the asymptotic incompatibility measure in multiparameter quantum estimation

Alessandro Candeloro$^{1,2}$, Matteo G.A. Paris$^{1,2}$, Marco G. Genoni$^{1,2}$

$^1$ Quantum Technology Lab, Dipartimento di Fisica Aldo Pontremoli, Università degli Studi di Milano, I - 20133, Milano, Italy

$^2$ Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Milano, I - 20133, Milano, Italy

E-mail: alessandro.candeloro@unimi.it, matteo.paris@fisica.unimi.it, marco.genoni@fisica.unimi.it

Abstract. We address the use of asymptotic incompatibility (AI) to assess the quantumness of a multiparameter quantum statistical model. AI is a recently introduced measure which quantifies the difference between the Holevo and the SLD scalar bounds, and can be evaluated using only the symmetric logarithmic derivative (SLD) operators of the model. At first, we evaluate analytically the AI of the most general quantum statistical models involving two-level (qubit) and single-mode Gaussian continuous-variable quantum systems, and prove that AI is a simple monotonous function of the state purity. Then, we numerically investigate the same problem for qudits ($d$-dimensional quantum systems, with $2 < d \leq 4$), showing that, while in general AI is not in general a function of purity, we have enough numerical evidence to conclude that the maximum amount of AI is achievable only for quantum statistical models characterized by a purity larger than $\mu_{\min} = 1/(d - 1)$. In addition, by parametrizing qudit states as thermal (Gibbs) states, numerical results suggest that, once the spectrum of the Hamiltonian is fixed, the AI measure is in one-to-one correspondence with the fictitious temperature parameter $\beta$ characterizing the family of density operators. Finally, by studying in detail the definition and properties of the AI measure we find that: i) given a quantum statistical model, one can readily identify the maximum number of asymptotically compatible parameters; ii) the AI of a quantum statistical model bounds from above the AI of any sub-model that can be defined by fixing one or more of the original unknown parameters (or functions thereof), leading to possibly useful bounds on the AI of models involving noisy quantum dynamics.
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1. Introduction

Quantum metrology is currently revolutionizing the field of parameter estimation and sensing by enhancing precision to a level that cannot be achieved via purely classical
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Most of the paradigmatic results in quantum metrology have been obtained for the estimation of single parameters, typically corresponding to a phase or a frequency. In those cases, the ultimate and in principle achievable bounds are derived in terms of the quantum Fisher information, which is in turn obtained via the symmetric logarithmic derivative (SLD) operator \( [4, 5] \). The extension to the multiparameter case is however not straightforward \([6, 7, 8, 9]\). In fact, besides the expected complications due to the fact that one needs to estimate more than one parameter, the peculiar properties of quantum mechanics make this extension definitely non-trivial. In particular, the (potential) non-commutativity of the optimal measurements corresponding to different parameters poses more fundamental and interesting questions. A bound to precision of multiparameter estimation may be obtained by generalizing the single-parameter case, i.e. using the SLD operators corresponding to the different parameters. On the other hand, several other bounds may be introduced, the most relevant being the one based on the right logarithmic derivative operator \([10]\), and the so-called Holevo bound \([11]\).

In general, all these bounds are not tight, i.e. it is not guaranteed that there exists a quantum measurement that allows to saturate them. However, the Holevo bound stands out as the most fundamental (scalar) bound for quantum multiparameter estimation as it may be saturated by performing collective measurements on an asymptotically large number of copies of the quantum state encoding the set of parameters \([12, 13]\). Moreover, in some cases, e.g. for pure states \([14]\) and for the estimation of a displacement by Gaussian probes \([11]\), the Holevo bound can be achieved also in the standard scenario, i.e. by single-copy measurements. These fundamental aspects have been investigated in several multiparameter problems that may have practical applications in the quantum regimes, such as superresolution of incoherent sources \([15, 16, 17, 18]\), estimation of multiple phases (or in general of unitary parameters) \([19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31]\), and estimation of phase and noise \([32, 33, 34, 27, 35, 30]\).

Recently, the difference between the SLD and the Holevo bound led to more fundamental studies, focusing on the incompatibility of parameters and leading to the definition of measures able to capture this particular aspect \([36, 37]\). In particular in \([36]\), a quantity has been introduced to quantify the quantumness of a quantum multiparameter problem. This quantity, denoted by \( R_\lambda \), is equal to zero if and only if the Holevo bound coincides with the SLD based bound, and thus if the parameters to be estimated are asymptotically compatible. Similarly, it takes its largest value \( R_\lambda = 1 \) when the difference between the Holevo and the SLD bound is maximum, that is when the parameters are highly incompatible even in the asymptotic regime. Given these properties, in the following we will refer to \( R_\lambda \) as asymptotic incompatibility (AI). The properties of AI has been discussed in relationship with the phase diagram of a quantum many-body system in \([36]\), while its main properties and its behaviour for estimation problems encoded in qubit systems have been thoroughly investigated in \([38]\).

In this paper, we focus on the fundamental properties of the AI measure \( R_\lambda \). We study its relationship with the purity of the density operators defining the quantum statistical model, and prove that for some classes of states, the two quantities are indeed in one-to-one correspondence. More in general, we find evidence that the maximum amount of incompatibility may be achieved only for purity exceeding a threshold depending on the dimension of the Hilbert space. We conjecture that this may be a general property of quantum statistical models. Moreover, we derive some
bounds on the AI measure for quantum statistical submodels, and provide a method to directly identify the maximum number of compatible parameters in certain estimation problems.

The manuscript is organized as follows: in Sec. 2 we review the main aspects of multiparameter quantum estimation and we introduce the AI measure $R_{\lambda}$. In Sec. 3, we show our main results concerning the relationship between the AI measure and the purity of the quantum states, while in Sec. 4 we will derive further properties regarding the AI of parameters of specific quantum statistical models. Sec. 5 closes the paper with some concluding remarks.

2. Quantum multiparameter estimation

The goal of typical metrological problem is to estimate the value of a set $\lambda$ of $p$ independent parameters from a set of $M$ possible outcomes $x = \{x_1, x_2, ..., x_M\}$ that depend on a conditional probability distribution $p(x|\lambda)$ that is referred to as statistical model. The estimated value of the parameters is obtained via an estimator function $\hat{\lambda}(x)$. If we denote by $E_{\lambda}[\hat{\lambda}]$ the mean value of the function $\hat{\lambda}$ over the probability distribution $p(x|\lambda)$, then the precision of any unbiased estimator is given in terms of the covariance matrix $\text{Cov}_{\lambda}[\hat{\lambda}] = E_{\lambda}\left[ (\hat{\lambda} - E_{\lambda}[\hat{\lambda}])_\alpha (\hat{\lambda} - E_{\lambda}[\hat{\lambda}])_\beta \right]$. The latter satisfies the classical Cramér-Rao (CCR) bound

$$\text{Cov}_{\lambda}[\hat{\lambda}] \geq \frac{1}{M} F^{c}(\lambda)^{-1},$$

(1)

where the classical Fisher Information matrix (CFIM) is defined via its elements

$$F^{c}_{\alpha\beta}(\lambda) = \int d\chi p(x|\lambda) \left[ \partial_\alpha \log p(x|\lambda) \right] \left[ \partial_\beta \log p(x|\lambda) \right].$$

(2)

The inequality must be understood as the fact that $\text{Cov}_{\lambda}[\hat{\lambda}] - M^{-1} F^{c}(\lambda)^{-1}$ is a semi-definite positive matrix [39, 40, 41]. Classical estimation theory studies the conditions for the attainability of the CCRB and optimal estimators are the ones for which the inequality is saturated. In the limit of a large number of measurements $M \to \infty$, the maximum likelihood estimator is proven to be optimal [42].

Moving to the quantum realm, the parameters are encoded in a family of density operators $\rho_\lambda$ referred to as a quantum statistical model. As a consequence, the conditional probabilities of observing a certain outcome are obtained through the Born rule $p(k|\lambda) = \text{Tr}[\rho_\lambda \Pi_k]$. These depends on the measurement process involved, which can be described in its generality by a POVM, i.e by a set of operators $\Pi = \{\Pi_k | \Pi_k \geq 0, \sum_k \Pi_k = \hat{I}\}$. By using different approaches, measurement-independent bounds on the matrix covariance have been introduced [6, 8, 9]. Among them, in this paper we are going to deal first with the bound obtained via the symmetric logarithmic derivative (SLD) operators, that is typically referred to as SLD-bound. SLD operators $\hat{L}_\alpha$, are defined implicitly as the solutions of the Lyapunov equations

$$\partial_\alpha g_\lambda = \frac{\hat{L}_\alpha g_\lambda + g_\lambda \hat{L}_\alpha}{2}.$$  

(3)

The corresponding SLD quantum Fisher information matrix (QFIM) is obtained via the formula

$$Q_{\alpha\beta}(\lambda) = \text{Tr} \left[ g_\lambda \frac{\hat{L}_\alpha \hat{L}_\beta + \hat{L}_\beta \hat{L}_\alpha}{2} \right],$$

(4)
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and the corresponding SLD quantum Cramer-Rao (QCR) matrix bound reads [41],

\[ \text{Cov}_{\lambda}[^{\lambda}] \geq Q(\lambda)^{-1}. \] (5)

It can be shown that his bound is in fact achievable for single-parameter estimation [4, 43, 44], and the optimal POVM corresponds to the eigenstates of the SLD operator. If we now consider the multiparameter case \( p > 1 \), the different SLD operators may not commute, and an optimal simultaneous estimation of all the parameters can not be in general obtained. As a consequence, the QCR matrix bound may not always be achievable and bounds more informative than the one provided by the SLD operators may exist.

To gain more insight, scalar bounds have been introduced by the use of a weight matrix \( \mathbf{W} \), a real and positive definite matrix of dimension \( p \times p \). The SLD-QCR scalar bound obtainable from Equation (5) can be written as follow

\[ \text{Tr} \left[ \mathbf{W} \text{Cov}_{\lambda}[^{\lambda}] \right] \geq C^S(\lambda, \mathbf{W}) = \text{Tr} \left[ \mathbf{W}Q(\lambda)^{-1} \right]. \] (6)

The role of the weight matrix \( \mathbf{W} \) is twofold: it can be seen as a way to balance the precision of different parameters as well as a change of parametrization. Indeed, a reparametrization \( \gamma = \gamma(\lambda) \) lead us to a new QFIM, which is determined be the reparametrization matrix \( B_{\alpha\beta} = \partial \lambda_{\beta} / \partial \gamma_{\alpha} \) as [45]

\[ Q(\gamma) = BQ(\lambda)B^T. \] (7)

Likewise the matrix bound, also the scalar-QCR bound \( C^S(\mathbf{W}, \gamma) \) changes, and according to the definition (6), it correspond to the bound for the set of parameters \( \lambda \) with a weight matrix \( \mathbf{W}' = B^{-1}\mathbf{W}B^T \).

As its matrix counterpart, the SLD-QCR scalar bound (6) is not in general attainable due to the incompatibility of the optimal measurements corresponding to the different parameters. The problem of finding the most informative scalar bound was addressed by Holevo in [11]. The solution takes the name of Holevo Cramér-Rao bound (HCRB) and it will be denoted by \( C^H(\lambda, \mathbf{W}) \). It represents the most informative bound for the asymptotically model in which a collective measurement is performed on an asymptotically large number of copies of the state \( \varrho_{\lambda}^n = \bigotimes_{j=1}^n \varrho_{\lambda} \), with \( n \to \infty \) [12, 13]. In this limit, the bound is indeed achievable and for this reason it is typically considered as the most fundamental scalar bound for quantum multiparameter estimation. However, the evaluation of the HCRB requires a non-trivial minimization (see Appendix A for the formal definition of the HCRB). Nonetheless, some results have been obtained both numerically and even analytically under some assumptions on the quantum statistical model [33, 23, 46, 28, 29, 30, 47, 48, 49, 50]

2.1. Asymptotic incompatibility measure

As observed before, in a multiparameter scenario the optimal strategies for each single parameter estimation may not be compatible and as a result the lower bound (6) can not always be attained. A key object in this respect is the commutator \( [\hat{L}_S^\alpha, \hat{L}_S^\beta] \) between the different SLD-operators: if this commutator is equal to zero for all the parameters in \( \lambda \), all the SLD-bound are indeed achievable. However, as we will describe in a moment, its average value over the quantum statistical model \( g_{\lambda} \) plays an important role too. Typically this quantity is introduced via the so-called Uhlmann
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(or Berry) curvature [51, 8], defined via its matrix elements

$$U_{\alpha\beta}(\lambda) := -\frac{i}{2} \text{Tr}\left[\rho_\lambda \left[\hat{L}_\alpha^S, \hat{L}_\beta^S \right]\right].$$

(8)

One proves that a necessary and sufficient condition for the attainability of the SLD-QCR scalar bound (6) in the asymptotic limit is given by the compatibility condition, or weak commutativity, $$\mathbf{U} = 0$$ [52]. If this condition is fulfilled, that is if all the SLD operators commute on average, then $$C^H(\lambda, \mathbf{W}) = C^S(\lambda, \mathbf{W})$$, i.e. the SLD-QCR scalar bound can be attained in the asymptotic model $$\rho_\lambda^{\otimes n}$$.

More recent results have shown how the HCRB can be bounded from above as follows

$$C^S(\lambda, \mathbf{W}) \leq C^H(\lambda, \mathbf{W}) \leq (1 + \mathcal{R}_\lambda) C^S(\lambda, \mathbf{W}) \leq 2 C^S(\lambda, \mathbf{W})$$

(9)

that is $$C^H(\lambda, \mathbf{W})$$ cannot be larger than two times the SLD QCR scalar bound. In the chain of inequalities above, we have introduced the following parameter

$$\mathcal{R}_\lambda = \|i \mathbf{Q}(\lambda)^{-1} \mathbf{U}(\lambda)\|_{\infty},$$

(10)

where $$\|\mathbf{A}\|_{\infty}$$ denotes the largest eigenvalue of the matrix $$\mathbf{A}$$. In the rest of the manuscript we will focus on this quantity, that has been introduced, as a quantumness parameter, in [36] and studied in detail for qubit systems in [38]. As already suggested in Eq. (9), one can prove that

$$0 \leq \mathcal{R}_\lambda \leq 1,$$

and in particular that $$\mathcal{R}_\lambda = 0$$ if and only if $$\mathbf{U}(\lambda) = 0$$, that is when the model is asymptotically compatible. We also remark that, as shown in [38] the quantity $$\mathcal{R}_\lambda$$ is a property of the quantum statistical model $$\rho_\lambda$$ only, being also independent on possible reparametrization and, as a consequence, on the weight matrix $$\mathbf{W}$$. For all these reasons, in the following we will refer to $$\mathcal{R}_\lambda$$ as a measure of asymptotic incompatibility (AI) of the quantum statistical model $$\rho_\lambda$$ (we also refer to [38] for a list of other properties of $$\mathcal{R}_\lambda$$).

3. Asymptotic incompatibility and purity of the quantum statistical model

In this section we discuss the relationship between the asymptotic incompatibility measure $$\mathcal{R}_\lambda$$ and the purity of the quantum state $$\rho_\lambda$$ corresponding to the quantum statistical model under exam. We will mainly focus to scenarios where $$\rho_\lambda$$ describes the most general quantum state of a particular quantum system, starting from the simplest cases of a qubit and of a single-mode Gaussian continuous-variable quantum state, and then moving our attention to qudits, that is to quantum states living in a $$d$$-dimensional Hilbert space.

3.1. Asymptotic incompatibility for qubit systems

A generic mixed qubit state is typically written as

$$\rho_\lambda = \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbb{1} + \sum_{j=1}^{3} \gamma_j \sigma_j\right),$$

(11)

where the matrices $$\sigma_j$$ denote the Pauli matrices, while $$\gamma_1 = r \sin \theta \cos \phi$$, $$\gamma_2 = r \sin \theta \sin \phi$$, $$\gamma_3 = r \cos \theta$$. By considering the set of $$p = 3$$ parameters $$\lambda = (r, \theta, \phi)$$
characterizing the vector in the Bloch sphere, one can readily derive the SLD operators
by solving the corresponding Lyapunov equations, and obtains the SLD-QFI and the
Uhlmann curvature matrices

$$Q(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{1}{1 - r^2} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & r^2 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & r^2 \sin^2 \theta
\end{pmatrix},
$$
\hspace{1cm}
(12)

$$U(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & r^3 \sin \theta \\
0 & -r^3 \sin \theta & 0
\end{pmatrix}.
$$
\hspace{1cm}
(13)

The corresponding AI measure has been already derived in [38], obtaining
$$R_{\text{qubit}} = r.
$$

The purity of the quantum state $\rho(\lambda)$ can be easily evaluated, obtaining
$$\mu = \text{Tr}[\rho(\lambda)^2] = \frac{1 + r^2}{2},
$$
and thus leading to the result
$$R_{\text{qubit}} = \sqrt{2\mu - 1}.
$$

We thus observe how to AI $R_{\text{qubit}}$ is indeed a monotonic function of the purity of
the quantum state, and that in particular it takes its limiting value $R_{\text{qubit}} = 0$ for the
maximally mixed state, and $R_{\text{qubit}} = 1$ for pure states only.

3.2. Asymptotic incompatibility for a single-mode continuous-variable Gaussian system

As a second example we now consider a single-mode continuous-variable quantum
system, described by annihilation and creation operators satisfying the canonical
commutation relation $[\hat{a}, \hat{a}^\dagger] = 1$. Quantum states describing such systems belongs to
an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space. A well known subclass of such states is given by
Gaussian states, typically defined as those states having a Gaussian Wigner function
[53, 54]. These states have been indeed studied in great detail, both for the simple
mathematical formulation (they can be fully described by first and second moments
of the quadrature operators $q = (\hat{a} + \hat{a}^\dagger)/\sqrt{2}$ and $p = i(\hat{a}^\dagger - \hat{a})/\sqrt{2}$) and for practical
and fundamental reasons (they can be easily generated in the lab, and they can be
exploited for implementing quantum technology protocols as quantum teleportation).
We leave more details on Gaussian states in Appendix B, along with the formulas
needed to evaluate the SLD-QFI and the Uhlmann curvature matrices.

We here address the problem of complete estimating an arbitrary single mode Gaussian
state, which can be parametrized by $p = 5$ parameters, resulting from the application
of a complex squeezing operator $S(\xi) = \exp(\frac{1}{2} (\xi^2 - \xi^* a^2))$ and a complex
displacement operator $D(\alpha) = \exp(\alpha a^\dagger - \alpha^* a)$ on a thermal state $\nu_N = e^{\beta a a^\dagger}/Z$
with average photon number $\text{Tr}[\nu_N a a^\dagger] = N$. The corresponding quantum statistical
model is thus represented by the family of density operators [54]

$$\rho(\lambda) = D(\alpha) S(\xi) \nu_N S(\xi)^\dagger D(\alpha)^\dagger,
$$
\hspace{1cm}
(15)

with a parametrization in terms of the set $\lambda = \{R\alpha, I\alpha, r, \varphi, N\}$, and where we
have written the two complex parameters as $\xi = re^{i\varphi}$ and $\alpha = R\alpha + iI\alpha$. The first
moments vector $d = (\text{Tr}[\rho(\lambda) q], \text{Tr}[\rho(\lambda) p])^T$ has elements

$$\text{Tr}[\rho(\lambda) q] = \sqrt{2} R\alpha ,
$$
\hspace{1cm}
(16a)

$$\text{Tr}[\rho(\lambda) p] = \sqrt{2} I\alpha .
$$
\hspace{1cm}
(16b)
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while the elements of the covariance matrix (CM) (see Appendix B for details) can be expanded in terms of symmetric $2 \times 2$ matrices, i.e. $\sigma = s_1 \sigma_x + s_2 I_2 + s_3 \sigma_z$ (with $\sigma_x$ and $\sigma_z$ denoting the standard Pauli matrices), obtaining

$$s_1 = -(2N + 1) \sinh(2r) \sin(\varphi), \quad (17a)$$
$$s_2 = (2N + 1) \cosh(2r), \quad (17b)$$
$$s_3 = (2N + 1) \sinh(2r) \cos(\varphi). \quad (17c)$$

The matrix elements for the SLD-QFI matrix and for the Uhlmann curvature matrix can be directly evaluated via the formulas

$$Q_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[(\sigma^{-1} \partial_\alpha \sigma)(\sigma^{-1} \partial_\beta \sigma)] + \frac{2 \partial_\alpha \mu \partial_\beta \mu}{1 - \mu^4} + 2 (\partial_\alpha d)^T \sigma^{-1} \partial_\beta d, \quad (18)$$
$$U_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{\mu^2}{2(\mu^2 + 1)^2} \text{Tr}[\sigma \Omega [\partial_\alpha \sigma^{-1}, \partial_\beta \sigma^{-1}]] + 2 \mu^2 (\partial_\alpha d) \Omega (\partial_\beta d), \quad (19)$$

where the purity of single-mode Gaussian states is given by $\mu = 1/\sqrt{\det \sigma} = 1/(2N + 1)$. Notice that our result differ from that in [55] by a factor 2 in the first term of the Uhlmann matrix (for a detailed derivation, see Appendix B).

In particular, for the quantum statistical model defined above, we obtain

$$Q_{r,r} = \frac{4}{1 + \mu^2}, \quad (20d)$$
$$Q_{r,\varphi} = \frac{\sinh(2r)^2}{1 + \mu^2}, \quad (20e)$$
$$Q_{N,N} = \frac{4\mu^2}{1 - \mu^2}, \quad (20f)$$

and

$$U_{r,r} = 4\mu^2, \quad (21a)$$
$$U_{r,\varphi} = \frac{4\mu \sinh(2r)}{(1 + \mu^2)^2}, \quad (21b)$$

while the matrix elements not reported are null. The AI measure can be readily evaluated, obtaining

$$R_{GS} = \frac{2\mu}{1 + \mu^2}. \quad (22)$$

Also in this case we have thus obtained that AI is a monotonous function of purity $\mu$, and that one obtains that all the parameters become asymptotically compatible only in the limit of a maximally mixed state (that is $R_{GS} = 0$ only for $\mu \to 0$), while the maximum value of incompatibility $R_{GS} = 1$ is obtained if and only if $\rho_{\lambda}$ is a pure state.
3.3. Asymptotic incompatibility for qudit systems

Let us now move back to consider finite-dimensional quantum systems described via Hilbert spaces with dimension $d$ larger than two. The most natural way to describe the most general quantum states in this scenario is by the following parametrization

$$\rho_\gamma = \frac{1}{N} \left( I + \sum_{j=1}^{d^2-1} \gamma_j \Sigma_j \right)$$

(23)

where the matrices $\Sigma_j$ denotes the generators of the Lie algebra $su(d)$, and thus correspond to Pauli matrices for $d = 2$ and to Gell-Mann matrices for $d = 3$. The $p = d^2-1$ coordinates $\gamma$ represent the normalized Cartesian vector in the $d$-dimensional Bloch space and are also known as the components of the $d$-dimensional Bloch vector or as mixture coordinates [56].

For the estimation problem of $\gamma$, analytical solutions are very hard to derive. Hence, we addressed the problem numerically by randomly generating quantum density operators corresponding to $d = 3$ and $d = 4$. The results for the AI are reported in Fig. 1 as function of the purity of the state. We clearly see that in this case there is not a one-to-one correspondence between the value of $\mu$ and the value of $R(d)$. However, we see that the AI is strictly less than one when the purity of the state is lower than $\mu = 1/(d-1)$. Thus, we can state the following conjecture:

**Conjecture 1.** Given a quantum statistical model described by a family quantum states $\rho_\lambda$ living in a $d$-dimensional Hilbert space, the maximum amount of the AI measure $R_\lambda = 1$ may be observed only if the purity of the quantum state is larger than a minimum threshold $\mu_{\text{min}} = 1/(d-1)$.

This conjecture is clearly consistent for the two cases discussed above, i.e. qubit and single-mode Gaussian states, whose AI was exactly derived, and it is surrogated by the numerical evidence in Fig. 1.

This representation in terms of mixture coordinates $\gamma$ is not much relevant for our purposes. For this reason, we introduce here a second way to parametrize a $d$-dimensional quantum system, i.e.

$$\rho_\lambda = \frac{e^{-\beta H}}{\text{Tr}[e^{-\beta H}]}, \quad H = \sum_{j=1}^{d^2-1} \lambda_j \Sigma_j$$

(24)

The coordinates $\lambda$ are known as exponential coordinates [56] while the $\beta$ play the role of the inverse temperature of the state with respect to the Hamiltonian operator $H$, clearly recalling the Gibbs state form used in statistical mechanics. However, this is not a true coordinate since it can be included in the definition of the $\lambda$, hence must be considered more as a rescaling parameter which allow us to constrain the exponential coordinates to be in the interval $-1 \leq \lambda_i \leq 1$.

As a first case of study, we consider a diagonal $H$, i.e. $H = \text{diag} \{ \Delta_0, \Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_{d-1} \}$. The reason why we study this class of states is twofold: the first is that the calculations are greatly simplified, the second is that the results we find are also valid more generally, for reasons we will explain later. If we now address the problem of estimating all the $d^2 - 1$ parameters, we can exactly find that the AI
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Figure 1: Left panel: scatter plot of the AI measure (y-axis) vs purity (x-axis) for qutrit systems. The black lines are the AI for fixed spectrum of $H$, see main text for details. The most left line represents an effective two level system of $H$. Right panel: scatter plot of the AI measure (y-axis) vs purity (x-axis) for 4-dimensional quantum systems. Again, the black lines are the AI for a fixed spectrum of $H$. The red-dashed lines are effective two-level system of $H$ with different degeneracy.

is equal to

$$R_{\text{qudit}} = \tanh \left( \frac{\beta \Delta M}{2} \right)$$

(25)

where $\Delta M = \max_i \Delta_i - \min_j \Delta_j$, i.e. the maximum difference between the eigenvalues of $H$ (notice that the calculations are much simpler by evaluating the matrices for the parameters $\gamma$, and exploiting the fact that $R_\lambda$ is invariant under reparametrization). The result in (25) is consistent with the AI for a qubit states, since for $d = 2$ only the purity $\mu$ and the argument of the tanh are in one-to-one correspondence. Indeed, the purity can be written in terms of $\lambda$ as $\mu = (1 + \tanh(\beta |\lambda \cdot \lambda|)^2)/2$. In the case of diagonal $H$, we have $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0$ and $\Delta M = 2|\lambda_3|$. Hence, the purity of the qubit is given

$$\mu = \frac{1}{2} (1 + \tanh(\beta |\lambda_3|)^2) = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \tanh \left( \frac{\beta \Delta M}{2} \right)^2 \right)$$

(26)

and using (25) we reobtain (14). Remarkably, also the Gaussian case might be reduced to this expression if we consider that the purity in terms of the average number of excitation $N$ is $\mu = (2N + 1)^{-1}$. By replacing the value of $N$ by the formula for the Bose-Einstein statistics $N = 1/(\exp \beta \omega - 1)$, we obtain that the purity can be written as $\mu = \tanh(\beta \omega/2)$. Then, the AI (22) becomes exactly equal to (25) by fixing $\Delta M = 2\omega$.

This line of reasoning of course does not prove that the AI is equal to (25) for all the possible $d$-dimensional density matrix $\rho_\gamma$. However, numerical evidence show us that, once the values $\{\Delta_0, ..., \Delta_{d-1}\}$ are fixed, the AI depends on the value of $\beta$ only, according to (25), while it does not depend on any $d$-dimensional unitary rotation applied to the density matrix itself. In other words, once we fix the spectrum of $H$ and the temperature $\beta$, any unitary rotation performed on the state $U \rho_\gamma U^\dagger$ has the same identical AI of $\rho_\gamma$. For these reasons, we state a second conjecture here

**Conjecture 2.** Given a quantum statistical model described by a family quantum states $\rho_\lambda$ living in a $d$-dimensional Hilbert space, the AI corresponding to the full
estimation of the state is given by (25), where $\beta$ is the fictitious temperature of the state with respect to the Hamiltonian operator $H$ in the exponential coordinates (24).

Hence, numerical results suggest that the AI is property of the spectrum of $H$ only, and not of the basis of $H$. A further element in favour of this conjecture comes from Fig. 1, in which we clearly see that the AI for a fixed spectrum (black lines) span the whole area covered by the AI measure values corresponding to the random states generated. In addition, we see that AI for 4-dimensional system with a double degenerate spectrum, i.e. when the system reduces to a degenerate qubit, reaches the maximum value of 1 when the purity is $\mu = 1/2$, since in the case in which $\Delta_0 = \Delta_1$ and $\Delta_2 = \Delta_3$, we have that $\mu \to 1/2$ for $\beta \to \infty$.

4. Further properties of asymptotic incompatibility measure

In this section we analyze in more details some further properties of the AI measure $\mathcal{R}_{\lambda}$, sheding more light on the relationship between a given quantum statistical model $\varrho_{\lambda}$ and possible sub-models that arise when one or more parameters of the set $\lambda$ are considered known and thus not to be estimated.

In the definition of $\mathcal{R}_{\lambda}$ in Eq. (10), only the the largest eigenvalue of the matrix $I = i \mathcal{Q}(\lambda)^{-1} \mathcal{U}(\lambda)$ is considered. In the following we will study more in detail the role of the spectrum of $I$ in the characterization of the quantum statistical model. To do so, we first introduce the Cauchy interlace theorem [57]:

**Theorem 4.1** (Cauchy interlace theorem). Consider a $N \times N$ hermitian matrix $\mathcal{A}$ and any $(N-1) \times (N-1)$ principal sub-matrix $\mathcal{B}$ of $\mathcal{A}$. Consider the corresponding eigenvalues in decreasing order $a = \{a_1, \ldots, a_N\}$ and $b = \{b_1, \ldots, b_{N-1}\}$. Then, $a$ interlace $b$, that is

$$a_N \leq b_{N-1} \leq a_{N-1} \leq \ldots \leq b_2 \leq a_2 \leq b_1 \leq a_1.$$  \hspace{1cm} (27)

This result can now be applied for our purposes to the matrix $I$, leading to the following theorem:

**Theorem 4.2** (Bound on AI measure for quantum statistical sub-models). Given a quantum statistical model defined by a set of $p$ parameters $\lambda$, and any other possible sub-model defined by a set of (possibly reparametrized) $(p-1)$ parameters $\bar{\lambda}$, then the two corresponding AI measures $\mathcal{R}^{(p)}_{\lambda}$ and $\mathcal{R}^{(p-1)}_{\bar{\lambda}}$ satisfy the inequality

$$r_2 \leq \mathcal{R}^{(p-1)}_{\bar{\lambda}} \leq \mathcal{R}^{(p)}_{\lambda},$$  \hspace{1cm} (28)

where $r_2$ denotes the second largest eigenvalue of the matrix $I$ corresponding to the quantum statistical model $\varrho_{\lambda}$.

**Proof.** As observed in [36], the eigenvalues of $I$ are either 0 or given in pairs $h_i = \pm r_i$, with $0 < r_i \leq 1$, $i = 1, \ldots, \delta$ and $\delta \leq [(p+1)/2]$. The thesis of the theorem is thus a simple corollary of the Cauchy interlace theorem 4.1 stated above.

One can further show that, if we consider smaller sub-matrices of $I$, we can recursively apply this argument to smaller statistical sub-model $\bar{\lambda}$ with $(p-j)$ parameters. Eventually one obtains that the AI measure for the corresponding statistical sub-model is bounded as

$$r_{j+1} \leq \mathcal{R}^{(p-j)}_{\lambda} \leq \mathcal{R}^{(p)}_{\lambda},$$  \hspace{1cm} (29)
In particular we see that any statistical sub-model with \( p - j \) parameters is incompatible if we restrict ourselves to \( j \leq \delta - 1 \), since for those \( j \) we have that \( r_i > 0 \). This observation leads to the following corollary:

**Corollary** (Maximum number of compatible parameters of a quantum statistical model). By denoting with \( \delta \) the number of strictly positive eigenvalues of \( \mathcal{I} \), then the quantum statistical model \( \rho_\lambda \) contains at maximum number of compatible parameters equal to \( p_{\text{comp}} = p - \delta \).

Notice that a similar result has been obtained in [58], where a minimum number of compatible parameters is given in terms of the dimension of the Hilbert space only, without referring to a particular quantum statistical model. In all the examples we have examined, our corollary gives consistent results with the one formulated in [58].

In addition, the bound in [58] were derived for finite dimensional Hilbert space. In our case, no assumption on the dimension of Hilbert space was necessary, hence we can apply our result also for infinite dimensional system. For instance, let us consider the estimation of the qubit Bloch sphere parameters \( \lambda = (r, \theta, \phi) \), we indeed find the eigenvalues \( \operatorname{Eig}(\mathcal{I}) = \{r, -r, 0\} \), leading to \( p_{\text{comp}} = 2 \), that is indeed consistent with what has been shown in [58].

In the examples above, if we restrict to subsets of the original parameters \( \lambda = \{\text{Re} \alpha, \text{Im} \alpha, r, \phi, N\} \), all the results are directly available from the explicit solution of the SLD-QFIM (20) and the Uhlmann matrix (21). Here below we rather present an example where the results cannot be obtained straightforwardly in analytical form, while the properties discussed above can still provide a first insight without needing to solve exactly the estimation problem.

We address the estimation of two dynamical parameters, the frequency and the loss rate \( \dot{\lambda} = \{\omega, \gamma\} \) that characterize the evolution due to the Markovian master equation

\[
\dot{\rho} = -i\frac{\omega}{2}[q^2 + p^2, \rho] + \gamma [a, \rho],
\]

with \( [a, \rho] = \dot{a}a^\dagger \rho - \frac{1}{2} (a^\dagger \dot{a} \rho + \rho a^\dagger \dot{a}) \). By consider an initial Gaussian state \( \rho(0) \) as the one in Eq. (15), the dynamics remains Gaussian and thus can be fully described
Asymptotic incompatibility in multiparameter quantum estimation

Figure 2: Plot of $\mathcal{R}_\lambda^{(5)}$ (red line) and $\mathcal{R}_\lambda^{(2)}$ (blue line). Left panel: $\langle \hat{a}^{\dagger} \hat{a} \rangle = 4$; thick line: $\eta = 1$; dashed line: $\eta = 0.5$. Right panel: $\eta = 0.1$; thick line $\langle \hat{a}^{\dagger} \hat{a} \rangle = 4$; dashed line: $\langle \hat{a}^{\dagger} \hat{a} \rangle = 20$. Both panel: $\gamma = \omega = 1$.

by means of the first and second moments of its quadrature operators. In particular one can readily evaluate analytically the purity of the quantum state, obtaining

$$\mu(t) = \sqrt{(1 - e^{-\gamma t})(1 - e^{-\gamma t}(1 - 2s_2(0))) + e^{-2\gamma t}\mu(0)^2},$$

(33)

From this result and via Eq. (22), we can directly evaluate $\mathcal{R}_\lambda^{(5)}$, whereas the AI measure $\mathcal{R}_\lambda^{(2)}$ for the quantum statistical model defined above is evaluated numerically by exploiting the techniques reported in Appendix B. To present the results, we choose the initial state to be a pure state $N = 0$ and we parametrize it in terms of its average excitations number $\langle \hat{a}^{\dagger} \hat{a} \rangle$ and its fraction of squeezing $\eta$ defined as

$$\eta = \frac{\text{sinh}(r)^2}{\langle \hat{a}^{\dagger} \hat{a} \rangle},$$

(35)

We plot the results in Figure 2 and we see that $\mathcal{R}_\lambda^{(5)}$ is, as expected, always larger than $\mathcal{R}_\lambda^{(2)}$, confirming that $\mathcal{R}_\lambda^{(5)}$ can be used as an upper bound for the quantumness for any other sub-statistical model. Besides, as we see from the left panel in Figure 2, the upper bound may not be much informative, since the evolution of $\mathcal{R}_\lambda^{(5)}$ and $\mathcal{R}_\lambda^{(2)}$ in time are opposite. In addition, this example shows that the condition on the number of eigenvalue is not sufficient to have a compatible model.

5. Conclusions

In this paper, we have studied in details the properties of the AI measure $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$ of incompatibility and discussed its use in assessing the quantumness of multiparameter estimation problems. At first, we have focused on the estimation of the full set of parameters characterizing a given quantum system, showing that for qubits and single-mode Gaussian systems $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$ is a simple monotonous function of the purity $\mu$ of the state. We have then considered a generic $d$-dimensional quantum systems and, using analytical and numerical tools, we found that in general the one-to-one correspondence between $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$ and $\mu$ does not hold anymore. However, numerical results suggest that the maximum number of AI is achievable only for quantum statistical models having a purity $\mu \geq 1/(d - 1)$. We conjecture that this may be a general property of $d$-dimensional quantum systems. Upon considering quantum statistical
models described as Gibbs state of a given Hamiltonian, we have also shown that the AI measure can be written as a simple function of the fictitious temperature parameter and the spectrum of the Hamiltonian.

We have then studied in detail the role of the spectrum of the matrix \( I = iQ(\lambda)^{-1}U(\lambda) \) and have determined bounds on \( R_\lambda \) for quantum statistical submodels. In particular, we have shown that the number of strictly positive eigenvalues of \( I \) determines the maximum number of compatible parameters in a given statistical model.

Our results pave the way to a deeper understanding of the fundamental properties of multiparameter quantum estimation, and provide potentially useful tools to approach multiparameter problems that cannot be addressed analytically.
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Appendix A. The Holevo Cramér-Rao bound

The Holevo Bound \( C^H(\lambda, W) \) can be derived via the following minimization procedure

\[
C^H(\lambda, W) = \min_{X \in X_\lambda} \left[ \text{Tr} \left[ W \Re \mathcal{E}[\hat{X}] \right] + \|\sqrt{W} \Im \mathcal{E}[\hat{X}] \sqrt{W}\|_1 \right],
\]

where the elements of the hermitian \( d \times d \) matrix \( \mathcal{E} \) are

\[
\mathcal{E}_{\mu\nu} = \text{Tr} [g_\lambda \hat{X}_\mu \hat{X}_\nu],
\]

while \( \hat{X} \) is an array of \( d \) Hermitian operators such that

\[
\text{Tr}[g_\lambda \hat{X}_\mu] = 0 \\
\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[g_\lambda \{\hat{X}_\mu, \hat{L}_\nu^S\}] = \delta_{\mu\nu}
\]

Appendix B. Multiparameter estimation for continuous-variable Gaussian states

In this section we focus on estimation problems in bosonic continuous variable systems. In particular, we study \( n \) modes Gaussian state [53, 54], which are properly described in terms of quadrature operators \( \hat{r} = \{\hat{q}_1, \hat{p}_1, \ldots, \hat{q}_n, \hat{p}_n\} \). They satisfy the canonical commutation relation

\[
[r_j, r_k] = i\Omega_{jk},
\]

where \( \Omega = i\sigma^{\otimes n} \). A Gaussian state \( \rho \) is completely determined by its vector of first moments \( d = \text{Tr}[\rho \hat{r}] \) and its covariance matrix (CM) \( \sigma = \text{Tr}[\rho (\hat{r} - d)(\hat{r} - d)^T] \), with \( \{I, \hat{L}^T\}_{jk} = \hat{I}_j \hat{I}_k + \hat{I}_k \hat{I}_j \) [53, 54].

Let us assume that a set of parameters \( \lambda \) defines a quantum statistical models in a family of Gaussian quantum states \( g_\lambda \). One shows that the SLD for a parameter \( \alpha \in \lambda \) is at most quadratic in the moments [54] and can be written as

\[
\hat{L}_\alpha^S = L^{(0)}_\alpha I + L^{(1)}_\alpha \cdot \hat{r} + \hat{r}^T \cdot L^{(2)}_\alpha \cdot \hat{r},
\]
where $L_0(\alpha)$ is a real number, $L_1(\alpha)$ is a 2n real vector and $L_2(\alpha)$ is a $2n \times 2n$ real symmetric matrix. After some algebra, one can find that the SLD-QFI matrix elements are given by $[54, 55]$

$$Q_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[L_2(\alpha)(\partial_\beta \sigma)] + 2(\partial_\alpha d^T)\sigma^{-1}(\partial_\beta d) \tag{B.3}$$

Here below we derive the analogous result for the Uhlmann curvature matrix. First, we evaluate the commutator of $\hat{L}_\alpha^S$ and $\hat{L}_\beta^S$, that is

$$\left[\hat{L}_\alpha^S, \hat{L}_\beta^S\right] = [L_1(\alpha)\hat{r}, L_1(\beta)\hat{r}] + [L_1(\alpha)^T \hat{r}, \hat{r}^T L_2(\beta)\hat{r}] + \hat{r}^T L_2(\alpha)\hat{r}, L_2(\beta)^T \hat{r}] +$$

$$+ \hat{r}^T L_2(\alpha)^T \hat{r}, \hat{r}^T L_2(\beta)^T \hat{r}. \tag{B.4}$$

By recalling that $[\hat{r}_i, \hat{r}_k] = i\Omega_{ik}$, the first term of the latter is (we use Einstein convention on indexes summations)

$$[L_1(\alpha)^T \hat{r}, L_1(\beta)^T \hat{r}] = L_1(\alpha)^T \Omega L_1(\beta)\hat{1}; \tag{B.5}$$

the second term is (we recall that $L_{\alpha,jk} = L_{\alpha,kj}$)

$$[L_1(\alpha)^T \hat{r}, \hat{r}^T L_2(\beta)\hat{r}] = L_1(\alpha)^T L_{\beta,jk}[\hat{r}_i, \hat{r}_k] =$$

$$= L_1(\alpha)^T L_{\beta,jk}([\hat{r}_i, \hat{r}_j] \hat{r}_k + \hat{r}_j [\hat{r}_i, \hat{r}_k]) =$$

$$= L_1(\alpha)^T L_{\beta,jk}(i\Omega_{ij}\hat{r}_k + \hat{r}_j i\Omega_{ik}) =$$

$$= 2i L_1(\alpha)^T \Omega L_2(\beta)\hat{r}; \tag{B.6}$$

while the third term is

$$\hat{r}^T L_2(\alpha)^T \hat{r}, L_2(\beta)^T \hat{r} = 2i \hat{r}^T L_2(\alpha)^T \Omega L_2(\beta)\hat{r}; \tag{B.7}$$

and eventually the fourth term is (we used the symmetry of $L_2(\alpha)$ and the skew-symmetry of $\Omega$)

$$\hat{r}^T L_2(\alpha)\hat{r}, \hat{r}^T L_2(\beta)\hat{r} = L_2(\alpha,ij) L_{\beta,kl} [\hat{r}_i, \hat{r}_k] =$$

$$= L_2(\alpha,ij) L_{\beta,kl}(i\Omega_{jk}\hat{r}_i + i\hat{r}_k \hat{r}_i + i\Omega_{ij}\hat{r}_k \hat{r}_i + i\hat{r}_i \hat{r}_k \hat{r}_j) =$$

$$= 2i \hat{r}^T (L_2(\alpha)^T \Omega L_2(\beta) - L_2(\beta)^T \Omega L_2(\alpha)) \hat{r}. \tag{B.8}$$

So eventually we obtain

$$\left[\hat{L}_\alpha^S, \hat{L}_\beta^S\right] = i \left(L_1(\alpha)^T \Omega L_1(\beta)^T + 2B^T \hat{r} + 2\hat{r}^T A \hat{r}\right) \tag{B.9}$$

where $A$ and $B$ are respectively a $d \times d$ symmetric matrix and a $d$ vector

$$A = L_2(\alpha)^T \Omega L_2(\beta) - L_2(\beta)^T \Omega L_2(\alpha) \tag{B.10}$$

$$B = L_2(\alpha)^T \Omega L_2(\beta) - L_2(\beta)^T \Omega L_2(\alpha) \tag{B.11}$$

Now we can evaluate

$$U_{\alpha\beta} = -i \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[\d_{\alpha} \left[\hat{L}_\alpha^S, \hat{L}_\beta^S\right]] =$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} L_1(\alpha)^T \Omega L_1(\beta)^T + L_1(\alpha)^T \Omega L_2(\beta) \hat{d} + d^T L_2(\alpha)^T \Omega L_1(\beta)^T + \text{Tr}[\d_{\alpha} \hat{r}^T A \hat{r}] \tag{B.12}$$
Since $A_{ij} \Omega_{ij} = 0$, we obtain that
\[
\text{Tr} \left[ \partial \hat{\rho}^T A \hat{\rho} \right] = A_{ij} \text{Tr} \left[ \partial \hat{\rho}_i \hat{r}_j \right] = A_{ij} \left( \frac{\sigma_{ij}}{2} + \frac{i \Omega_{ij}}{2} + d_i d_j \right) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} [A \sigma] + d^T A d = \text{Tr} \left[ L^{(2)}_\alpha \Omega L^{(2)}_\beta \sigma \right] + 2 d^T L^{(2)}_\alpha \Omega L^{(2)}_\beta d \quad (B.14)
\]

From [54] we recall that $L^{(1)}_\alpha = 2 \sigma^{-1}(\partial_\alpha d) - 2 L^{(2)}_\alpha d$ and so we derive the following
\[
\frac{1}{2} L^{(1)}_\alpha^T \Omega L^{(1)}_\beta = 2 \left( (\partial_\alpha d)^T \sigma^{-1} \Omega^{-1} (\partial_\beta d) - d^T L^{(2)}_\alpha \Omega^{-1} (\partial_\beta d) \right) \left( B.15 \right)
\]
\[
L^{(1)}_\alpha^T \Omega L^{(2)}_\beta d = 2 \left( (\partial_\alpha d)^T \sigma^{-1} \Omega L^{(2)}_\beta d - d^T L^{(2)}_\alpha \Omega L^{(2)}_\beta d \right) \quad (B.16)
\]
\[
d^T L^{(2)}_\alpha \Omega L^{(2)}_\beta = 2 \left( d^T L^{(2)}_\alpha \sigma^{-1} (\partial_\beta d) - d^T L^{(2)}_\alpha \Omega L^{(2)}_\beta d \right) \quad (B.17)
\]

By inserting these last calculations, we end up with the following Uhlmann matrix
\[
U_{\alpha \beta} = \text{Tr} \left[ L^{(2)}_\alpha \Omega L^{(2)}_\beta \sigma \right] + 2 (\partial_\alpha d)^T \sigma^{-1} \Omega^{-1} (\partial_\beta d). \quad (B.19)
\]

Please notice that our result differ from that in [55] by a factor 2 in the first term of the Uhlmann matrix.

If we now focus on single-mode Gaussian state, we can write (B.3) and (B.19) only in terms of the covariance matrix $\sigma$, the vector $d$ and the purity of the state $\mu = 1/\sqrt{\det \sigma}$ as
\[
Q_{\alpha \beta} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ (\sigma^{-1} \partial_\alpha \sigma) (\sigma^{-1} \partial_\beta \sigma) \right] + \frac{2 \partial_\alpha \mu \partial_\beta \mu}{1 - \mu^4} + 2 (\partial_\alpha d)^T \sigma^{-1} (\partial_\beta d) \quad (B.20)
\]
\[
U_{\alpha \beta} = \frac{\mu^2}{2(\mu^2 + 1)^2} \text{Tr} \left\{ \sigma \Omega \left[ \partial_\alpha \sigma\sigma^{-1}, \partial_\beta \sigma\sigma^{-1} \right] \right\} + 2 \mu^2 (\partial_\alpha d)^T \Omega (\partial_\beta d). \quad (B.21)
\]
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