

Optimal phase measurements with pure Gaussian states

Alex Monras

*Grup de Física Teòrica & IFAE, Facultat de Ciències, Edifici Cn,
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona) Spain*

We analyze the Heisenberg limit on phase estimation for Gaussian states without reference to a phase operator. We prove that the most sensitive states to phase measurements with a given energy are the squeezed vacuum states. We show that at least two kinds of measurements exist that asymptotically attain such limit. One of them is described in terms of POVM measurements and its efficiency is exhaustively explored. We also study Gaussian measurements where phase quadrature measurements are performed. We show that this type of measurements can also be optimal in the large sample limit.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum phase measurements have been for a long time a field of attention for both theoretical and practical research in quantum theory [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18]. Many schemes have been proposed with the aim of optimally determining the phase shift produced by a physical process [10], usually acting on quantized harmonic oscillators. Despite all the efforts, few attempts have actually settled the issue with full generality [11]. Many different approaches exist and these works often have a restricted range of applicability. This difficulty arises for various reasons. The most important is the fact that a well defined phase operator does not exist for all states of the whole Fock space. This seems to indicate that Heisenberg's uncertainty relation for phase and number must be handled with care and a derivation without the use of such a phase operator is called for [19].

In this paper we are concerned with phase measurements on Gaussian states. First we review the derivation of the Heisenberg limit using the theory of quantum state estimation [19, 20], which does not require the existence of a phase operator. Then we propose an adaptive *positive operator-valued measure* (POVM) which asymptotically attains this limit by an adaptive method [21, 22, 23], in the limit of a large number of copies. We also determine the optimal heterodyne measurement for phase estimation, also in the asymptotic regime.

When performing phase measurements on Gaussian states, one usually implements them on light beams with a given average photon number, *i.e.*, a fixed energy. This is the condition used to compare different Gaussian states in order to determine their optimality, when phase sensitivity is considered. The techniques we use, namely, asymptotics in quantum statistics, are best suited for the problem at hand, where one usually has a light beam turned on for a large number of coherence times, which corresponds to a large number of such Gaussian states.

II. QUANTUM PARAMETER ESTIMATION

In this section we review the theory of quantum parameter estimation [6, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26], which leads to a generalization of the Heisenberg uncertainty relation.

Consider we have a family of quantum systems $\rho(\theta)$ labelled by a parameter θ . In our case, the parameter is the phase. This family corresponds to a curve in Hilbert space, and translations along such curve are generated by the generator G in the usual manner. In our case the generator is the number operator $G = a^\dagger a$,

$$\rho(\theta) = \exp(-i\theta G)\rho(0)\exp(i\theta G).$$

Throughout this paper we will use the following notation. We will write $|n\rangle$ to denote Fock states, *i.e.*, states with well defined number. On the other hand, let \mathcal{U} be the unitary operation that yields the state $\rho(\theta)$ from the vacuum,

$$\rho(\theta) = \mathcal{U}|0\rangle\langle 0|\mathcal{U}^\dagger.$$

We define the vectors $|\phi_n\rangle$ as the Fock states transformed by \mathcal{U} ,

$$|\phi_n\rangle = \mathcal{U}|n\rangle,$$

hence, $\rho(\theta) = |\phi_0\rangle\langle\phi_0|$. The set $\{|\phi_i\rangle\}$ can be considered as an eigenbasis of $\rho(\theta)$ where only $|\phi_0\rangle$ has non-null eigenvalue.

Our aim is to determine the parameter θ by performing the best possible POVM on the system. From the outcome of the measurement, x , we will give an estimation $\hat{\theta}(x)$, *i.e.*, a function that depends on the outcome x . Any function dependent on a random variable is itself a random variable. Hence, the expectation value of an estimator is [27]

$$E_\theta[\hat{\theta}] = \sum_x p_\theta(x)\hat{\theta}(x),$$

and the variance

$$\text{Var}_\theta[\hat{\theta}] = \sum_x p_\theta(x)(\hat{\theta}(x) - E_\theta[\hat{\theta}])^2,$$

where the underscore θ signifies the fact that the expectation value is taken with probability distribution $p_\theta(x)$. An estimator is called *unbiased* when

$$E_\theta[\hat{\theta}] = \theta.$$

It is a well known theorem in statistics that the variance of any unbiased estimator is lower bounded by the so-called Cramér-Rao bound, [27]

$$\text{Var}_\theta[\hat{\theta}] \geq \frac{1}{F(\theta)} \quad (1)$$

where $F(\theta)$ represents the Fisher information associated with the measurement,

$$F(\theta) = \sum_{x \in X_+} p(x|\theta) \left(\frac{\partial \log p(x|\theta)}{\partial \theta} \right)^2 \quad (2)$$

and the sum runs over the set of possible outcomes X_+ , i.e. those with $p(x|\theta) \neq 0$. In the quantum case, the probabilities are given by the Born rule $p(x|\theta) = \text{tr}[\rho(\theta)E_x]$, where the $\{E_x\}$ are the elements of a POVM. Furthermore, the Braunstein-Caves inequality [20] sets an upper bound on the Fisher information

$$F(\theta) \leq H(\theta) \quad (3)$$

where $H(\theta)$ does not depend on the measurement which is performed. $H(\theta)$ is sometimes regarded as the Quantum Fisher Information (QFI), and is defined as [6, 20, 21, 23]

$$H(\theta) = \text{tr}[\rho(\theta)\lambda(\theta)^2], \quad (4)$$

where λ is the *symmetric logarithmic derivative* (SLD), defined as the hermitian operator that fulfills

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \rho(\theta)}{\partial \theta} &= -i[G, \rho(\theta)] = \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(\lambda(\theta)\rho(\theta) + \rho(\theta)\lambda(\theta)). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

This sets a fundamental bound on the variance of any unbiased estimator, which only depends on the geometrical properties of the curve $\rho(\theta)$. Assuming $\rho(\theta) = |\phi_\theta\rangle\langle\phi_\theta|$ to be a pure state generated by G from $\rho(0)$, the SLD is

$$\lambda(\theta) = 2i(|\phi_\theta\rangle\langle\psi| - |\psi\rangle\langle\phi_\theta|) = -2i[G, \rho(\theta)]$$

where $|\psi\rangle = (1 - |\phi_0\rangle\langle\phi_0|)G|\phi_0\rangle$, with eigenvectors $|\phi^\pm\rangle = \pm i\sqrt{\langle\psi|\psi\rangle}|\phi_0\rangle + |\psi\rangle$ and eigenvalues $l_\pm = \pm 2\sqrt{\langle\psi|\psi\rangle}$. Note that $\langle\psi|\phi_0\rangle = 0$. Working out the value of H for pure states we get

$$H(\theta) = 4\langle\psi|\psi\rangle = 4\langle\Delta G\rangle_\theta^2,$$

where $\langle\Delta G\rangle_\theta^2$ is defined, as usual, $\langle\phi_0|G^2|\phi_0\rangle - \langle\phi_0|G|\phi_0\rangle^2$, where $\rho(\theta) = |\phi_\theta\rangle\langle\phi_\theta|$. Thus,

$$\text{Var}_\theta[\hat{\theta}] \langle\Delta G\rangle_\theta^2 \geq \frac{1}{4}. \quad (6)$$

This expression is similar to Heisenberg's uncertainty relation for canonically conjugate variables, but has some advantages (see [19]). First of all, it has been derived without the use of any phase operator. In fact, the only operator we need is the phase shift generator, i.e., the number operator. On the other hand, it sets a lower bound on the variance of an estimation, whereas the standard uncertainty relation does not concern optimality, but only variances obtained from measurements of observables (i.e., self-adjoint operators). In this sense, this relation is more general.

Now consider we have N identical copies of the same unknown state $\rho(\theta)$. In this case the collective state $\rho(\theta)^{\otimes N}$ is still a member of a one-parameter family, and it is straightforward to show that the QFI scales as N . If the same measurement is performed on all the copies, the classical Fisher information also scales as N , thus

$$\text{Var}_\theta[\hat{\theta}]_N \langle\Delta G\rangle_\theta^2 \geq \frac{1}{4N}.$$

An important issue is the attainability of these bounds. The Braunstein-Caves inequality is known to be saturable [20, 24], i.e., there exists a POVM which sets the equality in expression (3), (see sec. IV for details.) However, in the general case $\lambda(\theta)$ is not constant and the optimal POVM depends on the true value of θ . This suggests the need of an adaptive method, which in the large N limit attains the inequality by optimizing measurements from the information gathered so far. On the other hand, the Cramér-Rao bound is also known to be asymptotically saturable by means of the so-called *maximum likelihood estimator* (MLE). That is, for multiple measurements, the MLE estimator has a variance which approaches the inverse of the Fisher information, thus attaining equality also in expression (1). Therefore, in the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit one can rigorously write

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N \text{Var}_\theta[\hat{\theta}]_N = \frac{1}{4\langle\Delta G\rangle_\theta^2}$$

under MLE and optimal POVM measurements. Here the subscript N indicates that the variance is obtained from an N copy sample. This will be loosely written as

$$\text{Var}_\theta[\hat{\theta}] \sim \frac{1}{4\langle\Delta G\rangle_\theta^2}.$$

III. OPTIMAL GAUSSIAN STATE

Next we search for the optimal gaussian state which provides the highest sensitivity to phase measurements within our scheme, i.e., the one that maximizes its QFI. The state is obtained by applying a series of operations on the vacuum: (i) First a squeezing along a fixed direction, say Q , by $S(r) = \exp\left[\frac{r}{2}(a^2 - a^{\dagger 2})\right]$, (ii) then a displacement on the squeezed vacuum with $D(\alpha) = \exp(\alpha a^\dagger - \alpha^* a)$ along the Q axis, i.e., with real

α . (iii) Finally, we apply the unknown phase shift to be estimated, $U(\theta) = \exp(-i\theta a^\dagger a)$, which does not contribute to its final phase sensitivity. The final state is

$$|\phi_0\rangle = U(\theta)D(\alpha)S(r)|0\rangle \quad (7)$$

and has QFI

$$\begin{aligned} H(\theta) &= 4\langle \Delta a^\dagger a \rangle_\theta^2 \\ &= 4\left(|\alpha|^2 (\cosh r - \sinh r)^2 + 2\sinh^2 r \cosh^2 r\right) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Notice that H has no dependency on the phase. The energy of the state (7) is

$$\langle n \rangle_\theta = \langle a^\dagger a \rangle_\theta = |\alpha|^2 + \sinh^2 r$$

Now, we aim at maximizing H under the constrain of a fixed average number of photons. Using Lagrange multipliers one trivially finds that the most sensitive setting is $\alpha = 0$. As expected, all available energy is employed in squeezing. Therefore, the optimal gaussian state for phase sensitivity is a squeezed vacuum state, $|\phi_0\rangle = U(\theta)S(r)|0\rangle$, and has QFI

$$H = \cosh 4r - 1 = 8(\langle n \rangle^2 + \langle n \rangle).$$

Hence, optimal phase estimation has a phase variance that goes as

$$\text{Var}[\hat{\theta}] \sim \frac{1}{8(\langle n \rangle^2 + \langle n \rangle)} \quad (9)$$

IV. ASYMPTOTICALLY OPTIMAL MEASUREMENT

Take $\{E_x\}$ to be the POVM operators of the measurement to be performed. Following the derivation of the Braunstein-Caves inequality [20], one can check that the conditions on $\{E_x\}$ to be optimal are [24]

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im}[\text{tr}[\rho(\theta)E_x\lambda(\theta)]] &= 0, \\ \sqrt{\rho(\theta)}\lambda(\theta)\sqrt{E_x} &= K_x\sqrt{\rho(\theta)}\sqrt{E_x}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

for some constants K_x , for all x that have non-vanishing probabilities. Now, assuming the state to be pure $\rho^2 = \rho$ and the fact that any POVM can be decomposed into rank one operators $\sqrt{E_x} = m_x E_x$, one may write the second optimality condition as

$$\rho(\theta)\lambda(\theta)E_x = K_x\rho(\theta)E_x. \quad (11)$$

The rest of the POVM operators need not satisfy any conditions (further than those of a well defined POVM) since they are forbidden by definition. Finally, one can check that a sufficient condition to satisfy eqs. (10) and (11) is to have the POVM elements to be projectors onto

the eigenspaces of the SLD. Therefore there should be two POVM elements which are

$$E_\pm = \frac{1}{2\langle \psi|\psi \rangle} |\phi^\pm\rangle\langle \phi^\pm| \quad (12)$$

and a residual operator which is

$$E_0 = 1 - E_+ - E_-.$$

From hermiticity of λ it is straightforward to check that these measures are positive and, furthermore, they represent projective von Neuman measurements. This measurement is called *locally unbiased* [22] since it is known to give unbiased estimates when the true state has phase θ , and close to unbiased estimates when the true state has phase close to θ .

V. MAXIMUM LIKELIHOOD ESTIMATION

Now assume one has performed a series of non-optimal measurements on a vanishingly small number of copies, say \sqrt{N} , and has a rough guess $\hat{\theta}_0$ of the phase of $|\phi_0\rangle$. Let $\theta_0 = \theta - \delta\theta$ be the first estimation, where $\delta\theta$ represents its bias, which is assumed to be small, and let $|\hat{\phi}_0\rangle$ be the guessed state. Then one designs the optimal measurement assuming $\hat{\theta}_0$ to be the true phase, and measures accordingly the rest of the copies, $\bar{N} = N - \sqrt{N}$. Let us use $\{\hat{E}_x\}$ to denote the POVM of the actual measurement to be performed, based on the guess $\hat{\theta}_0$.

The true state is then

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\theta) &= \rho(\hat{\theta}_0) + \frac{1}{2}\left(\lambda(\hat{\theta}_0)\rho(\hat{\theta}_0) + \rho(\hat{\theta}_0)\lambda(\hat{\theta}_0)\right)\delta\theta + \\ &+ O(\delta\theta^2) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

The probabilities of obtaining outcomes $x = \pm$ are

$$p(\pm|\theta) = \text{tr}[\rho(\theta)\hat{E}_\pm] = \frac{1}{2} \pm \sqrt{\langle \hat{\psi}|\hat{\psi} \rangle}(\theta - \hat{\theta}_0) + O(\delta\theta^2)$$

with $|\hat{\psi}\rangle = (1 - |\hat{\phi}_0\rangle\langle \hat{\phi}_0|)G|\hat{\phi}_0\rangle$. After \bar{N} measurements, call N_\pm the amount of \pm outcomes, and compute the *loglikelihood* function for θ [27],

$$\log \mathcal{L}(\theta) = \log \left[\binom{\bar{N}}{N_+} p(+|\theta)^{N_+} p(-|\theta)^{N_-} \right] \quad (14)$$

Now maximize this function to obtain the maximum likelihood estimation,

$$\left. \frac{\partial \log \mathcal{L}(\theta)}{\partial \theta} \right|_{\hat{\theta}_{MLE}} = 0$$

which yields

$$\hat{\theta}_{MLE} = \hat{\theta}_0 + \frac{N_+ - N_-}{2\bar{N}\sqrt{\langle \hat{\psi}|\hat{\psi} \rangle}}.$$

One can easily check that the expectation value of this estimator is θ , and its variance is

$$\text{Var}_\theta[\hat{\theta}_{MLE}] = \frac{1}{4\langle\hat{\psi}|\hat{\psi}\rangle(N - \sqrt{N})} + O\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right)$$

where $\langle\hat{\psi}|\hat{\psi}\rangle = \langle\Delta a^\dagger a\rangle_{\hat{\phi}_0}^2$ is the number uncertainty of $|\hat{\phi}_0\rangle$. Since $|\hat{\phi}_0\rangle$ has the same number uncertainty as the real state $|\phi_0\rangle$, and assuming that the initial guess has a deviation $\delta\theta^2 \simeq N^{-1}$, one can check that

$$\text{Var}_\theta[\hat{\theta}_{MLE}] = \frac{1}{8(\langle n \rangle^2 + \langle n \rangle) N} + O\left(\frac{1}{N^{3/2}}\right).$$

hence, the optimal performance of (9) is asymptotically attained.

VI. OPTIMAL GAUSSIAN MEASUREMENTS

Now we face the problem of determining the optimal phase variance that can be attained by means of dyne measurements. These measurements consist on the simultaneous measurement of two conjugate variables, such as Q and P , or their phase generalizations X_α and $X_{\alpha+\pi/2}$. The simultaneous measurement is typically performed by splitting the signal state. This is usually done by means of a beam splitter. This introduces further noise in the detection process, since at least, vacuum fluctuations enter through the unused port of the beamsplitter, also called *auxiliary port*. However, by introducing some sort of squeezed vacuum in the unused port, one can reduce the noise in one quadrature, at the expense of increasing the noise in the corresponding conjugate quadrature. These measurements can be mathematically expressed as a covariant measurement [7, 8]

$$E(qp) = \frac{1}{2\pi} D(qp) \rho_0 D^\dagger(qp) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \rho_{qp} \quad (15)$$

where $(q, p) \equiv \chi$ are the outcomes of the measurement and represent coordinates in phase space, and ρ_0 represents the auxiliary state entering through the auxiliary port of the beamsplitter. From the covariance of the measurement, the latter can be taken to be a squeezed vacuum state [$\langle q \rangle = \langle p \rangle = 0$]. Now, one can relate the probability of obtaining outcome χ , $dP(\chi|\theta)$, with the fidelity [28] $\mathcal{F}(\rho_0, \rho(\theta)) = \text{tr} \sqrt{\rho(\theta)^{1/2} \rho_0 \rho(\theta)^{1/2}}$, as

$$dP(qp|\theta) = \text{tr}[\rho(\theta)E(qp)]dqdp = \frac{dqdp}{2\pi} \mathcal{F}(\rho_\chi, \rho(\theta)).$$

When ρ_0 is a Gaussian state the measurement is said to be Gaussian and the outcomes are Gaussian distributed. Moreover, when one of the two states is pure, this can be easily expressed in terms of the covariance matrices, $\mathcal{F}(\rho_\chi, \rho(\theta)) = 2\sqrt{\det M(\theta)} e^{-\chi^T M(\theta) \chi}$, [29], with $M(\theta) = (\gamma_0 + \gamma_\theta)^{-1}$. The covariance matrices of the input state

and the auxiliary state are

$$\gamma_\theta = \frac{1}{s^2} \begin{pmatrix} s^4 \cos^2 \theta + \sin^2 \theta & (s^4 - 1) \cos \theta \sin \theta \\ (s^4 - 1) \cos \theta \sin \theta & \cos^2 \theta + s^4 \sin^2 \theta \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\gamma_0 = \gamma_\theta [s \rightarrow t, \theta \rightarrow \theta']$$

where $s \equiv e^{-r}$ and θ (t and θ') are the squeezing parameter and phase of the input state (auxiliary state). Without loss of generality we can restrict s and t to be greater than 1, since s or t between 0 and 1 is equivalent to phase shifting the state over $\pi/2$ and changing s (t) into s^{-1} (t^{-1}). The probability density is then

$$P(\chi|\theta) = \frac{\sqrt{\det M(\theta)}}{\pi} \exp(-\chi^T M(\theta) \chi).$$

The Fisher information of such measurement is readily computed from (2),

$$F(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial \log \det M(\theta)}{\partial \theta} \right)^2 - \frac{\det \frac{\partial M(\theta)}{\partial \theta}}{\det M(\theta)}, \quad (16)$$

see the Appendix A for explicit expressions in terms of s , t , θ and θ' . It is easy to check that both $\det M(\theta)$ and $\det \frac{\partial M}{\partial \theta}$ depend only on $\cos 2(\theta' - \theta)$, which suggests to perform the change of variable $\varphi \equiv 2(\theta' - \theta)$. Also a slight change of notation will be introduced. From now on $F(\varphi)$ will refer to the Fisher information as a function depending on φ , whereas $F(\theta)$ denotes the dependency on the signal state's phase.

Now, imposing $\partial F(\varphi)/\partial \varphi = 0$ reveals three possible solutions, $\varphi = 0$ and $\varphi = \pm\varphi_0(s, t)$. The former is a maximum whenever the squeezing in the secondary port of the beamsplitter is weaker than a threshold,

$$1 < t < t_{critical}(s) \quad (17)$$

where $t_{critical}(s) = \frac{1}{2s} \sqrt{s^4 - 1 + \sqrt{s^8 + 14s^4 + 1}}$. In this case, the other solutions are non-physical, since the function φ_0 becomes complex. When $t > t_{critical}$ the trivial $\varphi = 0$ solution becomes a minimum and the solutions $\varphi = \pm\varphi_0(s, t)$ become real maxima.

Now, the Fisher information below the threshold [$1 < t < t_{critical}$] is maximal when $\varphi = 0$, which yields

$$F(\varphi = 0) = \frac{t^2(1 - s^4)^2}{s^2(s^2 + t^2)^2}$$

Considering t as a free parameter, the maximum is at the boundary $t = t_{critical}$, which provides a Fisher information

$$F|_{t=t_{critical}} = \frac{1 - 10s^4 + s^8 + \sqrt{1 + 14s^4 + s^8}(1 + s^4)}{9s^4}$$

On the other hand, over the threshold, [$t > t_{critical}$] the optimal angle becomes nonzero [$\varphi = \pm\varphi_0(s, t)$] and the Fisher information is

$$F(\varphi = \pm\varphi_0) = \frac{(1 - s^4)^2}{8s^4(s^2 + t^2)^2(1 + s^2t^2)^2} \times \quad (18)$$

$$\times [t^4(1 + s^8) + 4t^2(1 + t^4)s^2(1 + s^4) + s^4(4 + 6t^4 + 4t^8)]$$

which is maximum when $t \rightarrow \infty$. In such limit, the optimal angle becomes

$$\Phi(s) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_0(s, t) = \arccos\left(\frac{s^4 - 1}{s^4 + 1}\right)$$

and the Fisher information reads

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F(\pm\varphi_0(s, t)) = \frac{(1 - s^4)^2}{2s^4} = \cosh 4r - 1.$$

This is precisely the Heisenberg limit derived in Section II. This means that one can perform asymptotically optimal phase measurements with heterodyne measurements with an appropriate quantum state in the secondary port of the beamsplitter (*i.e.*, $\theta' = \theta + \Phi(s)/2$, $t \rightarrow \infty$), achieving a phase variance that goes as

$$\text{Var}[\hat{\theta}] \sim \frac{2s^4}{(1 - s^4)^2} = \frac{1}{8(\langle n \rangle^2 + \langle n \rangle)}.$$

The advantage of heterodyne measurements, apart from the fact that they can be readily realized in the laboratory, is the fact that they are gaussian distributed. This means that the variance of the estimation is exactly scaling with the number of samples, that is, $\text{Var}[\hat{\theta}]_{\bar{N}} = W/\bar{N}$ where W is independent of \bar{N} , and, again, \bar{N} is the number of copies measured after the first rough guess. This, together with the fact that MLE is known to asymptotically attain the Cramér-Rao bound (1), suggests that the bound is attained at every \bar{N} and not only asymptotically. However, the proportionality constant $W = F(\theta')^{-1}$ is still dependent on the relative phase of the state w.r.t. the auxiliary state in the secondary port,

i.e., the true φ . Thus, the dependency of $F(\varphi)$ on φ still makes this scheme an asymptotically optimal one, and not for low N values.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

We have seen that the Heisenberg limit is a valid inequality regardless of any phase operator. It is just a consequence of the Cramér-Rao and the Braunstein-Caves inequalities. We also have shown that asymptotical optimality can be attained by means of two-outcome POVMs. A design of a physical setup that implements these POVMs is an interesting problem to be solved. We have also provided the maximum likelihood estimator according to the outcomes of the measurement. Finally, we have shown that the Heisenberg limit can also be asymptotically attained by means of dyne measurements, and we have explicitly computed how this should be done.

Most of the schemes available so far attain the power law of the Heisenberg limit, however, the exact coefficient is usually not considered. An exception is the paper by Yurke *et al.* [30], which comes close to our bounds for large $\langle n \rangle$ [31]. However, our scheme is asymptotically optimal and beats, to the extent of our knowledge, any proposal available so far.

VIII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was developed at the Max-Planck Institut für Quantenoptik under the advice of Prof. I. Cirac. Fruitful discussions with him, Dr. M. Wolf and their Theory group at the MPQ are gratefully acknowledged.

APPENDIX A: FISHER INFORMATION FOR GAUSSIAN MEASUREMENTS

The explicit expression for the Fisher information of a Gaussian measurement, with signal state γ_θ and auxiliary state γ_0 is given by eq. (16), and reads

$$F(x) = \frac{2(1 - s^4)}{s^2} \frac{(1 + t^4) [t^2(1 + s^4) + s^2(1 + t^4)] - t^2(1 - s^4)(1 - t^4)x - s^2(1 - t^4)^2 x^2}{[4s^2 t^2 + (1 + t^4)(1 + s^2)] [1 - 2(1 - s^4)(1 - t^4)x] - (1 - s^4)^2 (1 - t^4)^2 x^2} \quad (\text{A1})$$

where $x = \cos 2(\theta - \theta')$. The nontrivial solutions to the maximization of this function are $\phi = \pm\phi_0(s, t)$ where

$$\phi_0(s, t) = \arccos\left(\frac{s^4 - 1}{t^4 - 1} \cdot \frac{t^2(1 + s^4)(1 + t^4) + 2s^2(1 + t^8)}{t^2(1 + 6s^2 + s^8) + 2s^2(1 + s^4)(1 + t^4)}\right) \quad (\text{A2})$$

- [1] D. Berry, *Adaptive phase measurements* (2002), PhD Dissertation.
 [2] D. Berry, H. Wiseman, and J. Breslin, *Physical Review A* **63**, 053804 (2001).
 [3] S. Braunstein, *Physical Review Letters* **69**, 3598 (1992).

- [4] M. Freyberger and W. Schleich, *Physical Review A* **49**, 5056 (1994).
 [5] C. Helstrom, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **IT-14** (1968).
 [6] C. Helstrom, *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory*

- (Academic Press, New York, 1976).
- [7] A. Holevo, *Covariant measurements and imprimitivity systems* (Lect. Notes Math. **1055**, 153, 1984).
 - [8] H. Holevo, *Probabilistic and statistical aspects of quantum theory* (North-Holland Publishing Company, 1982).
 - [9] D. Pegg and S. Barnett, *Physical Review A* **39**, 1665 (1989).
 - [10] B. Sanders and G. Milburn, *Physical Review Letters* **75**, 2944 (1995).
 - [11] W. Schelich and S. Barnett, *Quantum Phase and Phase Dependent Measurements*, vol. T48 (Special Issue of Phys. Scr., 1993).
 - [12] J. Shapiro and S. Shepard, *Physical Review A* **43**, 3795 (1991).
 - [13] J. Shapiro, S. Shepard, and N. Wong, *Physical Review Letters* **62**, 2377 (1989).
 - [14] D. Smithey, M. Beck, J. Cooper, and M. Raymer, *Physical Review A* **48**, 3159 (1993).
 - [15] L. Susskind and J. Glogower, *Physics* **1** (1964).
 - [16] H. Wiseman and R. Killip, *Physical Review A* **57**, 2169 (1998).
 - [17] H. Yuen and M. Lax, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **IT-19** (1973).
 - [18] Z. Y. Ou, *Physical Review A* **55**, 2598 (1997).
 - [19] S. Braunstein, C. Caves, and G. Milburn, *Annals of Physics* (San Diego) **247**, 135 (1996).
 - [20] S. L. Braunstein and C. M. Caves, *Physical Review Letters* **72**, 3439 (1994).
 - [21] R. Gill and S. Massar, *Physical Review A* **61**, 042312 (2000).
 - [22] M. Hayashi and K. Matsumoto, quant-ph/0308150 (2003), english translation of the manuscript which appeared in Surikaiseki Kenkyusho Kokyuroku No. 1055 (1998).
 - [23] K. Matsumoto, *Journal Physics A* **35**, 3111 (2002).
 - [24] O. Barndorff-Nielsen and R. Gill, *J. Phys. A:Math. Gen.* (2000).
 - [25] G. D'Ariano, M. Paris, and M. Sacchi, *Physical Review A* **62**, 023815 (2000).
 - [26] R. Gill, math.ST/0405571 (2004).
 - [27] H. Cramér, *Mathematical Methods of Statistics* (Princeton University Press, 1946).
 - [28] A. Uhlmann, *Reports on Mathematical Physics* **9**, 273 (1976).
 - [29] M. Wolf (2005), private communication.
 - [30] B. Yurke, S. L. McCall, and J. R. Klauder, *Physical Review A* **33**, 4033 (1986).
 - [31] See eq. (10.39) in ref. [30].