

# General tradeoff relation of fundamental quantum limits for multiparameter linear measurement

Guolong Li<sup>1,2,\*</sup> and Xiao-Ming Lu<sup>1,2,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*School of Sciences, Hangzhou Dianzi University, Hangzhou 310018, China*

<sup>2</sup>*Zhejiang Key Laboratory of Quantum State Control and Optical Field Manipulation, Hangzhou Dianzi University, Hangzhou 310018, China*

(Dated: December 20, 2024)

Linear measurement is an important class of measurements for sensing classical signals including gravitational wave (GW), dark matter, infrared ray, rotation rate, etc. In this Letter, we focus on multiparameter linear measurement and establish a general tradeoff relation that tightly constrains the fundamental quantum limits of two independent parameters in a monochromatic classical signal detected by any linear quantum device. Such a tradeoff relation is universal and fundamental for multiparameter linear measurement since arising from Heisenberg's uncertainty principle. Compared with the Holevo Cramér-Rao bound, our tradeoff bound can completely identify the dependence between the attainable precision limits on estimated parameters. The dependence becomes more obvious such that the individual precision can not simultaneously reach the quantum limit as the so-called incompatible coefficient rises. Eventually, we find a necessary condition under which an optimal measurement protocol can saturate the general tradeoff relation, and show that the measurement phase can be tuned for adjusting different precision weight. This result is related to many applications, particularly detuned GW sensors for searching post-merger remnants due to the direct relation between the detuned frequency and incompatible coefficient.

*Introduction.*— In quantum sensing and metrology, linear measurement has been developing into an important approach, widely applied in detecting, e.g. gravitational waves (GW) [1, 2], dark matter [3], infrared ray [4], and rotation velocity [5]. In linear measurements as presented in Fig. 1, input port observable  $\hat{G}$  of the device, as a *generator*, is linearly coupled to the signal  $s(t)$  with interaction Hamiltonian  $H_{\text{int}} = s(t)\hat{G}$ . Consequently, the observables that do not commute with the generator respond linearly to signal  $s(t)$  [6, 7] and, based on input/output relation [8], directly determine the output modes that carry information about the signal. To acquire the signal information, one can measure the output modes via macroscopic devices that produce classical data. Among various approaches to study the quantum noise, the linear-response theory has been developed for linear devices [9], such as quantum-limited force/displacement sensors [10], with susceptibility which represents linear response of dynamical observable.

After the great success [11–20] in, e.g., LIGO, interferometric GW sensors become vital linear devices. Moreover, the detuned counterparts have attracted much attention due to the outperformance of detecting kilohertz signals. Compared with  $\mathcal{O}(100)$  Hz GWs, the kilohertz ones are favorable to reveal the post-merger remnant of binary neutron-star mergers and inaccessible cores of neutron stars to better constrain the neutron-star equation-of-state and enable other explorations [21–27]. However, the detuning frequency leads to the incompatibility of the optimal measurements for two independent parameters of interest in a monochromatic signal, originating from Heisenberg's uncertainty principle (HUP). Therefore, quantum multiparameter estimation theory

is required in linear quantum devices for pursuing the quantum-limited measurement [28–36].




FIG. 1. Schematic representation of the multiparameter linear measurement for sensing a monochromatic signal  $s(\Omega) = \pi T(A + iB)$  with parameters of interest  $A$  and  $B$ .

In classical parameter estimation, the Cramér-Rao bound (CRB) characterizes attainable accuracy, quantified by the Fisher information matrix (FIM) [37–42]. In contrast to single parameter estimation [43, 44], simultaneous multiparameter estimation cannot guarantee asymptotic attainability of quantum CRB owing to HUP in quantum regime, leading to measurement incompatibility [45]. As a compromise, many prior error bounds are formulated in terms of the weighted mean errors of estimation [46–63]. Among them, the Holevo bound has been adopted to establish the limit in multiparameter linear measurement [64, 65]. However, the Holevo bound is cumbersome to calculate for its optimization over a set of special operators [64], and still difficult to completely identify the tradeoff curve/surface regarding attainable precisions of different parameters [59].

In this work, we employ the information regret tradeoff relation (IRTR) [66] which arises from measurement uncertainty relations [67–72], and establish a general

tradeoff relation of the fundamental precision limits to incompatible parameters in a linear measurement. Our result truly identifies the boundary of attainable errors with an analytical form, avoiding the disadvantage of the Holevo bound. Even if there exists incompatibility, we further find that a measurement scheme is capable of saturating the IRTR under an specific condition. Moreover, we demonstrate that this measurement scheme is adaptable via a probe phase to monitor both attainable estimation errors that strictly accord with the saturated IRTR. Finally, we provide an intuitive picture where the detuned configuration in GW interferometer amplifies the tradeoff effect while enhancing sensitivity of kilohertz GW signals. It reveals that, as analyzing the detuned device for precisely detecting kilohertz signals, one has to think over the tradeoff relation to investigate possible improvements of the quantum measurements.

*Preliminary.*— In the case of linear measurement as in Fig. 1, a dimensionless quadrature  $\hat{z} := \cos(\theta)\hat{x} + \sin(\theta)\hat{p}$  via canonical quadratures,  $\hat{x}$  and  $\hat{p}$  with  $[\hat{x}, \hat{p}] = i$ , can represent the output detected field, and linearly responds to signal  $s(\Omega)$  as  $\hat{z}(\Omega) = \hat{z}^{(0)}(\Omega) + \chi_{zG}(\Omega)s(\Omega)$  in the Fourier domain [9, 65, 73], where  $\hat{z}^{(0)}(\Omega)$  is the free part without signal impacting and  $\chi_{zG}(\Omega)$  is the susceptibility determined by the commutator of  $\hat{z}$  and the generator  $\hat{G}$ . For  $s(\Omega) = \pi T(A + iB)$  with the finite integration time  $T$ , as Fourier transformation of a monochromatic dimensionless signal  $s(t) = A \cos(\Omega t) + B \sin(\Omega t)$  at a positive angular frequency  $\Omega$ , one can focus on [65]

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}(\Omega) \\ \hat{p}(\Omega) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}^{(0)}(\Omega) \\ \hat{p}^{(0)}(\Omega) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \chi_{xG}(\Omega) \\ \chi_{pG}(\Omega) \end{bmatrix} \pi T(A + iB). \quad (1)$$

By splitting them into the real and imaginary parts, the Hermitian operators are obtained as

$$\vec{q} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi T}} \begin{bmatrix} \text{Re}[\hat{x}(\Omega)] \\ \text{Re}[\hat{p}(\Omega)] \\ \text{Im}[\hat{x}(\Omega)] \\ \text{Im}[\hat{p}(\Omega)] \end{bmatrix} = \vec{q}^{(0)} + A\vec{d}_A + B\vec{d}_B, \quad (2)$$

where the elements of  $\vec{q}$  satisfy  $[\hat{q}_1, \hat{q}_2] = [\hat{q}_3, \hat{q}_4] = i$  with all other commutators zero, as well as the quadrature vector  $\vec{q}^{(0)}$ , and two orthogonal vectors  $\vec{d}_A$  and  $\vec{d}_B$  depend on the real and imaginary parts of  $\chi_{xG}$  and  $\chi_{pG}$  with a common Euclidean norm  $\mathcal{N} = \left[ \pi T \left( |\chi_{xG}|^2 + |\chi_{pG}|^2 \right) \right]^{1/2}$ . Obviously, the parameters of interest  $A$  and  $B$  displace two harmonic oscillators.

After an appropriate symplectic transformation, the observable vector  $\vec{q}$  in Eq. (2) is turned into the other one  $\vec{X} := (\hat{X}_1, \hat{P}_1, \hat{X}_2, \hat{P}_2)^T$  of two harmonic oscillators [74],

$$\vec{X} = \vec{X}^{(0)} + \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} A' + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \mu \\ \sqrt{1-\mu^2} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} B', \quad (3)$$

with  $\mu := 2\pi T \mathcal{N}^{-2} (\text{Re}[\chi_{pG}] \text{Im}[\chi_{xG}] - \text{Re}[\chi_{xG}] \text{Im}[\chi_{pG}])$  ( $0 \leq \mu \leq 1$ ) and two rescaled parameters  $A' := \mathcal{N}A$  and  $B' := \mathcal{N}B$ . Here  $\hat{X}_j$  and  $\hat{P}_j$  with  $[\hat{X}_j, \hat{P}_k] = i\delta_{jk}$  can be regarded as amplitude and phase quadratures for the harmonic oscillator  $j$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ). If the linear device is initially prepared in vacuum state, due to the displacement from estimated signal parameters  $A$  and  $B$ , they are encoded in a two-mode coherent state  $|\psi\rangle = |\alpha_1\rangle |\alpha_2\rangle$  with

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(A' + i\mu B'), \quad \alpha_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sqrt{1-\mu^2}B'. \quad (4)$$

This treatment is highly available of assessing sensing precision in linear measurement devices.

In quantum multiparameter estimation theory, the density operator  $\hat{\rho}$  depends on an unknown vector parameter  $\vec{\theta} = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_n)$  which needs to be estimated by positive-operator-valued-measure (POVM)  $\hat{M} = \{\hat{M}_\omega | \hat{M}_\omega \geq 0, \sum_\omega \hat{M}_\omega = \hat{1}\}$ . An outcome  $\omega$  is obtained with probability  $p(\omega) = \text{tr}(\hat{M}_\omega \hat{\rho})$  based on Born's rule in quantum mechanics. Let  $\hat{\theta}_j$  be an estimator for parameter  $\theta_j$ , which maps observation data to the estimates, and the error-covariance matrix  $\mathcal{E}$  is defined via its element  $\mathcal{E}_{jk} := \mathbb{E}_\theta[(\hat{\theta}_j - \theta_j)(\hat{\theta}_k - \theta_k)]$ , where the expectation  $\mathbb{E}_\theta[\bullet]$  is taken with respect to the probability of observation data. The error-covariance matrix of unbiased estimators satisfies the CRB as  $\mathcal{E} \geq F(M)^{-1}$  [75, 76], where the classical FIM is

$$F(\hat{M})_{jk} = \mathbb{E}_\theta \left[ \frac{\partial \ln p(\omega)}{\partial \theta_j} \frac{\partial \ln p(\omega)}{\partial \theta_k} \right], \quad (5)$$

and the relation of two matrices  $X \geq Y$  means positive semi-definite matrix  $X - Y$ . Obviously, classical FIM depends on POVM  $\hat{M}$  via probability  $p(\omega)$  and, thus, characterizes the performance of a quantum measurement for multiple parameters.

Quantum parameter estimation pursues the optimization of estimation precision over quantum measurements. The quantum CRB manifests that, for any quantum measurement  $\hat{M}$ , the classical FIM is bounded as [77, 78]

$$F(\hat{M}) \leq \mathcal{F}, \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathcal{F} = \text{Re } \mathcal{Q}$  is the quantum FIM. Here a Hermitian matrix  $\mathcal{Q}$ , called *quantum geometric tensor*, is defined via  $\mathcal{Q}_{jk} := \text{tr}(\hat{L}_j \hat{L}_k \hat{\rho})$  with a Hermitian operator  $\hat{L}_j$ , called symmetric logarithmic derivative (SLD), obeying  $(\hat{L}_j \hat{\rho} + \hat{\rho} \hat{L}_j)/2 = \partial \hat{\rho} / \partial \theta_j$ . The hierarchy of CRBs is given by

$$\mathcal{E} \geq F^{-1} \geq \mathcal{F}^{-1}, \quad (7)$$

by combining quantum CRB in Eq. (6) with its classical counterpart. It means that, for multiple estimated parameters, a joint measurement must be optimal if its classical FIM saturates quantum FIM. However, when the optimal measurement for different estimated

parameters is incompatible, the saturation is impossible such that any joint measurement can not simultaneously achieve individual quantum CRBs for single parameter estimations. To reflect this case in quantum multi-parameter estimation, the regret of Fisher information as  $R(\hat{M}) := \mathcal{F} - F(\hat{M})$  is defined and positive semi-definite based on Eq. (6). Subsequently, the normalized-square-root regret is defined as  $\Delta_j := \sqrt{R_{jj}/\mathcal{F}_{jj}} = \sqrt{(\mathcal{F}_{jj} - F_{jj})/\mathcal{F}_{jj}}$  in an interval  $[0, 1]$ . For incompatible measurement, the information regrets of corresponding parameters cannot simultaneously vanish and satisfy the IRTR as [66]

$$\Delta_j^2 + \Delta_k^2 + 2\sqrt{1 - c_{jk}^2}\Delta_j\Delta_k \geq c_{jk}^2, \quad (8)$$

with *incompatibility coefficient*

$$c_{jk} = \frac{|\text{Im } \mathcal{Q}_{jk}|}{\sqrt{\text{Re } \mathcal{Q}_{jj} \text{Re } \mathcal{Q}_{kk}}} = \frac{|\text{Im } \mathcal{Q}_{jk}|}{\sqrt{\mathcal{F}_j \mathcal{F}_k}}. \quad (9)$$

If  $\hat{\rho}$  is a pure state, the inequality Eq. (8) is tight and there exist measurements that turn it into an equality. In such a case, even though the second inequality in Eq. (6) is untight for incompatible measurement, the Eq. (8) still allows us to acquire a tight tradeoff between precisions of estimated parameters. Such a general framework can be applied in our analysis on the joint linear measurement for two signal parameters.

*Quantum precision limit.*— Based on the output state with amplitudes in Eq. (4), the quantum geometric tensor  $\mathcal{Q}$  for parameter vector  $\theta = (A', B')$  is given by

$$\mathcal{Q} = 2 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & i\mu \\ -i\mu & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (10)$$

after some algebras in Sec. of Supplemental Material (SM) [79]. Thus, the quantum FIM is given by

$$\mathcal{F} = 2 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

and the corresponding incompatibility coefficient is  $c_{12} = \mu$  from Eq. (9). Combined the CRB Eq. (7) with the quantum FIM Eq. (11), the individual quantum CRB is  $\mathcal{E}_{A,B} \geq 1/2$  where  $\mathcal{E}_A \equiv \mathcal{E}_{11}$  and  $\mathcal{E}_B \equiv \mathcal{E}_{22}$  as shorthand for the variances of the signal parameters  $A'$  and  $B'$  denote their estimation precisions, respectively. However, owing to HUP which leads to incompatible quantum measurements, the variances of simultaneous measurement can not attain the individual quantum CRB, but should obey IRTR in Eq. (8).

The IRTR Eq. (8) with our results Eqs. (10) and (11) indicates that there exist a family of optimal measurements extracting the Fisher information such that the regret inequality

$$\Delta_1^2 + \Delta_2^2 + 2\sqrt{1 - \mu^2}\Delta_1\Delta_2 \geq \mu^2$$

is tight. According to the definition of regret of Fisher information, it is easy to obtain the IRTR as

$$\left(2 - \frac{F_{11} + F_{22}}{2}\right) + 2\sqrt{1 - \mu^2} \sqrt{\left(1 - \frac{F_{11}}{2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{F_{22}}{2}\right)} \geq \mu^2. \quad (12)$$

Furthermore, we can still apply Eq. (7) to obtain the tradeoff relation about the estimation precisions. In result, the above inequality is transformed into

$$\left(2 - \frac{\mathcal{E}_A^{-1} + \mathcal{E}_B^{-1}}{2}\right) + 2\sqrt{1 - \mu^2} \sqrt{\left(1 - \frac{\mathcal{E}_A^{-1}}{2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\mathcal{E}_B^{-1}}{2}\right)} \geq \mu^2. \quad (13)$$

This inequality is one of our main results since it fully reflects the tradeoff between parameter estimation precisions, especially for the optimal measurements that saturate it.

The incompatibility coefficient  $c_{12} = \mu$  in Eq. (13) plays a vital role on the tradeoff relation, resulting from the off-diagonal part of the matrix  $\mathcal{Q}$  in Eq. (10) via Eq. (9). For  $\mu = 0$ , both precisions can simultaneously attain the quantum limits  $\mathcal{E}_{A,B} = 1/2$  due to

$$\left(\sqrt{1 - \frac{\mathcal{E}_A^{-1}}{2}} + \sqrt{1 - \frac{\mathcal{E}_B^{-1}}{2}}\right)^2 \geq 0. \quad (14)$$

On the contrary, with incompatibility coefficient  $\mu$  rising, the Eq. (13) indicates that two estimation variances corresponding to two parameters of interest are dependent mutually and then their individual quantum CRBs are simultaneously unattainable.

On the other hand, another widely studied CRB, called Holevo Cramér-Rao bound (HCRB), also provides lower bound on variances in multiparameter quantum estimation [80]. The previous work [65] that proposed the sensing model has adopted HCRB as

$$\Sigma_H = \min_{\phi \in (0, \pi]} \left( \frac{w}{\cos(\phi)^2} + \frac{1-w}{\cos[\phi + \arcsin(\mu)]^2} \right), \quad (15)$$

from the jointly coherent state  $\hat{\rho}$  with displacement amplitudes Eqs. (4), where  $w \in (0, 1)$  represents the weight to construct *weighted mean squared estimation error*  $\Sigma = 2w\mathcal{E}_A + 2(1-w)\mathcal{E}_B$ . This framework implies that the estimation errors  $\mathcal{E}_{A(B)}$  should fulfill the explicit inequality as

$$2[w\mathcal{E}_A + (1-w)\mathcal{E}_B] \geq \Sigma_H. \quad (16)$$

So far, there are two distinct proposals for describing the bounds of the estimation errors, i.e., the *tradeoff bound* Eq. (13) and the *Holevo bound* Eq. (16).




FIG. 2. Comparison of the tradeoff bound and the Holevo bound for two estimated parameters of GW signals, for (a)  $\mu = 0.9$ , (b)  $\mu = 0.7$ , (c)  $\mu = 0.5$ , and (d)  $\mu = 0.1$ . In all panels, the lines include tradeoff bound (black solid line) and Holevo bound with  $w = 0.5$  (red dotted line),  $w = 0.15$  (blue dashed line), and  $w = 0.85$  (orange dot-dashed line). Each inset of panels (c) and (d) shows the corresponding zoom-in.

The following analysis clarifies that the tradeoff bound, employed in our work, is more informative than the Holevo bound. See Fig. 2 for an illustration of the comparison between both bounds for the multiparameter linear sensing. Even though the Holevo bounds with various weights  $w$  are exactly tangent to the tradeoff bound, the former cannot identify the tradeoff curve regarding the attainable precision limits on estimating both parameters. Consequently, it is the tradeoff bound in Eq. (13) that gives the exact dependence between two estimation errors and full information about the attainable error region. Furthermore, our bound Eq. (13) explicitly represents how  $\mu$  as a incompatibility coefficient affects the tradeoff relation.

*Estimation protocol.*— Here we study the performance of a specific quantum measurement for a classical signal in a linear sensing device. The adopted compatible observables are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{A}' &= \hat{X}_1 - \mathcal{T}(\phi)\hat{P}_2, \\ \hat{B}' &= -\mathcal{S}(\phi)\hat{P}_1 + \mathcal{C}(\phi)\hat{X}_2,\end{aligned}\quad (17)$$

for jointly estimating two parameters of interest  $A'$  and

$B'$ , with coefficients

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}(\phi) &= \cos \phi / \left( \sqrt{1 - \mu^2} \cos \phi - \mu \sin \phi \right), \\ \mathcal{S}(\phi) &= \sin \phi / \left( \sqrt{1 - \mu^2} \cos \phi - \mu \sin \phi \right), \\ \mathcal{T}(\phi) &= \mathcal{S}(\phi) / \mathcal{C}(\phi) = \tan \phi.\end{aligned}\quad (18)$$

The measurement phase  $\phi$  determines these coefficients, rewritten as  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $\mathcal{C}$ , and  $\mathcal{T}$  for short in the following. Obviously, both observable expectations are  $\langle \hat{A}' \rangle = A'$  and  $\langle \hat{B}' \rangle = B'$  where  $\langle \bullet \rangle = \langle \psi | \bullet | \psi \rangle$  takes the two-mode coherent state  $|\psi\rangle = |\alpha_1, \alpha_2\rangle$  with amplitudes in Eq. (4).

Denote by  $\xi$  and  $\eta$  the eigenvalues of  $\hat{A}'$  and  $\hat{B}'$  respectively, and the corresponding simultaneous eigenstate is

$$|\xi, \eta\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\mathcal{T}\mathcal{S}}} \int e^{-i\frac{\eta}{\mathcal{S}}x} |x\rangle_{X_1} \otimes \left| \frac{x - \xi}{\mathcal{T}} \right\rangle_{P_2} dx, \quad (19)$$

where  $|x\rangle_{X_1}$  and  $|(x - \xi)/\mathcal{T}\rangle_{P_2}$  are eigenstates of  $\hat{X}_1$  and  $\hat{P}_2$ , with the eigenvalues  $x$  and  $(x - \xi)/\mathcal{T}$ , respectively. It is known that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \xi, \eta | \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\mathcal{T}\mathcal{S}}} \int dx e^{i\frac{\eta}{\mathcal{S}}x} \left\{ \frac{1}{\pi^{1/4}} \exp \left[ -\frac{(x - A')^2}{2} + iB'\mu x \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \frac{1}{\pi^{1/4}} \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{x - \xi}{\mathcal{T}} \right)^2 - iB' \sqrt{1 - \mu^2} \left( \frac{x - \xi}{\mathcal{T}} \right) \right] \right\}.\end{aligned}\quad (20)$$

If outcomes of the observables  $\hat{A}'$  and  $\hat{B}'$  are  $\xi$  and  $\eta$ , the joint probability density function is given by  $p(\xi, \eta) = |\langle \xi, \eta | \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \rangle|^2$  via Eq. (20) (details in Sec. and of SM [79]). Applying this  $p(\xi, \eta)$  into Eq. (5), we can obtain the classical FIM as

$$F = 2 \begin{pmatrix} \cos^2 \phi & 0 \\ 0 & \left( \sqrt{1 - \mu^2} \cos \phi - \mu \sin \phi \right)^2 \end{pmatrix}.\quad (21)$$

Exactly, the tradeoff relation Eq. (12) holds in the considered measurement protocol from the above classical FIM and, furthermore, is tight under the condition

$$\mu \cos \phi + \sqrt{1 - \mu^2} \sin \phi \leq 0, \quad (22)$$

with  $\phi \in [0, \pi]$ , as derived in Sec. of SM [79]. These results manifest that, for specific  $\mu$ , there exists an optimal  $\phi$ -phase range to obtain the least estimation variances for both parameters of interest. We utilize the classical FIM (21) to compute and plot the left side of tradeoff relation (12) versus  $\phi$  in Fig. 3. The flat parts of both curves for two various  $\mu$  indicate that the inequality relation (12) becomes an equality when  $\phi$  satisfies condition (22). Remarkably, our tradeoff relation (12) is valuable to certify that the joint measurement of




FIG. 3. Combined with classical FIM (5), the left side of tradeoff relation (12) as a function of  $\phi$  for  $\mu = 0.9$  (blue solid line) and  $\mu = 0.5$  (red dashed line). For comparison, the corresponding straight lines denote  $\mu^2$ , the right side of Eq. (12). The flat parts mean that tradeoff relation (12) becomes equality and tight.




FIG. 4. The tradeoff relation (black solid line) and the estimation errors of the measurement protocol (blue dots) with various  $\phi$  attached. Here  $\mu = 0.9$  and  $\phi$  chosen according to tight condition (22).

the observables (17) saturates the inequality (12), and fully provides accessible region of estimation precisions.

In Fig. 4, we also compute and plot the estimation errors of the measurements (17) based on our main result Eq. (12) and the classical FIM (21) for estimating  $A'$  and  $B'$  with several  $\phi$  and  $\mu = 0.9$ . It also reveals that the errors of considered observables Eq. (17) saturate the tradeoff bound when measurement phase  $\phi$  conforms to the condition (22). As a result, the phase  $\phi$  acts as an available parameter to adjust the individual estimation error. In fact, as the phase  $\phi$  increases, the estimation for parameter  $A'$  becomes more accurate at the expense of rising estimation error for parameter  $B'$ .

*Detuned GW sensors.*— As shown in all panels of

Fig. 2, while both estimation variances can simultaneously attain the individual quantum CRB with  $\mu = 0$ , the simultaneous attainability is impossible owing to the tradeoff relation (13) with growing  $\mu$ . We use the estimation variances with equal weight, i.e.,  $\mathcal{E}_{A(B)}$  with  $w = 0.5$ , to reflect the gap between allowed bound and individual quantum CRB, and depict its variation with  $\mu$  in Fig. 5. It manifests that the tradeoff effect becomes obvious when  $\mu$  is larger than 0.5, resulting from a nonzero parameter in a specific device, e.g., the detuned frequency in a GW interferometer.




FIG. 5. Estimation variance with equal weight, i.e.,  $\mathcal{E}_{A(B)}$  with  $w = 0.5$ , versus  $\mu$ . The red dashed straight line represents  $\mathcal{E}_{A(B)} = 0.5$  as the individual quantum CRB in the multiparameter linear measurement.




FIG. 6. The relation between both sensitivities  $S_A$  and  $S_B$  of two parameters of interest,  $A$  and  $B$ , in the detuned GW interferometer for signal frequency  $\Omega = 3$  kHz with  $\Delta = 0.8\Omega$  (black solid line),  $\Delta = 0.6\Omega$  (red dashed line),  $\Delta = 0.4\Omega$  (blue dotted line), and  $\Delta = 0$  (brown dot). The dashed straight lines corresponding to different detunings  $\Delta$  denote the optimal sensitivities of the individual measurements for independent signal parameters  $A$  and  $B$ .

As a significant example, the detuned interferometer



is considered to improve sensitivity for sensing kilohertz GW signals, from postmerger remnant of binary neutron-star mergers, to explore extreme matter [11, 21–27, 81, 82]. However, the nonzero detuned frequency  $\Delta$  and several kilohertz signal frequency  $\Omega$  lead to the incompatibility coefficient as  $\mu = 2\Delta\Omega/(\gamma^2 + \Delta^2 + \Omega^2)$  with bandwidth  $\gamma$  [65], and thus our tradeoff relation Eq. (13) can enlighten researchers to learn the precisions of both estimated parameters of SW signal. In such detuned configurations for sensing kilohertz GWs, one has to confront an either-or situation where only one of both parameters can access higher precision region through manipulating the measurement parameter and, simultaneously, the precision of the other one is inevitably sacrificed based on the relation Eq. (13). For signal frequency  $\Omega = 3$  kHz, the Fig. 6 exhibits how the detuned frequency  $\Delta$  influences on the tradeoff relation between both sensitivities  $S_A := \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_A T}/\mathcal{N}$  and  $S_B := \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_B T}/\mathcal{N}$  of two parameters of interest,  $A$  and  $B$ , in a detuned configuration with arm length  $L = 4$  km, bandwidth  $\gamma = 42$  Hz, circulating power  $P = 750$  kW, and carrier laser frequency  $\omega_0 = 282$  THz. As shown, while the detuned frequency  $\Delta \sim \Omega$  is beneficial to high precision,  $\Delta = 0$  leads to larger sensitivities despite individual quantum CRB is achievable. More concretely, when the detuned frequency  $\Delta$  approaches the signal frequency  $\Omega$ , the signal sensing is capable of achieving smaller sensitivities, but encounters the tradeoff relation between the sensitivities that stops them from reaching the individual quantum CRB. Therefore, this work that demonstrates the tradeoff relation between the sensitivities for simultaneously measuring two independent signal parameters becomes available when the detuned GW sensors are applied for sensing kilohertz signals with higher precision.

*Conclusion.* — In summary, we have thoroughly analyzed the estimation errors of two independent parameters of a classical signal detected in a linear quantum device. Based on the framework of information regret tradeoff relation, we have put forward a general, analytical expression of the tradeoff relation between the attainable estimation variances. Compared with the Holevo Cramér-Rao bound proposed in previous work [65], our results root in incompatible measurements from a fundamental rule in quantum mechanics, called Heisenberg uncertainty principle, and thus can truly reveal the quantum limits on the estimation errors that manifest themselves as tradeoff relation. Moreover, we have found that the tradeoff effect turns to stronger with larger incompatibility coefficient and can be treated as a strict criterion to assess quantum multiparameter estimation for simultaneously sensing signal parameters of interest. Eventually, we have also proved that a proposed measurement can attain the tradeoff bound under a specific condition, and show that the ultimate errors for individual parameters are adjustable by shifting

a phase of the proposed measurement.

This work provides an available criterion for assessing the interferometric gravitational wave detectors which are set to be detuned for enhancing sensitivities of kilohertz signals. The reason is that the beneficial detuned frequency is directly related to the incompatibility coefficient and inevitably gives rise to our tradeoff bound in any quantum linear detectors.

*Acknowledgments.* This research is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 12104121, 12275062)...

---

\* gli@hdu.edu.cn

† lxm@hdu.edu.cn; <http://xmlu.me>

- [1] S. L. Danilishin and F. Y. Khalili, *Living Reviews in Relativity* **15**, 5 (2012).
- [2] R. X. Adhikari, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **86**, 121 (2014).
- [3] R. Ebadi, D. E. Kaplan, S. Rajendran, and R. L. Walsworth, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132**, 101001 (2024).
- [4] F. Zou, L. Du, Y. Li, and H. Dong, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132**, 153602 (2024).
- [5] G. Li, X.-M. Lu, X. Wang, J. Xin, and X. Li, *J. Opt. Soc. Am. B* **39**, 98 (2022).
- [6] H. Miao, R. X. Adhikari, Y. Ma, B. Pang, and Y. Chen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 050801 (2017).
- [7] H. Miao, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 012103 (2017).
- [8] C. W. Gardiner and M. J. Collett, *Phys. Rev. A* **31**, 3761 (1985).
- [9] R. Kubo, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **29**, 255 (1966).
- [10] V. B. Braginsky and F. Khalili, “Quantum measurement,” (Cambridge University Press, 1992).
- [11] B. P. Abbott, R. Abbott, T. D. Abbott, and *et al.* (LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 061102 (2016).
- [12] J. Aasi, B. P. Abbott, R. Abbott, T. Abbott, and *et al.* (LIGO Scientific Collaboration), *Class. Quantum Grav.* **32**, 074001 (2015).
- [13] F. Acernese, M. Agathos, K. Agatsuma, and *et al.*, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **32**, 024001 (2015).
- [14] T. Akutsu, M. Ando, K. Arai, and *et al.*, *Nature Astronomy* **3**, 35 (2019).
- [15] B. Abbott, R. Abbott, T. Abbott, and *et al.*, *Living Rev. Relativ* **23**, 1 (2020).
- [16] B. P. Abbott, R. Abbott, T. D. Abbott, and *et al.* (LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. X* **9**, 031040 (2019).
- [17] R. Abbott, T. D. Abbott, S. Abraham, and *et al.* (LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. X* **11**, 021053 (2021).
- [18] S. Vitale, *Science* **372**, eabc7397 (2021).
- [19] M. C. Miller and N. Yunes, *Nature* **568**, 469 (2019).
- [20] R.-G. Cai, Z. Cao, Z.-K. Guo, S.-J. Wang, and T. Yang, *National Science Review* **4**, 687 (2017).
- [21] L. Baiotti, *Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics* **109**, 103714 (2019).
- [22] A. Bauswein, N.-U. F. Bastian, D. B. Blaschke, K. Chatziioannou, J. A. Clark, T. Fischer, and M. Oer-

- tel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 061102 (2019).
- [23] N. Andersson, *Universe* **7** (2021), 10.3390/universe7040097.
- [24] M. Shibata, K. Kyutoku, T. Yamamoto, and K. Taniguchi, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 044030 (2009).
- [25] C. Messenger, K. Takami, S. Gossan, L. Rezzolla, and B. S. Sathyaprakash, *Phys. Rev. X* **4**, 041004 (2014).
- [26] C. D. Ott, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **26**, 063001 (2009).
- [27] P. D. Lasky, *Publications of the Astronomical Society of Australia* **32**, e034 (2015).
- [28] C. Helstrom, *Physics Letters A* **25**, 101 (1967).
- [29] C. Helstrom, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **14**, 234 (1968).
- [30] H. Yuen and M. Lax, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **19**, 740 (1973).
- [31] V. P. Belavkin, *Theoretical and Mathematical Physics* **26**, 213 (1976).
- [32] C. W. Helstrom, in *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory* (Academic Press, New York, 1976).
- [33] A. S. Holevo, in *Probabilistic and Statistical Aspects of Quantum Theory* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1982).
- [34] S. Personick, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **17**, 240 (1971).
- [35] M. Hayashi, ed., in *Asymptotic theory of quantum statistical inference: Selected Papers* (World Scientific Publishing Company, 2005).
- [36] M. Tsang, F. Albarelli, and A. Datta, *Phys. Rev. X* **10**, 031023 (2020).
- [37] R. A. Fisher, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Containing Papers of a Mathematical or Physical Character* **222**, 309 (1922).
- [38] R. A. Fisher, *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* **22**, 700 (1925).
- [39] S. M. Kay, in *Fundamentals of Statistical Signal Processing, Volume I: Estimation Theory* (Prentice Hall, 1993).
- [40] L. Wasserman, in *All of Statistics: A Concise Course in Statistical Inference* (Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 2010).
- [41] G. Casella and R. L. Berger, in *Statistical Inference, 2nd ed.* (Duxbury Press, Pacific Grove, 2002).
- [42] E. Lehmann and G. Casella, in *Theory of Point Estimation* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998).
- [43] S. L. Braunstein, C. M. Caves, and G. Milburn, *Annals of Physics* **247**, 135 (1996).
- [44] A. Fujiwara, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **39**, 12489 (2006).
- [45] P. Busch, T. Heinonen, and P. Lahti, *Physics Reports* **452**, 155 (2007).
- [46] A. Carollo, B. Spagnolo, A. A. Dubkov, and D. Valenti, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2019**, 094010 (2019).
- [47] J. Rubio, P. Knott, and J. Dunningham, *Journal of Physics Communications* **2**, 015027 (2018).
- [48] M. Tsang, “The holevo cramér-rao bound is at most thrice the helstrom version,” (2021), [arXiv:1911.08359 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.08359).
- [49] F. Albarelli, M. Tsang, and A. Datta, “Upper bounds on the holevo Cramér-Rao bound for multiparameter quantum parametric and semiparametric estimation,” (2020), [arXiv:1911.11036 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.11036).
- [50] J. S. Sidhu and P. Kok, *AVS Quantum Science* **2**, 014701 (2020).
- [51] X.-M. Lu, Z. Ma, and C. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. A* **101**, 022303 (2020).
- [52] J. S. Sidhu, Y. Ouyang, E. T. Campbell, and P. Kok, *Physical Review X* **11** (2021), 10.1103/physrevx.11.011028.
- [53] S. Ragy, M. Jarzyna, and R. Demkowicz-Dobrzański, *Phys. Rev. A* **94**, 052108 (2016).
- [54] N. Li, C. Ferrie, J. A. Gross, A. Kalev, and C. M. Caves, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 180402 (2016).
- [55] H. Zhu and M. Hayashi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 030404 (2018).
- [56] J. Suzuki, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **57**, 042201 (2016).
- [57] J. Suzuki, *Entropy* **21** (2019), 10.3390/e21070703.
- [58] J. Suzuki, Y. Yang, and M. Hayashi, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **53**, 453001 (2020).
- [59] I. Kull, P. A. Guérin, and F. Verstraete, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **53**, 244001 (2020).
- [60] A. Carollo, D. Valenti, and B. Spagnolo, *Physics Reports* **838**, 1 (2020), geometry of quantum phase transitions.
- [61] R. D. Gill and S. Massar, *Phys. Rev. A* **61**, 042312 (2000).
- [62] H. Nagaoka, “A new approach to Cramér-Rao bounds for quantum state estimation,” in *Asymptotic Theory of Quantum Statistical Inference* (2005) pp. 100–112.
- [63] K. Matsumoto, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **35**, 3111 (2002).
- [64] F. Albarelli, J. F. Friel, and A. Datta, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 200503 (2019).
- [65] J. W. Gardner, T. Gefen, S. A. Haine, J. J. Hope, and Y. Chen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132**, 130801 (2024).
- [66] X.-M. Lu and X. Wang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 120503 (2021).
- [67] M. Ozawa, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 042105 (2003).
- [68] M. Ozawa, *Physics Letters A* **320**, 367 (2004).
- [69] M. J. W. Hall, *Phys. Rev. A* **69**, 052113 (2004).
- [70] M. M. Weston, M. J. W. Hall, M. S. Palsson, H. M. Wiseman, and G. J. Pryde, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 220402 (2013).
- [71] C. Branciard, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **110**, 6742 (2013).
- [72] X.-M. Lu, S. Yu, K. Fujikawa, and C. H. Oh, *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 042113 (2014).
- [73] A. Buonanno and Y. Chen, *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 042001 (2002).
- [74] J. W. Gardner, T. Gefen, S. A. Haine, J. J. Hope, and Y. Chen, “Holevo cramér-rao bound for waveform estimation of gravitational waves,” (2023), [arXiv:2308.06253 \[gr-qc\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.06253).
- [75] H. Cramèr, in *Mathematical Methods of Statistics* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1946).
- [76] C. R. Rao, “Information and the accuracy attainable in the estimation of statistical parameters,” in *Breakthroughs in Statistics: Foundations and Basic Theory*, edited by S. Kotz and N. L. Johnson (Springer New York, New York, NY, 1992) pp. 235–247.
- [77] S. L. Braunstein and C. M. Caves, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72**, 3439 (1994).
- [78] J. Liu, H. Yuan, X.-M. Lu, and X. Wang, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **53**, 023001 (2019).
- [79] See Supplemental Material for detailed calculations.
- [80] B. Xia, J. Huang, H. Li, H. Wang, and G. Zeng, *Nat. Commun.* **14**, 1021 (2023).
- [81] B. P. A. et al., *The Astrophysical Journal Letters* **851**, L16 (2017).

[82] B. P. A. et al., *The Astrophysical Journal* **875**, 160 (2019).



## SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

### A. the derivation of quantum geometric tensor $\mathcal{Q}$

Here we derive the quantum geometric tensor  $\mathcal{Q}$  in Eq. (10) in the main text. In this part, we define the real and imaginary parts,  $\vartheta_1 \equiv \text{Re } \alpha$  and  $\vartheta_2 \equiv \text{Im } \alpha$ , for a coherent state  $|\alpha\rangle$  with amplitude  $\alpha$ . The coherent state  $|\alpha\rangle$  obeys

$$\frac{\partial |\alpha\rangle}{\partial \vartheta_1} = (-\vartheta_1 + a^\dagger) |\alpha\rangle, \quad \frac{\partial |\alpha\rangle}{\partial \vartheta_2} = (-\vartheta_2 + ia^\dagger) |\alpha\rangle. \quad (23)$$

Based on the two-mode coherent state  $|\psi\rangle = |\alpha_1, \alpha_2\rangle$  with both amplitudes in Eq. (4), we define their real and imaginary parts as

$$\begin{aligned} \vartheta_{11} \equiv \text{Re } \alpha_1 &= \frac{A'}{\sqrt{2}}, & \vartheta_{12} \equiv \text{Im } \alpha_1 &= \frac{\mu B'}{\sqrt{2}}, \\ \vartheta_{21} \equiv \text{Re } \alpha_2 &= \sqrt{\frac{1-\mu^2}{2}} B', & \vartheta_{22} \equiv \text{Im } \alpha_2 &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

According to Eq. (23), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial |\psi\rangle}{\partial A'} &= \frac{\partial \vartheta_{11}}{\partial A'} \frac{\partial |\alpha_1, \alpha_2\rangle}{\partial \vartheta_{11}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( -\frac{A'}{\sqrt{2}} + a_1^\dagger \right) |\psi\rangle, \\ \frac{\partial |\psi\rangle}{\partial B'} &= \frac{\partial \vartheta_{12}}{\partial B'} \frac{\partial |\alpha_1, \alpha_2\rangle}{\partial \vartheta_{12}} + \frac{\partial \vartheta_{21}}{\partial B'} \frac{\partial |\alpha_1, \alpha_2\rangle}{\partial \vartheta_{21}} = \left[ \frac{\mu}{\sqrt{2}} \left( -\frac{\mu B'}{\sqrt{2}} + ia_1^\dagger \right) + \sqrt{\frac{1-\mu^2}{2}} \left( -\sqrt{\frac{1-\mu^2}{2}} B' + a_2^\dagger \right) \right] |\psi\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( -\frac{B'}{\sqrt{2}} + i\mu a_1^\dagger + \sqrt{1-\mu^2} a_2^\dagger \right) |\psi\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

As for the pure state  $|\psi\rangle$ , the quantum geometric tensor is given by

$$\mathcal{Q}_{jk} = 4 \left( \frac{\partial \langle \psi |}{\partial \theta_j} \right) (\hat{1} - |\psi\rangle \langle \psi|) \left( \frac{\partial |\psi\rangle}{\partial \theta_k} \right). \quad (26)$$

Thus, using Eqs. (25), we obtain the results as

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \frac{\partial \langle \psi |}{\partial A'} \right) \left( \frac{\partial |\psi\rangle}{\partial A'} \right) &= \frac{1}{2} \left( \left| -\frac{A'}{\sqrt{2}} + \alpha_1 \right|^2 + 1 \right), & \left( \frac{\partial \langle \psi |}{\partial A'} \right) |\psi\rangle \langle \psi| \left( \frac{\partial |\psi\rangle}{\partial A'} \right) &= \frac{1}{2} \left| -\frac{A'}{\sqrt{2}} + \alpha_1 \right|^2, \\ \left( \frac{\partial \langle \psi |}{\partial B'} \right) \left( \frac{\partial |\psi\rangle}{\partial B'} \right) &= \frac{1}{2} \left( \left| -\frac{B'}{\sqrt{2}} - i\mu\alpha_1 + \sqrt{1-\mu^2}\alpha_2 \right|^2 + 1 \right), \\ \left( \frac{\partial \langle \psi |}{\partial B'} \right) |\psi\rangle \langle \psi| \left( \frac{\partial |\psi\rangle}{\partial B'} \right) &= \frac{1}{2} \left| -\frac{B'}{\sqrt{2}} - i\mu\alpha_1 + \sqrt{1-\mu^2}\alpha_2 \right|^2, \\ \left( \frac{\partial \langle \psi |}{\partial A'} \right) \left( \frac{\partial |\psi\rangle}{\partial B'} \right) &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ \left( -\frac{A'}{\sqrt{2}} + \alpha_1 \right) \left( -\frac{B'}{\sqrt{2}} + i\mu\alpha_1^* + \sqrt{1-\mu^2}\alpha_2^* \right) + i\mu \right], \\ \left( \frac{\partial \langle \psi |}{\partial A'} \right) |\psi\rangle \langle \psi| \left( \frac{\partial |\psi\rangle}{\partial B'} \right) &= \frac{1}{2} \left( -\frac{A'}{\sqrt{2}} + \alpha_1 \right) \left( -\frac{B'}{\sqrt{2}} + i\mu\alpha_1^* + \sqrt{1-\mu^2}\alpha_2^* \right), \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

and put them into Eq. (26) to acquire the quantum geometric tensor as

$$\mathcal{Q} = 2 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & i\mu \\ -i\mu & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (28)$$

### B. simultaneous eigenstate

Here we prove that the state (19) is a simultaneous eigenstate of the observations  $\hat{A}'$  and  $\hat{B}'$  defined in Eq. (17). On the one hand,

$$\hat{A}' |\xi, \eta\rangle = [\hat{X}_1 - \mathcal{T}(\phi)\hat{P}_2] |\xi, \eta\rangle = \left( x - \mathcal{T} \cdot \frac{x - \xi}{\mathcal{T}} \right) |\xi, \eta\rangle = \xi |\xi, \eta\rangle. \quad (29)$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\xi, \eta\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\mathcal{T}\mathcal{S}}} \int dp |p\rangle_{P_1} \langle p| \int dx' |x'\rangle_{X_2} \langle x'| \int dx e^{-i\frac{\eta}{\mathcal{S}}x} |x\rangle_{X_1} \otimes \left| \frac{x-\xi}{\mathcal{T}} \right\rangle_{P_2} dx \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\mathcal{T}\mathcal{S}}} \iiint |p\rangle_{P_1} \otimes |x'\rangle_{X_2} e^{-i\frac{\eta}{\mathcal{S}}x} (\langle p|_{P_1} \cdot |x\rangle_{X_1}) \left( \langle x'|_{X_2} \cdot \left| \frac{x-\xi}{\mathcal{T}} \right\rangle_{P_2} \right) dp dx' dx \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\mathcal{T}\mathcal{S}}} \iiint |p\rangle_{P_1} \otimes |x'\rangle_{X_2} \left( e^{-i\frac{\eta}{\mathcal{S}}x} \right) \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-ipx} \right) \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{ix' \frac{x-\xi}{\mathcal{T}}} \right) dp dx' dx \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\mathcal{T}\mathcal{S}}} \iiint |p\rangle_{P_1} \otimes |x'\rangle_{X_2} \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} e^{i\left(\frac{x'}{\mathcal{T}} - p - \frac{\eta}{\mathcal{S}}\right)x} \right) \left( e^{-i\frac{\xi}{\mathcal{T}}x'} \right) dp dx' dx \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\mathcal{T}\mathcal{S}}} \iint |p\rangle_{P_1} \otimes |x'\rangle_{X_2} \delta\left(\frac{x'}{\mathcal{T}} - p - \frac{\eta}{\mathcal{S}}\right) \left( e^{-i\frac{\xi}{\mathcal{T}}x'} \right) dp dx' \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\mathcal{T}\mathcal{S}}} \iint |p\rangle_{P_1} \otimes |x'\rangle_{X_2} \mathcal{T} \delta\left[x' - \mathcal{T}\left(p + \frac{\eta}{\mathcal{S}}\right)\right] \left( e^{-i\frac{\xi}{\mathcal{T}}x'} \right) dp dx' \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\mathcal{C}}} \int |p\rangle_{P_1} \otimes \left| \mathcal{T}\left(p + \frac{\eta}{\mathcal{S}}\right) \right\rangle_{X_2} \left( e^{-i\xi\left(p + \frac{\eta}{\mathcal{S}}\right)} \right) dp.
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Thus,

$$\hat{B}' |\xi, \eta\rangle = -\mathcal{S}p + \mathcal{C}\mathcal{T} \left( p + \frac{\eta}{\mathcal{S}} \right) |\xi, \eta\rangle = \eta |\xi, \eta\rangle, \tag{31}$$

via relation  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{T}\mathcal{C}$ . Besides, the normalization of state  $|\xi, \eta\rangle$  is shown as

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \xi', \eta' | \xi, \eta \rangle &= \frac{1}{2\pi|\mathcal{T}\mathcal{S}|} \int \int dx dx' e^{\frac{i}{\mathcal{S}}(\eta'x' - \eta x)} \delta(x - x') \delta\left[\frac{(x-\xi) - (x'-\xi')}{\mathcal{T}}\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi|\mathcal{T}\mathcal{S}|} \int dx e^{\frac{i}{\mathcal{S}}(\eta' - \eta)x} \delta\left(\frac{\xi' - \xi}{\mathcal{T}}\right) = \delta(\xi' - \xi) \frac{1}{2\pi|\mathcal{S}|} \int dx e^{\frac{i}{\mathcal{S}}(\eta' - \eta)x} \\
&= \delta(\xi' - \xi) \delta(\eta' - \eta).
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

### C. the joint probability density function

According to the coherent state  $|\alpha\rangle$ , with real and imaginary parts  $\vartheta_1$  and  $\vartheta_2$ , in the coordinate and momentum representations,

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_\alpha(x) =_X \langle x | \alpha \rangle &= \frac{1}{\pi^{1/4}} \exp \left[ -\frac{(x - \sqrt{2}\vartheta_1)^2}{2} + i\sqrt{2}\vartheta_2 x \right], \\
\varphi_\alpha(p) =_P \langle p | \alpha \rangle &= \frac{1}{\pi^{1/4}} \exp \left[ -\frac{(p - \sqrt{2}\vartheta_2)^2}{2} - i\sqrt{2}\vartheta_1 p \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

therefore the overlap between simultaneous eigenstate (19) and the two-mode coherent state with Eq. (4) is given by

$$\langle \xi, \eta | \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\mathcal{T}\mathcal{S}}} \int dx e^{i\frac{\eta}{\mathcal{S}}x} \psi_{\alpha_1}(x) \varphi_{\alpha_2} \left( \frac{x-\xi}{\mathcal{T}} \right). \tag{34}$$

Applying the coherent state amplitudes  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  in Eqs. (4) (or their real and imaginary parts in Eq. (24) directly) to the above equation, we can obtain Eq. (20) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \xi, \eta | \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\mathcal{T}\mathcal{S}}} \int dx e^{i\frac{\eta}{\mathcal{S}}x} \left\{ \frac{1}{\pi^{1/4}} \exp \left[ -\frac{(x-A)^2}{2} + iB'\mu x \right] \right\} \\
&\quad \times \left\{ \frac{1}{\pi^{1/4}} \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{x-\xi}{\mathcal{T}} \right)^2 - iB'\sqrt{1-\mu^2} \left( \frac{x-\xi}{\mathcal{T}} \right) \right] \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Thus, the joint probability density function is given by

$$p(\xi, \eta) = |\langle \xi, \eta | \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{\pi(1 + \mathcal{T}^2)} \left| \frac{\mathcal{T}}{\mathcal{S}} \right| \exp \left\{ -\frac{\mathcal{S}^2(\xi - A')^2 + [\mathcal{T}\eta - \mathcal{S}(\sqrt{1 - \mu^2} - \mathcal{T}\mu)B']^2}{\mathcal{S}^2(1 + \mathcal{T}^2)} \right\}. \quad (36)$$

#### D. the saturation of the measurement protocol

Here we derive the saturation of the measurement Eq. (17) and the corresponding condition Eq. (22). Substituting classical FIM (21) and matrix  $\mathcal{Q}$  (10) into the definition of normalized-square-root regret of Fisher information, we obtain

$$\Delta_1 = \sqrt{\frac{\text{Re } \mathcal{Q}_{11} - F_{11}}{\text{Re } \mathcal{Q}_{11}}} = \sqrt{\frac{2 - 2\cos^2 \phi}{2}} = |\sin \phi|, \quad (37)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_2 &= \sqrt{\frac{\text{Re } \mathcal{Q}_{22} - F_{22}}{\text{Re } \mathcal{Q}_{22}}} = \sqrt{\frac{2 - 2(\sqrt{1 - \mu^2} \cos \phi - \mu \sin \phi)^2}{2}} \\ &= \left| \mu \cos \phi + \sqrt{1 - \mu^2} \sin \phi \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Based on above normalized-square-root regret, the left side of the tradeoff relation (8) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} L &= \sin^2 \phi + \left( \mu \cos \phi + \sqrt{1 - \mu^2} \sin \phi \right)^2 \\ &\quad + 2\sqrt{1 - \mu^2} \sin \phi \left| \mu \cos \phi + \sqrt{1 - \mu^2} \sin \phi \right|, \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

with  $0 \leq \phi \leq \pi$  and  $c_{12} = \mu$  based on Eq. (9).

If

$$\mu \cos \phi + \sqrt{1 - \mu^2} \sin \phi \leq 0,$$

i.e., the condition which we establish in Eq. (22), the above expression (39) can be simplified as

$$L = \mu^2. \quad (40)$$

On the other hand, If  $\mu \cos \phi + \sqrt{1 - \mu^2} \sin \phi > 0$ , the left side of the tradeoff relation (39) turns to

$$L = \mu^2 + 4\sqrt{1 - \mu^2} \sin \phi \left( \sqrt{1 - \mu^2} \sin \phi + \mu \cos \phi \right). \quad (41)$$

This result conforms to the Fig. 3.

To sum up, the left side of the tradeoff relation (8) is given by

$$L = \begin{cases} \mu^2 & \mu \cos \phi + \sqrt{1 - \mu^2} \sin \phi \leq 0, \\ \mu^2 + 4\sqrt{1 - \mu^2} \sin \phi \left( \sqrt{1 - \mu^2} \sin \phi + \mu \cos \phi \right) & \mu \cos \phi + \sqrt{1 - \mu^2} \sin \phi > 0. \end{cases} \quad (42)$$

The measurement Eq. (17) is proved to saturate the ultimate tradeoff relation with the specific condition Eq. (22).