

Quantum entanglement enables single-shot trajectory sensing for weakly interacting particles

Zachary E. Chin*

Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA

David R. Leibbrandt

Department of Physics, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA

Isaac L. Chuang

Department of Physics, Center for Ultracold Atoms, and Research Laboratory of Electronics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA

(Dated: May 10, 2024)

Sensors for mapping the trajectory of an incoming particle find important utility in experimental high energy physics and searches for dark matter. For a quantum sensing protocol that uses projective measurements on a multi-qubit sensor array to infer the trajectory of an incident particle, we show that entanglement can dramatically reduce the particle-sensor interaction strength θ required for perfect trajectory discrimination. Within an interval of θ above this reduced threshold, any unentangled sensor requires $\Theta(\log(1/\epsilon))$ repetitions of the protocol to estimate the particle trajectory with ϵ error probability, whereas an entangled sensor can succeed with zero error in a single shot.

Introduction.—A particle’s trajectory through space and time is a fingerprint concealing its unique history and some of its most important properties. For example, the momentum and charge of high energy particles produced in colliders is revealed from the curvature of their paths through a magnetic field [1, 2]. Additionally, the cosmic origins of particles such as muons, neutrinos, and possible dark matter candidates can be traced from snapshots of their motion taken with detectors such as bubble chambers [3]. In biology and chemistry, positron emission tomography localizes tumors along a line traversed by emitted gamma photons [4], and mass spectrometers determine molar masses by filtering charged molecular fragments according to their trajectories [5]. Furthermore, seismograph arrays and the LIGO experiment respectively infer the propagation of vibrations and gravitational waves to triangulate distant rare events [6, 7].

Given that quantum sensors have previously increased sensitivities for measurements of forces [8] and electric/magnetic fields [9, 10], it would be natural to expect that trajectory sensors may also benefit from the use of quantum resources. For instance, a quantum version of the bubble chamber might replace the sensitive medium of a superheated liquid with an array of qubits. Instead of leaving bubbles, an incident particle would interact with the array by applying a local unitary operation to each qubit that it intercepts along its path, and the possible trajectories could ideally be distinguished with a single projective measurement. Such devices could be interpreted as distributed quantum sensor networks of qubits designed to map unknown spatially-structured perturbations and could extend current quantum particle detection schemes [11–14]. Existing quantum sensor networks for multiparameter estimation [15], clock synchronization [16], and telescoping [17] have previously shown that en-

tanglement enables improved measurement of spatially distributed quantities compared to what is possible classically. However, it remains unclear whether entanglement might similarly upgrade quantum sensors aiming to unambiguously distinguish particle trajectories.

The performance of a quantum trajectory sensor can be quantified by the failure probability of not determining the correct particle trajectory after a single measurement, which decreases with the strength θ of the interaction between the particle and the qubits it perturbs along its path. Our main question inquires whether entangled sensor states might exist which reduce the θ required for trajectory sensing to succeed with low failure probability using a single-shot measurement.

The concept of using projective measurements to detect various perturbations on an entangled quantum state is familiar elsewhere as the setting for quantum error correction, where the goal is instead to preserve the state. By reimagining codes as sensors rather than a means to protect information, our question equivalently asks whether quantum codes exist which allow the “errors” imposed by different particle trajectories to be distinguished using a syndrome measurement.

In this work, we formulate a noiseless, idealized version of the quantum trajectory sensing (TS) problem in which every qubit along the particle’s path is rotated by the same angle $\theta \in [0, \pi]$ around some fixed axis of the Bloch sphere, where θ parameterizes the particle-qubit interaction strength. We solve this problem and show for some threshold θ_{\min} that for all $\theta \in [\theta_{\min}, \pi)$, there exist entangled sensor states that perfectly discriminate trajectories in a single shot while any unentangled sensor must instead fail with nonzero probability. For $\theta \in [\theta_{\min}, \pi)$, an unentangled sensor requires $\Theta(\log(1/\epsilon))$ separate particles to repeatedly pass through the array along the same

path to estimate their common trajectory with ϵ error probability; in contrast, an entangled sensor could perfectly determine the trajectory with just one particle. We begin by developing intuition through a minimal example and introducing a mathematical framework for trajectory sensing. We then derive θ_{\min} for two TS scenarios and characterize the TS enhancement possible with entanglement.

A minimal example.—The following example provides a helpful concrete instance of a quantum trajectory sensor. Let Z and X be Pauli operators and denote the ± 1 eigenvectors of X with $|+\rangle$ and $|-\rangle$, respectively. Suppose an array of two qubits is prepared to some initial state $|\psi\rangle$, and an incoming particle rotates one of the qubits by $R_Z(\theta) = e^{-i\theta Z/2}$. If $\theta = \pi$ and $|\psi\rangle = |++\rangle$, the possible output states $|+-\rangle$ and $|-\rangle$ can be perfectly distinguished in a single measurement because they are orthogonal. However, if $\theta < \pi$ instead (a “weak” interaction regime), the outputs of $|\psi\rangle = |++\rangle$ are no longer orthogonal, and therefore they can only be distinguished with some nonzero probability of failure. For $\theta = \frac{\pi}{2}$, the *entangled* input $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle + |10\rangle)$ can in fact be verified to produce two possible orthogonal outputs, and thus a single measurement will perfectly determine the rotated qubit. Hence, this example demonstrates that output orthogonality is a requirement for a perfect trajectory sensor and suggests that an unentangled input state cannot perfectly distinguish all trajectories if $\theta < \pi$, whereas an entangled input possibly can.

Trajectory sensing problem.—We next formalize the TS problem. Suppose we are given an array of n qubits, each labeled 1 to n , as well as a fixed positive integer m where $m \leq n$. A *trajectory* is defined to be a size- m set of qubit indices, and the particle will interact with the array by rotating all of the qubits in its trajectory by $R_Z(\theta)$ for some fixed, precisely known interaction strength θ . The set of all allowed trajectories for the particle is represented with \mathcal{T} . In the example above, $n = 2$, $m = 1$, and $\mathcal{T} = \{\{1\}, \{2\}\}$. Given an n -qubit input sensor state $|\psi\rangle$, each trajectory $T \in \mathcal{T}$ yields a distinct output state $R^{(T)}(\theta)|\psi\rangle$, where $R^{(T)}(\theta)$ is the operation of applying $R_Z(\theta)$ to each of the qubits in T . The TS problem asks for what values of θ there exists an input state $|\psi\rangle$ such that all the outputs $R^{(T)}(\theta)|\psi\rangle$ for $T \in \mathcal{T}$ are mutually orthogonal and therefore perfectly distinguishable—with zero probability of failure—via a single projective measurement. These criteria can be represented mathematically by the following orthogonality conditions:

$$\langle\psi| R^{\dagger(T)}(\theta) R^{(T')}(\theta) |\psi\rangle = \delta_{T,T'} \quad (1)$$

for all $T, T' \in \mathcal{T}$. Any $|\psi\rangle$ satisfying these conditions at a particular θ will be called a TS state; however, note that in general $|\psi\rangle$ is not guaranteed to satisfy these criteria at interaction strengths other than θ .

Symmetric trajectory sensors.—We now introduce a general class of TS problems and provide a working ex-

ample to illustrate how to systematically determine the range of θ for which a valid TS state exists. A TS problem is fully determined by the values of n , m , and \mathcal{T} ; here we let $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{\text{sym}}$, where \mathcal{T}_{sym} includes all of the $\binom{n}{m}$ size- m subsets of the indices $\{1, \dots, n\}$ (see Figure 1). The symmetric TS problem seeks any TS state that yields orthogonal outputs for each trajectory in \mathcal{T}_{sym} , which we call a TS_{sym} state.




FIG. 1. Allowed particle trajectories (black lines) for TS_{sym} (left) and TS_{cyc} states (right) when $n = 4$ and $m = 2$.

The existence of a TS_{sym} state at a particular θ can be determined by substituting the naive general ansatz $|\psi\rangle = \sum_j c_j |j\rangle$ (where the $c_j \in \mathbb{C}$ and the $|j\rangle$ are Z -eigenbasis states) into Eq. (1) for all $T, T' \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{sym}}$ and checking if the resulting system admits a solution of c_j . A trivial solution is evident at $\theta = \pi$ (i.e., $|\psi\rangle = |+\rangle^{\otimes n}$), so we inquire whether a nontrivial solution exists at any weak $\theta < \pi$. For general n and m , however, this system would include $|\mathcal{T}_{\text{sym}}|^2 = \binom{n}{m}^2$ equations in 2^n complex variables, which is computationally intractable for large n .

Two symmetries of the symmetric TS problem can be leveraged to greatly simplify this system. The first is a permutation symmetry: \mathcal{T}_{sym} does not change after permuting the index labels assigned to each qubit. Consequently, a TS_{sym} state continues to satisfy Eq. (1) under any permutation of the indices.

A bit-flip symmetry also holds. Note that the complex conjugation of Eq. (1) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{T,T'} &= \left(\langle\psi| R^{\dagger(T)} R^{(T')} |\psi\rangle \right)^* = \langle\psi| \left(R^{\dagger(T)} R^{(T')} \right)^\dagger |\psi\rangle \\ &= \langle\psi| X^{\otimes n} \left(R^{\dagger(T)} R^{(T')} \right) X^{\otimes n} |\psi\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

for any $T, T' \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{sym}}$, since each $R^{(T)}(\theta)$ operator is a tensor product of single-qubit $R_Z(\theta)$ and identity operators and $X R_Z X = R_Z^\dagger$. Eq. (2) implies that $X^{\otimes n} |\psi\rangle$ also satisfies Eq. (1) if $|\psi\rangle$ does.

The fact that Eq. (1) remains satisfied under the action of these two symmetries ultimately enables the search for TS_{sym} states to be restricted to a much smaller symmetrized subspace; specifically, a TS_{sym} state exists if and only if there exists a TS_{sym} state which is permutation and bit-flip invariant [18]. Thus, the TS state ansatz can be simplified to span only this invariant space.

In particular, a symmetrized basis is given by the unnormalized states

$$|\bar{k}\rangle = |\text{wt}_n(k)\rangle + |\text{wt}_n(n-k)\rangle \quad (3)$$

for $k = 0, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, where $|\text{wt}_n(w)\rangle$ is the unnormalized sum over all n -qubit Z -eigenbasis states with Hamming weight w (e.g., $|\text{wt}_3(1)\rangle = |001\rangle + |010\rangle + |100\rangle$) and the amplitude of the $k = n/2$ state is halved if n is even to avoid double-counting. These states can equivalently be viewed as superpositions of Dicke states [19].

The specific case of $n = 4$ and $m = 2$ illustrates how these symmetry-based simplifications can be applied to cleanly determine bounds on the interval of feasible θ . Substituting the symmetrized TS state ansatz $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{k=0}^{n/2} \bar{c}_k |\bar{k}\rangle$ into Eq. (1) gives a system in just 3 variables $\bar{c}_k \in \mathbb{C}$ as opposed to the 2^4 variables used in the naive approach, and all but 3 of the equations become redundant. Accordingly, the existence of a TS_{sym} state for a given value of θ is determined by the existence of a solution to a 3-by-3 linear system:

$$\begin{cases} 1 &= |\bar{c}_0|^2 + 4|\bar{c}_1|^2 + 3|\bar{c}_2|^2 \\ 0 &= |\bar{c}_0|^2 + 2|\bar{c}_1|^2(1 + \cos\theta) + |\bar{c}_2|^2(1 + 2\cos\theta) \\ 0 &= |\bar{c}_0|^2 + 4|\bar{c}_1|^2\cos\theta + |\bar{c}_2|^2(2 + \cos 2\theta). \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Assuming $\theta \neq 0$, this system transforms into a normalization condition along with the two constraints $|\bar{c}_0|^2 = \cos(2\theta)|\bar{c}_2|^2$ and $|\bar{c}_1|^2 = -\cos(\theta)|\bar{c}_2|^2$. Because the $|\bar{c}_k|^2$ must be nonnegative, a solution requires $\cos 2\theta \geq 0$ and $\cos \theta \leq 0$. Subsequently, a TS_{sym} state exists solving this $n = 4, m = 2$ problem if $\theta \geq \frac{3\pi}{4}$, proving that nontrivial TS_{sym} states indeed exist in the weak interaction regime where $\theta < \pi$.

For general even n with $m = n/2$, the analogous symmetrized system has a solution if the \bar{c}_k similarly obey

$$|\bar{c}_k|^2 = (-1)^{m-k} \cos[(m-k)\theta] |\bar{c}_m|^2 \quad (5)$$

for all $k = 0, \dots, n/2$, and the requirement that $|\bar{c}_k|^2 \geq 0$ bounds the achievable θ per the following theorem (proved fully in [18]):

Theorem 1. *For arbitrary n and m , a sufficient criterion for the existence of a TS_{sym} state is*

$$\theta \geq \frac{(n-1)\pi}{n}. \quad (6)$$

Furthermore, when $m = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ or $\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$, Eq. (6) becomes a necessary criterion.

Theorem 1 confirms that arbitrarily sized TS_{sym} states exist at some nontrivial $\theta < \pi$. However, it also suggests that for a TS_{sym} state to perfectly distinguish trajectories, θ must increase towards its maximum value of π as the number of qubits n grows. This loss of ‘‘sensitivity’’ is intuitively a consequence of the fact that the number

$|\mathcal{T}_{\text{sym}}| = \binom{n}{m}$ of trajectories to be distinguished generally scales much faster than the number of qubits n in the sensor. This observation suggests that the sensitivity of a TS state to the interaction strength θ might be increased by systematically reducing the number of trajectories in \mathcal{T} .

Cyclic trajectory sensors.—Since particles like neutrinos and dark matter likely interact with lower θ than achievable with TS_{sym} states, it would be desirable to find alternative TS states that succeed at even smaller values of θ . Note that \mathcal{T}_{sym} includes many trajectories which may be unphysical in a practical setting (e.g., where the constituent qubits are not localized together along a continuous curve). In fact, many experimental applications may require relatively few trajectories—for example, neutrino paths might only comprise straight lines.

For these reasons, we now restrict \mathcal{T} to only include ‘‘continuous’’ trajectories where the m constituent qubits have consecutive indices modulo n (see Figure 1). Equivalently, $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{\text{cyc}}$ with $\mathcal{T}_{\text{cyc}} = \{z^j(\{1, \dots, m\}) : j = 1, \dots, n\}$, where $z = (1 \dots n)$ is the cyclic permutation of n indices. Observe that $\mathcal{T}_{\text{cyc}} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{\text{sym}}$ and $|\mathcal{T}_{\text{cyc}}| = n$ as opposed to $\binom{n}{m}$ in the symmetric case. The cyclic TS problem concerns finding any TS state distinguishing \mathcal{T}_{cyc} , which we will call a TS_{cyc} state. As before, we ask for what θ there exists a TS_{cyc} state satisfying Eq. (1) for all $T, T' \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{cyc}}$; however, the naive approach using a completely general TS ansatz still remains computationally intractable for large n .

The key insight is that there exist TS_{cyc} states which can be decomposed as the tensor product of multiple identical, smaller TS states, and this observation will allow for the system of Eq. (1) to be greatly simplified. The $n = 4, m = 2$ example illustrates this simplification. For a given θ , define $|\phi\rangle$ to be the two-qubit TS_{sym} state that yields orthogonal outputs for the smaller $n' = 2, m' = 1$ problem from the earlier minimal example. Preparing each of the qubit pairs $\{1, 3\}$ and $\{2, 4\}$ into the state $|\phi\rangle$, we then assert that the resulting 4-qubit state $|\psi\rangle = |\phi\rangle_{1,3} \otimes |\phi\rangle_{2,4}$ is a TS_{cyc} state with $n = 4, m = 2$ at the same value of θ .

This assertion is justified by considering the action of two trajectories $T = \{1, 2\}$ and $T' = \{2, 3\}$ on $|\psi\rangle$. To show the left side of Eq. (1) equals zero, the expression can be factored as

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \psi | R^{\dagger(T)} R^{(T')} | \psi \rangle \\ &= \langle \psi | (R_Z^\dagger \otimes R_Z^\dagger \otimes I \otimes I) (I \otimes R_Z \otimes R_Z \otimes I) | \psi \rangle \\ &= \left(\langle \phi |_{1,3} (R_Z^\dagger \otimes R_Z) | \phi \rangle_{1,3} \right) \left(\langle \phi |_{2,4} (I \otimes I) | \phi \rangle_{2,4} \right) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

due to the fact that $(R_Z \otimes I)|\phi\rangle$ and $(I \otimes R_Z)|\phi\rangle$ are orthogonal by the definition of $|\phi\rangle$. A similar argument holds for any other choice of $T, T' \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{cyc}}$, from which we conclude that $|\psi\rangle$ is indeed the desired TS_{cyc} state.

Moreover, since this $|\psi\rangle$ exists if a suitable $|\phi\rangle$ exists, the desired range of feasible θ includes the range of θ for which the smaller $n' = 2, m' = 1$ symmetric TS problem can be solved. Thus, by Theorem 1, a TS_{cyc} state $|\psi\rangle$ with $n = 4, m = 2$ exists if $\theta \geq \frac{\pi}{2}$. Limiting the set of allowed trajectories from \mathcal{T}_{sym} to \mathcal{T}_{cyc} therefore expands the range of feasible θ from $[\frac{3\pi}{4}, \pi]$ to $[\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi]$, supporting the intuition that decreasing the number of trajectories should also lower the minimum particle-qubit interaction strength needed to distinguish them.

This method of constructing TS_{cyc} states generalizes to show that, so long as $n = cm$ for some positive integer $c > 1$, a TS_{cyc} state exists which decomposes into m identical copies of a smaller TS_{sym} state with $n' = c, m' = 1$ [18]. Since the larger TS_{cyc} state exists over the range of θ for which the smaller TS_{sym} state exists, this decomposition permits the range of feasible θ to be expressed entirely in terms of the size parameter c of the smaller symmetric problem. Solving Eq. (1) for this smaller problem using the symmetries introduced earlier leads to the following theorem (also proved fully in [18]):

Theorem 2. *Let $n = cm$ for some positive integer $c > 1$. Then a sufficient criterion for the existence of a TS_{cyc} state is*

$$\theta \geq \arccos\left(-1 + \left\lceil \frac{c}{2} \right\rceil^{-1}\right). \quad (8)$$

In contrast to Theorem 1, Theorem 2 shows that so long as n is a constant multiple of m , the required θ needed for a TS_{cyc} state to perfectly distinguish trajectories remains constant as the number of qubits and trajectories (both equal n) grows. For example, when $n = 2m$, a TS_{sym} state requires $\theta \approx 0.95\pi$ to distinguish about a million trajectories, whereas a TS_{cyc} state only requires $\theta = 0.5\pi$!

Quantum enhancement from entanglement.—The powerful ability of TS_{sym} and TS_{cyc} states to perfectly distinguish trajectories in one shot for weak $\theta < \pi$ is a direct consequence of entanglement. Intuitively, entanglement allows the θ -rotations applied to each qubit in a trajectory to add constructively such that Eq. (1) can be satisfied. The following theorem rigorously asserts the proposition established in our earlier minimal example that there are no unentangled TS states if $\theta < \pi$:

Theorem 3. *For arbitrary n, m , and \mathcal{T} with $|\mathcal{T}| > 1$, a fully unentangled TS state of the form $\bigotimes_{i=0}^n |\psi_i\rangle$ for some single-qubit states $|\psi_i\rangle$ exists if and only if $\theta = \pi$.*

Proof. “ \implies ” direction: The expression obtained by substituting $\bigotimes_{i=0}^n |\psi_i\rangle$ into the left side of Eq. (1) can be expanded as a product of terms that look like $\langle \psi_i | A_i | \psi_i \rangle$, where $A_i = I, R_Z(\theta)$, or $R_Z^\dagger(\theta)$. Eq. (1) for any $T \neq T'$ hence implies that some $\langle \psi_i | R_Z(\theta) | \psi_i \rangle = 0$, which requires that $\theta = \pi$. “ \impliedby ” direction: if $\theta = \pi$, then $|+\rangle^{\otimes n}$ is a TS state. \square

It follows that the TS_{sym} and TS_{cyc} states constructed above must be entangled if $\theta < \pi$. Hence, entangled TS states can perfectly distinguish trajectories at lower θ than unentangled TS states can.

For the problem of distinguishing a fixed set of trajectories, this quantum enhancement can be appreciated visually by comparing, as a function of θ , the single-shot failure probabilities of a quantum protocol utilizing an entangled TS state against a “classical” protocol which instead uses an unentangled state as a sensor (see Supplemental Material [20] for details). Figure 2 shows for the case of $n = 4, m = 2$, and $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{\text{sym}}$ that the quantum protocol succeeds with lower failure probability for all nontrivial values $\theta \in (0, \pi)$ of the interaction strength. Furthermore, the quantum protocol succeeds with zero failure probability for all $\theta \geq \frac{3\pi}{4}$ satisfying Eq. (6) (depicted in the highlighted region), since Theorem 1 guarantees the existence of a TS state over this interval of θ . In contrast, so long as $\theta < \pi$, the classical protocol fails with some nonzero probability because Theorem 3 guarantees that no unentangled TS state exists over this range of θ . More generally, for arbitrary n and m , entanglement-enhanced trajectory sensing can succeed perfectly in one shot over an interval of $\theta \in [\theta_{\min}, \pi)$ where a protocol without entanglement cannot; θ_{\min} is the bound given by Eq. (6) or (8) when $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{\text{sym}}$ or \mathcal{T}_{cyc} , respectively.




FIG. 2. Single-shot failure probabilities of classical and quantum TS protocols vs. particle-qubit interaction strength θ when $n = 4, m = 2$, and $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{\text{sym}}$. Inset shows number of TS protocol repetitions required to estimate trajectory with error probability ϵ when $\theta = \theta_{\min} = \frac{3\pi}{4}$.

Entangled sensors exhibit decisive benefits even when we expand the TS protocol to allow for multiple repeated measurements. Suppose r particles sequentially pass through the array along the *same* trajectory T , and we measure and reinitialize the TS state between each particle interaction. We then perform a majority vote

on the r measurement outcomes to estimate T . The inset plot to Figure 2 shows for the protocols in the above example how large r must be for the majority vote to propose T with ϵ error probability when $\theta = \theta_{\min} = \frac{3\pi}{4}$. For an unentangled sensor with $\theta \in [\theta_{\min}, \pi)$, the probability that the majority vote fails is given by the lower tail of a binomial distribution in r trials, whose size is well-known to decrease exponentially with r . Subsequently, r must be on the order of $\Theta(\log(1/\epsilon))$ for the majority vote to succeed with error probability ϵ . On the other hand, an entangled sensor has perfect one-shot success probability over this range of θ and would only require a single particle to determine T with zero error.

Connection to error correction.—A simple shift of perspective allows trajectory sensing to be understood as a quantum error correction scenario and reveals that the existence of these TS states is no accident. Given n, m , and a set of trajectories \mathcal{T} , consider the quantum “error” channel

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{T}|} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} R^{(T)}(\theta) \rho R^{\dagger(T)}(\theta), \quad (9)$$

which corresponds to the action of picking an unknown trajectory $T \in \mathcal{T}$ uniformly at random and applying it to the input state density matrix ρ . Note that any TS state ρ_{TS} is actually a code state which corrects this error channel, since a single syndrome measurement can precisely reveal which error $R^{(T)}$ was applied to ρ_{TS} , and ρ_{TS} can then be recovered by applying the operator $R^{\dagger(T)}$. In fact, the existence criteria for a TS state given by Eq. (1) correspond exactly to a special case of the Knill-Laflamme error correction criteria for the channel \mathcal{E} and one-dimensional code $\{|\psi\rangle\}$ [21]. Although many conceivable codes can *recover* the errors from \mathcal{E} , TS codes are distinguished by the additional ability to perfectly *identify* and *discriminate* all possible errors.

It is natural to inquire whether the existing vast literature on quantum codes can be used to solve the TS problem. Indeed, the $n = 4, m = 2, \theta = \frac{\pi}{2}$ TS_{cyc} state $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|0011\rangle + |0110\rangle + |1100\rangle + |1001\rangle)$ constructed earlier spans a stabilizer code with generators $\langle -Z_1 Z_3, -Z_2 Z_4, X_1 X_3, X_2 X_4 \rangle$; this code is a subcode of the $[[4, 2, 2]]$ CSS code [22], which is the smallest toric code [23]. However, TS_{sym} states with $\theta < \pi$ and the same n, m instead constitute a new variety of non-stabilizer permutation-invariant codes, suggesting that such codes might be useful for discriminating highly correlated non-Pauli errors.

Conclusion.—The single-shot trajectory sensing made possible by entangled TS states is particularly promising for experimental applications where the desired particles rarely interact with the sensor. Realistically, very weakly interacting particles such as dark matter may require a θ too small for TS_{sym} or TS_{cyc} states to exist. However, for many applications, these classes of TS states may support more trajectories than needed, and further

restricting \mathcal{T} should continue to decrease the achievable θ . We also note that the sensors sought here determine a particle’s trajectory assuming it has already positively entered the device; as such, it would be desirable to augment these TS states with another sensor for simple particle detection. Additionally, although TS states may be particularly susceptible to decoherence due to their entanglement, they are fortunately typically not maximally entangled and in fact must utilize unusual multipartite entanglement. Finally, given that TS states are special quantum code states, we ask how known families of quantum codes might enable new trajectory sensing capabilities.

Z.E.C. acknowledges support from the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship under Grant No. 2141064. I.L.C. acknowledges support by the NSF Center for Ultracold Atoms.

* zchin@mit.edu

- [1] ATLAS Collaboration, *Journal of Instrumentation* **3**, S08003 (2008).
- [2] CMS Collaboration, *Journal of Instrumentation* **3**, S08004 (2008).
- [3] D. Baxter, C. Chen, M. Crisler, T. Cwiok, C. Dahl, A. Grimsted, J. Gupta, M. Jin, R. Puig, D. Temples, and J. Zhang, *Physical Review Letters* **118** (2017), 10.1103/physrevlett.118.231301.
- [4] J. Schwenck, D. Sonanini, J. M. Cotton, H.-G. Rammensee, C. la Fougère, L. Zender, and B. J. Pichler, *Nature Reviews Cancer* **23**, 474 (2023).
- [5] G. L. Glish and R. W. Vachet, *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery* **2**, 140 (2003).
- [6] M. Gal, A. M. Reading, N. Rawlinson, and V. Schulte-Pelkum, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth* **123**, 6871 (2018).
- [7] LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 061102 (2016).
- [8] Y. Xia, A. R. Agrawal, C. M. Pluchar, A. J. Brady, Z. Liu, Q. Zhuang, D. J. Wilson, and Z. Zhang, *Nature Photonics* **17**, 470 (2023).
- [9] K. A. Gilmore, M. Affolter, R. J. Lewis-Swan, D. Barberena, E. Jordan, A. M. Rey, and J. J. Bollinger, *Science* **373**, 673 (2021).
- [10] W. Wasilewski, K. Jensen, H. Krauter, J. J. Renema, M. V. Balabas, and E. S. Polzik, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 133601 (2010).
- [11] S. D. Bass and M. Doser, *Nature Reviews Physics* (2024), 10.1038/s42254-024-00714-3.
- [12] A. Ito, R. Kitano, W. Nakano, and R. Takai, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2024**, 124 (2024).
- [13] C. D. Wilen, S. Abdullah, N. A. Kurinsky, C. Stanford, L. Cardani, G. D’Imperio, C. Tomei, L. Faoro, L. B. Ioffe, C. H. Liu, A. Opremcek, B. G. Christensen, J. L. DuBois, and R. McDermott, *Nature* **594**, 369 (2021).
- [14] P. M. Harrington, M. Li, M. Hays, W. V. D. Pontseele, D. Mayer, H. D. Pinckney, F. Contipelli, M. Gingras, B. M. Niedzielski, H. Stickler, J. L. Yoder, M. E. Schwartz, J. A. Grover, K. Serniak, W. D. Oliver, and

- J. A. Formaggio, “Synchronous detection of cosmic rays and correlated errors in superconducting qubit arrays,” (2024), [arXiv:2402.03208 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [15] T. J. Proctor, P. A. Knott, and J. A. Dunningham, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 080501 (2018).
- [16] B. K. Malia, Y. Wu, J. Martínez-Rincón, and M. A. Kasevich, *Nature* **612**, 661 (2022).
- [17] D. Gottesman, T. Jennewein, and S. Croke, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 070503 (2012).
- [18] Z. E. Chin and I. L. Chuang (to be published).
- [19] R. H. Dicke, *Phys. Rev.* **93**, 99 (1954).
- [20] See Supplemental Material.
- [21] E. Knill and R. Laflamme, (1995), [arXiv:quant-ph/9604034 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [22] E. Knill, “Fault-tolerant postselected quantum computation: Schemes,” (2004), [arXiv:quant-ph/0402171 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [23] A. Kitaev, *Annals of Physics* **303**, 2 (2003).

Supplemental Material for: Quantum entanglement enables single-shot trajectory sensing for weakly interacting particles

Zachary E. Chin*

Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA

David R. Leibbrandt

Department of Physics, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA

Isaac L. Chuang

Department of Physics, Center for Ultracold Atoms, and Research Laboratory of Electronics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA

This Supplemental Material explains the classical and quantum trajectory sensing (TS) protocols whose failure probabilities are plotted in Figure 2 of the main text.

Classical protocol.—The following classical TS protocol does not use entangled sensors and serves as a performance benchmark in Figure 2. Let the notation $|\psi_{\theta'}\rangle$ represent a valid TS state which satisfies the orthogonality conditions for an arbitrary value θ' of the interaction strength. The protocol takes a set of allowed trajectories \mathcal{T}_{sym} and interaction strength θ as known inputs and proceeds as follows. First, the unentangled sensor state $|\psi_{\pi}\rangle = |+\rangle^{\otimes n}$ is prepared on the qubit array. Assume that an unknown trajectory T is chosen uniformly at random from \mathcal{T}_{sym} , transforming the sensor state to $R^{(T)}(\theta)|\psi_{\pi}\rangle$. Each qubit of this output state is subsequently measured in the $\{|+\rangle, |-\rangle\}$ basis; let S be the set of qubits which were measured to be $|-\rangle$. The proposed estimate for T is selected uniformly at random from the set \mathcal{T}' , where $\mathcal{T}' = \{T' \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{sym}} : S \subseteq T'\}$.

Quantum protocol.—The following quantum trajectory sensing protocol is used in Figure 2 to illustrate the TS enhancement possible with entangled sensors. Let $\theta_{\min} = \frac{(n-1)\pi}{n}$ be the bound given by Theorem 1. First

suppose that $\theta \geq \theta_{\min}$. Then the TS state $|\psi_{\theta}\rangle$ guaranteed to exist by Theorem 1 is prepared and an unknown, uniformly random trajectory $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{sym}}$ takes the state to $R^{(T)}(\theta)|\psi_{\theta}\rangle$. The output state is measured in the orthonormal (partial) basis of possible outputs $\{R^{(T')}(\theta)|\psi_{\theta}\rangle : T' \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{sym}}\}$, allowing T to be determined exactly with unit probability.

Now suppose that $\theta < \theta_{\min}$. Then Theorem 1 no longer guarantees the existence of a TS state yielding orthogonal outputs. In this case, $|\psi_{\theta_{\min}}\rangle$ is thus always chosen as the input. The output state $R^{(T)}|\psi_{\theta_{\min}}\rangle$ resulting from T is then subjected to the projective measurement with projectors

$$\left\{ P_{T'} \forall T' \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{sym}}, I - \sum_{T' \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{sym}}} P_{T'} \right\}, \quad (1)$$

where

$$P_{T'} = R^{(T')}(\theta_{\min})|\psi_{\theta_{\min}}\rangle\langle\psi_{\theta_{\min}}| R^{\dagger(T')}(\theta_{\min}) \quad (2)$$

for all $T' \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{sym}}$. If the measurement returns some $P_{T'}$, then T' is proposed as the estimate for T . Alternately, if the measurement returns $I - \sum P_{T'}$, then a trajectory is proposed uniformly at random from \mathcal{T}_{sym} .