

Quantum Process Tomography via ℓ_1 -norm Minimization

Robert L. Kosut

SC Solutions, Sunnyvale, CA 94085 (kosut@scsolutions.com)

For an initially well designed but imperfect quantum information system, the process matrix is almost sparse in an appropriate basis. Existing theory and associated computational methods (ℓ_1 -norm minimization) for reconstructing sparse signals establish conditions under which the sparse signal can be perfectly reconstructed from a very limited number of measurements (resources). Although a direct extension to quantum process tomography of the ℓ_1 -norm minimization theory has not yet emerged, the numerical examples presented here, which apply ℓ_1 -norm minimization to quantum process tomography, show a significant reduction in resources to achieve a desired estimation accuracy over existing methods.

Quantum process tomography (QPT) refers to the use of measured data to estimate the dynamics of a quantum system [1, 2]. Unfortunately, in the general case, the dimension of the parameter space for QPT can be prohibitive, scaling exponentially with the number of qubits. This in turn places the same burden on resources, *e.g.*, the number of applied inputs, measurement outcomes, and experiments to achieve a desired accuracy, as well as estimation computational complexity. A number of approaches have been developed to alleviate this burden. Of note are the various forms of ancilla assisted QPT (see [3] for a review), and the use of symmetrisation to estimate selected process properties [4]. Here we present a method which can be used either alone or in conjunction with any of the aforementioned approaches. The underlying premise is that for an initially well engineered design, the object that describes the quantum dynamics, the *process matrix*, will be *almost sparse* in the appropriate basis. Certainly in the ideal case of a perfect unitary channel, in the corresponding ideal basis, the process matrix is maximally sparse, *i.e.*, it has a *single* non-zero element. Since environmental interactions cannot be totally eliminated, the actual process matrix in this ideal basis will be populated with many small elements, and thus, is almost sparse.

These are the conditions under which methods using ℓ_1 -norm minimization – often referred to as *Compressive Sensing* – are applicable [5, 6, 7]. Specifically, for a class of incomplete linear measurement equations ($y = Ax$, $A \in \mathbf{R}^{m \times n}$, $m \ll n$), constrained ℓ_1 -norm minimization (minimize $\|x\|_{\ell_1}$ subject to $y = Ax$), a convex optimization problem, can perfectly estimate the sparse variable x . These methods also work very well for systems which do not satisfy the theoretical conditions, *i.e.*, for almost sparse variables and with measurement noise.

The underlying theory of ℓ_1 minimization shows that under certain conditions on the matrix A , to realize perfect recovery, the number of measurements, m , scales with the product of the log of the number of variables n and the sparsity. Since QPT parameters are linear in probability outcomes, and scale exponentially with the number of qubits, this approach heralds a possible linear scaling with qubits. The theory, however, has not as yet been extended to QPT. *The numerical examples here are not meant to lend support to this scaling as they are only presented for the two-qubit case.* The examples do, however, show more than an order of magnitude savings in resources over a standard constrained least-squares estimation using a

complete set of measurements, *i.e.*, $\text{rank}(A) \geq n$.

The paper is organized as follows: QPT formalism is described next, followed by a discussion of the genesis of process matrix (almost) sparsity. A form of the ℓ_1 minimization for QPT is then presented followed by numerical examples and some concluding remarks.

QPT Formalism.— Recall that the state-to-state dynamics of an *open* finite-dimensional quantum system can be described in the following canonical form [1]:

$$\hat{\rho} = \sum_{\alpha, \beta=1}^{n^2} X_{\alpha\beta} \Gamma_{\alpha} \rho \Gamma_{\beta}^{\dagger} \quad (1)$$

where ρ , $\hat{\rho} \in \mathbf{C}^{n \times n}$ are the input and output state, respectively, of dimension n , $X_{\alpha\beta}$ are the elements of the $n^2 \times n^2$ *process matrix* X , and the matrices Γ_{α} form an orthonormal basis set for $n \times n$ complex matrices:

$$\{\Gamma_{\alpha} \in \mathbf{C}^{n \times n} \mid \text{Tr} \Gamma_{\alpha}^{\dagger} \Gamma_{\beta} = \delta_{\alpha\beta}, \alpha, \beta = 1, \dots, n^2\} \quad (2)$$

It is assumed that the quantum system to be estimated is *completely positive and trace preserving* (CPTP). The set of feasible process matrices is then restricted to the convex set [8, 9],

$$\begin{aligned} X &\geq 0 \text{ (positive semidefinite)} \\ \sum_{\alpha, \beta=1}^{n^2} X_{\alpha\beta} \Gamma_{\beta}^{\dagger} \Gamma_{\alpha} &= I_n \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

It follows from (3) that the number of real parameters in the process matrix is $n^4 - n^2$. For q qubits $n = 2^q$, hence, scaling with parameters is exponential in the number of qubits.

Collecting data.— A common method for collecting data from a quantum system is via repeated identical experiments. Denote by $i = 1, \dots, n_{\text{out}}$ the distinct *outcomes*, and by $k = 1, \dots, n_{\text{cfg}}$ the experimental *configurations*, *e.g.*, any “knobs” associated with state inputs and/or measurement devices. The measurement outcomes are recorded from identical experiments in each configuration k repeated N_k times. Let N_{ik} denote the number of times out of N_k that outcome i occurred in configuration k . The QPT data are the recorded outcome counts,

$$\{N_{ik} \mid i = 1, \dots, n_{\text{out}}, k = 1, \dots, n_{\text{cfg}}\} \quad (4)$$

where $N = \sum_{k=1}^{n_{\text{cfg}}} N_k = \sum_{k=1}^{n_{\text{cfg}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{out}}} N_{ik}$ is the total number of experiments.

Estimating the process matrix.— An *empirical estimate* of the probability of measuring outcome i in configuration k can be obtained from (4) as,

$$p_{ik}^{\text{emp}} = N_{ik}/N_k \quad (5)$$

From the Born Rule the *model probability* of outcome i given configuration k with observable M_{ik} is, $p_{ik} = \text{Tr } M_{ik} \hat{\rho}_k$, where from (1), $\hat{\rho}_k = \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{n^2} X_{\alpha\beta} \Gamma_\alpha \rho_k \Gamma_\beta^\dagger$. In terms of the process matrix X , the Born rule then becomes,

$$\begin{aligned} p_{ik}(X) &= \text{Tr } G_{ik} X \\ (G_{ik})_{\alpha\beta} &= \text{Tr } \Gamma_\beta^\dagger M_{ik} \Gamma_\alpha \rho_k \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The $n_{\text{out}} n_{\text{cfg}}$ matrices $G_{ik} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ capture the effect of measurements in the matrix basis set (2). For each outcome i , the complete set of configurations is the combination of all these matrices and the input states: $\{\rho_k, G_{ik}\}_{k=1}^{n_{\text{cfg}}}$.

A process matrix estimate can be obtained by minimizing the difference between the empirical probability estimates p_{ik}^{emp} and the model probabilities $p_{ik}(X)$ subject to the feasibility constraint (3). Using a “least-squares” measure of probability error leads to estimating the process matrix by solving the optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{minimize } & V_{\text{LS}}(X) = \sum_{i,k} (p_{ik}^{\text{emp}} - p_{ik}(X))^2 \\ \text{subject to } & X \text{ satisfies (3)} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Because the outcomes of each experiment are independent, a maximum likelihood approach can also be considered, *i.e.*,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{minimize } & V_{\text{ML}}(X) = - \sum_{i,k} N_{ik} \log p_{ik}(X) \\ \text{subject to } & X \text{ satisfies (3)} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Both (7) and (8) are convex optimization problems with the optimization variables being the elements of X [8, 9]. The resulting solution (estimate) will always be CPTP (3). Unfortunately, as already mentioned, the dimension of the parameter space ($n^4 - n^2, n = 2^q$) can severely strain resources to the point of impracticality. To see this more clearly, let the linear relation in (6) between the $n_{\text{out}} n_{\text{cfg}}$ model probability outcomes and the n^4 elements of the process matrix be represented by an $n_{\text{out}} n_{\text{cfg}} \times n^4$ matrix \mathcal{G} , *i.e.*,

$$\vec{p} = \mathcal{G} \vec{X} \quad (9)$$

where \vec{p}, \vec{X} are vectors formed from the p_{ik} and elements of X , respectively. Accounting for the n^2 linear constraints in (3), X can be recovered from either (7) or (8) to within any desired accuracy by using enough data (N in (4) sufficiently large), provided that $\text{rank}(\mathcal{G}) \geq n_{\text{out}} n_{\text{cfg}} \geq n^4 - n^2$. Therefore it would seem that the resources, $n_{\text{out}} n_{\text{cfg}}$, must also scale exponentially with the number of qubits. This, however, is not the case when the process matrix is almost sparse and where the sparsity pattern is not known[17].

Almost sparsity of the process matrix.— With no noise the ideal channel $\rho \rightarrow \hat{\rho}$ for a quantum information system is a unitary, *i.e.*, $\hat{\rho} = U \rho U^\dagger$. Let $\{\bar{\Gamma}_\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}\}_{\alpha=1}^{n^2}$ denote the “Natural-Basis” for matrices in $\mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$, *i.e.*, each basis matrix has a single non-zero element of one. In this basis, the process matrix associated with the ideal unitary channel has the rank-1 form, $X_{\text{ideal}} = x x^\dagger$ with $x \in \mathbb{C}^{n^2}$, $x^\dagger x = n$. A singular value decomposition (SVD) gives $X_{\text{ideal}} = V \text{diag}(n, 0, \dots, 0) V^\dagger$ with $V \in \mathbb{C}^{n^2 \times n^2}$ a unitary. An equivalent process matrix can be formed from the SVD




FIG. 1: Absolute values of the elements of the process matrix $X \in \mathbb{C}^{16 \times 16}$ for: (a) ideal in the Natural-Basis; (b) ideal in Ideal/SVD-Basis; (c) actual ($p_{\text{bf}} = 0.05$) in Natural-Basis; (d) actual ($p_{\text{bf}} = 0.05$) in Ideal/SVD-Basis; (e) actual ($p_{\text{bf}} = 0.2$) in Natural-Basis; (f) actual ($p_{\text{bf}} = 0.2$) in Ideal/SVD-Basis.

in what is referred to here as the “Ideal/SVD-Basis,” $\{\Gamma_\alpha = \sum_{\alpha'=1}^{n^2} V_{\alpha'\alpha} \bar{\Gamma}_{\alpha'} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}\}_{\alpha=1}^{n^2}$. The equivalent process matrix, in this basis, denoted by X_{ideal} , is maximally sparse with a single non-zero element, specifically, $(X_{\text{ideal}})_{11} = n$. As will always be the case, the actual channel will be a perturbation of the ideal unitary. If the noise source is small then the process matrix in the nominal basis will be almost sparse.

Example: Noisy two-qubit memory.— Consider a system which is ideally a two-qubit quantum memory, thus $U = I_4, n = 4$. Suppose the actual system is a perturbation of identity by independent bit-flip errors in each channel occurring with probability p_{bf} . For $p_{\text{bf}} = 0.05$ and $p_{\text{bf}} = 0.2$, the respective channel fidelities are about 0.90 and 0.64, which for quantum information processing would need to be discovered by QPT and then corrected for the device to ever work. Referring to Fig.1, in the Natural-Basis, Fig.1(a), the ideal 16×16 process matrix has 16 non-zero elements out of 256, all of magnitude one. Using the Ideal/SVD-Basis the corresponding process matrix as shown in Fig.1(b) has a *single* non-zero element of magnitude $n = 4$ – it is clearly maximally sparse. Fig.1(c)-(d) and (e)-(f), respectively, show the effect of the two p_{bf} levels in the two basis sets. In the Ideal/SVD-basis Fig.1(d) and (f) show that the actual (noisy) process matrices are almost sparse.

Sparsity minimization.— A known heuristic for minimizing sparsity without knowing the sparsity pattern, and also accu-

ing the benefit of using fewer resources, is to minimize the ℓ_1 -norm of the vector of variables [5, 6, 9]. For QPT the equivalent ℓ_1 norm is defined here as the sum of the absolute values of the real and imaginary parts of each element of the process matrix. There are many related approaches to incorporate this norm. For example, an estimate of X can be obtained by solving the following convex optimization problem:[18]

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} \quad \|X\|_{\ell_1} \equiv \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{n^2} (|\text{Re } X_{\alpha\beta}| + |\text{Im } X_{\alpha\beta}|) \\ & \text{subject to} \quad V(X) \leq \sigma, X \text{ satisfies (3)} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

with, *e.g.*, $V(X)$ from (7) or (8). The optimization parameter σ is used to regulate the tradeoff between fitting X to the data by minimizing $V(X)$ vs. minimizing the sparsity of X via the ℓ_1 -norm. Selecting σ is often done by averaging $V(X)$ over a series of surrogates for X obtained from anticipated scenarios or iterating estimation and experiment design, *e.g.*, [8].

In the examples to follow we use the modification of (10) suggested in [7], referred to there as “ ℓ_1 -reweighted minimization.” In this approach a weighted ℓ_1 -norm is used with the weights determined iteratively. The algorithm described in [7] is:

Initialize $\sigma > 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$, $W = I_{n^4}$

Repeat

1. *Solve for X*

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} \quad \|WX\|_{\ell_1} \\ & \text{subject to} \quad V(X) \leq \sigma, X \text{ satisfies (3)} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

2. *Update weights*

$$\begin{aligned} W &= \text{diag}(1/(|x_1| + \varepsilon), \dots, 1/(|x_{n^4}| + \varepsilon)) \\ x &= \vec{X} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Until convergence – the objective stops decreasing or a maximum number of iterations is reached.

In each of the examples to follow the procedure for QPT is: (i) solve (7) to obtain X_{ℓ_2} ; (ii) set $\sigma = 1.3 V(X_{\ell_2})$; (iii) solve the reweighting algorithm (11)-(12) for X_{ℓ_1} .

Example: QPT of noisy two-qubit memory.— For the systems from the example in Fig.1, the inputs and measurements are selected from the set of two-qubit states: $|a\rangle$, $|+\rangle = (|a\rangle + |b\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, $|-\rangle = (|a\rangle - |b\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ with $a, b = 1, \dots, 16$. Specifically, the available set of states are the 16 columns of the matrices,

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -i & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -i & 0 & -i & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -i & 0 & 0 & -i \end{bmatrix} \quad (13)$$

Considering only coincident input/measurement counts [10], the relevant probability outcomes (6) are,

$$\begin{aligned} p_{ab}(X) &= g_{ab}^\dagger X g_{ab}, X \in \mathbf{C}^{16 \times 16} \\ (g_{ab})_\alpha &= \phi_a^\dagger \Gamma_\alpha \phi_b, \alpha = 1, \dots, 16 \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

with $\phi_a, \phi_b (a, b) \in \{1, \dots, 16\}$ the selected columns of (13).

Fig.2 shows the error in estimating the process matrix $\Delta X = X_{\text{true}} - X_{\text{est}}$ as measured by the RMS matrix norm




FIG. 2: RMS estimation error $\|X_{\text{true}} - X_{\text{est}}\|_{\text{rms}}$ vs. number of experiments per configuration: selected columns of (13). Error bars show the deviation from 50 runs at each setting.

ℓ_2 -minimization (\square): $X_{\text{est}} = X_{\ell_2}$ is from (7) using all 16 input/output combinations. This gives a matrix $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbf{C}^{256 \times 256}$ as defined in (9) which is full rank, *i.e.*, $\text{rank}(\mathcal{G}) = 256$.

ℓ_1 -minimization (\diamond): $X_{\text{est}} = X_{\ell_1}$ is from (11)-(12) using 6 inputs and 6 measurements obtained from the columns of the second matrix in (13). This gives $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbf{C}^{36 \times 256}$ which is full rank, *i.e.*, $\text{rank}(\mathcal{G}) = 36$.

$\|\Delta X\|_{\text{rms}} = (1/n)(\text{Tr } \Delta X^\dagger \Delta X)^{1/2}$ vs. the number of experiments per input selected from the set (13) [19]. The results shown are from simulations described in the caption.

The benefit of ℓ_1 -minimization compared to the standard ℓ_2 -minimization is seen most clearly with small amounts of data from highly incomplete measurements. For example, for $p_{\text{bf}} = 0.05$ [Fig.2(a)], at 50×10^3 experiments per input for the 6-input/6-output configuration ($\mathcal{G} \in \mathbf{C}^{36 \times 256}$) the ℓ_1 RMS estimation error is 0.0019. Compare this to the ℓ_2 error of 0.0012 at 500×10^3 experiments per input for the 16-input/16-output configuration ($\mathcal{G} \in \mathbf{C}^{256 \times 256}$). The latter improvement can be attributed mostly to the 10-fold increase in the number of experiments per input. The additional resources to achieve this are significant, *i.e.*, 16 inputs for ℓ_2 vs. 6 for ℓ_1 , and additionally, an increase in the *total* number of experiments from $6 \times 50 \times 10^3$ to $16 \times 500 \times 10^3$. It is certainly not intuitive that to estimate the 240 parameters of the process matrix, the clearly incomplete set of measurements using only 36 outcomes (\diamond in Fig.2) could produce results not only similar

to, but for each number of experiments per input, even better than the full input case with all 256 combinations of inputs and measurements (\square in Fig.2). As seen the ℓ_1 error is about 1/2 the ℓ_2 error. Also, reweighting reduced the (unweighted) ℓ_1 error by 1/2-1/3.

Comparing the estimation errors with the error between the actual and ideal (solid lines in Fig.2) suggests that at least 50×10^3 experiments per input are needed to achieve a sufficient post-QPT error correction towards the ideal unitary. Fig.2 also reveals that the estimation errors are very similar for both levels of bit-flip error, $p_{\text{bf}} \in \{0.05, 0.20\}$. This is explained by the Cramér-Rao bound which defines the asymptotic error of any unbiased estimator, *i.e.*, the RMS decays as Δ/\sqrt{N} . Here Δ is effectively the error between the empirical (5) and actual (6) probabilities which by definition is of order one; this provides a reasonable fit to the data in Fig.2.

Infinite data.— With infinite data the measurements are effectively noise-free, so the empirical probability estimates are equivalent to the true probabilities. Infinite data estimates are obtained by solving (7) and (11)-(12) with the constraint $V(X) \leq \sigma$ replaced by the linear equality constraint $p_{ik}(X) = p_{ik}(X_{\text{true}})$. For the numerical examples here, (14) gives the linear equality $g_{ab}^\dagger(X - X_{\text{true}})g_{ab} = 0$.

In the examples, both X_{ℓ_1} from (11)-(12) and X_{ℓ_2} from (7) were numerically equal to X_{true} . This is to be expected for X_{ℓ_2} because of the complete set of 256 full rank measurements. Almost sparsity makes perfect estimation possible with the highly incomplete set of 36 measurements.

The infinite data case is useful for evaluating different configuration strategies in simulation, *i.e.*, consider only those that result in a good estimate.

To stress the efficacy of ℓ_1 -minimization as a heuristic for sparsity, consider replacing the ℓ_1 norm in (11)-(12) with the

RMS norm $\|X\|_{\text{rms}}$, which is effectively the ℓ_2 norm of \vec{X} . Solving the 6-input/6-output case (\diamond in Fig.2) for $p_{\text{bf}} = 0.05$ with infinite data gives an RMS error of 0.11, which is considerably larger than the error between the actual and ideal of 0.03 (solid line in Fig.2(a)). The estimate gets even worse with finite data. This again emphasizes the advantage of ℓ_1 minimization for sparse signal reconstruction [5, 6].

Conclusions.— The use of the ℓ_1 -norm minimization methods of Compressive Sensing [5, 6, 7] appear to apply equally well to sparse QPT. The examples of sparse process matrices presented here are meant to represent typical initial imperfect, designs. The numerical results illustrate how estimation resource tradeoffs can be obtained. Additionally, the findings suggest that QPT resources need not scale exponentially with qubits. In the ideal case, the theoretical question of showing linear scaling with sparsity using ℓ_1 minimization for QPT remains open.

Because ℓ_1 minimization uses considerably fewer resources than standard QPT, use in an on-line setting combined with optimal quantum error correction tuned to the specific QPT errors is compelling, *e.g.*, [11, 12, 13]. Another future direction is in conjunction with Hamiltonian parameter estimation. Here a bank of estimators can be applied to the data where each estimator is tuned via the Ideal/SVD-Basis to one of a number of finite samples of the unknown parameters. Such an approach may prove useful for a small number of parameters. In quantum metrology often a single uncertain parameter is to be estimated in an unknown noisy environment, *e.g.*, [14, 15].

Acknowledgments.— Thanks to A. Gilchrist, I. Walmsley, D. Lidar, H. Rabitz, and M. Mohseni for suggestions and comments. The idea of applying ℓ_1 minimization to QPT arose during discussions at [20].

-
- [1] M.A. Nielsen and I.L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2000).
- [2] G. M. D'Ariano and P. L. Presti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 4195 (2001).
- [3] M. Mohseni, A. T. Rezakhani, and D. A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 032322 (2008).
- [4] J. Emerson *et al.*, Science **317**, 1893 (2007).
- [5] D. Donoho, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **52**, (2006).
- [6] E. J. Candes, J. Romberg, and T. Tao, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **59**, 1207 (2006).
- [7] E. J. Candes, M. B. Wakin, and S. Boyd, J. Fourier Anal. and Appl. **14**, 877 (2008).
- [8] R. L. Kosut, I. A. Walmsley, and H. Rabitz, quant-ph/0411093 (2004).
- [9] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2004).
- [10] J. L. O'Brien *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 080502 (2004).
- [11] M. Reimpell and R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 080501 (2005).
- [12] A. S. Fletcher, P. W. Shor, and M. Z. Win, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 012338 (2007), quant-ph/0606035.
- [13] R. L. Kosut, A. Shabani, and D. A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 020502 (2008), (arXiv:quant-ph/0703274).
- [14] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 010401 (2006).
- [15] U. Dorner *et al.*, quant-ph/0807.3659 (2008).
- [16] M. Mohseni and A. T. Rezakhani, quant-ph/arXiv:0805.3188 (2008).
- [17] A known sparsity pattern can arise from the underlying dynamics, thereby inherently increasing QPT efficiency [16].
- [18] There are many alternatives to (10), *e.g.*, minimize $\|X\|_{\ell_1} + \lambda V(X)$ subject to X satisfies (3) or minimize $V(X)$ subject to $\|X\|_{\ell_1} \leq s$, X satisfies (3).
- [19] The number of experiments per input/measurement configuration here is chosen uniformly. An optimal (non-uniform) choice which minimizes the Cramér-Rao lower bound can be cast as a convex optimization problem [8].
- [20] *Workshop on Quantum Estimation: Theory and Practice*, Aug. 25-30, 2008, Perimeter Institute, Waterloo, Canada.