

Heisenberg-Limited Quantum Metrology without Ancilla

Qiushi Liu* and Yuxiang Yang†

*QICI Quantum Information and Computation Initiative, Department of Computer Science,
The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong, China*

(Dated: March 8, 2024)

The asymptotic theory of quantum channel estimation has been well established, but in general noiseless and controllable ancilla is required for attaining the ultimate limit in the asymptotic regime. Little is known about the metrological performance without noiseless ancilla, which is more relevant in practical circumstances. In this work, we present a novel theoretical framework to address this problem, bridging quantum metrology and the asymptotic theory of quantum channels. Leveraging this framework, we prove sufficient conditions for achieving the Heisenberg limit with repeated application of the channel to estimate, both with and without applying interleaved unitary control operations. For the latter case, we design an algorithm to identify the control operation. Finally, we analyze several intriguing examples by our approach.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum metrology [1–3] is one of the most promising quantum technologies in the noisy intermediate-scale quantum (NISQ) era [4] and has already seen wide applications, for example, in gravitational wave detection [5, 6], quantum clocks [7, 8], and high-resolution imaging [9, 10]. The goal of quantum metrology is to boost the precision of estimating some unknown physical parameter, by using quantum resources.

In a prototypical setup, one would like to estimate θ , given N copies of an unknown quantum channel \mathcal{E}_θ in each round of the experiment. Independently estimating each copy of \mathcal{E}_θ results in a mean squared error (MSE) $\delta\theta^2$ following the standard quantum limit (SQL) $1/N$. By leveraging quantum entanglement in preparing a probe state (parallel strategy), or coherently applying a sequence of \mathcal{E}_θ interleaved with control operations (sequential strategy), the ultimate limit of $\delta\theta^2$ is the Heisenberg limit (HL) $1/N^2$. The $1/N^2$ scaling is known to hold for unitary channel estimation [11], but is susceptible to noise [12]. It is thus a desideratum to investigate what types of noisy channels can achieve the HL, and whether and how the HL can be recovered by active control given N noisy channels.

Quantum channel estimation follows either the HL or the SQL in the asymptotic limit $N \rightarrow \infty$. Extensive research has focused on identifying the ultimate precision limit for a given quantum channel [12–18], which signifies whether a quantum scaling advantage can exist. Both parallel and sequential strategies achieve the same optimal asymptotic scaling [18]. However, in order to attain the optimal precision limit, it is in general assumed that one has unbounded quantum memory when $N \rightarrow \infty$. When the HL can be achieved with sequential strategies, there is no need for the unbounded memory, but the noiseless ancilla and the syndrome measurements are required for repeatedly applying quantum error correction (QEC) [17, 19, 20].

The requirement of the noiseless ancilla, however, is a major obstacle in many real-world applications. Ancilla-free quantum metrology was mainly studied in the case of parallel strategies, and we review some of previous work here. For parallel channel estimation with dephasing or erasure noise, optimal ancilla-free and ancilla-assisted strategies are asymptotically equal [16]. With amplitude damping noise, ancilla-assisted estimation has a constant multiplicative factor improvement over ancilla-free estimation [16, 21]. For Hamiltonian parameter estimation under Markovian noise (which can be seen as a special case of channel estimation), with N probes and the evolution time t , researchers usually allow for a repeated sequence of interleaved fast control operations with frequency $1/\delta t$ for a parallel strategy (unlike in parallel channel estimation). When (i) the “Hamiltonian-not-in-Lindblad-span” (HNLS) [19, 20] condition is satisfied and (ii) for qubit probes where the signal and noise act individually on each probe, an ancilla-free repetition code can achieve the HL [22–24]. Recently, Ref. [25] showed that the optimal precision limit with respect to N (but not t) can be in general achieved asymptotically (with both the scaling and its coefficient) by ancilla-free error correction codes in Hamiltonian parameter estimation. Nevertheless, the protocol in Ref. [25] requires interleaved control and does not apply to general parallel channel estimation, where no interleaved control operations can be done. In fact, we already have a counterexample in the case of phase estimation under amplitude damping noise [16, 21].

For sequential strategies, it was known that ancilla-free QEC protocols achieving the same HL as ancilla-assisted ones exist for Hamiltonian estimation under Markovian noise, when (i) the signal and noise commute and (ii) HNLS

* qslu@cs.hku.hk

† yuxiang@cs.hku.hk

is satisfied [26]. However, little is known about general problems of quantum channel estimation without noiseless ancilla, as well as the performance of applying identical unitary control in noisy channel estimation. We also remark that previous works on the ancilla-free QEC for metrology still require syndrome measurements in general. Such requirement is not only challenging for near-term devices, but may also impose a strong demand on the programmability of quantum sensors even in the long term.

In this work, we establish a theoretical framework for sequential quantum channel estimation without ancilla, where even the syndrome measurement in QEC is not allowed. In contrast to existing results that rely on QEC, we identify conditions to achieve the ultimate precision limit with the simple setup in Fig. 1. This is motivated by typical optical experiments, where it is favorable to apply identical unitary control operations in a loop made of mirrors [27]. For estimating N copies of a general quantum channel, we prove a sufficient condition for achieving the HL¹. Based on this, we further show a sufficient condition for achieving the HL for estimating unital channels, when repeating identical unitary control operations is available. The unitary control can be systematically identified by an algorithm, and we show cases where the HL cannot be recovered without such control. We demonstrate several inspiring applications of our theoretical framework for certain types of quantum channels.




FIG. 1. Control-enhanced sequential strategy for estimating θ from $N = 2$ channels \mathcal{E}_θ on an optical platform. Trivial $U_c = I$ corresponds to a control-free strategy.

Our framework establishes a close relation between the metrological limit and the spectral properties of a quantum channel. It thus provides a new perspective on quantum metrology drawn from the asymptotic theory of quantum channels, where researchers have shown great interest in quantum ergodicity and mixing [28–32]. We expect that our results may also have applications in these areas beyond quantum metrology.

The manuscript is organized as follows. In Section II, we introduce some basis notions and notations related to spectral properties of quantum channels and quantum Fisher information (QFI) [33–35], a key quantity in metrology. In Section III, we derive a general formula for the lower bound on the QFI when a control-free strategy is used in sequential channel estimation, and specifically give a condition for achieving the HL. In Section IV we prove conditions for achieving the HL with identical unitary control operations in sequential estimation of unital channels, and establish an algorithm that outputs a desired control. In particular, we make a comparison between our approach and the well established error-corrected metrology at the end of Section IV. In Section V, we show the utility of our approach through several examples. In Section V A, we present examples where the HL is achievable with a control-free strategy, even if the conventional “Hamiltonian-not-in-Kraus-span” (HNKS) condition [17] is ill-defined, and a decoherence-free subspace (DFS) [36] does not exist. In Section V B, we illustrate an example where we can systematically identify a unitary control to attain the HL without any ancilla, while no existing technique achieving this was previously known.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Asymptotics of quantum channels

A parametrized quantum channel \mathcal{E}_θ can be described by Kraus operators: $\mathcal{E}_\theta(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^r K_i^\theta \rho K_i^{\theta\dagger}$. By representing a quantum state ρ on d -dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} as a d^2 -dimensional vector $|\rho\rangle\rangle$ (where $|\rho\rangle\rangle = (\rho_{11}, \rho_{12}, \dots, \rho_{dd})^T$)

¹ In this work we only care about the precision scaling $1/N^2$, regardless of the coefficient.

denotes the vectorization of ρ), we can describe the action of a quantum channel on a state as the action of a matrix on a vector. This *Liouville representation* of the quantum channel is given by a $d^2 \times d^2$ transition matrix $T_\theta = \sum_{i=1}^r K_i^\theta \otimes K_i^{\theta*}$, and we thus have $|\mathcal{E}_\theta(\rho)\rangle\rangle = T_\theta|\rho\rangle\rangle$.

T_θ has many useful properties (for example, see Refs. [29, 30] for reference), and we briefly review those relevant here. Consider the spectrum $\{\lambda_i\}_i$ of T_θ , such that $T_\theta|R_i\rangle\rangle = \lambda_i|R_i\rangle\rangle$. For clarity, we call $\{|R_i\rangle\rangle\}_i$ the *eigenvectors* and $\{R_i\}_i$ the *eigenmatrices*. All the eigenvalues satisfy $|\lambda_i| \leq 1$ (with at least one $\lambda_j = 1$), and those satisfying $|\lambda_i| = 1$ are called *peripheral eigenvalues*, with the corresponding eigenvectors called *peripheral eigenvectors*. The eigenvalues are either real or come in complex conjugate pairs. Moreover, R_i can always be chosen to be Hermitian for every real λ_i , and $|R_i^\dagger\rangle\rangle$ must be an eigenvector corresponding to λ_i^* . It is also known that every quantum channel has at least one *fixed point state* ρ_* , and without loss of generality, we take $\lambda_1 = 1$ with R_1 proportional to a density matrix. As T_θ is a trace-preserving map, we have $\text{Tr} R_j = 0$ if $\lambda_j \neq 1$.

We denote the set of indices of peripheral eigenvalues by \mathcal{S} . In general, T_θ is not necessarily diagonalizable, but simply admits a Jordan normal form. However, for all the peripheral eigenvalues $\{\lambda_i | i \in \mathcal{S}\}$, the Jordan blocks are all one-dimensional [29, Chapter 6]. In the asymptotic limit of applying N quantum channels repeatedly, i.e., applying T_θ^N , only the peripheral eigenvalues and eigenvectors take effect in the output $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} T_\theta^N|\rho\rangle\rangle$. We will see that, the metrological performance of concatenating $N \rightarrow \infty$ quantum channels is only related to the peripheral eigenvalues and eigenvectors.

B. Quantum Fisher information

QFI is a measure of the information about the unknown parameter θ one can extract as much as possible. Formally, given a parametrized quantum state ρ_θ , the MSE $\delta\theta^2$ for any unbiased estimator is bounded by the quantum Cramér-Rao bound (QCRB) [33–35]

$$\delta\theta^2 \geq \frac{1}{\nu F^Q(\rho_\theta)}, \quad (1)$$

where $F^Q(\rho_\theta)$ is the QFI and ν is the number that the experiment is repeated. As the bound is achievable in the limit of large ν , the QFI can be regarded as a score function for (single-parameter) quantum metrology. We say the HL is achieved if the QFI has a scaling of N^2 , and the SQL is achieved if the QFI has a scaling of N , where QFI is defined for the output state obtained from N identical channels with parallel or sequential strategies.

The QFI of a state ρ_θ is defined by

$$F^Q(\rho_\theta) = \text{Tr}(\rho_\theta L_{\rho_\theta}^2), \quad (2)$$

where L_{ρ_θ} is the symmetric logarithmic derivative (SLD) defined through $2\dot{\rho}_\theta = \rho_\theta L_{\rho_\theta} + L_{\rho_\theta} \rho_\theta$, having denoted the derivative of X with respect to θ by \dot{X} . For a pure state $\rho_\theta = |\psi_\theta\rangle\langle\psi_\theta|$, the QFI can be computed in a simpler way:

$$F^Q(|\psi_\theta\rangle\langle\psi_\theta|) = 4 \left(\langle\dot{\psi}_\theta|\dot{\psi}_\theta\rangle - |\langle\psi_\theta|\dot{\psi}_\theta\rangle|^2 \right). \quad (3)$$

III. SEQUENTIAL QFI WITH CONTROL-FREE STRATEGIES

In channel estimation, the QFI given by Eq. (2) is often hard to evaluate for large N , as computing the SLD L_{ρ_θ} requires the spectral decomposition of ρ_θ [35]. It is thus more practical to obtain a bound on the QFI of N channels with specified strategies. Previous works [12–15] derive upper bounds on the QFI with ancilla-assisted strategies by formulating optimization problems, but these bounds are no longer tight without ancilla. To address the challenging problem of ancilla-free QFI, we employ a technique based on vectorization to derive a lower bound on QFI, which efficiently yields a simple result circumventing any involved optimization but can provide a guaranteed precision scaling.

Ref. [37] showed that, for a state ρ_θ , the QFI $F^Q(\rho_\theta)$ has a close relation to the *associated QFI* $\tilde{F}^Q(\tilde{\rho}_\theta) = \text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}_\theta L_{\tilde{\rho}_\theta}^2)$, where $\tilde{\rho}_\theta := |\rho_\theta\rangle\rangle\langle\langle\rho_\theta| / \text{Tr}(\rho_\theta^2)$ is the density operator of the *associated state*, and $L_{\tilde{\rho}_\theta}$ is the *associated SLD* defined by $2\dot{\tilde{\rho}}_\theta = \tilde{\rho}_\theta L_{\tilde{\rho}_\theta} + L_{\tilde{\rho}_\theta} \tilde{\rho}_\theta$. Specifically, the QFI of ρ_θ can be lower bounded by the associated QFI up to a non-vanishing multiplicative factor:

$$F^Q(\rho_\theta) \geq \frac{\text{Tr}(\rho_\theta^2)}{4\lambda_{\max}(\rho_\theta)} \tilde{F}^Q(\tilde{\rho}_\theta), \quad (4)$$

where $\lambda_{\max}(\rho_\theta)$ is the largest eigenvalue of ρ_θ .

In this work, we focus on the scaling of the associated QFI \tilde{F}^Q obtained from estimating N quantum channels sequentially, which is easier to compute and gives a sufficient condition for attaining the same scaling in terms of the original QFI F^Q . As a starting point, we introduce a lemma providing a closed-form formula of the associated QFI, which is a slight generalization of the result in Ref. [37].

Lemma 1. *The associated QFI of the associated state $\tilde{\rho}_\theta = |\rho_\theta\rangle\langle\rho_\theta|/\text{Tr}(\rho_\theta^2)$ is given by*

$$\tilde{F}^Q(\tilde{\rho}_\theta) = 4 \left\{ \frac{\langle\dot{\rho}_\theta|\dot{\rho}_\theta\rangle}{\text{Tr}(\rho_\theta^2)} - \left[\frac{\langle\rho_\theta|\dot{\rho}_\theta\rangle}{\text{Tr}(\rho_\theta^2)} \right]^2 \right\}. \quad (5)$$

Proof. By noting that $\tilde{\rho}_\theta^2 = \tilde{\rho}_\theta$, we can take the SLD $L_{\tilde{\rho}_\theta} = 2\dot{\tilde{\rho}}_\theta$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\tilde{\rho}_\theta} &= 2 \left\{ \frac{|\dot{\rho}_\theta\rangle\langle\rho_\theta|}{\text{Tr}(\rho_\theta^2)} + \frac{|\rho_\theta\rangle\langle\dot{\rho}_\theta|}{\text{Tr}(\rho_\theta^2)} - \frac{d\text{Tr}(\rho_\theta^2)/d\theta}{[\text{Tr}(\rho_\theta^2)]^2} |\rho_\theta\rangle\langle\rho_\theta| \right\} \\ &= \frac{2}{\text{Tr}(\rho_\theta^2)} (|\dot{\rho}_\theta\rangle\langle\rho_\theta| + |\rho_\theta\rangle\langle\dot{\rho}_\theta| - 2\langle\rho_\theta|\dot{\rho}_\theta\rangle\tilde{\rho}_\theta), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

having used $d\text{Tr}(\rho_\theta^2)/d\theta = 2\text{Tr}(\rho_\theta\dot{\rho}_\theta) = 2\langle\rho_\theta|\dot{\rho}_\theta\rangle$. Then we have

$$L_{\tilde{\rho}_\theta}^2 = \frac{4}{[\text{Tr}(\rho_\theta^2)]^2} [\text{Tr}(\rho_\theta^2) \langle\dot{\rho}_\theta|\dot{\rho}_\theta\rangle\tilde{\rho}_\theta - \langle\rho_\theta|\dot{\rho}_\theta\rangle (|\dot{\rho}_\theta\rangle\langle\rho_\theta| + |\rho_\theta\rangle\langle\dot{\rho}_\theta|) + \text{Tr}(\rho_\theta^2) |\dot{\rho}_\theta\rangle\langle\dot{\rho}_\theta|], \quad (7)$$

which yields

$$\tilde{F}^Q(\tilde{\rho}_\theta) = \text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}_\theta L_{\tilde{\rho}_\theta}^2) = 4 \left\{ \frac{\langle\dot{\rho}_\theta|\dot{\rho}_\theta\rangle}{\text{Tr}(\rho_\theta^2)} - \left[\frac{\langle\rho_\theta|\dot{\rho}_\theta\rangle}{\text{Tr}(\rho_\theta^2)} \right]^2 \right\}. \quad (8)$$

□

Note that Eq. (5) has an analogous form to the pure state QFI given by Eq. (3), which greatly facilitates the analysis below.

Now we turn to the case of estimating N quantum channels \mathcal{E}_θ sequentially. First, without the use of the ancilla and interleaved control operations, the problem is to study the QFI of $\mathcal{E}_\theta^N(\rho_0)$ for a suitable probe state ρ_0 . With the vectorization trick, we can focus the associated QFI for $T_\theta^N|\rho_0\rangle$ to obtain a lower bound on $F^Q[\mathcal{E}_\theta^N(\rho_0)]$. Leveraging Lemma 1, we can connect the asymptotic associated QFI (for $N \rightarrow \infty$) to the spectral properties of T_θ as follows.

Theorem 1. *Given a quantum channel T_θ with peripheral eigenvalues $\{\lambda_i | i \in \mathbf{S}\}$ and peripheral eigenvectors $\{|R_i\rangle | i \in \mathbf{S}\}$, and an input state in its vectorization form $|\rho_0\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{d^2} a_i |R_i\rangle$ (having chosen a set of linearly independent vectors $\{|R_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{d^2}$ that forms a Jordan basis), by repeated application of T_θ for $N \rightarrow \infty$ times, the asymptotic associated QFI of the associated output state $\tilde{\rho}_\theta = |\rho_\theta\rangle\langle\rho_\theta|/\text{Tr}(\rho_\theta^2)$ for $|\rho_\theta\rangle = T_\theta^N|\rho_0\rangle$ is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4}\tilde{F}^Q(\tilde{\rho}_\theta) &= N^2 \left[\sum_{i,j \in \mathbf{S}} \beta_{ij} \frac{\lambda_i^* \dot{\lambda}_j}{\lambda_i^* \lambda_j} - \left(\sum_{i,j \in \mathbf{S}} \beta_{ij} \frac{\dot{\lambda}_j}{\lambda_j} \right)^2 \right] \\ &+ N \frac{1}{\text{Tr}(\rho_\theta^2)} \sum_{i,j \in \mathbf{S}} (\lambda_i^* \lambda_j)^N \left(2 \frac{\dot{\lambda}_j}{\lambda_j} - \sum_{kl} \beta_{kl} \frac{\lambda_k^* \dot{\lambda}_l}{\lambda_k^* \lambda_l} \right) (\dot{a}_i a_j \langle R_i | R_j \rangle + a_i a_j \langle \dot{R}_i | R_j \rangle) \\ &+ o(N), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $\beta_{ij} = (\lambda_i^* \lambda_j)^N a_i a_j \langle R_i | R_j \rangle / \text{Tr}(\rho_\theta^2)$ satisfying $\sum_{i,j \in \mathbf{S}} \beta_{ij} = 1$, $\beta_{ii} = a_i^2 \geq 0$ and $\beta_{ij} = \beta_{ji}^*$.

Proof. In general T_θ may or may not be diagonalizable. If T_θ is not diagonalizable, we can add some additional linearly independent vectors $|R_i\rangle$ orthogonal to the subspace of peripheral eigenvectors, such that $\{|R_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{d^2}$ forms a Jordan basis which spans the whole d^2 -dimensional vector space. Under such choice we have the decomposition

$|\rho_0\rangle\rangle = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} a_i |R_i\rangle\rangle$. Without loss of generality, we can always choose a_i to be nonnegative real numbers and $\langle\langle R_i | R_i \rangle\rangle = 1$ for all i . By our choice $R_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\text{Tr}(\rho_*^2)}} \rho_*$ for a fixed point state ρ_* , and $a_1 = 1/\text{Tr} R_1$. Then we have ²

$$|\rho_\theta\rangle\rangle = T_\theta^N |\rho_0\rangle\rangle = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} a_i \lambda_i^N |R_i\rangle\rangle, \quad N \rightarrow \infty, \quad (10)$$

since the N -th power of any Jordan block corresponding to $|\lambda_i| < 1$ converges to 0 as $N \rightarrow \infty$. It follows that

$$|\dot{\rho}_\theta\rangle\rangle = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \left(N a_i \lambda_i^{N-1} \dot{\lambda}_i |R_i\rangle\rangle + \dot{a}_i \lambda_i^N |R_i\rangle\rangle + a_i \lambda_i^N |\dot{R}_i\rangle\rangle \right). \quad (11)$$

Thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle \dot{\rho}_\theta | \dot{\rho}_\theta \rangle\rangle &= N^2 \sum_{i, j \in \mathcal{S}} (\lambda_i^* \lambda_j)^{N-1} a_i a_j \lambda_i^* \dot{\lambda}_j \langle\langle R_i | R_j \rangle\rangle \\ &\quad + 2N \sum_{i, j \in \mathcal{S}} (\lambda_i^* \lambda_j)^{N-1} \lambda_i^* \dot{\lambda}_j \left(\dot{a}_i a_j \langle\langle R_i | R_j \rangle\rangle + a_i a_j \langle\langle \dot{R}_i | R_j \rangle\rangle \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i, j \in \mathcal{S}} (\lambda_i^* \lambda_j)^N \left(\dot{a}_i \dot{a}_j \langle\langle R_i | R_j \rangle\rangle + a_i a_j \langle\langle \dot{R}_i | \dot{R}_j \rangle\rangle + \dot{a}_i a_j \langle\langle R_i | \dot{R}_j \rangle\rangle + a_i \dot{a}_j \langle\langle \dot{R}_i | R_j \rangle\rangle \right), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

and

$$\langle\langle \rho_\theta | \dot{\rho}_\theta \rangle\rangle = N \sum_{i, j \in \mathcal{S}} (\lambda_i^* \lambda_j)^{N-1} a_i a_j \lambda_i^* \dot{\lambda}_j \langle\langle R_i | R_j \rangle\rangle + \sum_{i, j \in \mathcal{S}} (\lambda_i^* \lambda_j)^N \left(a_i \dot{a}_j \langle\langle R_i | R_j \rangle\rangle + a_i a_j \langle\langle R_i | \dot{R}_j \rangle\rangle \right), \quad (13)$$

having used the property that eigenvalues come in complex conjugate pairs. By using Lemma 1 and the relation $\text{Tr}(\rho_\theta^2) = \langle\langle \rho_\theta | \rho_\theta \rangle\rangle = \sum_{i, j \in \mathcal{S}} (\lambda_i^* \lambda_j)^N a_i a_j \langle\langle R_i | R_j \rangle\rangle$, we then obtain Eq. (9). \square

For a general channel T_θ , Theorem 1 straightforwardly yields sufficient conditions for achieving the HL or SQL with a control-free strategy. Furthermore, when all the eigenvectors of T_θ are mutually orthogonal, Theorem 1 provides a simpler sufficient condition for attaining the HL.

Corollary 1. *If all the peripheral eigenvectors $\{\lim_{\theta \rightarrow \theta_0} |R_i\rangle\rangle\}_i$ of T_θ are mutually orthogonal, and there exists some peripheral eigenvalue λ_j such that $\dot{\lambda}_j \neq 0$, then the sequential QFI of N channels can achieve the HL at $\theta = \theta_0$.*

Proof. In this case, we can further restrict these eigenvectors to be orthonormal in the limit of $\theta \rightarrow \theta_0$, such that $\langle\langle R_i | R_j \rangle\rangle = \delta_{ij}$, and the associated QFI is reduced to

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\tilde{F}^Q(\tilde{\rho}_\theta)}{N^2} &= 4 \left[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} a_i^2 |\dot{\lambda}_i|^2 - \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} a_i^2 \lambda_i^* \dot{\lambda}_i \right)^2 \right] \\ &\geq 4 \left[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} a_i^2 |\dot{\lambda}_i|^2 - \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} a_i^2 |\dot{\lambda}_i| \right)^2 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} a_i^2 = 1$. The inequality strictly holds if $\lambda_j^* \dot{\lambda}_j$ is not real for some $a_j^2 \neq 0$, which implies HL. If we see $\{a_i^2\}_i$ as a probability distribution over i , then any nonzero variance of $|\dot{\lambda}_i|$ also implies HL.

We denote the fixed point state by ρ_* with the eigenvalue $\lambda_1 = 1$. If there exists some λ_j such that $|\lambda_j| = 1$ and $\dot{\lambda}_j \neq 0$, we will see that it is always possible to choose an input state with $a_1^2 > 0$ and $a_j^2 > 0$. By the trace-preserving property of the quantum channel $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow \theta_0} \text{Tr} R_j = 0$, so we can take an input state $\rho_0 = (1 - \alpha)I/d + \alpha \rho_* + \beta (R_j + R_j^\dagger)$ for some $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$. Note that if R_j is proportional to a Hermitian matrix, we have the freedom to simply take R_j to be Hermitian. Since $|\dot{\lambda}_1| = 0$ and $|\dot{\lambda}_j| > 0$, this choice of the input state allows for the HL. \square

Furthermore, we can relax the requirement of orthogonality for all peripheral eigenvectors in Corollary 1 for unital channels.

Corollary 2. *For a unital channel T_θ , if there exists some peripheral eigenvalue λ_j such that $\dot{\lambda}_j \neq 0$, and the associated eigenmatrix $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow \theta_0} R_j$ either is Hermitian (up to a multiplicative factor) or satisfies $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow \theta_0} \text{Tr}(R_j^2) = 0$, then the sequential QFI of N channels can achieve the HL at $\theta = \theta_0$.*

² We assume that $\lambda_i, |R_i\rangle\rangle, a_i$ are all continuously differentiable with respect to θ .

Proof. Since $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow \theta_0} R_j = 0$ by the trace-preserving property of the quantum channel and $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow \theta_0} \langle\langle R_j^\dagger | R_j \rangle\rangle = \lim_{\theta \rightarrow \theta_0} \text{Tr}(R_j^2)$, we have either mutually orthogonal peripheral eigenvectors $|I\rangle, |R_j\rangle, |R_j^\dagger\rangle$ when R_j is not proportional to a Hermitian matrix, or mutually orthogonal peripheral eigenvectors $|I\rangle, |R_j\rangle$ otherwise, in the limit of $\theta \rightarrow \theta_0$. Then we can choose an input state $\rho_0 = I/d + \alpha(R_j + R_j^\dagger)$ for some $\alpha > 0$ in both cases (we simply take R_j to be Hermitian if it is proportional to a Hermitian matrix). Following the same line of reasoning in the proof of Corollary 1, this choice of the input state allows for the HL. \square

Corollaries 1 and 2 provide simple relations between the capability of achieving HL and the existence of nonzero derivatives of peripheral eigenvalues, when the quantum channel has orthogonal peripheral eigenvectors in the limit of $\theta \rightarrow \theta_0$. Based on such relations, in some cases where such nontrivial peripheral eigenvalues are absent, we can still regulate the spectrum of a quantum channel by appending control operations to the channel to estimate, as demonstrated in Section IV.

IV. SEQUENTIAL QFI WITH INTERLEAVED CONTROL OPERATIONS

We prove a sufficient condition for achieving the HL with interleaved identical unitary control operations for the sequential estimation of N unital channels.

Theorem 2. For a unital channel $T_\theta = \sum_i K_i^\theta \otimes K_i^{\theta*}$, denote by \mathcal{P} the projection on the subspace \mathcal{P} of eigenmatrices of $T_\theta^\dagger T_\theta$ with eigenvalues 1. If at $\theta = \theta_0$, (i)

$$PT_\theta^\dagger \dot{T}_\theta P \neq 0 \quad (\text{non-vanishing signal condition}) \quad (15)$$

is a normal operator and (ii) there exists a unitary U_c (which can be identified by Algorithm 1 whenever it exists) such that

$$U_c^\dagger R_0 U_c = \sum_k K_k^{\theta_0} R_0 K_k^{\theta_0\dagger}, \quad (\text{unitary equivalence condition}) \quad (16)$$

for some R_0 as an eigenmatrix of $PT_\theta^\dagger \dot{T}_\theta P$ associated with a nonzero eigenvalue, then the sequential QFI of N channels can achieve the HL by applying the same unitary control U_c following each channel T_θ .

Proof. First, since T_θ is unital, its largest singular value is 1 [38, Theorem 4.27]. Therefore, all the peripheral eigenmatrices of T_θ lie in the subspace \mathcal{P} . We will show that the regulated channel $(U_c \otimes U_c^*)T_\theta$ has mutually orthogonal peripheral eigenvectors $\{|I\rangle, |R_0\rangle\}$ or $\{|I\rangle, |R_0\rangle, |R_0^\dagger\rangle\}$ in the limit of $\theta \rightarrow \theta_0$, even if this may not hold for T_θ itself.

Now we will show that $R_0 \in \mathcal{P}$ is the limit of a peripheral eigenmatrix of $(U_c \otimes U_c^*)T_\theta$. Denoting by μ_0 the eigenvalue of $T_\theta^\dagger \dot{T}_\theta$ associated with R_0 , we have

$$\mu_0 |R_0\rangle = \lim_{\theta \rightarrow \theta_0} T_\theta^\dagger \dot{T}_\theta |R_0\rangle = T_{\theta_0}^\dagger \lim_{d\theta \rightarrow 0} \frac{T_{\theta_0+d\theta} - T_{\theta_0}}{d\theta} |R_0\rangle = T_{\theta_0}^\dagger (U_c^\dagger \otimes U_c^T)(U_c \otimes U_c^*) \lim_{d\theta \rightarrow 0} \frac{T_{\theta_0+d\theta} - T_{\theta_0}}{d\theta} |R_0\rangle, \quad (17)$$

so for $d\theta \rightarrow 0$ we obtain $(U_c \otimes U_c^*)T_{\theta_0+d\theta}|R_0\rangle \propto |R_0\rangle$, by noting that $T_{\theta_0}^\dagger (U_c^\dagger \otimes U_c^T)|R_0\rangle = |R_0\rangle$ and $(U_c \otimes U_c^*)T_{\theta_0}|R_0\rangle = |R_0\rangle$. Indeed, R_0 is the limit of a peripheral eigenmatrix of $(U_c \otimes U_c^*)T_\theta$. Analogously, R_0^\dagger is also an eigenmatrix of $T_\theta^\dagger \dot{T}_\theta$ and a peripheral eigenmatrix of $(U_c \otimes U_c^*)T_\theta$.

Then we will show that for any peripheral eigenvalue λ_j of $(U_c \otimes U_c^*)T_\theta$ with the normalized eigenvector $|R_j\rangle$, we have $\lambda_j^* \dot{\lambda}_j = \langle\langle R_j | T_\theta^\dagger \dot{T}_\theta | R_j \rangle\rangle$. By taking derivatives on both sides of $(U_c \otimes U_c^*)T_\theta |R_j\rangle = \lambda_j |R_j\rangle$ we obtain

$$(U_c \otimes U_c^*)\dot{T}_\theta |R_j\rangle + (U_c \otimes U_c^*)T_\theta |\dot{R}_j\rangle = \dot{\lambda}_j |R_j\rangle + \lambda_j |\dot{R}_j\rangle. \quad (18)$$

It follows that

$$\langle\langle R_j | T_\theta^\dagger \dot{T}_\theta | R_j \rangle\rangle + \langle\langle R_j | T_\theta^\dagger T_\theta | \dot{R}_j \rangle\rangle = \langle\langle R_j | \lambda_j^* \dot{\lambda}_j | R_j \rangle\rangle + \langle\langle R_j | \lambda_j^* \lambda_j | \dot{R}_j \rangle\rangle. \quad (19)$$

Note that $\langle\langle R_j | T_\theta^\dagger T_\theta | R_j \rangle\rangle = \langle\langle R_j | R_j \rangle\rangle$ since $R_j \in \mathcal{P}$. Then we obtain $\lambda_j^* \dot{\lambda}_j = \langle\langle R_j | T_\theta^\dagger \dot{T}_\theta | R_j \rangle\rangle$.

$PT_\theta^\dagger \dot{T}_\theta P \neq 0$ thus implies the existence of some $\dot{\lambda}_j \neq 0$. In particular, R_0 is such an eigenmatrix of $PT_\theta^\dagger \dot{T}_\theta P$ with eigenvalue $\mu_0 = \lambda_0^* \dot{\lambda}_0$, and R_0^\dagger is thus an eigenmatrix of $PT_\theta^\dagger \dot{T}_\theta P$ with eigenvalue $\mu_0^* = \lambda_0 \dot{\lambda}_0^*$. Since $PT_\theta^\dagger \dot{T}_\theta P$ is assumed

to be a normal matrix, it has orthogonal eigenvectors. Therefore, if $\mu_0 \neq \mu_0^*$, $|R_0\rangle\rangle$ and $|R_0^\dagger\rangle\rangle$ are orthogonal to each other; otherwise, we can choose R_0 to be Hermitian (for example, by redefining R_0 as $R_0 + R_0^\dagger$ or $i(R_0 - R_0^\dagger)$). Moreover, due to the trace-preserving properties of quantum channels, $\text{Tr}(R_0) = \text{Tr}(R_0^\dagger) = 0$. We then have mutually orthogonal peripheral eigenvectors $\{|I\rangle\rangle, |R_0\rangle\rangle\}$ or $\{|I\rangle\rangle, |R_0\rangle\rangle, |R_0^\dagger\rangle\rangle\}$ in the limit of $\theta \rightarrow \theta_0$. Finally, by Corollary 2 the repeated application of $(U_c \otimes U_c^*)T_\theta$ can achieve the HL. \square

Remarkably, there exists a unitary control operation satisfying Eq. (16) if and only if Algorithm 1 can successfully find a U_c . Note that, except for the trivial case where R_0 and R_0^\dagger are associated with the same eigenvalue of $PT_\theta^\dagger T_\theta P$ (such that R_0 can be chosen as a Hermitian matrix and finding U_c is trivial), the condition Eq. (16) can be reformulated as

$$U_c^\dagger R_i U_c = \sum_k K_k^{\theta_0} R_i K_k^{\theta_0 \dagger}, \quad \forall i = 1, 2, \quad (20)$$

where $R_1 = R_0 + R_0^\dagger$ and $R_2 = i(R_0 - R_0^\dagger)$ are two Hermitian matrices. The key idea behind Algorithm 1 is using the principal angles [39–41] to characterize the relation between subspaces. For two arbitrary subspaces F and G associated with projections Π_F and Π_G on the subspaces, the principal angles can be determined by performing the singular value decomposition (SVD) of $\Pi_F \Pi_G$ (i.e., the principal angles are arccosine values of the singular values). The geometrical relation between two subspaces can then be fully characterized by the relation between a set of subspaces of lower dimensions. By iterative reduction of the dimensions of subspaces, at last the reduced subspaces either are mutually orthogonal to each other, or share the same dimensions and degenerate principal angles. It is thus possible to choose a set of canonical orthonormal vectors for each subspace, and the inner products between these vectors are uniquely determined. If U_c satisfying Eq. (16) exists, all the inner products are preserved by the action of the channel T_θ , so we can choose a unitary transformation to simulate the effect. A detailed proof of the validity of Algorithm 1 is given below.

Proof. First, it is easy to see that the existence of a unitary transformation between two sets of Hermitian matrices is equivalent to the existence of a unitary transformation between two sets of subspaces, if we apply the spectral decomposition to each Hermitian matrix. Denote by $\{P_1, \dots, P_K\}$ the subspaces generated by the spectral decomposition of all matrices in $\{R_i\}_{i=1}^2$, and by $\{Q_1, \dots, Q_K\}$ the subspaces generated by the spectral decomposition of all matrices in $\{\sum_k K_k^{\theta_0} R_i K_k^{\theta_0 \dagger}\}_{i=1}^2$.

We start from the characterization of the principal angles between two subspaces F and G . It is always possible to choose a set of orthonormal basis vectors $V_F = \{|u_1\rangle, \dots, |u_\alpha\rangle, |v_1\rangle, \dots, |v_\beta\rangle, |\psi_1\rangle, \dots, |\psi_\gamma\rangle\}$ for F and a set of orthonormal basis vectors $V_G = \{|u'_1\rangle, \dots, |u'_\alpha\rangle, |w_1\rangle, \dots, |w_\beta\rangle, |\phi_1\rangle, \dots, |\phi_\delta\rangle\}$ for G , such that any vector in the set V_F and any vector in the set V_G are orthogonal, except for

$$\langle v_i | w_i \rangle = \cos(\eta_i), \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, \beta \quad (21)$$

and

$$\langle u_i | u'_i \rangle = 1, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, \alpha, \quad (22)$$

where $0 < \eta_i < \pi/2$ are nontrivial principal angles. We say this is a canonical order of basis vectors for these two subspaces F and G . These principal angles can be determined by performing the SVD of $\Pi_F \Pi_G$, as $\cos(\eta_j)$ is the singular value. By the uniqueness of SVD, $\{|u_i\rangle = |u'_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^\alpha$ are unique up to a unitary transformation, $\{|v_j\rangle\}$ and $\{|w_j\rangle\}$ associated with the same η_j are unique up to a simultaneous unitary transformation, $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^\gamma$ are unique up to a unitary transformation, and $\{|\phi_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^\delta$ are unique up to a unitary transformation. The geometrical relation between two subspaces F and G are thus fully characterized by the angles between a set of lower-dimensional subspaces.

Iteratively, we repeat the procedure of reducing the dimensions of subspaces, for all pairs of subspaces in the set $\{P_1, \dots, P_K\}$, until any pair of the dimension-reduced subspaces are either mutually orthogonal or have the same dimensions and identical principal angles. Denote by $\{\tilde{P}_1, \dots, \tilde{P}_M\}$ this set of subspaces iteratively obtained so far. We then fix a canonical order of basis vectors for all these subspaces through such a procedure: we first choose an order of basis vectors for subspace \tilde{P}_1 with the associated projection $\tilde{\Pi}_1$. Then for any subspace \tilde{P}_j (with the projection $\tilde{\Pi}_j$) in $\{\tilde{P}_2, \dots, \tilde{P}_M\}$ which is nonorthogonal to \tilde{P}_1 , the canonical order of basis vectors is uniquely determined by fixing the isometry \tilde{U} in the SVD of $\tilde{P}_1 \tilde{\Pi}_j = \tilde{U} \tilde{D} \tilde{V}^\dagger$, where the diagonal elements of \tilde{D} only contain nonzero singular values. We can thus choose $\tilde{V}^\dagger = \tilde{D}^{-1} \tilde{U}^\dagger \tilde{P}_1 \tilde{\Pi}_j$, where each column of \tilde{U} is the predetermined canonical basis vector for subspace $\tilde{\Pi}_1$. After finding all subspaces P_j nonorthogonal to P_1 , we simply fix the order of basis vectors for another subspace in the remaining set of unchosen subspaces and repeat the process. Therefore, we find a set of basis vectors

Algorithm 1: Identification of a unitary control U_c in Theorem 2.

Input: R_0 in Eq. (16)
Output: Unitary control U_c
 $R_1 \leftarrow R_0 + R_0^\dagger$, $R_2 \leftarrow i(R_0 - R_0^\dagger)$
 $\text{List}_{\text{in}} \leftarrow [R_1, R_2]$, $\text{List}_{\text{out}} \leftarrow [\sum_k K_k^{\theta_0} R_1 K_k^{\theta_0 \dagger}, \sum_k K_k^{\theta_0} R_2 K_k^{\theta_0 \dagger}]$
 $\text{Vectors}_{\text{in-out}} \leftarrow []$ /* To store two sets of vectors connected by a unitary transformation U_c^\dagger */
for List **in** $[\text{List}_{\text{in}}, \text{List}_{\text{out}}]$ **do**
 for $j \leftarrow 1$ **to** 2 **do**
 $R \leftarrow \text{List}[j]$
 Spectral decomposition $R = \sum_{k=1}^{n_\Pi} \alpha_k \Pi_k$, where $\Pi_k = \sum_{a=1}^{n_v^{(k)}} |v_{ka}\rangle\langle v_{ka}|$ /* $\{\Pi_k\}_k$ is a set of projections; α_k are different for different k and follow the descending order */
 $S_k \leftarrow [|v_{k1}\rangle, \dots, |v_{kn_v^{(k)}}\rangle]$, $\forall k = 1, \dots, n_\Pi$ /* S_k is a subspace spanned by orthonormal $\{|v_{ka}\rangle\}_a$ */
 $\mathcal{S}_j \leftarrow [S_1, \dots, S_{n_\Pi}]$ /* \mathcal{S}_j is a list of subspaces corresponding to R */
 $\mathcal{S} \leftarrow \bigcup_{j=1}^m \mathcal{S}_j$ /* \mathcal{S} is the union of all subspaces */
 repeat
 for every pair of S_x, S_y **in** \mathcal{S} **do**
 Π_x, Π_y are the projections on S_x, S_y
 Compute the SVD of $\Pi_x \Pi_y = U D V^\dagger$
 Obtain a list of subspaces $[X_1, \dots, X_{n_s}]$, each spanned by the column vectors of U corresponding to the same *nonzero* singular value in the ascending order
 Obtain a list of subspaces $[Y_1, \dots, Y_{n_s-1}]$, each spanned by the row vectors of V^T corresponding to the same *nonzero and nonunity* singular value in the ascending order
 X_{n_s+1} is the orthogonal complement to X_1, \dots, X_{n_s} in S_x and Y_{n_s} is the orthogonal complement to Y_1, \dots, Y_{n_s-1} in S_y
 $\mathcal{S}_{xy} \leftarrow [X_1, \dots, X_{n_s+1}, Y_1, \dots, Y_{n_s}]$ /* The angles between S_x, S_y are uniquely mapped to angles between subspaces in \mathcal{S}_{xy} */
 $\mathcal{S} \leftarrow \bigcup_{x,y} \mathcal{S}_{xy}$
 Remove redundant subspaces in \mathcal{S} if they are associated with identical projections
 until **for** every pair of subspaces S_a, S_b in \mathcal{S} with projections Π_a, Π_b , either $\Pi_a \Pi_b = 0$, or Π_a and Π_b have the same rank and all nonzero singular values of $\Pi_a \Pi_b$ are the same
 $\mathcal{S}' \leftarrow []$ /* \mathcal{S}' is to store subspaces with basis vectors in a uniquely determined canonical order */
 repeat
 Add the first subspace S_1 in \mathcal{S} to \mathcal{S}' and remove S_1 from \mathcal{S}
 Find all the remaining subspaces Q_1, \dots, Q_L in \mathcal{S} which are not orthogonal to S_1 , and remove them from \mathcal{S}
 for $j \leftarrow 1$ **to** L **do**
 Π_1, Γ_j are rank- n_j projections on S_1, Q_j
 Construct isometry \tilde{U} with each column as a basis vector in subspace S_1
 $\tilde{V}^\dagger \leftarrow \tilde{D}^{-1} \tilde{U}^\dagger \Pi_1 \Gamma_j$, where \tilde{D} is diagonal with all diagonal elements as the nonzero singular value of $\Pi_1 \Gamma_j$
 $Q_j \leftarrow [|v_1\rangle, \dots, |v_{n_j}\rangle]$, where $|v_1\rangle, \dots, |v_{n_j}\rangle$ are the row vectors of \tilde{V}^T
 Add Q_j to \mathcal{S}' and remove Q_j from \mathcal{S}
 until \mathcal{S} is empty
 $\text{List}_{\text{vectors}} \leftarrow []$
 Add all the basis vectors of all the subspaces in \mathcal{S}' to $\text{List}_{\text{vectors}}$, following the order established so far
 Add $\text{List}_{\text{vectors}}$ to $\text{Vectors}_{\text{in-out}}$
For $i = 1, 2$, construct matrices M_i , with each column as a basis vector in $\text{Vectors}_{\text{in-out}}[i]$ following the established order
 Compute the SVD of $M_2 M_1^\dagger = U' D' V'^\dagger$
 $U_c \leftarrow V' U'^\dagger$ /* U_c^\dagger maps vectors in $\text{Vectors}_{\text{in-out}}[1]$ to vectors in $\text{Vectors}_{\text{in-out}}[2]$ */
Sanity check: If Eq. (16) is satisfied by U_c , output U_c and succeed; otherwise, there does not exist a unitary satisfying Eq. (16).

uniquely determined, and we can construct a matrix M_1 , whose columns are these basis vectors in this canonical order. In the same way, we can also reduce the dimensions for subspaces in $\{Q_1, \dots, Q_K\}$, find a corresponding set of basis vectors and construct matrix M_2 .

Finally, we would like to find a unitary U_c such that $U_c^\dagger M_1 = M_2$. This can be easily done, by computing the SVD of $M_2 M_1^\dagger = U' D' V'^\dagger$ and choose $U_c = V' U'^\dagger$. One way to see this is that U_c^\dagger is the solution to the unitary Procrustes problem $\arg \min_U \|U M_1 - M_2\|_2^2$ [42]. Such U_c exists if and only if the inner products between column vectors of M_1 are identical to the inner products between column vectors of M_2 . Tracing back the iterative reduction and considering the uniqueness of the canonical choice, if these inner products are preserved, then $U_c^\dagger P_i U_c = Q_i$, $\forall i = 1, \dots, K$, and

therefore U_c is a solution of Eq. (16). In turn, if a unitary satisfying Eq. (16) exists, it must preserve all these inner products by construction. Therefore, U_c satisfying Eq. (16) exists if and only if Algorithm 1 can successfully identify it. \square

It is worth noting that, applying such control operations is essential for achieving the HL in some cases, as we will see in the example in Section V B. The key there is to establish a decoherence-free subspace (DFS) [36] where the signal does not vanish, by appending U_c to the original channel T_θ , even if T_θ itself has no nontrivial peripheral eigenmatrices except for the fixed point state. The action of the unitary control U_c has a close relation to QEC, but our strategy is limited to a more restricted case where the control is unitary, no ancilla is required and no error detection syndrome measurement can be performed. Remarkably, it is possible to achieve the HL with unitary control and an ancilla-free mixed input state, without the need to work on the subspace of pure states required by Knill-Laflamme condition [43], in the example in Section V B.

We conclude this section with a discussion on the relation between our approach and existing QEC-based approaches. QEC has been a greatly successful routine in compensating for the noise effect in quantum metrology [17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 44–46]. When the well-known ‘‘Hamiltonian-not-in-Kraus-span’’ (HNKS) condition is satisfied, i.e., $H := \sum_i K_i^\dagger \dot{K}_i \notin \text{Span}_{\text{Herm}}\{K_i^\dagger K_j\}_{ij}$, one can always construct an error correction code to achieve the HL by using noiseless ancillae [17]. This is accomplished by finding a projection \hat{P} on the ancilla-assisted logical subspace, such that $\hat{P}K_i^\dagger K_j \hat{P} \propto \hat{P}, \forall i, j$ and $\hat{P}H\hat{P} \not\propto \hat{P}$. It is, however, much less known whether and how an ancilla-free error correction code can achieve the HL. A notable progress in the context of Hamiltonian estimation is that an optimal ancilla-free QEC achieving the HL exists for Hamiltonian estimation under Markovian noise, when (i) the signal and noise commute and (ii) the ‘‘Hamiltonian-not-in-Lindblad-span’’ (HNLS) is satisfied [26]. The codespace construction therein relies on the simultaneous diagonalization of commuting operators, and thus is applicable to limited cases.

In general, it is a challenging task to find an ancilla-free QEC, and determine whether and how the HL can be recovered simply by applying unitary control rather than more involved syndrome measurements (which further requires additional ancillae). Our framework provides a systematic solution to this problem under certain conditions, and in Section V B we show how to apply unitary control operations and a mixed state to achieve the HL for a quantum channel when $\{K_i^\dagger K_j\}_{ij}$ do not commute and the signal does not commute with the noise. The unitary control plays a significant role in constructing the DFS, which corresponds to a subsystem of a mixed state. Without the unitary control, the DFS is absent in the channel to estimate. The examples presented in Sections V A 2 and V B further highlight the distinction between our approach and QEC.

V. EXAMPLES

We apply our framework to several intriguing examples achieving the HL without ancilla, which provide some new insights into when and how the HL can be attained.

A. HL without control operations

1. The singularity of ‘‘Hamiltonian-not-in-Kraus-span’’ condition

We first consider a simple but illuminating example, which reveals some subtle issues not captured by the well-known ‘‘Hamiltonian-not-in-Kraus-span’’ (HNKS) condition, but made explicit by our theoretical framework. In essence this issue arises from the ill-defined ‘‘Hamiltonian’’ in certain cases.

Suppose we want to estimate θ from N copies of a σ_z -rotation with the single qubit dephasing noise, described by Kraus operators $K_1 = \sqrt{1-p}e^{-i\phi\sigma_z/2}$ and $K_2 = \sqrt{p}\sigma_z e^{-i\phi\sigma_z/2}$. Both p and ϕ are functions of the parameter of interest θ . This specific problem is of fundamental interest in the asymptotic theory of quantum channel estimation, because any quantum channel can simulate a logical dephasing channel by using error correction (with ancilla in general).

Ref. [17, Eq. (B5)] showed that this channel has a ‘‘Hamiltonian’’ independent of p : $H = i\sum_j K_j^\dagger \dot{K}_j = \frac{\dot{\phi}}{2}\sigma_z$. The authors therefore concluded that HL can only be achieved if $\dot{\phi} \neq 0$ and $p = 0$, according to the HNKS condition. However, our analysis shows that HL can also be achieved if $p = 0$ or 1 and $\dot{p} \neq 0$. Specifically, $T_\theta = \sum_i K_i \otimes K_i^*$ has 4 eigenvalues: $\{1, 1, (1-2p)e^{-i\phi}, (1-2p)e^{i\phi}\}$, and the eigenvectors are mutually orthogonal. For $\lambda = (1-2p)e^{i\phi}$ we have $\dot{\lambda}|_{p=0} = (i\dot{\phi} - 2\dot{p})e^{i\phi}$, so by Corollary 1 we can choose an input state $\rho_0 = I/2 + \alpha(|0\rangle\langle 1| + |1\rangle\langle 0|)$ (for some $0 < \alpha < 1/2^3$)

³ Here we do not choose $\alpha = 1/2$ corresponding to a pure state, such that the rank of the output state is independent of θ at the true

which achieves the HL when (i) $p = 0$ or 1 and (ii) either $\dot{\phi} \neq 0$ or $\dot{p} \neq 0$.

2. HL beyond quantum error correction

Existing protocols achieving the HL are mainly based on QEC, which constructs a DFS, where the noise is eliminated but the signal remains to take effect. By QEC the simulated channel is an identity channel on the logical subspace. Our analysis, however, opens up new possibilities to achieve HL beyond QEC.

Consider a quantum channel described by Kraus operators $K_1 = |2\rangle\langle 0|$, $K_2 = |2\rangle\langle 1|$, $K_3 = \sqrt{2\theta}|2\rangle\langle 2|$, $K_4 = \sqrt{1/2 - \theta}|0\rangle\langle 2|$, and $K_5 = \sqrt{1/2 - \theta}|1\rangle\langle 2|$, where $0 \leq \theta \leq 1/2$ is the parameter of interest. Now $T_\theta = \sum_i K_i \otimes K_i^*$ has 2 nonzero eigenvalues: $\{1, -1 + 2\theta\}$, with the fixed point $\text{diag}\{1/2 - \theta, 1/2 - \theta, 1\}$ and the other eigenmatrix $\text{diag}\{1/2, 1/2, -1\}$ (where $\text{diag}\{a_i\}_i$ denotes a diagonal matrix with diagonal elements $\{a_i\}_i$). At $\theta = 0$, we can choose an input state $\rho_0 = \text{diag}\{1/4, 1/4, 1/2\} + \alpha \text{diag}\{1/4, 1/4, -1/2\}$ for some $-1 < \alpha < 1$ and $\alpha \neq 0$. Here these two eigenvectors are not orthogonal. By Theorem 1, the associated QFI of the asymptotic output state exhibits an interesting oscillating behaviour given by

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\tilde{F}^Q(\tilde{\rho}_\theta)}{N^2} = \begin{cases} \frac{128\alpha^2}{(3\alpha^2 + 2\alpha + 3)^2}, & \text{if } N \text{ is odd,} \\ \frac{128\alpha^2}{(3\alpha^2 - 2\alpha + 3)^2}, & \text{if } N \text{ is even.} \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

The QFI of the output state is lower bounded by

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F^Q(\rho_\theta)}{N^2} \geq \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{Tr}(\rho_\theta^2)}{4\lambda_{\max}(\rho_\theta)N^2} \tilde{F}^Q(\tilde{\rho}_\theta) = \begin{cases} \frac{8\alpha^2}{(3\alpha^2 + 2\alpha + 3)(1 + \alpha)}, & \text{if } N \text{ is odd,} \\ \frac{16\alpha^2}{(3\alpha^2 - 2\alpha + 3)(1 + \alpha)}, & \text{if } N \text{ is even,} \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

when $1/3 < \alpha < 1$. However, Eq. (24) only gives a lower bound on the actual QFI, so it is unclear whether the QFI also oscillates with N asymptotically. We compute the exact QFI for this example, and find that this oscillating behaviour indeed exists for fairly large N , as illustrated in Fig. 2. Since N is a finite number in a realistic scenario, we anticipate that this phenomenon may be of practical interest and deserves further investigation.




FIG. 2. Comparison between the actual QFI $F^Q(\rho_\theta)/N^2$ and the bound Eq. (24). The input state is a fixed state $\rho_0 = \text{diag}\{1/4, 1/4, 1/2\} + \alpha \text{diag}\{1/4, 1/4, -1/2\}$ for $\alpha = 0.9$.

Furthermore, we remark that this quantum channel is irreducible, i.e., having a unique full-rank fixed point, and does not admit a DFS. The HL here is therefore not a result of QEC, but stems from the decay of root-of-unity

value, to avoid the issue of the discontinuity of QFI at the rank changing point. See Refs. [47–50] for more discussions.

peripheral eigenvalues corresponding to diagonalizable conserved quantities [31]. It is worth noting that the HNKs condition is also ill-defined for this example.

B. HL with unitary control operations

Consider estimating a two-qubit quantum channel characterized by the Liouville representation (16×16 transition matrix)

$$T_\theta = T^{(\text{noise})} [U_t(\theta) \otimes U_t(\theta)^*], \quad (25)$$

where $U_t(\theta) = e^{-itH_0(\theta)}$ with the evolution time t , and the signal θ of interest is the coupling strength in a Heisenberg model Hamiltonian

$$H_0(\theta) = \sigma_z \otimes I + I \otimes \sigma_z + \theta H_J. \quad (26)$$

for $H_J = \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x + \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y + \sigma_z \otimes \sigma_z$. The 16×16 matrix $T^{(\text{noise})}$ representing the noise independent of θ is given by (the intuition behind this choice will be explained later)

$$T^{(\text{noise})} = \begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_2 \\ 0 & \omega_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_4 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_4 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_3^* & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_4^* & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_1 & \omega_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_3^* & 0 & 0 & \omega_4^* & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_4^* & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_3^* & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_1 & 0 \\ \omega_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_1 \\ 0 & \omega_4^* & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_3^* & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_2 & \omega_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_4 & 0 & 0 & \omega_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (27)$$

having defined

$$\omega_1 = 1 - p_1 - p_2, \quad \omega_2 = 1 - \omega_1, \quad \omega_3 = e^{-i\phi_1}(1 - p_1 - p_2 - p_3) - e^{-i\phi_4}p_3, \quad \omega_4 = e^{-i\phi_2}p_1 - e^{-i\phi_3}p_2, \quad (28)$$

for $p_1, p_2, p_3 \geq 0$, $p_1 + p_2 + p_3 \leq 1$, and $\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3, \phi_4$ are real numbers. All $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^3$ and $\{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^4$ are constants independent of the parameter θ to estimate.

We remark that our approach only requires the knowledge about such a ‘‘tomographic’’ description of a single composed noisy channel T_θ in the neighborhood of the ground truth θ_0 , given by Eq. (25), which is particularly suitable for dealing with the experimental data⁴. Here for simplicity of presentation, we assume that we know the forms of unitary $U_t(\theta)$ and the noise $T^{(\text{noise})}$ respectively [which is a reasonable assumption if one can characterize the inherent noise independent of $U_t(\theta)$], but in principle our framework would also work if we only know the description of T_θ . There is no need to choose a Kraus representation which is non-unique.

We can readily employ our theoretical framework to show that the sequential estimation of N channels T_θ can achieve the HL by interleaving proper unitary control U_c , and this control can be identified solely from the form of T_θ . Note that $T_\theta^\dagger T_\theta$ has 4 eigenvalues of 1 with eigenmatrices in the subspace \mathcal{P} (associated with the projection P on it) and

$$PT_\theta^\dagger \dot{T}_\theta P = -itPT_\theta^\dagger T_\theta [H_J \otimes I - I \otimes H_J^T] P \quad (29)$$

⁴ Certainly, the true value θ_0 of θ should only be roughly known before the experiment. In practice, one can adaptively update the input state and the control based on the updated estimate of θ during the experiment [51–53].

has 2 nonzero eigenvalues, with mutually orthogonal eigenmatrices (up to phase factors)

$$R_1 = U_t(\theta)^\dagger (|01\rangle\langle 11| + |10\rangle\langle 00|)U_t(\theta), \quad R_2 = R_1^\dagger = U_t(\theta)^\dagger (|00\rangle\langle 10| + |11\rangle\langle 01|)U_t(\theta). \quad (30)$$

Next, by applying Algorithm 1 to T_θ , we numerically check that the unitary equivalence condition Eq. (16) is satisfied, i.e., the algorithm outputs a U_c satisfying

$$T_{\theta_0}|R_i\rangle\rangle = (U_c^\dagger \otimes U_c^T)|R_i\rangle\rangle, \quad \forall i = 1, 2. \quad (31)$$

However, U_c is a numerical solution not admitting a simple form. For simplicity of presentation, since we have assumed that the form of $U_t(\theta)$ is known, we can apply Algorithm 1 just for the noise part $T^{(\text{noise})}$, i.e., we require that

$$T^{(\text{noise})}|\tilde{R}_i\rangle\rangle = (\tilde{U}_c^\dagger \otimes \tilde{U}_c^T)|\tilde{R}_i\rangle\rangle, \quad \forall i = 1, 2, \quad (32)$$

where $\tilde{R}_i = U_t(\theta_0)R_iU_t(\theta_0)^\dagger$, $\forall i = 1, 2$. Then the result \tilde{U}_c output by Algorithm 1 is simply a CNOT gate

$$\tilde{U}_c = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (33)$$

This implies that for achieving the HL in estimating the composed noisy channel T_θ , we can choose the unitary control

$$U_c = U_t(\theta_0)^\dagger \tilde{U}_c, \quad (34)$$

and take an input state, for example,

$$\rho_0 = \frac{I}{2} \otimes \frac{I}{2} + \alpha(R_1 + R_1^\dagger) = \frac{I}{2} \otimes \frac{I}{2} + \alpha U_t(\theta_0)^\dagger (\sigma_x \otimes I) U_t(\theta_0), \quad (35)$$

for some $0 < \alpha < 1/4$, and incorporate unitary control $U_c = U_t(\theta_0)^\dagger \tilde{U}_c$ after each application of T_θ .

It is worth noting that the control is essential for achieving the HL here. Without the control U_c , T_θ generically has only one fixed point state (the maximally mixed state) on the peripheral eigenspaces, so no information can be retrieved after $N \rightarrow \infty$ applications in a control-free strategy. Besides, it lacks a systematic way to determine whether and how one can construct an ancilla-free error correction code without syndrome measurements for achieving the HL, which underlines the power of our approach.

Having illustrated how to apply our approach to this concrete example, now we discuss the intuition behind it. In fact, one can verify that a possible Kraus representation of $T^{(\text{noise})}$ is

$$K_1^{(\text{noise})} = \sqrt{1-p_1-p_2-p_3}W_1, \quad K_2^{(\text{noise})} = \sqrt{p_1}W_2(\sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x), \quad K_3^{(\text{noise})} = \sqrt{p_2}W_3(\sigma_x \otimes \sigma_y), \quad K_4^{(\text{noise})} = \sqrt{p_3}W_4(I \otimes \sigma_z), \quad (36)$$

where each unitary W_i in general can be different:

$$W_i = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\phi_i} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & e^{i\phi_i} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \forall i = 1, 2, 3, 4. \quad (37)$$

We remark that any unitary W_i itself, as part of the noise, is unknown *a priori*. Now a Kraus representation for the composed T_θ is $\{K_i^\theta = K_i^{(\text{noise})}U_t(\theta)\}_{i=1}^4$. Note that, not all $\{K_i^\theta K_j^\theta\}_{ij}$ commute with each other, and the signal H_j does not commute with noise, which goes beyond the requirement of the protocol in Ref.[26]. It is also impossible to find a codespace such that any logical state in the space is stabilized by the noise, as in Ref. [54].

The intuition why U_c given by Eq. (33) works for this example is that, even if for general values of $\{\phi_i\}$, $W_i \neq U_c^\dagger$ for any i , the Kraus operators of the channel to estimate $\{K_i^\theta\}$ simulate the action of a unitary transformation on the effective subspace spanned by R_1 and R_2 at $\theta = \theta_0$, where the signal does not vanish. A proper unitary control U_c can thus reverse the effect of the noise and recover the HL, and this can be systematically identified by our approach.

Now consider an alternative case where all $W_i = W$, and W is an arbitrary unitary which can be known. A control operation achieving the HL can be chosen as $U_c = U_t(\theta_0)^\dagger W^\dagger$. Remarkably, in this case, preparing the input state Eq. (35) is fully robust to any local state preparation error on the second qubit, i.e., there is no need to initialize the second qubit. The reason is that the regulated channel $(U_c \otimes U_c^*)T_\theta$ is unitarily diagonalizable at $\theta = \theta_0$. For an arbitrary state of the second qubit $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}(I + r_x\sigma_x + r_y\sigma_y + r_z\sigma_z)$ with $r_x^2 + r_y^2 + r_z^2 = 1$, all the contributions from $\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z$ vanish in the asymptotic limit, as they are orthogonal to the peripheral eigenspace. Therefore, the choice of σ has no detrimental effect on achieving the guaranteed HL.

Hence, this informative example reveals three key distinctions between our approach and QEC:

1. We provide an algorithmic routine to find the probe state and identical unitary control for achieving the HL without ancilla in an experiment-friendly scenario, while such a routine is lacking for ancilla-free QEC.
2. We do not use syndrome measurement, which requires additional noiseless ancillae.
3. Our approach makes it possible to input all the information into one qubit, while the other qubit can be arbitrarily initialized, and apply $U_t(\theta_0)^\dagger$ for preparing the input state for the HL. This is, however, not attainable while constructing an error correction code by the Knill-Laflamme condition.

Overall, our formalism works in a more resource-deficient scenario, which can be of practical interest.

VI. CONCLUSION

We establish a systematic formalism for the problem of sequential channel estimation without ancilla. By vectorizing the quantum state and investigating the spectral properties of quantum channels, we derive useful formulas for the QFI with ancilla-free sequential strategies, and identify sufficient conditions for achieving the HL, in both control-free and control-enhanced scenarios. Our approach has a close relation to QEC, but, more importantly, sometimes extends its applicability beyond QEC scenarios. With our formalism, one can take more restricted strategies where only identical unitary control is applied and no syndrome measurement is required, and overcome the challenges one could have in identifying ancilla-free error correction codes. We also present several intriguing examples to manifest our approach. These examples indicate that it is possible to achieve the HL even when the conventional HNKS condition is ill-defined, and we can identify unitary control operations to achieve the HL for challenging tasks in a systematic way. In addition, although we mainly focused on the HL, Theorem 1 also yields conditions for achieving the SQL when the HL cannot be attained. Our formalism thus opens up new possibilities in quantum metrology by getting rid of the requirement for the noiseless ancilla.

Our approach is well-suited for experimental design. Compared with our previous works [55, 56], the obtained protocol is not strictly optimal but has a performance guarantee of the precision scaling. The complexity of the algorithm is much lower and does not grow with N . The simple setup allows the circuit to be looped many times, thus facilitating experimental demonstration of quantum metrology for large N .

A very recent work [57] derived conditions for achieving the SQL with limited control for single-qubit channel estimation. An interesting future work is thus to try extending this result to higher dimensions within our framework.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China via Excellent Young Scientists Fund (Hong Kong and Macau) Project 12322516, Guangdong Basic and Applied Basic Research Foundation (Project No. 2022A1515010340), and the Hong Kong Research Grant Council (RGC) through the Early Career Scheme (ECS) grant 27310822 and the General Research Fund (GRF) grant 17303923.

-
- [1] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, Quantum-enhanced measurements: Beating the standard quantum limit, *Science* **306**, 1330 (2004), <https://www.science.org/doi/pdf/10.1126/science.1104149>.
 - [2] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, Quantum Metrology, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 010401 (2006).
 - [3] C. L. Degen, F. Reinhard, and P. Cappellaro, Quantum sensing, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **89**, 035002 (2017).
 - [4] J. Preskill, Quantum Computing in the NISQ era and beyond, *Quantum* **2**, 79 (2018).
 - [5] R. Schnabel, N. Mavalvala, D. E. McClelland, and P. K. Lam, Quantum metrology for gravitational wave astronomy, *Nat. Commun.* **1**, 121 (2010).
 - [6] M. Tse, H. Yu, N. Kijbunchoo, A. Fernandez-Galiana, P. Dupej, L. Barsotti, C. D. Blair, D. D. Brown, S. E. Dwyer, A. Effler, M. Evans, P. Fritschel, V. V. Frolov, A. C. Green, G. L. Mansell, F. Matichard, N. Mavalvala, D. E. McClelland, L. McCuller, T. McRae, J. Miller, A. Mullavey, E. Oelker, I. Y. Phinney, D. Sigg, B. J. J. Slagmolen, T. Vo, R. L. Ward, C. Whittle, R. Abbott, C. Adams, R. X. Adhikari, A. Ananyeva, S. Appert, K. Arai, J. S. Areeda, Y. Asali, S. M. Aston, C. Austin, A. M. Baer, M. Ball, S. W. Ballmer, S. Banagiri, D. Barker, J. Bartlett, B. K. Berger, J. Betzwieser, D. Bhattacharjee, G. Billingsley, S. Biscans, R. M. Blair, N. Bode, P. Booker, R. Bork, A. Bramley, A. F. Brooks, A. Buikema, C. Cahillane, K. C. Cannon, X. Chen, A. A. Ciobanu, F. Clara, S. J. Cooper, K. R. Corley, S. T. Countryman, P. B. Covas, D. C. Coyne, L. E. H. Datrier, D. Davis, C. Di Fronzo, J. C. Driggers, T. Etzel, T. M. Evans, J. Feicht, P. Fulda, M. Fyffe, J. A. Giaime, K. D. Giardino, P. Godwin, E. Goetz, S. Gras, C. Gray, R. Gray, A. Gupta, E. K. Gustafson, R. Gustafson, J. Hanks, J. Hanson, T. Hardwick, R. K. Hasskew, M. C. Heintze, A. F. Helmling-Cornell, N. A.

- Holland, J. D. Jones, S. Kandhasamy, S. Karki, M. Kasprzack, K. Kawabe, P. J. King, J. S. Kissel, R. Kumar, M. Landry, B. B. Lane, B. Lantz, M. Laxen, Y. K. Lecoche, J. Leviton, J. Liu, M. Lormand, A. P. Lundgren, R. Macas, M. MacInnis, D. M. Macleod, S. Márka, Z. Márka, D. V. Martynov, K. Mason, T. J. Massinger, R. McCarthy, S. McCormick, J. McIver, G. Mendell, K. Merfeld, E. L. Merilh, F. Meylahn, T. Mistry, R. Mittleman, G. Moreno, C. M. Mow-Lowry, S. Mozzon, T. J. N. Nelson, P. Nguyen, L. K. Nuttall, J. Oberling, R. J. Oram, B. O'Reilly, C. Osthelder, D. J. Ottaway, H. Overmier, J. R. Palamos, W. Parker, E. Payne, A. Pele, C. J. Perez, M. Pirello, H. Radkins, K. E. Ramirez, J. W. Richardson, K. Riles, N. A. Robertson, J. G. Rollins, C. L. Romel, J. H. Romie, M. P. Ross, K. Ryan, T. Sadecki, E. J. Sanchez, L. E. Sanchez, T. R. Saravanan, R. L. Savage, D. Schaetzel, R. Schnabel, R. M. S. Schofield, E. Schwartz, D. Sellers, T. J. Shaffer, J. R. Smith, S. Soni, B. Sorazu, A. P. Spencer, K. A. Strain, L. Sun, M. J. Szczepańczyk, M. Thomas, P. Thomas, K. A. Thorne, K. Toland, C. I. Torrie, G. Traylor, A. L. Urban, G. Vajente, G. Valdes, D. C. Vander-Hyde, P. J. Veitch, K. Venkateswara, G. Venugopalan, A. D. Viets, C. Vorvick, M. Wade, J. Warner, B. Weaver, R. Weiss, B. Willke, C. C. Wipf, L. Xiao, H. Yamamoto, M. J. Yap, H. Yu, L. Zhang, M. E. Zucker, and J. Zweizig, Quantum-enhanced advanced ligo detectors in the era of gravitational-wave astronomy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 231107 (2019).
- [7] V. Bužek, R. Derka, and S. Massar, Optimal Quantum Clocks, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 2207 (1999).
- [8] E. Pedrozo-Peñañiel, S. Colombo, C. Shu, A. F. Adiyatullin, Z. Li, E. Mendez, B. Braverman, A. Kawasaki, D. Akamatsu, Y. Xiao, and V. Vuletić, Entanglement on an optical atomic-clock transition, *Nature* **588**, 414 (2020).
- [9] G. Brida, M. Genovese, and I. Ruo Berchera, Experimental realization of sub-shot-noise quantum imaging, *Nat. Photonics* **4**, 227 (2010).
- [10] D. Le Sage, K. Arai, D. R. Glenn, S. J. DeVience, L. M. Pham, L. Rahn-Lee, M. D. Lukin, A. Yacoby, A. Komeili, and R. L. Walsworth, Optical magnetic imaging of living cells, *Nature* **496**, 486 (2013).
- [11] H. Yuan and C.-H. F. Fung, Optimal feedback scheme and universal time scaling for hamiltonian parameter estimation, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 110401 (2015).
- [12] R. Demkowicz-Dobrzański, J. Kołodyński, and M. Guţă, The elusive heisenberg limit in quantum-enhanced metrology, *Nat. Commun.* **3**, 1063 (2012).
- [13] A. Fujiwara and H. Imai, A fibre bundle over manifolds of quantum channels and its application to quantum statistics, *J. Phys. A* **41**, 255304 (2008).
- [14] B. M. Escher, R. L. de Matos Filho, and L. Davidovich, General framework for estimating the ultimate precision limit in noisy quantum-enhanced metrology, *Nat. Phys.* **7**, 406 (2011).
- [15] J. Kołodyński and R. Demkowicz-Dobrzański, Efficient tools for quantum metrology with uncorrelated noise, *New J. Phys.* **15**, 073043 (2013).
- [16] R. Demkowicz-Dobrzański and L. Maccone, Using entanglement against noise in quantum metrology, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 250801 (2014).
- [17] S. Zhou and L. Jiang, Asymptotic theory of quantum channel estimation, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 010343 (2021).
- [18] S. Kurdziałek, W. Górecki, F. Albarelli, and R. Demkowicz-Dobrzański, Using adaptiveness and causal superpositions against noise in quantum metrology, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 090801 (2023).
- [19] R. Demkowicz-Dobrzański, J. Czajkowski, and P. Sekatski, Adaptive Quantum Metrology under General Markovian Noise, *Phys. Rev. X* **7**, 041009 (2017).
- [20] S. Zhou, M. Zhang, J. Preskill, and L. Jiang, Achieving the heisenberg limit in quantum metrology using quantum error correction, *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 78 (2018).
- [21] S. I. Knysh, E. H. Chen, and G. A. Durkin, True limits to precision via unique quantum probe (2014), arXiv:1402.0495 [quant-ph].
- [22] W. Dür, M. Skotiniotis, F. Fröwis, and B. Kraus, Improved Quantum Metrology Using Quantum Error Correction, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 080801 (2014).
- [23] G. Arrad, Y. Vinkler, D. Aharonov, and A. Retzker, Increasing sensing resolution with error correction, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 150801 (2014).
- [24] Y. Peng and H. Fan, Achieving the heisenberg limit under general markovian noise using quantum error correction without ancilla, *Quantum Inf. Process.* **19**, 10.1007/s11128-020-02749-8 (2020).
- [25] S. Zhou, A. G. Manes, and L. Jiang, Achieving metrological limits using ancilla-free quantum error-correcting codes (2023), arXiv:2303.00881 [quant-ph].
- [26] D. Layden, S. Zhou, P. Cappellaro, and L. Jiang, Ancilla-free quantum error correction codes for quantum metrology, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 040502 (2019).
- [27] Z. Hou, R.-J. Wang, J.-F. Tang, H. Yuan, G.-Y. Xiang, C.-F. Li, and G.-C. Guo, Control-Enhanced Sequential Scheme for General Quantum Parameter Estimation at the Heisenberg Limit, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 040501 (2019).
- [28] D. E. Evans and R. Høegh-Krohn, Spectral properties of positive maps on c^* -algebras, *J. Lond. Math. Soc.* **s2-17**, 345 (1978).
- [29] M. M. Wolf, Quantum channels and operations-guided tour (2012).
- [30] D. Burgarth, G. Chiribella, V. Giovannetti, P. Perinotti, and K. Yuasa, Ergodic and mixing quantum channels in finite dimensions, *New J. Phys.* **15**, 073045 (2013).
- [31] V. V. Albert, Asymptotics of quantum channels: conserved quantities, an adiabatic limit, and matrix product states, *Quantum* **3**, 151 (2019).
- [32] C. Neill, P. Roushan, M. Fang, Y. Chen, M. Kolodrubetz, Z. Chen, A. Megrant, R. Barends, B. Campbell, B. Chiaro, A. Dunsworth, E. Jeffrey, J. Kelly, J. Mutus, P. J. J. O'Malley, C. Quintana, D. Sank, A. Vainsencher, J. Wenner, T. C. White, A. Polkovnikov, and J. M. Martinis, Ergodic dynamics and thermalization in an isolated quantum system, *Nat. Phys.* **12**, 1037 (2016).

- [33] C. Helstrom, *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory* (Academic Press, New York, 1976).
- [34] A. S. Holevo, *Probabilistic and Statistical Aspects of Quantum Theory*, Vol. 1 (Springer Science & Business Media, Berlin, 2011).
- [35] S. L. Braunstein and C. M. Caves, Statistical distance and the geometry of quantum states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72**, 3439 (1994).
- [36] D. A. Lidar, I. L. Chuang, and K. B. Whaley, Decoherence-free subspaces for quantum computation, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 2594 (1998).
- [37] S. Alipour, M. Mehboudi, and A. T. Rezakhani, Quantum metrology in open systems: Dissipative cramer-rao bound, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 120405 (2014).
- [38] J. Watrous, *The Theory of Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2018).
- [39] C. Jordan, Essai sur la géométrie à n dimensions, *Bull. Soc. Math. France* **3**, 103 (1875).
- [40] Å. Björck and G. H. Golub, Numerical methods for computing angles between linear subspaces, *Math. Comput.* **27**, 579 (1973), full publication date: Jul., 1973.
- [41] A. Galántai and C. J. Hegedűs, Jordan's principal angles in complex vector spaces, *Numer. Linear Algebra Appl.* **13**, 589 (2006), <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/nla.491>.
- [42] J. C. Gower and G. B. Dijkstra, *Procrustes Problems* (Oxford University Press, 2004).
- [43] E. Knill and R. Laflamme, Theory of quantum error-correcting codes, *Phys. Rev. A* **55**, 900 (1997).
- [44] E. M. Kessler, I. Lovchinsky, A. O. Sushkov, and M. D. Lukin, Quantum Error Correction for Metrology, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 150802 (2014).
- [45] R. Ozeri, Heisenberg limited metrology using quantum error-correction codes (2013), arXiv:1310.3432 [quant-ph].
- [46] F. Reiter, A. S. Sørensen, P. Zoller, and C. A. Muschik, Dissipative quantum error correction and application to quantum sensing with trapped ions, *Nat. Commun.* **8**, 1822 (2017).
- [47] D. Šafránek, Discontinuities of the quantum fisher information and the bures metric, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 052320 (2017).
- [48] L. Seveso, F. Albarelli, M. G. Genoni, and M. G. A. Paris, On the discontinuity of the quantum fisher information for quantum statistical models with parameter dependent rank, *J. Phys. A* **53**, 02LT01 (2019).
- [49] S. Zhou and L. Jiang, An exact correspondence between the quantum fisher information and the bures metric (2019), arXiv:1910.08473 [quant-ph].
- [50] Y. Ye and X.-M. Lu, Quantum cramer-rao bound for quantum statistical models with parameter-dependent rank, *Phys. Rev. A* **106**, 022429 (2022).
- [51] O. E. Barndorff-Nielsen and R. D. Gill, Fisher information in quantum statistics, *J. Phys. A* **33**, 4481 (2000).
- [52] M. Hayashi, Comparison between the cramer-rao and the mini-max approaches in quantum channel estimation, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **304**, 689 (2011).
- [53] Y. Yang, G. Chiribella, and M. Hayashi, Attaining the ultimate precision limit in quantum state estimation, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **368**, 223 (2019).
- [54] F. R. F. Pereira, S. Mancini, and G. G. La Guardia, Stabilizer codes for open quantum systems, *Sci. Rep.* **13**, 10540 (2023).
- [55] A. Altherr and Y. Yang, Quantum metrology for non-markovian processes, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 060501 (2021).
- [56] Q. Liu, Z. Hu, H. Yuan, and Y. Yang, Optimal strategies of quantum metrology with a strict hierarchy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, 070803 (2023).
- [57] S. Zhou, Limits of noisy quantum metrology with restricted quantum controls (2024), arXiv:2402.18765 [quant-ph].