

Quantum Parameter Estimation of Non-Hermitian Systems with Optimal Measurements

Xinglei Yu¹ and Chengjie Zhang^{1,*}

¹*School of Physical Science and Technology, Ningbo University, Ningbo, 315211, China*

Quantum parameter estimation with Hermitian systems has been applied in various fields. Here, we study the quantum parameter estimation for general parameter-independent non-Hermitian Hamiltonians and derive an intuitive expression of quantum Fisher information (QFI) for pure states. Furthermore, we propose the condition for optimal measurements, which applies to both non-Hermitian and Hermitian Hamiltonians. To illustrate these results, we calculate and study the QFI of a specific \mathcal{PT} -symmetric non-Hermitian Hamiltonian, and give the optimal measurement. Surprisingly, we find some interesting properties of QFI with this \mathcal{PT} -symmetric Hamiltonian, such as the mutations of QFI at critical values known as exceptional points. Moreover, we also compare the variance of estimation with the theoretical precision bound, to verify our condition for optimal measurements.

Introduction.— Quantum parameter estimation is a theory committed to high-precision measurement of parameters in a quantum system, which plays a crucial role in modern science and engineering. Helstrom [1] and Holevo [2] proposed the parameter-based uncertainty relation, and pioneered quantum metrology based on quantum parameter estimation. After that, Braunstein *et al.* [3, 4] proposed quantum Fisher information (QFI) which is the optimal Fisher information over different valid quantum measurements. It is a metric that characterizes the maximum amount of attainable information about the given parameter and provides a new ultimate bound often called quantum Cramér-Rao bound (QCRB). It has been found that QFI played an essential role in quantum information theory. The QFI can be used as criteria for bipartite and multipartite entanglement [5]. Moreover, Refs. [6, 7] proved that only genuine multipartite entanglement is able to reach a maximal metrological sensitivity. The QFI was also discovered to be related to the speed of quantum evolution [8–10] and used for the proper definition of a macroscopic superposition [11, 12]. In addition, QFI has also been applied to quantum Zeno effect [13, 14].

Recently, quite a few studies have shown that non-Hermitian systems have many interesting properties. An important discovery is that a non-Hermitian Hamiltonian with exact parity-time (\mathcal{PT}) symmetry may exhibit entirely real spectrum [15–19]. In such \mathcal{PT} -symmetric systems, under the standard inner product definition, eigenstates are not orthogonal and states do not conserve probabilities after evolution. Interestingly, the \mathcal{PT} -symmetry may be suddenly broken once the non-Hermiticity parameter exceeds a certain critical value known as the exceptional point (EP) [20, 21]. These discoveries have promoted the new development in material science [22, 23], topology [24, 25] and especially optics [26–30].

In previous quantum metrology researches, there have been a great quantity of works on Hermitian systems [31–44]. However, only a few quantum sensors based on non-Hermitian systems have been pro-

posed recently [45–50], these studies show that sensors may have enhanced sensitivity in \mathcal{PT} -symmetric non-Hermitian systems. The optimal homodyne-based measurement scheme and fundamental bounds of non-Hermitian quantum sensor have been studied in Ref. [51], which considered the effect of noise as induced by non-Hermiticity. Moreover, the parameter estimation in \mathcal{PT} symmetrical cavity magnonics system has also been studied in [52]. Considering the new developments in physics arising from the studies of non-Hermitian systems over the past two decades, it is significant to promote the study of quantum metrology in non-Hermitian systems.

In this paper, we derive a general intuitive expression of QFI for arbitrary parameter-independent non-Hermitian Hamiltonians and find the condition for optimal measurements based on the error-propagation formula. According to the expression we proposed, we calculate and study the QFI of a specific \mathcal{PT} -symmetric non-Hermitian Hamiltonian and find the optimal measurement. Interestingly, we find that the QFI of this \mathcal{PT} -symmetric Hamiltonian is *discontinuous* at EP, it will reduce to zero as EP is approached, but changes suddenly when the EP is exactly reached. We also find that the maximum values of QFI does not tend to zero near EP, and the expressions of the maximum value of QFI are the same in both cases of \mathcal{PT} -symmetry broken and not. Comparing the estimation variance generated by the optimal measurement with the lower bound of QCRB, we verify the condition for optimal measurement that we proposed.

QFI for general non-Hermitian Hamiltonians.— Before we calculate the QFI for parameter-independent non-Hermitian Hamiltonians, let us first review some basic concepts of the quantum estimation theory. The precision of estimation is usually characterized by the variance of the estimator, so we expect to reduce the variance as much as possible. But how can we know the lower bound of variance? According to the estimation theory, the variance of any unbiased estimator is limited by QCRB $V(\hat{\theta}) \geq 1/(n\mathcal{F}_\theta)$, where n is the number of

measurement, and \mathcal{F}_θ is the quantum Fisher information which gives the theoretical ultimate bound of parameter estimation precision. The general expression of QFI is $\mathcal{F}_\theta = \text{Tr}[L_\theta^2 \rho_\theta]$, where L_θ is a self-adjoint operator called Symmetric Logarithmic Derivative (SLD), satisfies the equation $(L_\theta \rho_\theta + \rho_\theta L_\theta)/2 = \partial_\theta \rho_\theta$. For an arbitrary state written in its eigenbasis $\rho_\theta = \sum_n c_n |\psi_n\rangle \langle \psi_n|$, the expression of QFI is [1, 2]

$$\mathcal{F}_\theta = 2 \sum_{n,m} \frac{|\langle \psi_n | \partial_\theta \rho_\theta | \psi_m \rangle|^2}{c_n + c_m}. \quad (1)$$

For unitary families and pure states model, the final state is $\rho_\theta = |\psi_\theta\rangle \langle \psi_\theta| = \hat{U}_\theta \rho_0 \hat{U}_\theta^\dagger$ and the QFI is $\mathcal{F}_\theta = 4 \langle \psi_0 | (\Delta \hat{H})^2 | \psi_0 \rangle$, where $\hat{U}_\theta = e^{-i\hat{H}\theta}$ is an unitary operator and \hat{H} is a parameter-independent Hermitian Hamiltonian.

Now let us discuss the QFI for parameter-independent non-Hermitian Hamiltonians in the case of pure states. If we turn to non-Hermitian Hamiltonians, under the standard inner product definition, the evolution operator is no more unitary due to $\hat{H} \neq \hat{H}^\dagger$, and the final state $|\psi_\theta\rangle$ is no longer normalized after evolution. Therefore, the QFI for pure states may no longer be written as the variance of Hamiltonian. According to the Born rule, we have $p(x|\theta) = \text{Tr}[\pi_x \rho_\theta]$, this requires ρ_θ to be normalized, so we cannot directly substitute ρ_θ into Eq. (1) to get the result. Thus, we assume that the pure state $\tilde{\rho}_\theta$ is the normalized final state :

$$\tilde{\rho}_\theta = |\varphi_\theta\rangle \langle \varphi_\theta| = \frac{\rho_\theta}{K_\theta},$$

where K_θ is the normalization coefficient, and $|\varphi_\theta\rangle = (\hat{U}_\theta / \sqrt{K_\theta}) |\psi_0\rangle$. Note K_θ is the inner product of $|\psi_\theta\rangle$ itself, it must be non-negative. According to Eq. (1), for the normalized $\tilde{\rho}_\theta$, we derive the QFI as follows [53],

$$\mathcal{F}_\theta = 4(\langle \hat{H}^\dagger \hat{H} \rangle_\theta - \langle \hat{H}^\dagger \rangle_\theta \langle \hat{H} \rangle_\theta). \quad (2)$$

Here, we define $\langle \hat{M} \rangle_\theta$ as the expectation value of the operator \hat{M} on the normalized final state $|\varphi_\theta\rangle$ ($\langle \hat{M} \rangle_\theta = \langle \varphi_\theta | \hat{M} | \varphi_\theta \rangle$). This result is quite similar to QFI of Hermitian Hamiltonians which is four times the variance of Hermitian Hamiltonians, but here, the QFI depends on the normalized final state $\tilde{\rho}_\theta$. Obviously, the QFI is the parameter-dependent function, we can infer that for given non-Hermitian Hamiltonians and initial states, the QFI is no more a constant, but changes with the parameter θ .

Condition for optimal measurements.— The QCRB and QFI give the achievable ultimate bound on precision of parameter estimation. However, how can we actually reach this bound in parameter-independent non-Hermitian systems? Here, we propose a condition to reach this bound. We define $\delta \hat{M} = \hat{M} - \langle \hat{M} \rangle_\theta$ and

$(\Delta \hat{M})^2 = \langle \delta \hat{M}^\dagger \delta \hat{M} \rangle_\theta = \langle \hat{M}^\dagger \hat{M} \rangle_\theta - \langle \hat{M}^\dagger \rangle_\theta \langle \hat{M} \rangle_\theta$. For an observable \hat{A} , the precision of estimation can be characterized with the error-propagation formula [54, 55],

$$(\Delta \theta)^2 = \frac{(\Delta \hat{A})^2}{|\partial_\theta \langle \hat{A} \rangle_\theta|^2}. \quad (3)$$

According to the Non-Hermitian uncertainty relationship $(\Delta \hat{A})^2 (\Delta \hat{B})^2 \geq |\langle \hat{A}^\dagger \hat{B} \rangle - \langle \hat{A}^\dagger \rangle \langle \hat{B} \rangle|$ [56–60] which was first proposed by Pati *et al.* in Ref. [56], we can obtain an inequality as follows [53],

$$(\Delta \theta)^2 = \frac{(\Delta \hat{A})^2}{|\partial_\theta \langle \hat{A} \rangle_\theta|^2} \geq \frac{(\Delta \hat{A})^2}{4(\Delta \hat{A})^2 (\Delta \hat{H})^2} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{F}_\theta}, \quad (4)$$

the right term is exactly the lower bound of QCRB. To saturate this inequality, the Hermitian operator A must obey the relationship as follows [53],

$$|f\rangle = iC |g\rangle, \quad (5)$$

where $|f\rangle = \delta \hat{H} |\varphi_\theta\rangle$, $|g\rangle = \delta \hat{A} |\varphi_\theta\rangle$ and C is a real number. Except for the general Non-Hermitian Hamiltonians, this relationship also applies to the Hermitian Hamiltonians, which has already been obtained in Ref. [61]. The detailed derivation of this relationship can be found in the Supplemental Material [53]. Notice that this relationship not only depends on the measurements, but is also related to the initial states. For a given Hamiltonian, on the basis of finding the optimal initial states to maximize the QFI, we can further find the optimal measurements according to Eq. (5). In this way, we can estimate the parameters with highest precision.

Example of a \mathcal{PT} -symmetric Hamiltonian.—Let us now consider a two-level \mathcal{PT} -symmetric Hamiltonian to illustrate the results in previous sections. We calculate the QFI in both cases of \mathcal{PT} -symmetry broken and not, the details can be found in the Supplemental Material [53]. The \mathcal{PT} -symmetric Hamiltonian is [17]

$$\hat{H}_s = \begin{pmatrix} r e^{i\omega} & s \\ s & r e^{-i\omega} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

where $s > 0$, r and ω are real. We can see that the eigenvalues $\lambda_\pm = \mu \pm \sqrt{v_0} = r \cos \omega \pm \sqrt{s^2 - r^2 \sin^2 \omega}$ are still real when the \mathcal{PT} -symmetry is not broken, i.e., $s^2 > r^2 \sin^2 \omega$. Note that at EP, i.e., $s^2 = r^2 \sin^2 \omega$, the eigenvalues $\lambda = r \cos \omega$ is degenerate, and when $s^2 < r^2 \sin^2 \omega$, \mathcal{PT} -symmetry will spontaneously be broken, the two eigenvalues $\varepsilon_\pm = \mu \pm i\sqrt{v_1} = r \cos \omega \pm i\sqrt{r^2 \sin^2 \omega - s^2}$ are complex.

First we calculate the QFI of Hamiltonian \hat{H}_s when \mathcal{PT} -symmetry is not broken. Assume that the eigenstates are normalized, we have

$$|\lambda_+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\alpha/2} \\ e^{-i\alpha/2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad |\lambda_-\rangle = \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\alpha/2} \\ -e^{i\alpha/2} \end{pmatrix},$$




FIG. 1: The evolution of QFI as a function of θ . The blue curve corresponds to the QFI when \mathcal{PT} -symmetry is not broken, we set $s = 1, r = 0.25, \omega = \pi/2$, and the initial state is $|\psi_0\rangle = N(|\lambda_+\rangle + |\lambda_-\rangle)$. The red curve corresponds to the QFI in the case of \mathcal{PT} -symmetry broken, we set $s = 0.25, r = 1, \omega = \pi/2$, and the initial state is $|\psi_0\rangle = N(|\varepsilon_+\rangle - |\varepsilon_-\rangle)$. Thus, these two systems have the same modulus of energy, but $\sin \alpha = 1/n$. According to Eq. (11), their maximum value of QFI both are 6.25.

where $\sin \alpha = n = (r/s) \sin \omega$, and we set the initial state to be normalized and arbitrary

$$|\psi_0\rangle = N(|\lambda_+\rangle + me^{i\varphi} |\lambda_-\rangle),$$

where m and relative phase φ are real, N is the normalization coefficient. Notice that the eigenstates are not orthogonal, we have $\langle \lambda_+ | \lambda_- \rangle = \sin \alpha$. We apply Eq. (2) and derive the QFI as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(r)} = \frac{16m^2v_0^2}{[(1+m^2)s + 2mr \sin \omega \cos(2\sqrt{v_0}\theta + \varphi)]^2}. \quad (7)$$

The expression shows that QFI will oscillate with θ due to $\cos(2\sqrt{v_0}\theta + \varphi)$.

Obviously, the value of QFI would be affected by the initial states. We further find out the optimal initial state that maximizes the QFI. Notice the form of Eq. (7), we can see that the relative phase φ is only contained in $\cos(2\sqrt{v_0}\theta + \varphi)$. Thus, φ has nothing to do with the amplitude and frequency of $\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(r)}$. Then we solve $\partial \mathcal{F}_\theta^{(r)} / \partial m = 0$, and obtain that the extremum of $\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(r)}$ reaches the maximum when $m = \pm 1$. Now we can make sure that in the case of \mathcal{PT} -symmetry not broken, the optimal initial state is

$$|\psi_0\rangle = N(|\lambda_+\rangle \pm e^{i\varphi} |\lambda_-\rangle). \quad (8)$$

Next we are going to calculate the QFI of \hat{H}_s when \mathcal{PT} -symmetry is broken. In this case, the normalized eigenstates are

$$|\varepsilon_\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(r \sin \omega \pm \sqrt{v_1})^2 + s^2}} \begin{pmatrix} i(r \sin \omega \pm \sqrt{v_1}) \\ s \end{pmatrix},$$

and the arbitrary initial state is $|\psi_0\rangle = N(|\varepsilon_+\rangle + me^{i\varphi} |\varepsilon_-\rangle)$. Notice that in this case, $(r/s) \sin \omega > 1$, we cannot define α as before, here we use $n = (r/s) \sin \omega$. According to Eq. (2), the corresponding QFI is

$$\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(i)} = \frac{16m^2v_1^2e^{4\sqrt{v_1}\theta}}{[A(e^{4\sqrt{v_1}\theta} + m^2) + 2mse^{2\sqrt{v_1}\theta} \cos \varphi]^2}, \quad (9)$$

where $A = |r \sin \omega|$. We also find the optimal initial state by solving $\partial \mathcal{F}_\theta^{(i)} / \partial \varphi = 0$ and $\partial \mathcal{F}_\theta^{(i)} / \partial m = 0$. The optimal initial state is

$$|\psi_0\rangle = N(|\varepsilon_+\rangle + m |\varepsilon_-\rangle), \quad (10)$$

where $m < 0$ and $\varphi = 0$. We can see that the Eq. (9) is quite different from the Eq. (7), without the oscillation term but gain and attenuation term. As shown in Fig. 1, QFI oscillates with θ in the case of \mathcal{PT} -symmetry not broken; when \mathcal{PT} -symmetry is broken, QFI has only one peak and quickly attenuates with θ . Therefore, the QFI performance is better when the \mathcal{PT} -symmetry is not broken, and we do more research on this. We find that in the case of \mathcal{PT} -symmetry not broken, the curve of QFI shifts along the θ -axis as we change the relative phase φ in initial states $|\psi_0\rangle$. So we can maximize the QFI for a specific parameter θ_0 by adjusting the relative phase φ in initial states. More analyses are detailed in Supplemental Material [53].

With the optimal initial states, we calculate the maximum values of QFI with θ as the variable in both cases of \mathcal{PT} -symmetry broken and not. Interestingly, we find that $\mathcal{F}_{\theta, \max}$ has the same expressions in both cases,

$$\mathcal{F}_{\theta, \max} = 4(s + |r \sin \omega|)^2, \quad (s^2 \neq r^2 \sin^2 \omega). \quad (11)$$

As for EP, the eigenvalues are degenerate $\lambda_\pm = \mu$, if the initial states can be expressed with eigenstates, we have

$$\mathcal{F}_\theta = 4(\langle \psi_0 | e^{i\mu\theta} \mu^2 e^{-i\mu\theta} | \psi_0 \rangle - \langle \psi_0 | e^{i\mu\theta} \mu e^{-i\mu\theta} | \psi_0 \rangle^2) = 0.$$

However, the eigenstates also coalesce at EP, they are not a set of complete basis, an arbitrary initial state $|\psi_0\rangle$ may not be able to be expressed by the superpositions of eigenstates, so the QFI may not be zero at EP. Based on Eq. (7) and Eq. (9), we can see that the QFI always tends to zero as EP is approached in both cases of \mathcal{PT} -symmetry broken and not, since v_0 and v_1 both tend to zero near EP. Therefore, the QFI could be discontinuous at EP for the initial states that are linearly independent of the eigenstates. As shown in Fig. 2(a), we set the initial state as $|0\rangle\langle 0|$ at EP ($s = 2$) which is linearly independent of the eigenstate, the QFI \mathcal{F}_θ tends to zero as EP is approached, but it suddenly increases to 16 at EP.

Notice that although the QFI is continuous at EP for the initial states that can be expressed by eigenstates, the maximum value of QFI is still discontinuous at EP.




FIG. 2: The evolutions of QFI as a function of s . (a) We set $r = 2, \omega = \pi/2, m = 1, \varphi = 0$ and $\theta = 0$, hence the system reaches EP when $s = 2$. And the initial state is $|0\rangle\langle 0|$ at EP, we have $\mathcal{F}_\theta = 16$. (b) We set $r = 2$ and $\omega = \pi/2$, the system reaches EP when $s = 2$.

As mentioned above, the QFI tends to zero as EP is approached, but according to Eq. (11), $\mathcal{F}_{\theta, \max}$ does not reduce to zero near EP. As shown in Fig. 2(b), in both cases of \mathcal{PT} -symmetry broken and not, the maximum value of QFI $\mathcal{F}_{\theta, \max}$ does not reduce to zero as EP ($s = 2$) is approached, i.e., there still exists some intervals of θ that $\mathcal{F}_\theta \neq 0$ near EP. When the system exactly reaches EP, $\mathcal{F}_{\theta, \max}$ suddenly reduce to zero. We can see that in Eq. (7) and Eq. (9), the numerator contains ν_0 or ν_1 which gradually tends to zero as EP is approached, hence there is a continuous decrease in \mathcal{F}_θ to zero near EP. However, for $\mathcal{F}_{\theta, \max}$, when ν_0 and ν_1 in the numerator tend to zero, there is also an infinitesimal of the same order in the denominator that tends to zero, which makes $\mathcal{F}_{\theta, \max}$ not reduce to zero near EP [53].

On the basis of finding the optimal initial state, we further find an optimal measurement for Hamiltonian \hat{H}_s , for simplicity, we set $\omega = \pi/2$. According to Eq. (5), for optimal initial state $|\psi_0\rangle = N(|\lambda_+\rangle + e^{i\varphi}|\lambda_-\rangle)$, the corresponding optimal measurement is $|0\rangle\langle 0|$, detailed calculation can be found in the Supplemental Material [53]. Moreover, to verify the condition for optimal measurement that we proposed, we compare the estimation variance $(\Delta\theta)^2$ generated by $|0\rangle\langle 0|$ with the reciprocal of QFI $1/\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(r)}$. To make the expressions concise, we use $n = r/s$ here, according to error-propagation formula Eq. (3), we can obtain the precision of the estimation for arbitrary initial state as follows,

$$(\Delta\theta)^2 = p/q, \quad (12)$$

where $p = [1 + m^2 + 2mn \sin(2\gamma_0 + \beta)]^2 [1 + m^2 - 2m \cos 2\gamma_0 + 4mn \sin(2\gamma_0 + \beta)] (1 + m^2 + 2m \cos 2\gamma_0)$, $q = 16m^2\nu_0(1 - n^2)[2mn + (1 + m^2) \sin(2\gamma_0 + \beta)]^2$, $\gamma_0 = \sqrt{\nu_0}\theta + \varphi/2$ and β is determined by n ($\sin \beta = n, \cos \beta = -\sqrt{1 - n^2}$). In Fig. 3(a), we can see that only if $m = 1$, $(\Delta\theta)^2$ (the red solid curve) and the $1/\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(r)}$ (blue dashed curve) overlap, i.e., the precision of the estimation reaches the QCRB. In Fig. 3(b), the initial state is




FIG. 3: The evolution of the variance $(\Delta\theta)^2$ (red solid line) and the reciprocal of QFI $1/\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(r)}$ (blue dashed line) as functions of θ , we set the Hamiltonian and the relative phase to remain unchanged, $s = 0.5, r = 0.25, \varphi = 0$. (a) We set the initial state is optimal $m = 1.0$. The actual precision $(\Delta\theta)^2$ is equal to $1/\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(r)}$, which means the QCRB is saturated. (b) We set $m = 1.2$, $(\Delta\theta)^2$ is larger than $1/\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(r)}$, the precision of the estimation declines.

changed to $|\psi_0\rangle = N(|\lambda_+\rangle + 1.2|\lambda_-\rangle)$, $(\Delta\theta)^2$ is larger than $1/\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(r)}$ in some intervals, the precision of the estimation declines. Thus, $|0\rangle\langle 0|$ is exactly the optimal measurement of \hat{H}_s for the optimal initial state.

Discussions and conclusions.— We simply discuss the method to simulate the \mathcal{PT} -symmetric Hamiltonian \hat{H}_s in this section. In short, the expectation value of \hat{H}_s on $|\varphi_\theta\rangle$ can be described with the weak value of the dilated Hamiltonian \tilde{H} on the preselected state $|\tilde{\varphi}_i\rangle$ and postselected state $|\tilde{\varphi}_f\rangle$, i.e. $\langle\varphi_\theta|\hat{H}_s|\varphi_\theta\rangle_\eta / \langle\varphi_\theta|\varphi_\theta\rangle_\eta = \langle\tilde{\varphi}_i|\tilde{H}|\tilde{\varphi}_f\rangle / \langle\tilde{\varphi}_i|\tilde{\varphi}_f\rangle$ [62], where η is a metric operator, $|\tilde{\varphi}_i\rangle$ and $|\tilde{\varphi}_f\rangle$ are specially dilated from $|\varphi_\theta\rangle$. The right term is exactly the weak value $\langle\tilde{H}\rangle_w$ of dilated Hamiltonian \tilde{H} , we can obtain it through weak measurement of \tilde{H} . To realize the weak measurement, we need a pointer \hat{P} weakly coupling with \tilde{H} , the interaction Hamiltonian can be written as $\hat{H}_{int} = \tilde{H} \otimes \hat{P}$. It has been proved that if we choose \hat{P} as Pauli operator $\hat{\sigma}_z$ and the initial pointer state is $|P_i\rangle = (|+\rangle + |-\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, the real and imaginary parts of the weak value $\langle\tilde{H}\rangle_w$ can be read out by measuring the expectations of Pauli matrices $\hat{\sigma}_y$ and $\hat{\sigma}_z$ respectively on postselected pointer state $|P_f\rangle$ [49].

In conclusion, we have proposed an expression of QFI with general parameter-independent non-Hermitian Hamiltonians. It is four times the variance of non-Hermitian Hamiltonians on normalized final states, which is quite similar to the QFI of Hermitian Hamiltonians. We also find the condition for optimal measurements, it applies to both Hermitian and non-Hermitian Hamiltonians. Consider a specific \mathcal{PT} -symmetric non-Hermitian Hamiltonian as an example, we calculate the QFI and find the optimal measurement. Surprisingly, we find some interesting properties of the QFI of this

\mathcal{PT} -symmetric Hamiltonian. Considering the application of QFI and \mathcal{PT} -symmetry in optics and quantum information, non-Hermitian Hamiltonian QFI is expected to promote the further development of quantum metrology and non-Hermitian physics.

APPENDIX A: Detailed derivation of QFI for non-Hermitian Hamiltonians

For an arbitrary final state written in its eigenbasis $\rho_\theta = \sum_n c_n |\psi_n\rangle\langle\psi_n|$, the expression for QFI is [1, 2]

$$\mathcal{F}_\theta = 2 \sum_{n,m} \frac{|\langle\psi_n|\partial_\theta\rho_\theta|\psi_m\rangle|^2}{c_n + c_m}. \quad (\text{A1})$$

As for non-Hermitian Hamiltonians, the final pure state is no more normalized. Thus, we assume that $\tilde{\rho}_\theta$ is the normalized final state:

$$\tilde{\rho}_\theta = |\varphi_\theta\rangle\langle\varphi_\theta| + 0 \sum_i |i\rangle\langle i| = \frac{|\psi_\theta\rangle\langle\psi_\theta|}{K_\theta} + 0 \sum_i |i\rangle\langle i|, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where $K_\theta = \langle\psi_\theta|\psi_\theta\rangle$ is the normalization coefficient and $|i\rangle$ represents other eigenstates that orthogonal to $|\varphi_\theta\rangle$. According to Eq. (A1), we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_\theta &= 2 \left[\frac{|\langle\varphi_\theta|\partial_\theta\varphi_\theta\rangle + \langle\partial_\theta\varphi_\theta|\varphi_\theta\rangle|^2}{2} + 2 \sum_i |\langle\partial_\theta\varphi_\theta|i\rangle|^2 \right] \\ &= 2 \left[\frac{|\partial_\theta(\langle\varphi_\theta|\varphi_\theta\rangle)|^2}{2} + 2 \sum_i \langle\partial_\theta\varphi_\theta|i\rangle\langle i|\partial_\theta\varphi_\theta\rangle \right] \\ &= 4 \langle\partial_\theta\varphi_\theta|(\sum_i |i\rangle\langle i|)|\partial_\theta\varphi_\theta\rangle \\ &= 4 \langle\partial_\theta\varphi_\theta|(I - |\varphi_\theta\rangle\langle\varphi_\theta|)|\partial_\theta\varphi_\theta\rangle \\ &= 4(\langle\partial_\theta\varphi_\theta|\partial_\theta\varphi_\theta\rangle - |\langle\partial_\theta\varphi_\theta|\varphi_\theta\rangle|^2), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A3})$$

where $|\partial_\theta\varphi_\theta\rangle = \partial_\theta|\varphi_\theta\rangle$. And then, we further expand $|\partial_\theta\varphi_\theta\rangle$ with \hat{U}_θ and K_θ , we have $|\partial_\theta\varphi_\theta\rangle = \partial_\theta(\hat{U}_\theta/\sqrt{K_\theta})|\psi_0\rangle$. Thus, we can obtain the first term:

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle\partial_\theta\varphi_\theta|\partial_\theta\varphi_\theta\rangle \\ &= \langle\psi_0|\frac{\sqrt{K_\theta}(\partial_\theta\hat{U}_\theta^\dagger) - \frac{(\partial_\theta K_\theta)}{2\sqrt{K_\theta}}\hat{U}_\theta^\dagger}{K_\theta} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{K_\theta}(\partial_\theta\hat{U}_\theta) - \frac{(\partial_\theta K_\theta)}{2\sqrt{K_\theta}}\hat{U}_\theta}{K_\theta}|\psi_0\rangle \\ &= \langle\hat{H}^\dagger\hat{H}\rangle_\theta - \frac{i(\partial_\theta K_\theta)}{2K_\theta}(\langle\hat{H}^\dagger\rangle_\theta - \langle\hat{H}\rangle_\theta) + \frac{(\partial_\theta K_\theta)^2}{4K_\theta^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

where $\hat{U}_\theta = e^{-i\hat{H}\theta}$ and $\partial_\theta\hat{U}_\theta = -i\hat{U}_\theta\hat{H}$, note that \hat{H} commutes with \hat{U}_θ . Here, we define $\langle\hat{X}\rangle_\theta$ as the expectation of operator \hat{X} on normalized final state ($\langle\hat{X}\rangle_\theta = \langle\varphi_\theta|\hat{X}|\varphi_\theta\rangle$). In the same way, we can also obtain the

expression for the second term as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &|\langle\partial_\theta\varphi_\theta|\varphi_\theta\rangle|^2 \\ &= |\langle\psi_0|\frac{\sqrt{K_\theta}(\partial_\theta\hat{U}_\theta^\dagger) - \frac{(\partial_\theta K_\theta)}{2\sqrt{K_\theta}}\hat{U}_\theta^\dagger}{K_\theta} \frac{\hat{U}_\theta}{\sqrt{K_\theta}}|\psi_0\rangle|^2 \\ &= |\langle\psi_0|\frac{i\hat{U}_\theta^\dagger\hat{H}^\dagger\hat{U}_\theta - \frac{(\partial_\theta K_\theta)}{2K_\theta}\hat{U}_\theta^\dagger\hat{U}_\theta}{K_\theta}|\psi_0\rangle|^2 \\ &= |i\langle\hat{H}^\dagger\rangle_\theta - \frac{(\partial_\theta K_\theta)}{2K_\theta}|^2 \\ &= \langle\hat{H}^\dagger\rangle_\theta\langle\hat{H}\rangle_\theta - \frac{i(\partial_\theta K_\theta)}{2K_\theta}(\langle\hat{H}^\dagger\rangle_\theta - \langle\hat{H}\rangle_\theta) + \frac{(\partial_\theta K_\theta)^2}{4K_\theta^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

Substituting these two results back into Eq. (A3), we work out the concise and intuitive expression of QFI,

$$\mathcal{F}_\theta = 4(\langle\hat{H}^\dagger\hat{H}\rangle_\theta - \langle\hat{H}^\dagger\rangle_\theta\langle\hat{H}\rangle_\theta), \quad (\text{A6})$$

If the Hamiltonian is Hermitian, this result returns to $\mathcal{F}_\theta = 4\langle\psi_0|(\Delta\hat{H})^2|\psi_0\rangle$.

APPENDIX B: Proof of the condition for optimal measurements

Suppose we have a Hermitian operator \hat{A} as a measurement, according to the error-propagation formula [54, 55], we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta\theta)^2 &= \frac{(\Delta\hat{A})^2}{|\partial_\theta\langle\hat{A}\rangle_\theta|^2} \\ &= \frac{(\Delta\hat{A})^2}{|\langle\partial_\theta\varphi_\theta|\hat{A}|\varphi_\theta\rangle + \langle\varphi_\theta|\hat{A}|\partial_\theta\varphi_\theta\rangle|^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A7})$$

where $|\varphi_\theta\rangle$ is the normalized final state.

In the case of Non-Hermitian Hamiltonians, let $Q = \partial_\theta\langle\hat{A}\rangle_\theta = \langle\partial_\theta\varphi_\theta|\hat{A}|\varphi_\theta\rangle + \langle\varphi_\theta|\hat{A}|\partial_\theta\varphi_\theta\rangle$ and expand this expression, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \langle\psi_0|\partial_\theta\left(\frac{\hat{U}_\theta^\dagger}{\sqrt{K_\theta}}\right)\hat{A}|\varphi_\theta\rangle + \langle\varphi_\theta|\hat{A}\partial_\theta\left(\frac{\hat{U}_\theta}{\sqrt{K_\theta}}\right)|\psi_0\rangle \\ &= \langle\psi_0|\frac{\sqrt{K_\theta}\hat{U}_\theta^\dagger(i\hat{H}^\dagger) - \frac{\partial_\theta K_\theta}{2\sqrt{K_\theta}}\hat{U}_\theta^\dagger}{K_\theta}\hat{A}|\varphi_\theta\rangle + \bar{Z} \\ &= \langle\varphi_\theta|(i\hat{H}^\dagger - \frac{\partial_\theta K_\theta}{2K_\theta})\hat{A}|\varphi_\theta\rangle + \langle\varphi_\theta|\hat{A}(-i\hat{H} - \frac{\partial_\theta K_\theta}{2K_\theta})|\varphi_\theta\rangle \\ &= \langle\varphi_\theta|i(\hat{H}^\dagger\hat{A} - \hat{A}\hat{H})|\varphi_\theta\rangle - \frac{\partial_\theta K_\theta}{K_\theta}\langle\varphi_\theta|\hat{A}|\varphi_\theta\rangle \\ &= i(\langle\hat{H}^\dagger\hat{A}\rangle_\theta - \langle\hat{A}\hat{H}\rangle_\theta) - \frac{\partial_\theta K_\theta}{K_\theta}\langle\hat{A}\rangle_\theta, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A8})$$

where $\bar{Z} = \langle\varphi_\theta|\hat{A}\partial_\theta(\hat{U}_\theta/\sqrt{K_\theta})|\psi_0\rangle$, $\partial_\theta(\hat{U}_\theta/\sqrt{K_\theta}) = [\sqrt{K_\theta}\hat{U}_\theta(-i\hat{H}) - (\partial_\theta K_\theta/2\sqrt{K_\theta})\hat{U}_\theta]/K_\theta$, and $K_\theta =$

$\langle \psi_\theta | \psi_\theta \rangle$ is the normalization coefficient of final state, then $(\partial_\theta K_\theta) / K_\theta$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial_\theta K_\theta}{K_\theta} &= \frac{\partial_\theta (\langle \psi_\theta | \hat{U}_\theta^\dagger \hat{U}_\theta | \psi_0 \rangle)}{K_\theta} \\ &= \frac{\langle \psi_0 | \hat{U}_\theta^\dagger i \hat{H}^\dagger \hat{U}_\theta | \psi_0 \rangle + \langle \psi_0 | \hat{U}_\theta^\dagger (-i \hat{H}) \hat{U}_\theta | \psi_0 \rangle}{K_\theta} \\ &= \langle \varphi_\theta | i(\hat{H}^\dagger - \hat{H}) | \varphi_\theta \rangle \\ &= i(\langle \hat{H}^\dagger \rangle_\theta - \langle \hat{H} \rangle_\theta). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A9})$$

Substitute the result into Eq. (A8), we have

$$Q = i[(\langle \hat{H}^\dagger \hat{A} \rangle_\theta - \langle \hat{A} \hat{H} \rangle_\theta) - (\langle \hat{H}^\dagger \rangle_\theta - \langle \hat{H} \rangle_\theta) \langle \hat{A} \rangle_\theta]. \quad (\text{A10})$$

Then $|Q|^2$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} |Q|^2 &= -(\langle \hat{H}^\dagger \hat{A} \rangle_\theta - \langle \hat{A} \hat{H} \rangle_\theta)^2 - (\langle \hat{H}^\dagger \rangle_\theta - \langle \hat{H} \rangle_\theta)^2 \langle \hat{A} \rangle_\theta^2 \\ &\quad + 2(\langle \hat{H}^\dagger \rangle_\theta - \langle \hat{H} \rangle_\theta)(\langle \hat{H}^\dagger \hat{A} \rangle_\theta - \langle \hat{A} \hat{H} \rangle_\theta) \langle \hat{A} \rangle_\theta \\ &= -[(\langle \hat{H}^\dagger \hat{A} \rangle_\theta + \langle \hat{A} \hat{H} \rangle_\theta)^2 + (\langle \hat{H}^\dagger \rangle_\theta + \langle \hat{H} \rangle_\theta)^2 \langle \hat{A} \rangle_\theta^2 \\ &\quad - 2(\langle \hat{H}^\dagger \rangle_\theta + \langle \hat{H} \rangle_\theta)(\langle \hat{H}^\dagger \hat{A} \rangle_\theta + \langle \hat{A} \hat{H} \rangle_\theta) \langle \hat{A} \rangle_\theta] \\ &\quad + 4[\langle \hat{H}^\dagger \hat{A} \rangle_\theta \langle \hat{A} \hat{H} \rangle_\theta + \langle \hat{H}^\dagger \rangle_\theta \langle \hat{H} \rangle_\theta \langle \hat{A} \rangle_\theta^2 - \\ &\quad \langle \hat{H}^\dagger \hat{A} \rangle_\theta \langle \hat{H} \rangle_\theta \langle \hat{A} \rangle_\theta - \langle \hat{A} \hat{H} \rangle_\theta \langle \hat{H}^\dagger \rangle_\theta \langle \hat{A} \rangle_\theta]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A11})$$

According to the non-Hermitian uncertainty relation $(\Delta \hat{A})^2 (\Delta \hat{B})^2 \geq |\langle \hat{A}^\dagger \hat{B} \rangle - \langle \hat{A}^\dagger \rangle \langle \hat{B} \rangle|^2$ [59, 60], we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta \hat{H})^2 (\Delta \hat{A})^2 &\geq |\langle \hat{H}^\dagger \hat{A} \rangle_\theta - \langle \hat{H}^\dagger \rangle_\theta \langle \hat{A} \rangle_\theta|^2 \\ &= \langle \hat{H}^\dagger \hat{A} \rangle_\theta \langle \hat{A} \hat{H} \rangle_\theta + \langle \hat{H}^\dagger \rangle_\theta \langle \hat{H} \rangle_\theta \langle \hat{A} \rangle_\theta^2 \\ &\quad - \langle \hat{H}^\dagger \hat{A} \rangle_\theta \langle \hat{H} \rangle_\theta \langle \hat{A} \rangle_\theta - \langle \hat{A} \hat{H} \rangle_\theta \langle \hat{H}^\dagger \rangle_\theta \langle \hat{A} \rangle_\theta, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A12})$$

where $(\Delta \hat{H})^2 = \langle \hat{H}^\dagger \hat{H} \rangle_\theta - \langle \hat{H}^\dagger \rangle_\theta \langle \hat{H} \rangle_\theta$. The expression in the last brackets of Eq. (A11) is exactly the same as $(\Delta \hat{H})^2 (\Delta \hat{A})^2$. Then, we can derive an inequality as follows,

$$|Q|^2 \leq 4(\Delta \hat{H})^2 (\Delta \hat{A})^2 - [(\langle \hat{H}^\dagger \hat{A} \rangle_\theta + \langle \hat{A} \hat{H} \rangle_\theta) - (\langle \hat{H}^\dagger \rangle_\theta + \langle \hat{H} \rangle_\theta) \langle \hat{A} \rangle_\theta]^2. \quad (\text{A13})$$

Here, we define an operator $\delta \hat{M} = \hat{M} - \langle \hat{M} \rangle_\theta$, then we have

$$|f\rangle = \delta \hat{H} | \varphi_\theta \rangle = \hat{H} | \varphi_\theta \rangle - \langle \hat{H} \rangle_\theta | \varphi_\theta \rangle, \quad (\text{A14})$$

$$|g\rangle = \delta \hat{A} | \varphi_\theta \rangle = \hat{A} | \varphi_\theta \rangle - \langle \hat{A} \rangle_\theta | \varphi_\theta \rangle, \quad (\text{A15})$$

$$\langle f | g \rangle = \langle \hat{H}^\dagger \hat{A} \rangle_\theta - \langle \hat{H}^\dagger \rangle_\theta \langle \hat{A} \rangle_\theta. \quad (\text{A16})$$

Then the inequality Eq. (A13) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} |Q|^2 &\leq 4(\Delta \hat{H})^2 (\Delta \hat{A})^2 - [(\langle \hat{H}^\dagger \hat{A} \rangle_\theta - \langle \hat{H}^\dagger \rangle_\theta \langle \hat{A} \rangle_\theta) + \\ &\quad (\langle \hat{A} \hat{H} \rangle_\theta - \langle \hat{H} \rangle_\theta \langle \hat{A} \rangle_\theta)]^2 \\ &= 4(\Delta \hat{H})^2 (\Delta \hat{A})^2 - (\langle f | g \rangle + \langle g | f \rangle) \\ &\leq 4(\Delta \hat{H})^2 (\Delta \hat{A})^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A17})$$

According to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the first inequality is saturated only if $|f\rangle = C|g\rangle$, where C is a constant. Furthermore, if C is an imaginary number, the second inequality will be saturated. Then we have

$$(\Delta \theta)^2 = \frac{(\Delta \hat{A})^2}{|\partial_\theta \langle \hat{A} \rangle_\theta|^2} \geq \frac{1}{4(\Delta \hat{H})^2} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{F}_\theta}. \quad (\text{A18})$$

Now we obtain the condition of optimal measurements as follows,

$$|f\rangle = iC|g\rangle, \quad (\text{A19})$$

where C is a real number. Actually, this relationship is also useful for Hermitian Hamiltonians, which has already been obtained in [61].

As for Hermitian Hamiltonians, the error-propagation formula can be expanded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta \theta)^2 &= \frac{(\Delta \hat{A})^2}{|\partial_\theta \langle \hat{A} \rangle_\theta|^2} \\ &= \frac{(\Delta \hat{A})^2}{|\langle \partial_\theta \varphi_\theta | \hat{A} | \varphi_\theta \rangle + \langle \varphi_\theta | \hat{A} | \partial_\theta \varphi_\theta \rangle|^2} \\ &= \frac{(\Delta \hat{A})^2}{|\langle \hat{H} \hat{A} - \hat{A} \hat{H} \rangle|^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A20})$$

According to Heisenberg uncertainty relation, we have $|\langle \hat{H} \hat{A} - \hat{A} \hat{H} \rangle|^2 \leq 4(\Delta \hat{A})^2 (\Delta \hat{H})^2$. Therefore, the variance of θ is limited,

$$(\Delta \theta)^2 \geq \frac{1}{4(\Delta \hat{H})^2} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{F}_\theta}. \quad (\text{A21})$$

The condition that saturates the inequality is also $|f\rangle = iC|g\rangle$. Hofmann has proposed this condition in 2009 [61].

APPENDIX C: QFI of a specific \mathcal{PT} -symmetric non-Hermitian Hamiltonian.

Here, we provide the detailed calculations of the QFI for a specific \mathcal{PT} -symmetric Hamiltonian based on Eq. (A6). For a given two level \mathcal{PT} -symmetric Hamiltonian:

$$\hat{H}_s = \begin{pmatrix} re^{i\omega} & s \\ s & re^{-i\omega} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A22})$$

where $s > 0$, r and ω are real. We can see that the eigenvalues $\lambda_\pm = \mu \pm \sqrt{v_0} = r \cos \omega \pm \sqrt{s^2 - r^2} \sin^2 \omega$ are still real when the \mathcal{PT} -symmetry is not broken, i.e. $s^2 > r^2 \sin^2 \omega$. And the normalized eigenstates are

$$|\lambda_+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\alpha/2} \\ e^{-i\alpha/2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad |\lambda_-\rangle = \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\alpha/2} \\ -e^{i\alpha/2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

where $\sin \alpha = (r/s) \sin \omega$. As discussed above, it is necessary to derive the normalized coefficient K_θ . For an arbitrary initial state $|\psi_0\rangle = N(|\lambda_+\rangle + me^{i\varphi} |\lambda_-\rangle)$ written




FIG. 4: The evolution of QFI as a function of θ . The blue curve corresponds to the QFI when \mathcal{PT} -symmetry is not broken, we set $s = 1, r = 0.25, \omega = \pi/2$, and the initial state is $|\psi_0\rangle = N(|\lambda_+\rangle + |\lambda_-\rangle)$. The red curve corresponds to the QFI in the case of \mathcal{PT} -symmetry broken, we set $s = 0.25, r = 1, \omega = \pi/2$, and the initial state is $|\psi_0\rangle = N(|\varepsilon_+\rangle - |\varepsilon_-\rangle)$. According to Eq. (A32) and Eq. (A33), their maximum value of QFI both are 6.25.

in \hat{H}_s -present, we are able to work out the normalized coefficient K_θ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} K_\theta^{(r)} &= \langle \psi_0 | \hat{U}_\theta^\dagger \hat{U}_\theta | \psi_0 \rangle \\ &= N^2 \{ e^{i(\lambda_+^* - \lambda_-)\theta} + m^2 e^{i(\lambda_-^* - \lambda_+)\theta} + \\ &\quad 2m \text{Re}[e^{i[(\lambda_+^* - \lambda_-)\theta + \varphi]} \lambda_+^* \lambda_- \langle \lambda_+ | \lambda_- \rangle] \} \\ &= N^2 \{ 1 + m^2 + 2m \sin \alpha \cos \gamma \}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A23})$$

where $\gamma = 2\sqrt{v_0}\theta + \varphi$. Let $N_\theta^{(r)} = N^2/K_\theta^{(r)}$, then $\langle \hat{H}_s^\dagger \hat{H}_s \rangle$ and $\langle \hat{H}_s \rangle$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \hat{H}_s^\dagger \hat{H}_s \rangle_\theta &= N_\theta^{(r)} (|\lambda_+|^2 + m^2 |\lambda_-|^2 + \\ &\quad 2\text{Re}[m \lambda_+^* \lambda_- e^{i[(\lambda_+^* - \lambda_-)\theta + \varphi]} \langle \lambda_+ | \lambda_- \rangle]) \\ &= N_\theta^{(r)} [(r \cos \omega + \sqrt{v_0})^2 + m^2 (r \cos \omega - \sqrt{v_0})^2 \\ &\quad + 2m(r^2 \cos^2 \omega - v_0) \sin \alpha \cos \gamma], \\ \langle \hat{H}_s \rangle_\theta &= N_\theta^{(r)} \{ \lambda_+ + m^2 \lambda_- + m \sin \alpha (\lambda_+ e^{i\gamma} + \lambda_- e^{-i\gamma}) \} \\ &= N_\theta^{(r)} [(r \cos \omega + \sqrt{v_0}) + m^2 (r \cos \omega - \sqrt{v_0}) + \\ &\quad 2m \sin \alpha (r \cos \omega \cos \gamma + i\sqrt{v_0} \sin \gamma)] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A24})$$

According to Eq. (A6), we have

$$\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(r)} = \frac{16m^2(s^2 - r^2 \sin^2 \omega)^2}{[s(1 + m^2) + 2mr \sin \omega \cos(2\sqrt{v_0}\theta + \varphi)]^2}. \quad (\text{A25})$$

In the case of \mathcal{PT} -symmetry broken, the eigenvalues turn to $\varepsilon_\pm = \mu \pm \sqrt{v_1} = r \cos \omega \pm i\sqrt{r^2 \sin^2 \omega - s^2}$, and the normalized eigenstates are

$$|\varepsilon_\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(r \sin \omega \pm \sqrt{v_1})^2 + t^2}} \begin{pmatrix} i(r \sin \omega \pm \sqrt{v_1}) \\ t \end{pmatrix}.$$




FIG. 5: The evolution of QFI $\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(r)}$ for \mathcal{PT} -symmetric Hamiltonian as a function of θ . We set that $s = 1, r = 0.4, \omega = \pi/2, m = 1$ and φ changes from 0 to $2\pi/3$.

Let $n = r \sin \omega / s$, for an arbitrary initial state $|\psi_0\rangle = N(|\varepsilon_+\rangle + m e^{i\varphi} |\varepsilon_-\rangle)$, similarly, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} N_\theta^{(i)} &= \frac{|N|^2}{K_\theta^{(i)}} = \frac{1}{e^{2\sqrt{v_1}\theta} + m^2 e^{-2\sqrt{v_1}\theta} + 2m\zeta \cos \varphi}, \\ \langle \hat{H}_s^\dagger \hat{H}_s \rangle_\theta &= N_\theta^{(i)} \{ |\varepsilon_+|^2 e^{i(\varepsilon_+^* - \varepsilon_+)\theta} + m^2 |\varepsilon_-|^2 e^{i(\varepsilon_-^* - \varepsilon_-)\theta} \\ &\quad + 2\text{Re}(m e^{i[(\varepsilon_+^* - \varepsilon_+)\theta + \varphi]} \varepsilon_+^* \varepsilon_- \zeta) \} \\ &= N_\theta^{(i)} \{ (r^2 - s^2) e^{2\sqrt{v_1}\theta} + m^2 (r^2 - s^2) e^{-2\sqrt{v_1}\theta} + \\ &\quad 2m\zeta [(r^2 \cos 2\omega + s^2) \cos \varphi + 2r\sqrt{v_1} \cos \omega \sin \varphi] \}, \\ \langle \hat{H}_s \rangle_\theta &= N_\theta^{(i)} [\varepsilon_+^* e^{2\sqrt{v_1}\theta} + m^2 \varepsilon_-^* e^{-2\sqrt{v_1}\theta} + 2m\zeta \text{Re}(\varepsilon_+^* e^{i\varphi})] \\ &= N_\theta^{(i)} [(r \cos \omega - i\sqrt{v_1}) e^{2\sqrt{v_1}\theta} + m^2 (r \cos \omega + \\ &\quad i\sqrt{v_1}) e^{-2\sqrt{v_1}\theta} + 2m\zeta (r \cos \omega \cos \varphi + \sqrt{v_1} \sin \varphi)], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A26})$$

where $\zeta = \langle \varepsilon_+ | \varepsilon_- \rangle = 1/|n|$. Collecting these results, we arrive at

$$\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(i)} = \frac{16m^2(r^2 \sin^2 \omega - s^2)^2 e^{4\sqrt{v_1}\theta}}{[A(e^{4\sqrt{v_1}\theta} + m^2) + 2mse^{2\sqrt{v_1}\theta} \cos \varphi]^2}, \quad (\text{A27})$$

where $A = |r \sin \omega|$. As shown in Fig. 4, the QFI is quite different in these two cases. We set that in both cases, the initial states are both optimal. Fig. 4 shows that the QFI oscillates with θ when \mathcal{PT} -symmetry is not broken; on the contrary, the QFI has only one peak and quickly attenuates with θ when \mathcal{PT} -symmetry is broken. We can see that the performance of QFI is much better when the \mathcal{PT} -symmetry is not broken, so we will study more on this. Fig. 5 shows that, for the given Hamiltonian, the curve of QFI shifts along the θ -axis with the change of φ . As discussed in section V, we know that QFI of \mathcal{PT} -symmetric Hamiltonian \hat{H}_s can be much larger than that of Hermitian Hamiltonian in some specific intervals of θ , what if the actual parameter θ_0 is in the intervals that QFI of \hat{H}_s is smaller than that of Hermitian Hamiltonians? According to Eq. (A25), the relative phase φ is only

contained in $\cos(2\sqrt{v_0}\theta + \varphi)$, hence φ has nothing to do with the amplitude and frequency of $\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(r)}$. As shown in Fig. 5, we can shift the curve of QFI to maximize the QFI for a specific parameter θ_0 by adjusting the relative phase φ .

Then we discuss the maximum value of QFI and why $\mathcal{F}_{\theta, \max}$ does not reduce to zero as EP is approached. In the two cases of \mathcal{PT} -symmetry broken and not, the QFI with optimal initial states respectively are

$$\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(r)} = \frac{4(s^2 - r^2 \sin^2 \omega)^2}{[s + r \sin \omega \cos(2\sqrt{v_0}\theta + \varphi)]^2}, \quad (\text{A28})$$

$$\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(i)} = \frac{16m^2(r^2 \sin^2 \omega - s^2)^2}{[A(e^{2\sqrt{v_1}\theta} + m^2 e^{-2\sqrt{v_1}\theta}) + 2ms]^2}, \quad (\text{A29})$$

where $A = |r \sin \omega|$. For $\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(r)}$, if $r \sin \omega > 0$, it is maximum when $\cos(2\sqrt{v_0}\theta + \varphi) = -1$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{\theta, \max}^{(r)} &= \frac{4(s + r \sin \omega)^2 (s - r \sin \omega)^2}{(s - r \sin \omega)^2} \\ &= 4(s + r \sin \omega)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A30})$$

The system reaches EP when $s - r \sin \omega = 0$. However, $(s - r \sin \omega)^2$ in the $\mathcal{F}_{\theta, \max}^{(r)}$ is omitted, so $\mathcal{F}_{\theta, \max}^{(r)}$ will not reduce to zero as EP is approached. If $r \sin \omega < 0$, $\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(r)}$ is maximum when $\cos(2\sqrt{v_0}\theta + \varphi) = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{\theta, \max}^{(r)} &= \frac{4(s + r \sin \omega)^2 (s - r \sin \omega)^2}{(s + r \sin \omega)^2} \\ &= 4(s - r \sin \omega)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A31})$$

Similarly, the system reaches EP when $s + r \sin \omega = 0$, but $(s + r \sin \omega)^2$ in $\mathcal{F}_{\theta, \max}^{(r)}$ is omitted. To sum up, $\mathcal{F}_{\theta, \max}^{(r)}$ can be written as

$$\mathcal{F}_{\theta, \max}^{(r)} = 4(s + |r \sin \omega|)^2, \quad (\text{A32})$$

it will not reduce to zero as EP is approached.

As for $\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(i)}$, it is maximum when $\theta = \ln(-m)/2\sqrt{v_1}$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{\theta, \max}^{(i)} &= \frac{4(r^2 \sin^2 \omega - s^2)^2}{(s - |r \sin \omega|)^2} \\ &= \frac{4(r^2 \sin^2 \omega - s^2)^2 B^2}{(r^2 \sin^2 \omega - s^2)^2} = B^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A33})$$

where $B = s + |r \sin \omega|$. Similarly, the system reaches EP when $r^2 \sin^2 \omega - s^2 = 0$, but $(r^2 \sin^2 \omega - s^2)^2$ is omitted in $\mathcal{F}_{\theta, \max}^{(i)}$, so $\mathcal{F}_{\theta, \max}^{(i)}$ will not reduce to zero near EP.

APPENDIX D: Optimal measurement of the specific \mathcal{PT} -symmetric Hamiltonian

In the main text, we give an optimal measurement $|0\rangle\langle 0|$ for the \mathcal{PT} -symmetric non-Hermitian Hamiltonian \hat{H}_s in the case of PT symmetry not broken, in this section, we are going to prove that the measurement $|0\rangle\langle 0|$ satisfies the condition Eq. (A19). Here, we denote $\hat{X} = |0\rangle\langle 0|$ and use $n = r/s$, and remember that we set $\omega = \pi/2$. As discussed in the main text, the measurement is optimal only for the optimal initial state. In the case of \mathcal{PT} -symmetry not broken, the optimal initial state is $|\psi_0\rangle = N(|\lambda_+\rangle + e^{i\varphi} |\lambda_-\rangle)$, then we can obtain $\langle \hat{H}_s \rangle_\theta$ and $\langle \hat{X} \rangle_\theta$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \hat{H}_s \rangle_\theta &= -i2N_\theta^{(r)} v_0 [n\sqrt{1-n^2} \cos(2\sqrt{v_0}\theta + \varphi) + n^2 \sin(2\sqrt{v_0}\theta + \varphi)], \\ \langle \hat{X} \rangle_\theta &= N_\theta^{(r)} \{1 + [(2n^2 - 1) \cos(2\sqrt{v_0}\theta + \varphi) - 2n\sqrt{1-n^2} \sin(2\sqrt{v_0}\theta + \varphi)]\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A34})$$

According to Eq. (A14) and Eq. (A15), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |f\rangle &= (\hat{H}_s - \langle \hat{H}_s \rangle) |\varphi_\theta\rangle \\ &= \frac{4e^{i\frac{\varphi}{2}} N_\theta^{(r)} v_0}{s} \sqrt{\frac{N_\theta^{(r)}}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \cos \gamma_0 \\ i \sin(\gamma_0 + \beta) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A35}) \\ |g\rangle &= (\hat{X} - \langle \hat{X} \rangle) |\varphi_\theta\rangle \\ &= 4e^{i\frac{\varphi}{2}} N_\theta^{(r)} \sqrt{\frac{N_\theta^{(r)}}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} i \cos^2 \gamma_0 \sin(\gamma_0 + \beta) \\ -\cos \gamma_0 \sin^2(\gamma_0 + \beta) \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A36})$$

where $\gamma_0 = \sqrt{v_0}\theta + \varphi/2$ and β is determined by n ($\sin \beta = n, \cos \beta = -\sqrt{1-n^2}$). Then we obtain

$$|f\rangle = -\frac{iv_0}{s \cos \gamma_0 \sin(\gamma_0 + \beta)} |g\rangle. \quad (\text{A37})$$

Obviously, this result satisfies the condition $|f\rangle = iC |g\rangle$. Moreover, we compare the estimation variance generated by $|0\rangle\langle 0|$ with the reciprocal of $\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(r)}$. According to error-propagation formula Eq. (A7), we can obtain the precision of the estimation for arbitrary initial state

$$(\Delta\theta)^2 = \frac{p}{q}, \quad (\text{A38})$$

where $p = [1 + m^2 + 2mn \sin(2\gamma_0 + \beta)]^2 [1 + m^2 - 2m \cos 2\gamma_0 + 4mn \sin(2\gamma_0 + \beta)] (1 + m^2 + 2m \cos 2\gamma_0)$ and $q = 16m^2 v_0 (1 - n^2) [2mn + (1 + m^2) \sin(2\gamma_0 + \beta)]^2$. As shown in Fig. 6(a), as we set $m = 1$, the two curves coincide completely which means the precision of estimation reaches quantum CRB. According to Fig. 6(b), (c), and (d), we see that the variance of parameter gradually increases with the change of m . Therefore, $|0\rangle\langle 0|$ is indeed the optimal measurement only for the optimal initial state.




FIG. 6: The evolution of the variance $(\Delta\theta)^2$ and the reciprocal of QFI $1/\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(r)}$ as functions of θ , we set the Hamiltonian and the relative phase to remain unchanged, $s = 0.5, n = 0.5, \varphi = 0$. (a) We set the initial state to be optimal $m = 1.0$. The actual precision $(\Delta\theta)^2$ is equal to $1/\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(1)}$, which means the quantum CRB is saturated. (b) We set $m = 1.1$, the variance $(\Delta\theta)^2$ is larger than $1/\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(r)}$, the precision of the estimation declines. In (c) and (d), we set $m = 1.2$ and $m = 1.3$ respectively, the precision of the estimation further declines.

APPENDIX E: Comparison of Hermitian and non-Hermitian Hamiltonian QFI

Knowing the QFI of \hat{H}_s , we compare $\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(r)}$ with the QFI of two Hermitian Hamiltonians, for simplicity, we set $\omega = \pi/2$. The Hermitian Hamiltonians are

$$\hat{H}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{s^2 - r^2} & 0 \\ 0 & -\sqrt{s^2 - r^2} \end{pmatrix}, \hat{H}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} s & -ir \\ ir & s \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that \hat{H}_0 has the same eigenvalues with \mathcal{PT} -symmetric Hamiltonian \hat{H}_s , and $\hat{H}_1^\dagger \hat{H}_1 = \hat{H}_s^\dagger \hat{H}_s$. That is why we select these two Hermitian Hamiltonians. It is not difficult to calculate the optimal QFI, we have $\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(0)} = 4\lambda_0^2$ and $\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(1)} = 4r^2$. We find that the QFI of Hamiltonian \hat{H}_s can be much larger than that of two Hermitian Hamiltonians. To illustrate this, we define




FIG. 7: The evolution of ratio S_θ as a function of θ . We set that $s = 1, n$ changes from 0.2 to 0.6 with an interval of 0.2, and the initial state $|\psi_0\rangle = N(|\lambda_+\rangle + |\lambda_-\rangle)$ remains unchanged. (a) The ratio factor $S_\theta^{(0)}$ of systems with different modulus of energy. (b) The ratio factor $S_\theta^{(1)}$ of systems with different modulus of energy.

the ratios S_θ as functions as follows:

$$S_\theta^{(0)} = \frac{\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(r)}}{\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(0)}} = \frac{4m^2(1-n^2)}{[1+m^2+2mn\sin(2\sqrt{v_0}\theta+\varphi+\alpha)]^2},$$

$$S_\theta^{(1)} = \frac{\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(r)}}{\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(1)}} = \frac{4m^2(1-n^2)^2}{n^2[1+m^2+2mn\sin(2\sqrt{v_0}\theta+\varphi+\alpha)]^2}. \quad (\text{A39})$$

Let us consider an example of the comparison, we set the initial state as $|\psi_0\rangle = N(|\lambda_+\rangle + |\lambda_-\rangle)$ which is optimal, and change the modulus of energy λ_0 . If there is $S_\theta > 1$, our conjecture is verified. We can see that in Fig. 7(a) and (b), the ratios $S_\theta^{(0)}$ and $S_\theta^{(1)}$ change with the value of n , and the curves above the grey dotted line indicate that the QFI for non-Hermitian system can be larger than that of Hermitian systems in some intervals, among them, the maximum value of $S_\theta^{(0)}$ can reach 4, while the maximum value of $S_\theta^{(1)}$ can even reach 36! As mentioned in section III, as we change the relative phase φ in initial state $|\psi_0\rangle$, the curves shift along the θ -axis, so that we can guarantee that $\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(r)}$ can be larger than $\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(0)}$ or $\mathcal{F}_\theta^{(1)}$ in arbitrary intervals of θ .

* Electronic address: chengjie.zhang@gmail.com

- [1] C. W. Helstrom, *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory* (Academic Press, New York, 1976).
- [2] A. S. Holevo, *Probabilistic and Statistical Aspects of Quantum Theory* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1982).
- [3] S. L. Braunstein and C. M. Caves, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72**, 3439 (1994).
- [4] S. L. Braunstein, C. M. Caves, G.J. Milburn, *Ann. Phys.* **247**, 135-173 (1996).
- [5] L. Pezzé and A. Smerzi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 100401 (2009).
- [6] P. Hyllus, W. Laskowski, R. Krischek, C. Schwemmer, W. Wieczorek, H. Weinfurter, L. Pezzé, and A. Smerzi, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 022321 (2012).
- [7] G. Tóth, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 022322 (2012).
- [8] A. del Campo, I. L. Egusquiza, M. B. Plenio, and S. F. Huelga, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 050403 (2013).
- [9] M. M. Taddei, B. M. Escher, L. Davidovich, and R. L. de Matos Filho, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 050402 (2013).
- [10] F. Fröwis, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 052127 (2012).
- [11] F. Fröwis and W. Dür, *New J. Phys.* **14**, 093039 (2012).
- [12] F. Fröwis and W. Dür, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 110402 (2011).
- [13] A. Smerzi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 150410 (2012).
- [14] F. Schäfer, I. Herrera, S. Cherukattil, C. Lovovichio, F.S. Cataliotti, F. Caruso and A. Smerzi, *Nat. Commun* **5**, 3194 (2014).
- [15] C. M. Bender and S. Boettcher, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 5243 (1998).
- [16] P. Dorey, C. Dunning and R. Tateo, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **34**, 5679 (2001).
- [17] C. M. Bender, D. C. Brody, and H. F. Jones, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 270401 (2002).
- [18] A. Mostafazadeh, *J. Math. Phys.* **43**, 2814 (2002).
- [19] C. M. Bender, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **70**, 947 (2007).
- [20] M.V. Berry, *Czech. J. Phys.* **54**, 1039-1047 (2004).
- [21] W. D. Heiss, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **45**, 444016 (2012).
- [22] N. Lazarides and G. P. Tsironis, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 053901 (2013).
- [23] F. Monticone, C. A. Valagiannopoulos, and A. Alù, *Phys. Rev. X* **6**, 041018 (2016).
- [24] Y.-C. Hu and T. L. Hughes, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 153101 (2011).
- [25] M. S. Rudner and L. S. Levitov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 065703 (2009).
- [26] K. G. Makris, R. El-Ganainy, D. N. Christodoulides, and Z. H. Musslimani, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 103904 (2008).
- [27] R. El-Ganainy, K. G. Makris, D. N. Christodoulides, and Z. H. Musslimani, *Opt. Lett.* **32**, 2632-2634 (2007).
- [28] Z. H. Musslimani, K. G. Makris, R. El-Ganainy, and D. N. Christodoulides, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 030402 (2008).
- [29] A. Guo, G. J. Salamo, D. Duchesne, R. Morandotti, M. Volatier-Ravot, V. Aimez, G. A. Siviloglou, and D. N. Christodoulides, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 093902 (2009).
- [30] C. E. Rüter, K. G. Makris, R. El-Ganainy, D. N. Christodoulides, M. Segev and D. Kip, *Nature Phys* **6**, 192-195 (2010).
- [31] S. Wildermuth, S. Hofferberth, I. Lesanovsky, S. Groth, P. Krüger, and J. Schmiedmayer, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **88**, 264103 (2006).
- [32] M. Vengalattore, J. M. Higbie, S. R. Leslie, J. Guzman, L. E. Sadler, and D. M. Stamper-Kurn, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 200801 (2007).
- [33] N. Behbood, F. Martin Ciurana, G. Colangelo, M. Napolitano, M. W. Mitchell, and R. J. Sewell, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **102**, 173504 (2013).
- [34] M. Koschorreck, M. Napolitano, B. Dubost, and M. W. Mitchell, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **98**, 074101 (2011).
- [35] W. Muessel, H. Strobel, D. Linnemann, D. B. Hume, and M. K. Oberthaler, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 103004 (2014).
- [36] P. M. Anisimov, G. M. Raterman, A. Chiruvelli, W. N. Plick, S. D. Huver, H. Lee, and J. P. Dowling, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 103602 (2010).
- [37] P. M. Anisimov, G. M. Raterman, A. Chiruvelli, W. N. Plick, S. D. Huver, H. Lee, and J. P. Dowling, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 103602 (2010).
- [38] J. Joo, W. J. Munro, and T. P. Spiller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 083601 (2011).
- [39] M. G. Genoni, S. Olivares, and M. G. A. Paris, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 153603 (2011).
- [40] N. Thomas-Peter, B. J. Smith, A. Datta, L. Zhang, U. Dorner, and I. A. Walmsley, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 113603 (2011).
- [41] L. Pezzè, M. A. Ciampini, N. Spagnolo, P. C. Humphreys, A. Datta, I. A. Walmsley, M. Barbieri, F. Sciarrino, and A. Smerzi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 130504 (2017).
- [42] X.-M. Lu and X. Wang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 120503 (2021).
- [43] H. Yuan and C.-H. F. Fung, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 110401 (2015).
- [44] H. Yuan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 160801 (2016).
- [45] J. Wiersig, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 203901 (2014).
- [46] Z.-P. Liu, J. Zhang, Ş. K. özdemir, B. Peng, H. Jing, X.-Y. Lü, C.-W. Li, L. Yang, F. Nori, and Y.-X. Liu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 110802 (2016).
- [47] W. Chen, Ş. K. özdemir, G. Zhao, J. Wiersig, L. Yang, *Nature* **548**, 192-196 (2017).
- [48] H. Hodaie, A. U. Hassan, S. Wittek, H. Garcia-Gracia, R. El-Ganainy, D. N. Christodoulides, M. Khajavikhan, *Nature* **548**, 187-191 (2017).
- [49] S. Yu, Y. Meng, J.-S. Tang, X.-Y. Xu, Y.-T. Wang, P. Yin, Z.-J. Ke, W. Liu, Z.-P. Li, Y.-Z. Yang, G. Chen, Y.-J. Han, C.-F. Li, and G.-C. Guo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 240506 (2020).
- [50] Y. Chu, Y. Liu, H. Liu, and J. Cai, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 020501 (2020).
- [51] H.-K. Lau, A. A. Clerk, *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 4320 (2018).
- [52] D. Xie, C. Xu and A. M. Wang, *Results Phys.* **26**, 104430 (2021).
- [53] See Supplemental Material for detailed derivations.
- [54] B. Yurke, S. L. McCall, and J. R. Klauder, *Phys. Rev. A* **33**, 4033 (1986).
- [55] S. F. Huelga, C. Macchiavello, T. Pellizzari, A. K. Ekert, M. B. Plenio, and J. I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 3865 (1997).
- [56] A. K. Pati, U. Singh, and U. Sinha, *Phys. Rev. A* **92**, 052120 (2015).
- [57] M. J. W. Hall, A. K. Pati, and J. Wu, *Phys. Rev. A* **93**, 052118, (2016).
- [58] D. Mondal, S. Bagchi, and A. K. Pati, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 052117, (2017).
- [59] B. Yu, N. Jing, and X. Li-Jost, *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 022116 (2019).
- [60] X. Zhao, C. Zhang, *Front. Phys.* **10**, 862868. (2022).
- [61] H. F. Hofmann, *Phys. Rev. A* **79**, 033822 (2009).
- [62] M. Huang, R.-K. Lee, L. Zhang, S.-M. Fei, and J. Wu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 080404 (2019).