

RLD Fisher Information Bound for Multiparameter Estimation of Quantum Channels

Vishal Katariya¹ and Mark M. Wilde^{1,2}

¹*Hearne Institute for Theoretical Physics, Department of Physics and Astronomy,
and Center for Computation and Technology, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803, USA*

²*Stanford Institute for Theoretical Physics, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305, USA*

(Dated: September 18, 2022)

One of the fundamental tasks in quantum metrology is to estimate multiple parameters embedded in a noisy process, i.e., a quantum channel. In this paper, we study fundamental limits to quantum channel estimation via the concept of amortization and the right logarithmic derivative (RLD) Fisher information value. Our key technical result is the proof of a chain-rule inequality for the RLD Fisher information value, which implies that amortization, i.e., access to a catalyst state family, does not increase the RLD Fisher information value of quantum channels. This technical result leads to a fundamental limitation for multiparameter channel estimation in the sequential setting, in terms of the RLD Fisher information value. As a consequence, we conclude that if the RLD Fisher information value is finite, then Heisenberg scaling is unattainable in the multiparameter setting.

Introduction—Parameter estimation is an information-processing task in which quantum technologies can provide an improvement in performance over the best known classical technologies. On one hand, classical parameter estimation is limited by the shot-noise limit. On the other hand, quantum parameter estimation can offer a superclassical “Heisenberg” scaling in estimation error, in principle [1]. Heisenberg scaling refers to the mean-squared error of an estimator scaling as $1/n^2$, whereas the shot-noise limit means that the error scales no better than $1/n$. Here, n refers either to the number of channel uses or to the total probing time allowed in the estimation task. One of the fundamental questions in quantum estimation theory is to identify estimation tasks for which Heisenberg scaling is possible.

One of the most important mathematical tools in estimation theory, both classical and quantum, is the Cramér–Rao bound (CRB) [2–4]. It is used to place lower bounds on the mean squared error of estimators and involves an information quantity known as the Fisher information. The latter captures the amount of information carried by a distribution or a quantum channel regarding the unknown parameter(s). There are an infinite number of quantum generalizations of the classical Fisher information, due to the noncommutativity of quantum states.

In this paper, we focus on one quantum generalization of the Fisher information, known as the right logarithmic derivative (RLD) Fisher information [5], and we study its properties and application in quantum channel estimation. In particular, we prove that the RLD Fisher information of quantum channels is a single-letter multiparameter Cramér–Rao bound for all quantum channels, in the most general setting of channel estimation depicted in Figure 1. “Single-letter” here is a term from information theory, meaning that the RLD Fisher information is evaluated with respect to a single copy of the channel only (see (26) for a precise statement of our result). We approach this problem by introducing the amortized RLD Fisher information value, which quantifies the net increase in RLD Fisher information that one obtains by sampling from a quantum channel. We prove a chain-

rule property for the RLD Fisher information value of a quantum channel, and we then use this to conclude our single-letter multiparameter Cramér–Rao bound. This bound implies that Heisenberg scaling is unattainable for channel estimation in the multiparameter setting, whenever the RLD Fisher information value is finite. Finally, we apply our bound to a concrete example of physical interest: estimating the parameters of a generalized amplitude damping channel.

Parameter Estimation—The goal of classical parameter estimation is to obtain an estimate $\hat{\theta}$ of an unknown real parameter θ embedded in a probability distribution $p_\theta(x)$, corresponding to a random variable X , where we have suppressed the dependence of X on θ in our notation. The goal is to guess the value of θ from a realization x of the random variable X , and the estimate $\hat{\theta}(X)$ is itself a random variable, being a function of X . It is common to assume unbiased estimators, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}(X)] = \theta$. The unbiasedness condition means that the estimator is accurate and has no systematic error. Hence we focus on studying the precision of unbiased estimators.

A natural metric to benchmark the performance of an estimator is the mean-squared error $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\theta}(X) - \theta)^2]$, abbreviated as MSE. For an unbiased estimator, the MSE is equal to the variance $\text{Var}(\hat{\theta}(X))$. The Cramér–Rao bound (CRB) places a lower bound on the variance of an unbiased estimator [2–4]:

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\theta}(X)) \geq \frac{1}{I_F(\theta; \{p_\theta\}_\theta)}, \quad (1)$$

where $I_F(\theta; \{p_\theta\}_\theta)$ is the classical Fisher information, defined as

$$I_F(\theta; \{p_\theta\}_\theta) := \mathbb{E}[(\partial_\theta \ln p_\theta(X))^2]. \quad (2)$$

If one has n independent samples x^n described by the random sequence $X^n \equiv X_1, \dots, X_n$, then the corresponding CRB is

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\theta}(X^n)) \geq \frac{1}{n I_F(\theta; \{p_\theta\}_\theta)}. \quad (3)$$




FIG. 1. Processing n uses of channel \mathcal{N}^θ in a sequential or adaptive manner is the most general approach to channel parameter estimation. The n uses of the channel are interleaved with n quantum channels \mathcal{S}^1 through \mathcal{S}^{n-1} , which can also share memory systems with each other. The final measurement's outcome is then used to obtain an estimate of the unknown parameter vector θ .

Estimation theory has been generalized to quantum systems, where quantum probes and quantum measurements are allowed (see, e.g., [6, 7] for recent reviews). We then have an infinite number of logarithmic derivative operators that each reduce to the logarithmic derivative $\partial_\theta \ln p_\theta(x)$ in the classical case in (2). For single-parameter estimation, the right logarithmic derivative (RLD) operator is defined implicitly via the differential equation $\partial_\theta \rho_\theta = \rho_\theta R_\theta$, where $\{\rho_\theta\}_\theta$ is a differentiable family of quantum states. The RLD Fisher information will be formally defined in the next section.

Consider the task of estimating a real parameter θ encoded in a quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta$ (see [8–23] for extensive literature on this problem). The most general setting for this problem, given n uses of the channel, consists of performing the estimation via a sequential strategy [1, 17, 24, 25] as depicted in Figure 1. Assuming an unbiased estimator, the following quantum Cramér–Rao bound (QCRB) holds in this general setting of channel estimation [26]:

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\theta}) \geq \frac{1}{n \hat{I}_F(\theta; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta)}, \quad (4)$$

where $\hat{I}_F(\theta; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta)$ is the RLD Fisher information for the parameter θ encoded in the channel family $\{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta$ [14], and we define it formally later in (9). The result in (4) is presented in our companion paper [26] and is a special case of the more general result reported here in (26). A restricted subset of the most general sequential strategies consist of parallel strategies, where the n uses of the channel are made simultaneously using an entangled probe state.

The task of simultaneously estimating multiple parameters is a much more involved task than estimating a single parameter; however, Cramér–Rao bounds can still be constructed. This problem, too, has an extensive literature and a number of important recent results [5, 27–41]. See [42, 43] for recent reviews on multiparameter estimation. In the quantum case, an additional complication is that the optimal measurements for each parameter may not be compatible. Consider that D parameters need to be estimated and are encoded in a vector $\theta := [\theta_1 \ \theta_2 \ \cdots \ \theta_D]^T$. For a differentiable family $\{\rho_\theta\}_\theta$ of quantum states, one defines D RLD operators using the differential equations $\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_\theta = \rho_\theta R_{\theta_j}$ for $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, D\}$. The RLD Fisher information, instead

of being a scalar, takes the form of a $D \times D$ matrix with elements $\hat{I}_F(\theta; \{\rho_\theta\}_\theta)_{j,k} := \text{Tr}[R_{\theta_j}^\dagger \rho_\theta R_{\theta_k}]$. This leads to the following matrix Cramér–Rao bound [44, 45]:

$$\text{Cov}(\theta) \geq \hat{I}_F(\theta; \{\rho_\theta\}_\theta)^{-1}. \quad (5)$$

$\text{Cov}(\theta)$ is a covariance matrix with matrix elements defined as

$$[\text{Cov}(\theta)]_{j,k} = \sum_l \text{Tr}[M_l \rho_\theta] (\hat{\theta}_j(l) - \theta_j) (\hat{\theta}_k(l) - \theta_k), \quad (6)$$

where $M_l \geq 0$ are measurement operators satisfying $\sum_l M_l = \mathbb{I}$, and $\hat{\theta}(l) := [\hat{\theta}_1(l) \ \hat{\theta}_2(l) \ \cdots \ \hat{\theta}_D(l)]^T$ is a function that maps the measurement result l to an estimate of the parameters θ .

Right Logarithmic Derivative—The right logarithmic derivative (RLD) operator leads to one quantum generalization of the classical logarithmic derivative [5]. We begin by defining it for the case of single parameter estimation. Consider a single unknown parameter θ embedded in a quantum state ρ_θ . The RLD Fisher information of the family $\{\rho_\theta\}_\theta$ of states is defined as

$$\hat{I}_F(\theta; \{\rho_\theta\}_\theta) = \text{Tr}[(\partial_\theta \rho_\theta)^2 \rho_\theta^{-1}], \quad (7)$$

if $\text{supp}(\partial_\theta \rho_\theta) \subseteq \text{supp}(\rho_\theta)$, and it is set to $+\infty$ otherwise. The inverse ρ_θ^{-1} is taken on the support of ρ_θ . The RLD Fisher information is the largest noncommutative Fisher information [5, 46]. In some sense, it can also be considered as the most classical of them.

Alternatively, if the support condition $\text{supp}(\partial_\theta \rho_\theta) \subseteq \text{supp}(\rho_\theta)$ is satisfied, then the RLD Fisher information can also be defined using the RLD operator R_θ as follows: $\hat{I}_F(\theta; \{\rho_\theta\}_\theta) = \text{Tr}[\rho_\theta R_\theta^2]$. Recall that R_θ is implicitly defined by the differential equation $\partial_\theta \rho_\theta = \rho_\theta R_\theta$.

If, instead of a state family $\{\rho_\theta\}_\theta$, we have a differentiable channel family $\{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta$, then the RLD Fisher information of this channel family is defined as

$$\hat{I}_F(\theta; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta) := \sup_{\rho_{RA}} \hat{I}_F(\theta; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta(\rho_{RA})\}_\theta) \quad (8)$$

$$= \left\| \text{Tr}_B[(\partial_\theta \Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})(\Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})^{-1}(\partial_\theta \Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})] \right\|_\infty, \quad (9)$$

if $\text{supp}(\partial_\theta \Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta}) \subseteq \text{supp}(\Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})$, and it is equal to $+\infty$ otherwise, where

$$\Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta} := \sum_{i,j} |i\rangle\langle j|_R \otimes \mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta(|i\rangle\langle j|_A) \quad (10)$$

is the Choi operator of the channel $\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta$. The optimization in (8) is with respect to all bipartite input states ρ_{RA} that have no dependence on the parameter θ , and the equality in (9) was established in [14]. Note that the optimal value in (8) is achieved by a pure bipartite state with system R isomorphic to system A . The RLD Fisher information of a channel family $\hat{I}_F(\theta; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta)$ is efficiently computable via a semidefinite program [26].

The RLD Fisher information of isometric or unitary channels is an uninteresting information measure. This is because a differentiable family $\{\mathcal{U}_\theta\}_\theta$ of isometric or unitary channels induces a differentiable family of pure states. The RLD Fisher information in this case is either infinite or zero, neither of which lead to a useful CRB.

In multiparameter estimation, we have a differentiable family $\{\rho_\theta\}_\theta$ of quantum states, and the RLD Fisher information matrix is given by

$$\hat{I}_F(\theta; \{\rho_\theta\}_\theta) := \sum_{j,k=1}^D \text{Tr}[(\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_\theta) \rho_\theta^{-1} (\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_\theta)] |j\rangle\langle k| \quad (11)$$

if $(\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_\theta)(\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_\theta) \Pi_{\rho_\theta}^\perp = 0$ for all $j, k \in \{1, \dots, D\}$, where $\Pi_{\rho_\theta}^\perp$ is the projection onto the kernel of ρ_θ , and otherwise, it is undefined (i.e., has some entries equal to $+\infty$). We provide more details of the multiparameter RLD Fisher information matrix of state families in Appendix A.

As stated in the previous section, the RLD Fisher information matrix is featured in the matrix quantum Cramer–Rao inequality in (5). To obtain scalar Cramer–Rao bounds from this matrix inequality, we define a $D \times D$ positive semidefinite, unit trace weight matrix W (also known as the risk matrix). Then we obtain the RLD Fisher information value, a scalar defined as

$$\hat{I}_F(\theta, W; \{\rho_\theta\}_\theta) := \text{Tr}[W \hat{I}_F(\theta; \{\rho_\theta\}_\theta)] \quad (12)$$

if $\sum_{j,k=1}^D \langle k|W|j\rangle (\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_\theta)(\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_\theta) \Pi_{\rho_\theta}^\perp = 0$ and $+\infty$ otherwise. By a generalization of [26, Proposition 23], this quantity can be calculated by means of a semi-definite program. Using a weight matrix W satisfying $\text{Tr}[W] = 1$, we obtain the following scalar Cramer–Rao bound:

$$\text{Tr}[W \text{Cov}(\theta)] \geq \frac{1}{n \hat{I}_F(\theta, W; \{\rho_\theta\}_\theta)}, \quad (13)$$

where n is the number of copies of ρ_θ available. We provide further details and a proof of this bound in Appendix B.

For a differentiable channel family $\{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta$ and a weight matrix W , the RLD Fisher information value is as follows:

$$\hat{I}_F(\theta, W; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta) = \left\| \sum_{j,k=1}^D \langle k|W|j\rangle \text{Tr}_B[(\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{RB}^\theta)(\Gamma_{RB}^\theta)^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{RB}^\theta)] \right\|_\infty \quad (14)$$

if

$$\sum_{j,k=1}^D \langle k|W|j\rangle (\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{RB}^\theta)(\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{RB}^\theta) \Pi_{\Gamma_{RB}^\theta}^\perp = 0 \quad (15)$$

and it is equal to $+\infty$ otherwise, where Γ_{RB}^θ is the Choi operator of the channel $\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta$. By a generalization of [26, Proposition 25], this quantity can be calculated by means of a semi-definite program.

Amortized Fisher Information—Amortized channel divergences were defined in [47] to provide a mathematical framework for studying the power of sequential strategies over parallel ones in quantum channel discrimination. With the view of performing a similar comparison for quantum channel estimation, we define the amortized Fisher information for quantum channel families [26]. For the channel family $\{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta$, the amortized RLD Fisher information is defined as

$$\hat{I}_F^A(\theta; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta) := \sup_{\{\rho_{RA}^\theta\}_\theta} \left[\hat{I}_F(\theta; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta(\rho_{RA}^\theta)\}_\theta) - \hat{I}_F(\theta; \{\rho_{RA}^\theta\}_\theta) \right]. \quad (16)$$

For the case of multiparameter estimation, we define the amortized RLD Fisher information value as follows:

$$\hat{I}_F^A(\theta, W; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta) := \sup_{\{\rho_{RA}^\theta\}_\theta} \left[\hat{I}_F(\theta, W; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta(\rho_{RA}^\theta)\}_\theta) - \hat{I}_F(\theta, W; \{\rho_{RA}^\theta\}_\theta) \right]. \quad (17)$$

The framework of amortized Fisher information can be applied more generally beyond RLD Fisher information, as discussed in our companion paper [26], and it is helpful in clarifying the power of sequential strategies when estimating a parameter encoded in a quantum channel. In the sequential strategies described in Figure 1, one can qualitatively say that the goal is to “accumulate” as much information about θ into the state being carried forward from one channel use to another. The amortized Fisher information captures the marginal increase in Fisher information per channel use in such a scenario.

A basic inequality obeyed by the amortized RLD Fisher information, as a direct consequence of definitions in (8) and (16), is that

$$\hat{I}_F^A(\theta; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta) \geq \hat{I}_F(\theta; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta). \quad (18)$$

This can be easily understood by considering the right-hand side to arise from restricting to input states with no parameter dependence. It also holds for the multiparameter case:

$$\hat{I}_F^A(\theta, W; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta) \geq \hat{I}_F(\theta, W; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta). \quad (19)$$

For the RLD Fisher information of quantum channels, we actually have something much stronger, what is called an “amortization collapse,” i.e.,

$$\hat{I}_F^A(\theta; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta) = \hat{I}_F(\theta; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta), \quad (20)$$

$$\hat{I}_F^A(\theta, W; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta) = \hat{I}_F(\theta, W; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta). \quad (21)$$

The meaning of an amortization collapse is that the RLD Fisher information cannot be increased by using a catalyst. That is, a catalyst state family $\{\rho_{RA}^\theta\}_\theta$ at the channel input does not increase the RLD Fisher information $\hat{I}_F(\theta, W; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta)$ by any more than its own RLD Fisher information $\hat{I}_F(\theta, W; \{\rho_{RA}^\theta\}_\theta)$. Continuing the earlier discussion of amortized Fisher information capturing marginal increment in resource, the amortization collapse in (20)–(21) means that the RLD Fisher information gained during each of the n sequential uses of the channel $\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta$ is the same. To establish the amortization collapse for the RLD Fisher information, we prove a chain-rule inequality, as discussed below.

Chain Rule—Let $\{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta$ be a differentiable family of quantum channels, and let $\{\rho_{RA}^\theta\}_\theta$ be a differentiable family of quantum states on systems RA , where the system R can be of arbitrary size. Then the following chain rule holds [26]

$$\hat{I}_F(\theta; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta(\rho_{RA}^\theta)\}_\theta) \leq \hat{I}_F(\theta; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta) + \hat{I}_F(\theta; \{\rho_{RA}^\theta\}_\theta). \quad (22)$$

This can be generalized to the case of estimating multiple parameters. With W a weight matrix as defined above, let $\{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta$ be a differentiable family of quantum channels, and let $\{\rho_{RA}^\theta\}_\theta$ be a differentiable family of quantum states. Then the following chain-rule inequality holds

$$\hat{I}_F(\theta, W; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta(\rho_{RA}^\theta)\}_\theta) \leq \hat{I}_F(\theta, W; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta) + \hat{I}_F(\theta, W; \{\rho_{RA}^\theta\}_\theta), \quad (23)$$

as proved in Appendix C.

We now show how the chain rule results in an amortization collapse for the mathematically simpler case of a single parameter. The chain rule in (22) can be rewritten as

$$\hat{I}_F(\theta; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta(\rho_{RA}^\theta)\}_\theta) - \hat{I}_F(\theta; \{\rho_{RA}^\theta\}_\theta) \leq \hat{I}_F(\theta; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta). \quad (24)$$

Taking the supremum over input state families on the left-hand side gives $\hat{I}_F^A(\theta; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta) \leq \hat{I}_F(\theta; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta)$. When the above is combined with (18), we obtain the desired amortization collapse in (20).

The same reasoning can be repeated for the case of estimating multiple parameters. That is, the chain rule for the multiparameter RLD Fisher information (23) leads to the amortization collapse in (21). The amortization collapse for the RLD Fisher information implies that the n -sequential-use RLD Fisher information is simply n times the single-use RLD Fisher information.

Single-letter quantum Cramer–Rao Bounds—Using the chain rule, the ensuing amortization collapse for the RLD Fisher information, and Theorem 18 of [26], we




FIG. 2. Logarithm of RLD and SLD Fisher information values versus loss γ for noise $N = 0.2$. Both lines indicate lower bounds on the quantity $\text{Tr}[W \text{Cov}(\{\gamma, N\})]$ where $W = \frac{1}{4} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ (as discussed in the main text, the SLD Fisher information value is a lower bound up to a constant prefactor). For the SLD quantity, we optimize over input states of the form $\sqrt{p}|00\rangle + \sqrt{1-p}|11\rangle$.

obtain the following single-letter Cramer–Rao bound for unbiased estimators. In the case of estimating a single parameter θ , we have [26]

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\theta}) \geq \frac{1}{n \hat{I}_F(\theta; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta)}. \quad (25)$$

For the multiparameter case, with differentiable channel family $\{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta$ and a weight matrix W , we use the chain rule, ensuing amortization collapse, as well as Theorem 4 (stated and proved in Appendix D), to obtain the following multiparameter Cramer–Rao bound:

$$\text{Tr}[W \text{Cov}(\theta)] \geq \frac{1}{n \hat{I}_F(\theta, W; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta)}. \quad (26)$$

The bounds in (25) and (26) have an important implication: if the RLD Fisher information is finite, then Heisenberg scaling is impossible. That is, if $\text{supp}(\partial_\theta \Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta}) \subseteq \text{supp}(\Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})$ for the single-parameter case or if (15) holds for the multiparameter case, then any estimator is limited by the shot-noise limit. A simple corollary of this is that for any full-rank quantum channel family, Heisenberg scaling is unattainable. This complements results on this problem from other works [12–14, 19, 20, 48].

Evaluating bounds for Generalized Amplitude Damping Channel—Here, we apply the Cramer–Rao bounds derived in (25) and (26) to the task of estimating the parameters of a generalized amplitude damping channel [49], a qubit-to-qubit channel that is used to model noise in, e.g., superconducting quantum circuits. A generalized amplitude damping channel (GADC) is defined in

terms of its loss parameter $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and noise parameter $N \in (0, 1)$.

The Choi operator of a GADC $\mathcal{A}_{\gamma,N}$ with loss parameter γ and noise parameter N is given by

$$\Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma,N}} := \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \gamma N & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{1 - \gamma} \\ 0 & \gamma N & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \gamma(1 - N) & 0 \\ \sqrt{1 - \gamma} & 0 & 0 & 1 - \gamma(1 - N) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (27)$$

Consider that we wish to estimate both parameters γ and N simultaneously. Let us choose $W = \frac{1}{4} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. To compute the RLD bound in (26), we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{I}_F(\{\gamma, N\}, W; \{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma,N}\}_{\gamma,N}) = \\ & \frac{1}{4} \left\| \text{Tr}_B[(\partial_\gamma \Gamma^{\mathcal{A}})(\Gamma^{\mathcal{A}})^{-1}(\partial_\gamma \Gamma^{\mathcal{A}}) + (\partial_\gamma \Gamma^{\mathcal{A}})(\Gamma^{\mathcal{A}})^{-1}(\partial_N \Gamma^{\mathcal{A}}) \right. \\ & \left. + (\partial_N \Gamma^{\mathcal{A}})(\Gamma^{\mathcal{A}})^{-1}(\partial_\gamma \Gamma^{\mathcal{A}}) + 3(\partial_N \Gamma^{\mathcal{A}})(\Gamma^{\mathcal{A}})^{-1}(\partial_N \Gamma^{\mathcal{A}})] \right\|_\infty. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where \mathcal{A} is used as shorthand for $\mathcal{A}_{\gamma,N}$. As a consequence of (26), the inverse of (28) is a lower bound on $\text{Tr}[W \text{Cov}(\{\gamma, N\})]$.

We compare the RLD Fisher information bound to the generalized Helstrom Cramer–Rao bound [38], which in this case reduces to the SLD Fisher information bound. This lower bound can be achieved asymptotically up to a constant prefactor [37, 50–53].

To calculate the SLD Fisher information, we choose input probe state $|\psi(p)\rangle := \sqrt{p}|00\rangle + \sqrt{1-p}|11\rangle$, with W chosen as above. It suffices to optimize over such states due to the σ_Z covariance of the channel $\mathcal{A}_{\gamma,N}$. We optimize over parameter p to obtain the SLD Fisher information bound (to be clear, we minimize

$$\text{Tr}[W[I_F(\{\gamma, N\}; \{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma,N}(\psi(p))\})_{\{\gamma,N\}}^{-1}]] \quad (29)$$

with respect to p). We compare the two bounds in Figure 2, where we keep N fixed and vary γ from 0 to 1. Figure 2 demonstrates that the RLD lower bound is within one to two orders of magnitude of the SLD Fisher information. Full details of this calculation can be found in Appendix E.

Conclusion—In this paper, we provided a single-letter Cramer–Rao bound for the task of multiparameter estimation. We did so by introducing the amortized RLD Fisher information and proving an amortization collapse for it. The single-letter Cramer–Rao bound also leads to a simple yet rigorous no-go condition for Heisenberg scaling in quantum multiparameter estimation. Finally, we evaluated our bound when estimating the two parameters of a generalized amplitude damping channel.

Lately, multiparameter estimation has been a fruitful area of study in quantum information theory. We believe that our results both complement and extend the current body of work, and therefore will have metrological applications both theoretically and experimentally.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge Pieter Kok, Jasminder Sidhu, and Sisi Zhou for helpful discussions. VK acknowledges support from the LSU Economic Development Assistantship. VK and MMW acknowledge support from the US National Science Foundation via grant number 1907615. MMW acknowledges support from Stanford QFARM and AFOSR (FA9550-19-1-0369). This paper is dedicated to the memory of Jonathan P. Dowling. Jon’s impact on quantum metrology was far-reaching, and he played a role in inspiring this project.

-
- [1] Vittorio Giovannetti, Seth Lloyd, and Lorenzo Maccone. Quantum metrology. *Physical Review Letters*, 96(1):010401, January 2006. arXiv:quant-ph/0509179.
 - [2] Harald Cramér. *Mathematical Methods of Statistics*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, USA, 1946.
 - [3] Calyampudi Radakrishna Rao. Information and the accuracy attainable in the estimation of statistical parameters. *Bulletin of the Calcutta Mathematical Society*, 37:81–89, 1945.
 - [4] Steven M. Kay. *Fundamentals of Statistical Signal Processing, Volume I: Estimation Theory*. Prentice Hall, 1993.
 - [5] Horace Yuen and Melvin Lax. Multiple-parameter quantum estimation and measurement of nonselfadjoint observables. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 19(6):740–750, November 1973.
 - [6] Jasminder S. Sidhu and Pieter Kok. A geometric perspective on quantum parameter estimation. *AVS Quantum Science*, 2(1):014701, February 2020. arXiv:1907.06628.
 - [7] Jonathan P. Dowling and Kaushik P. Seshadreesan. Quantum optical technologies for metrology, sensing and imaging. *Journal of Lightwave Technology*, 33(12):2359–2370, June 2015. arXiv:1412.7578.
 - [8] Masahide Sasaki, Masashi Ban, and Stephen M. Barnett. Optimal parameter estimation of a depolarizing channel. *Physical Review A*, 66(2):022308, August 2002. arXiv:quant-ph/0203113.
 - [9] Akio Fujiwara and Hiroshi Imai. Quantum parameter estimation of a generalized Pauli channel. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 36(29):8093–8103, July 2003.
 - [10] Akio Fujiwara. Estimation of a generalized amplitude-damping channel. *Physical Review A*, 70(1):012317, July 2004.
 - [11] Zhengfeng Ji, Guoming Wang, Runyao Duan, Yuan Feng, and Mingsheng Ying. Parameter estimation of quantum channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 54(11):5172–5185, November 2008. arXiv:quant-

- ph/0610060.
- [12] Akio Fujiwara and Hiroshi Imai. A fibre bundle over manifolds of quantum channels and its application to quantum statistics. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 41(25):255304, June 2008.
 - [13] Keiji Matsumoto. On metric of quantum channel spaces. June 2010. arXiv:1006.0300.
 - [14] Masahito Hayashi. Comparison between the Cramer-Rao and the mini-max approaches in quantum channel estimation. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 304(3):689–709, June 2011. arXiv:1003.4575.
 - [15] Rafal Demkowicz-Dobrzanski, Jan Kolodyński, and Madalin Guta. The elusive Heisenberg limit in quantum enhanced metrology. *Nature Communications*, 3(1):1063, January 2012. arXiv:1201.3940.
 - [16] Jan Kolodyński and Rafal Demkowicz-Dobrzański. Efficient tools for quantum metrology with uncorrelated noise. *New Journal of Physics*, 15(7):073043, July 2013. arXiv:1303.7271.
 - [17] Rafal Demkowicz-Dobrzanski and Lorenzo Maccone. Using entanglement against noise in quantum metrology. *Physical Review Letters*, 113(25):250801, December 2014. arXiv:1407.2934.
 - [18] Pavel Sekatski, Michalis Skotiniotis, Janek Kolodyński, and Wolfgang Dür. Quantum metrology with full and fast quantum control. *Quantum*, 1:27, September 2017. arXiv:1603.08944.
 - [19] Rafal Demkowicz-Dobrzanski, Jan Czajkowski, and Pavel Sekatski. Adaptive quantum metrology under general Markovian noise. *Physical Review X*, 7(4):041009, October 2017. arXiv:1704.06280.
 - [20] Sisi Zhou, Mengzhen Zhang, John Preskill, and Liang Jiang. Achieving the Heisenberg limit in quantum metrology using quantum error correction. *Nature Communications*, 9(1):78, December 2018. arXiv:1706.02445.
 - [21] Sisi Zhou and Liang Jiang. Optimal approximate quantum error correction for quantum metrology. *Physical Review Research*, 2(1):013235, March 2020. arXiv:1910.08472.
 - [22] Sisi Zhou and Liang Jiang. An exact correspondence between the quantum Fisher information and the Bures metric. October 2019. arXiv:1910.08473.
 - [23] Yuxiang Yang, Giulio Chiribella, and Masahito Hayashi. Communication cost of quantum channels. February 2020. arXiv:2002.06840.
 - [24] Wim van Dam, Giacomo Mauro D’Ariano, Artur Ekert, Chiara Macchiavello, and Michele Mosca. Optimal quantum circuits for general phase estimation. *Physical Review Letters*, 98(9):090501, March 2007. arXiv:quant-ph/0609160.
 - [25] Haidong Yuan and Chi-Hang Fred Fung. Fidelity and Fisher information on quantum channels. *New Journal of Physics*, 19(11):113039, November 2017. arXiv:1506.00819.
 - [26] Vishal Katariya and Mark M. Wilde. Geometric distinguishability measures limit quantum channel estimation and discrimination. April 2020. arXiv:2004.10708.
 - [27] Carl W. Helstrom. Minimum mean-squared error of estimates in quantum statistics. *Physics Letters A*, 25(2):101–102, July 1967.
 - [28] Alexander S. Holevo. An analogue of statistical decision theory and noncommutative probability theory. *Trudy Moskovskogo Matematicheskogo Obshchestva*, 26:133–149, 1972.
 - [29] Viacheslav P. Belavkin. Generalized uncertainty relations and efficient measurements in quantum systems. *Theoretical and Mathematical Physics*, 26(3):213–222, March 1976.
 - [30] Emilio Bagan, M. A. Ballester, Richard D. Gill, Alex Monras, and Ramon Muñoz-Tapia. Optimal full estimation of qubit mixed states. *Physical Review A*, 73(3):032301, March 2006. arXiv:quant-ph/0510158.
 - [31] Alex Monras and Fabrizio Illuminati. Measurement of damping and temperature: Precision bounds in Gaussian dissipative channels. *Physical Review A*, 83(1):012315, January 2011. arXiv:1010.0442.
 - [32] Peter C. Humphreys, Marco Barbieri, Animesh Datta, and Ian A. Walmsley. Quantum enhanced multiple phase estimation. *Physical Review Letters*, 111(7):070403, August 2013. arXiv:1307.7653.
 - [33] Jie-Dong Yue, Yu-Ran Zhang, and Heng Fan. Quantum-enhanced metrology for multiple phase estimation with noise. *Scientific Reports*, 4(1):5933, May 2015. arXiv:1310.4959.
 - [34] Sammy Ragy, Marcin Jarzyna, and Rafal Demkowicz-Dobrzanski. Compatibility in multiparameter quantum metrology. *Physical Review A*, 94(5):052108, November 2016. arXiv:1608.02634.
 - [35] Jasmininder S. Sidhu, Yingkai Ouyang, Earl T. Campbell, and Pieter Kok. Tight bounds on the simultaneous estimation of incompatible parameters. December 2019. arXiv:1912.09218.
 - [36] Francesco Albarelli, Jamie F. Friel, and Animesh Datta. Evaluating the Holevo Cramer–Rao bound for multi-parameter quantum metrology. June 2019. arXiv:1906.05724.
 - [37] Mankei Tsang. The Holevo Cramer–Rao bound is at most thrice the Helstrom version. November 2019. arXiv:1911.08359.
 - [38] Francesco Albarelli, Mankei Tsang, and Animesh Datta. Upper bounds on the Holevo Cramer–Rao bound for multiparameter quantum parametric and semiparametric estimation. August 2020. arXiv:1911.11036.
 - [39] Rafal Demkowicz-Dobrzanski, Wojciech Gorecki, and Madalin Guta. Multi-parameter estimation beyond quantum Fisher information. January 2020. arXiv:2001.11742.
 - [40] Jamie Friel, Pantita Palittapongarnpim, Francesco Albarelli, and Animesh Datta. Attainability of the Holevo–Cramer–Rao bound for two-qubit 3D magnetometry. August 2020. arXiv:2008.01502.
 - [41] Wojciech Gorecki, Sisi Zhou, Liang Jiang, and Rafal Demkowicz-Dobrzanski. Optimal probes and error-correction schemes in multi-parameter quantum metrology. *Quantum*, 4:288, July 2020. arXiv:1901.00896.
 - [42] Magdalena Szczykulska, Tillmann Baumgratz, and Animesh Datta. Multi-parameter quantum metrology. *Advances in Physics: X*, 1(4):621–639, July 2016. arXiv:1604.02615.
 - [43] Francesco Albarelli, Marco Barbieri, Marco G. Genoni, and Ilaria Gianani. A perspective on multiparameter quantum metrology: From theoretical tools to applications in quantum imaging. *Physics Letters A*, 384(12):126311, April 2020. arXiv:1911.12067.
 - [44] Carl W. Helstrom. Cramer–Rao inequalities for operator-valued measures in quantum mechanics. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 8(5):361–376, 1973.
 - [45] Carl W. Helstrom. *Quantum Detection and Estimation*

- Theory*. Academic Press, 1976.
- [46] Denes Petz and Catalin Ghinea. Introduction to quantum Fisher information. *Quantum Probability and Related Topics*, pages 261–281, January 2011. arXiv:1008.2417.
 - [47] Mark M. Wilde, Mario Berta, Christoph Hirche, and Eneet Kaur. Amortized channel divergence for asymptotic quantum channel discrimination. *Letters in Mathematical Physics*, 110:2277–2336, August 2020. arXiv:1808.01498.
 - [48] Sisi Zhou and Liang Jiang. The theory of entanglement-assisted metrology for quantum channels. March 2020. arXiv:2003.10559.
 - [49] Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L. Chuang. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
 - [50] Madalin Guta and Jonas Kahn. Local asymptotic normality for qubit states. *Physical Review A*, 73(5):052108, May 2006. arXiv:quant-ph/0512075.
 - [51] Masahito Hayashi and Keiji Matsumoto. Asymptotic performance of optimal state estimation in qubit system. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 49(10):102101, October 2008. arXiv:quant-ph/0411073.
 - [52] Koichi Yamagata, Akio Fujiwara, and Richard D. Gill. Quantum local asymptotic normality based on a new quantum likelihood ratio. *The Annals of Statistics*, 41(4):2197–2217, August 2013. arXiv:1210.3749.
 - [53] Yuxiang Yang, Giulio Chiribella, and Masahito Hayashi. Attaining the ultimate precision limit in quantum state estimation. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 368(1):223–293, May 2019. arXiv:1802.07587.
 - [54] Frank Hansen and Gert K. Pedersen. Jensen’s operator inequality. *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society*, 35(4):553–564, July 2003. arXiv:math/0204049.
 - [55] Kun Fang and Hamza Fawzi. Geometric Rényi divergence and its applications in quantum channel capacities. September 2019. arXiv:1909.05758v1.

Supplementary Material for “RLD Fisher Information Bound for Multiparameter Estimation of Quantum Channels”

by Vishal Katariya and Mark M. Wilde

Appendix A: RLD Fisher Information

Let $\{\rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ be a differentiable family of d -dimensional quantum states, and suppose that the parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ contains D elements. In the case that the following finiteness conditions hold

$$(\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{RA}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}})(\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{RA}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \Pi_{\rho^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}^{\perp} = 0 \quad \forall j, k \in \{1, \dots, D\} \quad (\text{A1})$$

the matrix elements of the multiparameter RLD Fisher information matrix are defined as follows:

$$[\widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \{\rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})]_{j,k} := \text{Tr}[(\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1} (\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})], \quad (\text{A2})$$

Then the RLD Fisher information matrix is defined as

$$\widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \{\rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) := \sum_{j,k=1}^D \text{Tr}[(\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1} (\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})] |j\rangle\langle k| \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$= \text{Tr}_2 \left[\sum_{j,k=1}^D |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1} (\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \right]. \quad (\text{A4})$$

If the finiteness conditions in (A1) do not hold, then the RLD matrix is undefined (some or all of its entries are equal to $+\infty$). The analysis for this statement is similar to that given in our companion paper [26, Proposition 4].

Suppose that the finiteness conditions in (A1) hold. Let R_{θ_j} denote the RLD operator satisfying the following differential equation:

$$\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} R_{\theta_j}. \quad (\text{A5})$$

We find upon substitution that

$$[\widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \{\rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})]_{j,k} = \text{Tr}[(\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1} (\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})] \quad (\text{A6})$$

$$= \text{Tr}[(\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})^{\dagger} \rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1} (\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})] \quad (\text{A7})$$

$$= \text{Tr}[(\rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} R_{\theta_j})^{\dagger} \rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1} (\rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} R_{\theta_k})] \quad (\text{A8})$$

$$= \text{Tr}[R_{\theta_j}^{\dagger} \rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} R_{\theta_k}]. \quad (\text{A9})$$

If we define a $D \times D$ positive semi-definite weight matrix W , then the RLD Fisher information value is given by

$$\widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) := \text{Tr}[W \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \{\rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})] \quad (\text{A10})$$

$$= \text{Tr} \left[(W \otimes I_d) \left(\sum_{j,k=1}^D |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1} (\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \right) \right] \quad (\text{A11})$$

$$= \sum_{j,k=1}^D \langle k|W|j\rangle \text{Tr}[(\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1} (\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})]. \quad (\text{A12})$$

The same quantity for a differentiable family $\{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta$ of quantum channels, is defined as

$$\widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta) := \sup_{\rho_{RA}} \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta(\rho_{RA})\}_\theta), \quad (\text{A13})$$

where the optimization is with respect to every bipartite state ρ_{RA} with system R arbitrarily large. However, note that, by a standard argument, it suffices to optimize over pure states ψ_{RA} with system R isomorphic to the channel input system A .

The finiteness conditions for the state and channel quantities, respectively, involving the weight matrix W are

$$\left[\sum_{j,k=1}^D \langle k|W|j \rangle (\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_\theta) (\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_\theta) \right] \Pi_{\rho_\theta}^\perp = 0, \quad (\text{A14})$$

$$\left[\sum_{j,k=1}^D \langle k|W|j \rangle (\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta}) (\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta}) \right] \Pi_{\Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta}}^\perp = 0. \quad (\text{A15})$$

The argument for the first finiteness condition is similar to that given for (A1), while the argument for the second relies on a generalization of the argument in [26, Proposition 13].

Proposition 1 *Let $\{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta$ be a differentiable family of quantum channels, and let W be a $D \times D$ weight matrix. Suppose that (A15) holds. Then the RLD Fisher information value of quantum channels has the following explicit form:*

$$\widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta) = \left\| \sum_{j,k=1}^D \langle k|W|j \rangle \text{Tr}_B [(\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta}) (\Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})^{-1} (\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})] \right\|_\infty, \quad (\text{A16})$$

where $\Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta}$ is the Choi operator of the channel $\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta$.

Proof. Recall that every pure state ψ_{RA} can be written as

$$\psi_{RA} = Z_R \Gamma_{RA} Z_R^\dagger, \quad (\text{A17})$$

where Z_R is a square operator satisfying $\text{Tr}[Z_R^\dagger Z_R] = 1$. This implies that

$$\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta(\psi_{RA}) = \mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta(Z_R \Gamma_{RA} Z_R^\dagger) \quad (\text{A18})$$

$$= Z_R \mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta(\Gamma_{RA}) Z_R^\dagger \quad (\text{A19})$$

$$= Z_R \Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta} Z_R^\dagger. \quad (\text{A20})$$

It suffices to optimize over pure states ψ_{RA} such that $\psi_A > 0$ because these states are dense in the set of all pure bipartite states. Then consider that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\psi_{RA}} \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta(\psi_{RA})\}_\theta) \\ &= \sup_{\psi_{RA}} \sum_{j,k=1}^D \langle k|W|j \rangle \text{Tr} [(\partial_{\theta_j} \mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta(\psi_{RA})) (\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta(\psi_{RA}))^{-1} (\partial_{\theta_k} \mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta(\psi_{RA}))] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A21})$$

$$= \sup_{Z_R: \text{Tr}[Z_R^\dagger Z_R]=1} \sum_{j,k=1}^D \langle k|W|j \rangle \text{Tr} [(\partial_{\theta_j} Z_R \Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta} Z_R^\dagger) (Z_R \Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta} Z_R^\dagger)^{-1} (\partial_{\theta_k} Z_R \Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta} Z_R^\dagger)] \quad (\text{A22})$$

$$= \sup_{Z_R: \text{Tr}[Z_R^\dagger Z_R]=1} \sum_{j,k=1}^D \langle k|W|j \rangle \text{Tr} \left[Z_R (\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta}) Z_R^\dagger Z_R^{-\dagger} (\Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})^{-1} Z_R^{-1} Z_R (\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta}) Z_R^\dagger \right] \quad (\text{A23})$$

$$= \sup_{Z_R: \text{Tr}[Z_R^\dagger Z_R]=1} \sum_{j,k=1}^D \langle k|W|j \rangle \text{Tr} \left[Z_R^\dagger Z_R (\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta}) (\Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})^{-1} (\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta}) \right] \quad (\text{A24})$$

$$= \sup_{Z_R: \text{Tr}[Z_R^\dagger Z_R]=1} \text{Tr} \left[Z_R^\dagger Z_R \sum_{j,k=1}^D \langle k|W|j \rangle \text{Tr}_B \left[(\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta}) (\Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})^{-1} (\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta}) \right] \right] \quad (\text{A25})$$

$$= \left\| \sum_{j,k=1}^D \langle k|W|j \rangle \text{Tr}_B \left[(\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta}) (\Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})^{-1} (\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta}) \right] \right\|_\infty \quad (\text{A26})$$

The last equality is a consequence of the characterization of the infinity norm of a positive semi-definite operator Y as $\|Y\|_\infty = \sup_{\rho>0, \text{Tr}[\rho]=1} \text{Tr}[Y\rho]$. ■

Appendix B: Multiparameter Cramer–Rao bound

We start with the matrix inequality [6, 44, 45]

$$\text{Cov}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \geq \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \{\rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})^{-1}. \quad (\text{B1})$$

Let us take W as a positive semi-definite weight matrix, and then define the normalized operator W' as

$$W' := \frac{W}{\text{Tr}[W]}. \quad (\text{B2})$$

The matrix inequality in (B1) implies the following:

$$\text{Tr}[W] \text{Tr}[W' \text{Cov}(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \geq \text{Tr}[W] \text{Tr}[W' \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \{\rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})^{-1}] \quad (\text{B3})$$

$$= \text{Tr}[W] \text{Tr}[W'^{1/2} \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \{\rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})^{-1} W'^{1/2}] \quad (\text{B4})$$

$$= \text{Tr}[W] \sum_k \langle k|W'^{1/2} \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \{\rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})^{-1} W'^{1/2}|k \rangle \quad (\text{B5})$$

$$\geq \text{Tr}[W] \left[\sum_k \langle k|W'^{1/2} \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \{\rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) W'^{1/2}|k \rangle \right]^{-1} \quad (\text{B6})$$

$$= \frac{\text{Tr}[W]}{\text{Tr}[W'^{1/2} \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \{\rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) W'^{1/2}]} \quad (\text{B7})$$

$$= \frac{\text{Tr}[W]}{\text{Tr}[W' \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \{\rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})]} \quad (\text{B8})$$

$$= \frac{\text{Tr}[W]^2}{\text{Tr}[W \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \{\rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})]}. \quad (\text{B9})$$

The first inequality is a consequence of (B1). The first equality follows from cyclicity of trace. The second inequality uses the operator Jensen inequality [54] for the operator convex function $f(x) = x^{-1}$. The next equality comes again from cyclicity of trace, and the last equality comes from the definition of W' .

The reasoning above leads us to

$$\text{Tr}[W\text{Cov}(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \geq \frac{(\text{Tr}[W])^2}{\text{Tr}[W\hat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \{\rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})]} \quad (\text{B10})$$

for every positive semi-definite matrix W , which implies that

$$\text{Tr}[W'\text{Cov}(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \geq \frac{1}{\text{Tr}[W'\hat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \{\rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})]} \quad (\text{B11})$$

for every positive semi-definite matrix W' such that $\text{Tr}[W'] = 1$.

Appendix C: Chain Rule for RLD Fisher Information

In this appendix, we provide a proof of the chain-rule property for the RLD Fisher information value, as stated in the main text (Eq. (23)). First, we establish the chain rule in the form of an operator inequality:

Proposition 2 *Let $\{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ be a differentiable family of quantum channels, and let $\{\rho_{RA}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ be a differentiable family of quantum states. Then the following chain-rule operator inequality holds*

$$\hat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\rho_{RA}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}})\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \leq \sum_{j,k=1}^D |j\rangle\langle k| \text{Tr}[(\rho_S^{\boldsymbol{\theta}})^T \text{Tr}_B[(\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}})(\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}})] + \hat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \{\rho_{RA}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})], \quad (\text{C1})$$

where $\rho_S^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is equal to the reduced state of $\rho_{RA}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ on system A and system S is isomorphic to system A .

Proof. In the proof, we make use of the following identity:

$$\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\rho_{RA}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = \langle \Gamma |_{AS} \rho_{RA}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}} | \Gamma \rangle_{AS}, \quad (\text{C2})$$

where

$$| \Gamma \rangle_{AS} := \sum_i |i\rangle_A |i\rangle_S. \quad (\text{C3})$$

Consider that

$$\hat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\rho_{RA}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}})\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = \text{Tr}_2 \left[\sum_{j,k=1}^D |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} \mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\rho_{RA}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}})) (\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\rho_{RA}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}))^{-1} (\partial_{\theta_k} \mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\rho_{RA}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}})) \right]. \quad (\text{C4})$$

So we now focus on the operator inside the trace:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j,k=1}^D |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} \mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\rho_{RA}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}})) (\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\rho_{RA}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}))^{-1} (\partial_{\theta_k} \mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\rho_{RA}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}})) \\ &= \sum_{j,k=1}^D |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} \langle \Gamma |_{AS} \rho_{RA}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}} | \Gamma \rangle_{AS}) (\langle \Gamma |_{AS} \rho_{RA}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}} | \Gamma \rangle_{AS})^{-1} (\partial_{\theta_k} \langle \Gamma |_{AS} \rho_{RA}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}} | \Gamma \rangle_{AS}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C5})$$

$$= \sum_{j,k=1}^D |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes \langle \Gamma |_{AS} \partial_{\theta_j} (\rho_{RA}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}) | \Gamma \rangle_{AS} (\langle \Gamma |_{AS} \rho_{RA}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}} | \Gamma \rangle_{AS})^{-1} \langle \Gamma |_{AS} \partial_{\theta_k} (\rho_{RA}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}) | \Gamma \rangle_{AS} \quad (\text{C6})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left(\sum_{j=1}^D |j\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \langle \Gamma|_{AS} \partial_{\theta_j} (\rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) | \Gamma \rangle_{AS} \right) (|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \langle \Gamma|_{AS} \rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}} | \Gamma \rangle_{AS})^{-1} \\
&\quad \times \left(\sum_{k=1}^D |0\rangle\langle k| \otimes \langle \Gamma|_{AS} \partial_{\theta_k} (\rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) | \Gamma \rangle_{AS} \right) \tag{C7}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \langle \Gamma|_{AS} \left(\sum_{j=1}^D |j\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \partial_{\theta_j} (\rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) \right) | \Gamma \rangle_{AS} (\langle \Gamma|_{AS} (|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) | \Gamma \rangle_{AS})^{-1} \\
&\quad \times \langle \Gamma|_{AS} \left(\sum_{k=1}^D |0\rangle\langle k| \otimes \partial_{\theta_k} (\rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) \right) | \Gamma \rangle_{AS}. \tag{C8}
\end{aligned}$$

Then identifying

$$X = \sum_{k=1}^D |0\rangle\langle k| \otimes \partial_{\theta_k} (\rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}), \tag{C9}$$

$$Y = |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}} \tag{C10}$$

$$L = I_D \otimes \langle \Gamma|_{AS} \otimes I_{RB}, \tag{C11}$$

we can apply the well known transformer inequality $LX^{\dagger}L^{\dagger}(LYL^{\dagger})^{-1}LXL^{\dagger} \leq LX^{\dagger}Y^{-1}XL^{\dagger}$ (see, e.g., [26, Lemma 59] as well as [55]) to find that the last line above is not larger than the following one in the operator-inequality sense:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle \Gamma|_{AS} \left(\sum_{j=1}^D |j\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \partial_{\theta_j} (\rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) \right) (|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^D |0\rangle\langle k| \otimes \partial_{\theta_k} (\rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) \right) | \Gamma \rangle_{AS} \\
&= \langle \Gamma|_{AS} \sum_{j,k=1}^D |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes \partial_{\theta_j} (\rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) (\rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})^{-1} \partial_{\theta_k} (\rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) | \Gamma \rangle_{AS} \tag{C12}
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \sum_{j,k=1}^D |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes \langle \Gamma|_{AS} \partial_{\theta_j} (\rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) (\rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})^{-1} \partial_{\theta_k} (\rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) | \Gamma \rangle_{AS}. \tag{C13}$$

Consider that

$$\partial_{\theta_j} (\rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) = (\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}} + \rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}). \tag{C14}$$

Then we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_{\theta_j} (\rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) (\rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})^{-1} \\
&= ((\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}} + \rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})) (\rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})^{-1} \tag{C15}
\end{aligned}$$

$$= ((\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}} + \rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})) ((\rho_{RA}^{\theta})^{-1} \otimes (\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})^{-1}) \tag{C16}$$

$$= (\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) (\rho_{RA}^{\theta})^{-1} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}} (\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})^{-1} + \rho_{RA}^{\theta} (\rho_{RA}^{\theta})^{-1} \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) (\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})^{-1} \tag{C17}$$

$$= (\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) (\rho_{RA}^{\theta})^{-1} \otimes \Pi_{\Gamma^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}} + \Pi_{\rho^{\theta}} \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) (\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})^{-1}. \tag{C18}$$

Right multiplying this last line by $\partial_{\theta_k} (\rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})$ gives

$$((\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) (\rho_{RA}^{\theta})^{-1} \otimes \Pi_{\Gamma^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}} + \Pi_{\rho^{\theta}} \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) (\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})^{-1}) \partial_{\theta_k} (\rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= ((\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{RA}^{\theta})(\rho_{RA}^{\theta})^{-1} \otimes \Pi_{\Gamma^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}} + \Pi_{\rho^{\theta}} \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})(\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})^{-1})((\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}} + \rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes (\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})) \quad (C19) \\
&= ((\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{RA}^{\theta})(\rho_{RA}^{\theta})^{-1} \otimes \Pi_{\Gamma^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}})((\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) + ((\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{RA}^{\theta})(\rho_{RA}^{\theta})^{-1} \otimes \Pi_{\Gamma^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}})(\rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes (\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})) \\
&\quad + (\Pi_{\rho^{\theta}} \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})(\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})^{-1})((\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) + (\Pi_{\rho^{\theta}} \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})(\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})^{-1})(\rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes (\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})) \quad (C20)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= (\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{RA}^{\theta})(\rho_{RA}^{\theta})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}} + (\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) \Pi_{\rho^{\theta}} \otimes \Pi_{\Gamma^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}}(\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) \\
&\quad + \Pi_{\rho^{\theta}}(\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) \Pi_{\Gamma^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}} + \rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})(\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}). \quad (C21)
\end{aligned}$$

Adding in the terms $(\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) \Pi_{\rho^{\theta}}^{\perp} = 0$, $(\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) \Pi_{\Gamma^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}}^{\perp} = 0$, $\Pi_{\rho^{\theta}}^{\perp}(\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) = 0$, and $\Pi_{\Gamma^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}}^{\perp}(\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) = 0$, which follow from the support conditions for finite RLD Fisher information, the last line above becomes as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&= (\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{RA}^{\theta})(\rho_{RA}^{\theta})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}} + (\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) \otimes (\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) \\
&\quad + (\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) + \rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})(\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}). \quad (C22)
\end{aligned}$$

So then the relevant matrix is simplified as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j,k=1}^D |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes \langle \Gamma|_{AS} [(\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{RA}^{\theta})(\rho_{RA}^{\theta})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}} + (\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) \otimes (\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) \\
&\quad + (\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) + \rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})(\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})] |\Gamma\rangle_{AS}. \quad (C23)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have established the following operator inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j,k=1}^D |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} \mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^{\theta}(\rho_{RA}^{\theta}))(\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^{\theta}(\rho_{RA}^{\theta}))^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^{\theta}(\rho_{RA}^{\theta})) \\
&\leq \sum_{j,k=1}^D |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes \langle \Gamma|_{AS} [(\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{RA}^{\theta})(\rho_{RA}^{\theta})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}} + (\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) \otimes (\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) \\
&\quad + (\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) + \rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})(\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})] |\Gamma\rangle_{AS}. \quad (C24)
\end{aligned}$$

We can then take a partial trace over the RB systems and arrive at the following operator inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\widehat{I}_F(\theta; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^{\theta}(\rho_{RA}^{\theta})\}_{\theta}) \\
&\leq \sum_{j,k=1}^D |j\rangle\langle k| \text{Tr}_{RB} [\langle \Gamma|_{AS} [(\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{RA}^{\theta})(\rho_{RA}^{\theta})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}} + (\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) \otimes (\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) \\
&\quad + (\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}) + \rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})(\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})] |\Gamma\rangle_{AS}]. \quad (C25)
\end{aligned}$$

Now we evaluate each term on the right:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle \Gamma|_{AS} \text{Tr}_{RB} [(\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{RA}^{\theta})(\rho_{RA}^{\theta})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) \otimes \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}] |\Gamma\rangle_{AS} \\
&= \langle \Gamma|_{AS} \text{Tr}_R [(\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{RA}^{\theta})(\rho_{RA}^{\theta})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{RA}^{\theta})] \otimes \text{Tr}_B [\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}] |\Gamma\rangle_{AS} \quad (C26)
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \langle \Gamma|_{AS} \text{Tr}_R [(\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{RA}^{\theta})(\rho_{RA}^{\theta})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{RA}^{\theta})] \otimes I_S |\Gamma\rangle_{AS} \quad (C27)$$

$$= \text{Tr}[(\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{RA}^{\theta})(\rho_{RA}^{\theta})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{RA}^{\theta})], \quad (C28)$$

$$\langle \Gamma|_{AS} \text{Tr}_{RB} [(\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})] |\Gamma\rangle_{AS}$$

$$= \langle \Gamma |_{AS} \text{Tr}_R[\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}] \otimes \text{Tr}_B[\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}] | \Gamma \rangle_{AS} \quad (\text{C29})$$

$$= \langle \Gamma |_{AS} \text{Tr}_R[\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}] \otimes \partial_{\theta_j} \text{Tr}_B[\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}}] | \Gamma \rangle_{AS} \quad (\text{C30})$$

$$= \langle \Gamma |_{AS} \text{Tr}_R[\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}] \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} I_S) | \Gamma \rangle_{AS} \quad (\text{C31})$$

$$= 0, \quad (\text{C32})$$

$$\langle \Gamma |_{AS} \text{Tr}_{RB}[(\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{RA}^{\theta}) \otimes (\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})] | \Gamma \rangle_{AS} = 0, \quad (\text{C33})$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \Gamma |_{AS} \text{Tr}_{RB}[\rho_{RA}^{\theta} \otimes (\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})(\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})] | \Gamma \rangle_{AS} \\ &= \langle \Gamma |_{AS} \rho_A^{\theta} \otimes \text{Tr}_B[(\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})(\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})] | \Gamma \rangle_{AS} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C34})$$

$$= \text{Tr}[(\rho_S^{\theta})^T \text{Tr}_B[(\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})(\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})]]. \quad (\text{C35})$$

Substituting back above, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \widehat{I}_F(\theta; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^{\theta}(\rho_{RA}^{\theta})\}_{\theta}) \\ & \leq \sum_{j,k=1}^D |j\rangle\langle k| \text{Tr}[(\partial_{\theta_j} \rho_{RA}^{\theta})(\rho_{RA}^{\theta})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \rho_{RA}^{\theta})] \\ & \quad + \sum_{j,k=1}^D |j\rangle\langle k| \text{Tr}[(\rho_S^{\theta})^T \text{Tr}_B[(\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})(\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})]] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C36})$$

$$= \widehat{I}_F(\theta; \{\rho_{RA}^{\theta}\}_{\theta}) + \sum_{j,k=1}^D |j\rangle\langle k| \text{Tr}[(\rho_S^{\theta})^T \text{Tr}_B[(\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})(\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})]]. \quad (\text{C37})$$

This concludes the proof. ■

Now we show how the operator-inequality chain rule leads us to the desired result in (23).

Proposition 3 *Let W be a $D \times D$ weight matrix, let $\{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^{\theta}\}_{\theta}$ be a differentiable family of quantum channels, and let $\{\rho_{RA}^{\theta}\}_{\theta}$ be a differentiable family of quantum states. Then the following chain-rule inequality holds*

$$\widehat{I}_F(\theta, W; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^{\theta}(\rho_{RA}^{\theta})\}_{\theta}) \leq \widehat{I}_F(\theta, W; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^{\theta}\}_{\theta}) + \widehat{I}_F(\theta, W; \{\rho_{RA}^{\theta}\}_{\theta}). \quad (\text{C38})$$

Proof. We start by restating the operator-inequality chain rule in (C1):

$$\widehat{I}_F(\theta; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^{\theta}(\rho_{RA}^{\theta})\}_{\theta}) \leq \sum_{j,k=1}^D |j\rangle\langle k| \text{Tr}[(\rho_S^{\theta})^T \text{Tr}_B[(\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})(\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})]] + \widehat{I}_F(\theta; \{\rho_{RA}^{\theta}\}_{\theta}). \quad (\text{C39})$$

We sandwich the above with $W^{1/2}$ on both sides and take the trace (a positive map overall) to preserve the inequality and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}[W \widehat{I}_F(\theta; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^{\theta}(\rho_{RA}^{\theta})\}_{\theta})] & \leq \text{Tr} \left[W \sum_{j,k=1}^D |j\rangle\langle k| \text{Tr}[(\rho_S^{\theta})^T \text{Tr}_B[(\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})(\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^{\theta}})]] \right] \\ & \quad + \text{Tr}[W \widehat{I}_F(\theta; \{\rho_{RA}^{\theta}\}_{\theta})]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C40})$$

Using the definition of the RLD Fisher information value, the above simplifies to

$$\widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta(\rho_{RA}^\theta)\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \leq \text{Tr} \left[W \sum_{j,k=1}^D |j\rangle\langle k| \text{Tr}[(\rho_S^\theta)^T \text{Tr}_B[(\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})(\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})]] \right] + \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\rho_{RA}^\theta\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}). \quad (\text{C41})$$

Now we consider that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Tr} \left[W \sum_{j,k=1}^D |j\rangle\langle k| \text{Tr}[(\rho_S^\theta)^T \text{Tr}_B[(\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})(\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})]] \right] \\ &= \sum_{j,k=1}^D \langle k|W|j\rangle \text{Tr}[(\rho_S^\theta)^T \text{Tr}_B[(\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})(\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})]] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C42})$$

$$= \text{Tr} \left[(\rho_S^\theta)^T \sum_{j,k=1}^D \langle k|W|j\rangle \text{Tr}_B[(\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})(\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})] \right] \quad (\text{C43})$$

$$\leq \sup_{\rho_S^\theta} \text{Tr} \left[(\rho_S^\theta)^T \sum_{j,k=1}^D \langle k|W|j\rangle \text{Tr}_B[(\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})(\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})] \right] \quad (\text{C44})$$

$$= \left\| \sum_{j,k=1}^D \langle k|W|j\rangle \text{Tr}_B[(\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})(\Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{SB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})] \right\|_\infty \quad (\text{C45})$$

$$= \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}). \quad (\text{C46})$$

Using the above and (C41), we conclude that

$$\widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta(\rho_{RA}^\theta)\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \leq \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) + \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\rho_{RA}^\theta\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}). \quad (\text{C47})$$

This concludes the proof. ■

Appendix D: Converse for RLD Fisher Information

The following inequality is a multi-parameter generalization of the inequality given in [26, Theorem 18].

Theorem 4 Consider a general sequential estimation protocol of the form depicted in Figure 1. The following inequality holds:

$$\widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\omega_{R_n B_n}^\theta\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \leq n \cdot \widehat{I}_F^A(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}), \quad (\text{D1})$$

where $\omega_{R_n B_n}^\theta$ is the final state of the estimation protocol.

Proof. Consider that

$$\begin{aligned} & \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\omega_{R_n B_n}^\theta\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \\ &= \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\omega_{R_n B_n}^\theta\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\rho_{R_1 A_1}\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D2})$$

$$= \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\omega_{R_n B_n}^\theta\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\rho_{R_1 A_1}\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) + \sum_{i=2}^n \left(\widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\rho_{R_i A_i}^\theta\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\rho_{R_{i-1} A_{i-1}}^\theta\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \right) \quad (\text{D3})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\omega_{R_n B_n}^\theta\}_\theta) - \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\rho_{R_1 A_1}\}_\theta) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=2}^n \left(\widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\mathcal{S}_{R_{i-1} B_{i-1} \rightarrow R_i A_i}^{i-1}(\rho_{R_{i-1} B_{i-1}}^\theta)\}_\theta) - \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\rho_{R_i A_i}^\theta\}_\theta) \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{D4}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\omega_{R_n B_n}^\theta\}_\theta) - \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\rho_{R_1 A_1}\}_\theta) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=2}^n \left(\widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\rho_{R_{i-1} B_{i-1}}^\theta\}_\theta) - \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\rho_{R_i A_i}^\theta\}_\theta) \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{D5}$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\rho_{R_i B_i}^\theta\}_\theta) - \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\rho_{R_i A_i}^\theta\}_\theta) \right) \tag{D6}$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\mathcal{N}_{A_i \rightarrow B_i}^\theta(\rho_{R_i A_i}^\theta)\}_\theta) - \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\rho_{R_i A_i}^\theta\}_\theta) \right) \tag{D7}$$

$$\leq n \cdot \sup_{\{\rho_{RA}^\theta\}_\theta} \left[\widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta(\rho_{RA}^\theta)\}_\theta) - \widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\rho_{RA}^\theta\}_\theta) \right] \tag{D8}$$

$$= n \cdot \widehat{I}_F^A(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta). \tag{D9}$$

The first equality follows because the initial state $\rho_{R_1 A_1}$ has no dependence on any of the parameters in $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. The first inequality arises due to the data-processing inequality for the RLD Fisher information. The other steps are straightforward manipulations. ■

Appendix E: Estimating the parameters of a generalized amplitude damping channel

For completeness, we restate the Choi matrix of a generalized amplitude damping channel (GADC) $\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}$ with parameters γ and N :

$$\Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}} := \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \gamma N & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{1 - \gamma} \\ 0 & \gamma N & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \gamma(1 - N) & 0 \\ \sqrt{1 - \gamma} & 0 & 0 & 1 - \gamma(1 - N) \end{bmatrix}. \tag{E1}$$

This means that

$$\left(\Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}} \right)^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1 - \gamma(1 - N)}{(1 - N)N\gamma^2} & 0 & 0 & \frac{-\sqrt{1 - \gamma}}{(1 - N)N\gamma^2} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\gamma N} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\gamma(1 - N)} & 0 \\ \frac{-\sqrt{1 - \gamma}}{(1 - N)N\gamma^2} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1 - \gamma N}{(1 - N)N\gamma^2} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{E2}$$

1. RLD Fisher Information Value

We use that

$$\widehat{I}_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}, W; \{\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}^\theta\}_\theta) = \left\| \sum_{j,k=1}^D \langle k | W | j \rangle \text{Tr}_B [(\partial_{\theta_j} \Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})(\Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_k} \Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{N}^\theta})] \right\|_\infty. \tag{E3}$$

This is proved in Proposition 1 in Appendix A.

We consider $W = \frac{1}{4} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$ which means that

$$\widehat{I}_F(\{\gamma, N\}; W; \{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}\}_{\gamma, N}) = \frac{1}{4} \left\| \text{Tr}_B[(\partial_\gamma \Gamma^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}})(\Gamma^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}})^{-1}(\partial_\gamma \Gamma^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}})] + \text{Tr}_B[(\partial_\gamma \Gamma^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}})(\Gamma^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}})^{-1}(\partial_N \Gamma^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}})] \right. \\ \left. \text{Tr}_B[(\partial_N \Gamma^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}})(\Gamma^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}})^{-1}(\partial_\gamma \Gamma^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}})] + 3 \text{Tr}_B[(\partial_N \Gamma^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}})(\Gamma^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}})^{-1}(\partial_N \Gamma^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}})] \right\|_\infty. \quad (\text{E4})$$

We have

$$\partial_\gamma \Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}} = \begin{bmatrix} -N & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{1-\gamma}} \\ 0 & N & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1-N & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{1-\gamma}} & 0 & 0 & -(1-N) \end{bmatrix}, \text{ and} \quad (\text{E5})$$

$$\partial_N \Gamma_{RB}^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}} = -\gamma (I_2 \otimes \sigma_Z). \quad (\text{E6})$$

We then have

$$\text{Tr}_B[(\partial_\gamma \Gamma^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}})(\Gamma^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}})^{-1}(\partial_\gamma \Gamma^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}})] = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\frac{1}{N-\gamma N} + \frac{1}{1-N} - 4}{4\gamma^2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\frac{1}{(\gamma-1)(N-1)} + \frac{1}{N} - 4}{4\gamma^2} \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{E7})$$

$$\text{Tr}_B[(\partial_\gamma \Gamma^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}})(\Gamma^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}})^{-1}(\partial_N \Gamma^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}})] = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1-2N}{2\gamma N(1-N)} & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1-2N}{2\gamma N(1-N)} \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{E8})$$

$$\text{Tr}_B[(\partial_N \Gamma^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}})(\Gamma^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}})^{-1}(\partial_\gamma \Gamma^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}})] = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1-2N}{2\gamma N(1-N)} & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1-2N}{2\gamma N(1-N)} \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{E9})$$

$$\text{Tr}_B[(\partial_N \Gamma^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}})(\Gamma^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}})^{-1}(\partial_N \Gamma^{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}})] = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{N(1-N)} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{N(1-N)} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{E10})$$

With this in place, it is straightforward to evaluate (E4).

2. SLD Fisher Information Value

The SLD Fisher information, unlike the RLD quantity, does not have a compact expression in terms of the Choi operators of the channel family. Therefore, in this example, we make the choice of a pure entangled probe state:

$$|\psi_p\rangle = \sqrt{p}|00\rangle + \sqrt{1-p}|11\rangle, \quad (\text{E11})$$

which gives us

$$\rho_{\gamma, N} := \mathcal{A}_{\gamma, N}(\psi_p) = \begin{bmatrix} p(1-\gamma N) & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{p(1-p)(1-\gamma)} \\ 0 & p\gamma N & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & (1-p)\gamma(1-N) & 0 \\ \sqrt{p(1-p)(1-\gamma)} & 0 & 0 & (1-p)(1-(1-N)\gamma) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{E12})$$

The SLD Fisher information takes the form of a 2×2 matrix:

$$I_F(\gamma, N; \{\rho_{\gamma, N}\}_{\gamma, N})_{jk} = \text{Tr}[\rho_{\gamma, N} L_j L_k] \quad (\text{E13})$$

where j and k each take values 1 or 2 that correspond to either γ or N . We have L_j defined implicitly via

$$\partial_j \rho_{\gamma,N} = \frac{1}{2} (\rho_{\gamma,N} L_j + L_j \rho_{\gamma,N}). \quad (\text{E14})$$

Consider that $\rho_{\gamma,N}$ has spectral decomposition

$$\rho_{\gamma,N} = \sum_j \lambda_{\gamma,N}^j |\psi_{\gamma,N}^j\rangle \langle \psi_{\gamma,N}^j|. \quad (\text{E15})$$

We have

$$L_\gamma = 2 \sum_{j,k: \lambda_{\gamma,N}^j + \lambda_{\gamma,N}^k > 0} \frac{\langle \psi_{\gamma,N}^j | (\partial_\gamma \rho_{\gamma,N}) | \psi_{\gamma,N}^k \rangle}{\lambda_{\gamma,N}^j + \lambda_{\gamma,N}^k} |\psi_{\gamma,N}^j\rangle \langle \psi_{\gamma,N}^k| \text{ and} \quad (\text{E16})$$

$$L_N = 2 \sum_{j,k: \lambda_{\gamma,N}^j + \lambda_{\gamma,N}^k > 0} \frac{\langle \psi_{\gamma,N}^j | (\partial_N \rho_{\gamma,N}) | \psi_{\gamma,N}^k \rangle}{\lambda_{\gamma,N}^j + \lambda_{\gamma,N}^k} |\psi_{\gamma,N}^j\rangle \langle \psi_{\gamma,N}^k| \quad (\text{E17})$$

which enables us to calculate the elements of the SLD Fisher information matrix given in (E13).

The expression that we evaluate is the right-hand side of the following Cramer–Rao bound:

$$\text{Tr}[W \text{Cov}(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \geq \text{Tr}[W I_F(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \{\rho_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})^{-1}] \quad (\text{E18})$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is a vector of unknown parameters of length D , and W is a $D \times D$ positive semidefinite weight matrix. This is the Helstrom CRB, which is known to be attainable up to a constant factor [37, 38]. Again, we choose $W = \frac{1}{4} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$ just as we did in the case of calculating the RLD Fisher information. In more detail, we evaluate

$$\text{Tr}[W \text{Cov}(\{\gamma, N\})] \geq \min_{p \in [0,1]} \text{Tr}[W [I_F(\{\gamma, N\}; \{\mathcal{A}_{\gamma,N}(\psi_p)\}_{\{\gamma,N\}})]^{-1}]. \quad (\text{E19})$$