

Quantum information criteria for model selection in quantum state estimation

Hiroshi Yano¹ & Naoki Yamamoto^{1,2}

¹ Department of Applied Physics and Physico-Informatics, Keio University, Hiyoshi 3-14-1, Kohoku, Yokohama 223-8522, Japan

² Quantum Computing Center, Keio University, Hiyoshi 3-14-1, Kohoku, Yokohama 223-8522, Japan

E-mail: hiroshi.yano.gongon@keio.jp

Abstract. Quantum state estimation (or state tomography) is an indispensable task in quantum information processing. Because full state tomography that determines all elements of the density matrix is computationally demanding, one usually takes the strategy of assuming a certain model of quantum states and identifying the model parameters. However, it is difficult to make a valid assumption given little prior knowledge on a quantum state of interest, and thus we need a reasonable *model selection* method for quantum state estimation. Actually, in the classical statistical estimation theory, several types of information criteria have been established and widely used in practice for appropriately choosing a classical statistical model. In this study, we propose quantum information criteria for evaluating the quality of the estimated quantum state in terms of the quantum relative entropy, which is a natural quantum analogue of the classical information criterion defined in terms of Kullback–Leibler divergence. In particular, we derive two quantum information criteria depending on the type of an estimator for the quantum relative entropy; one uses the log-likelihood and the other uses the classical shadow. The general role of information criteria is to predict the performance of an estimated model for unseen data, although it is a function of only sampled data; this generalization capability of the proposed quantum information criteria is evaluated in numerical simulations.

1. Introduction

Quantum state estimation (or state tomography) [1] is an indispensable task in quantum information processing. Its purpose is to reconstruct a density matrix from the measurement data on an unknown quantum state obtained through an experiment. Generally, the increase of the size of quantum systems requires an exponential amount of measurement data in the system size for the full state tomography. Therefore, the state estimation for large quantum systems is possible only when some prior knowledge on the state is available and an associated specific technique requiring a feasible number of measurements can be constructed. The compressed sensing, for instance, is an efficient approach when a density matrix of the target state is of low rank [2]. Also, the matrix product state is a promising tool for estimating low-entangled states, such as ground states of certain local Hamiltonians in condensed matter physics [3, 4]. However, these approaches are not state universal (that is, the algorithms cannot be applied to arbitrary quantum states), and we need a model that can handle a wider class of quantum states. Promising such models are neural-network quantum states [5] and quantum Boltzmann machines (QBMs) [6], which both offer a compact variational representation of many-body quantum states. Note that those models are further characterized by some hyperparameters such as the network

width/depth of neural-network quantum states and the number of hidden variables of QBMs. Therefore, with a limited number of measurement data, we need to determine the best model of a quantum state that can explain the measurement data and moreover well predict some features associated with unseen data.

In the classical statistics, the theory for model selection [7] has been extensively developed, ranging from hypothesis testing to cross validation. In 1973, Akaike developed a novel paradigm for model selection [8]. That is, based on the likelihood principle and Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence, he derived the quantity for model selection called Akaike information criterion (AIC), which enables us to identify the best model of a target probability distribution using given empirical data. Since then, several other information criteria have been derived including Takeuchi information criterion (TIC) [9], to deal with models in various scenarios in social science as well as natural science [10, 11].

In the quantum state estimation, on the other hand, only a few works have been done for the problem of model selection. Some researches used AIC to select the best one from multiple candidates of parameterized quantum states [12, 13, 14]. In Ref. [12], AIC was introduced to eliminate redundant parameters of the parametric model of quantum states and succeeded in enhancing the estimation accuracy. It was shown there that reducing the number of parameters by AIC also contributed to circumventing the problem of local minima of the likelihood function in finding the maximum of the likelihood function. In Ref. [13], AIC was used to determine the structure of the target state for realizing quantum state estimation on a large scale. The model selection by AIC can be further applied to identify a noise model [14]. Note that these works are fully formulated within the classical statistics, where the KL divergence for classical probability distributions and accordingly AIC are calculated. Because these quantities are defined with fixed measurement process, such a classical approach does not fully extract information from the target quantum system for the best model selection.

Therefore, for the purpose of developing a genuine model selection method for quantum systems, in this paper we propose a new quantum-oriented information criterion that evaluates a quantum state in terms of the quantum relative entropy instead of the KL divergence. Actually, because the quantum relative entropy itself is independent of measurements, the proposed criterion can measure the intrinsic validity of the model. Note that we actually find some recent works that use the quantum relative entropy in quantum estimation problems [15, 16, 17]; for instance, Ref. [15] used the quantum relative entropy to train QBM for learning quantum states.

Here we briefly explain the essence of the proposed information criterion. In the classical case, the information criteria are constructed by using i.i.d. samples $\mathbf{x}_n = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ generated from an unknown true system. In particular, AIC uses this dataset to calculate the maximum likelihood estimator and evaluates the KL divergence between the estimated statistical model and the target true distribution. In order to reflect the concept of i.i.d. sampling for the quantum state estimation, we assume that a finite number of data are obtained through a tomographically complete measurement with uniform weights on a true quantum state; that is, we apply a unitary operator randomly chosen from the ensemble of unitaries and then measure the rotated state in the computational basis, the n repetitions of which give us the dataset $\mathbf{x}_n = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$. We also introduce an alternative representation of the measurement outcomes $\hat{\rho}_n = \{\hat{\rho}_1, \hat{\rho}_2, \dots, \hat{\rho}_n\}$ using the classical shadow [18]. Note that $\hat{\rho}_\alpha$ corresponds to x_α for $\alpha = 1, \dots, n$, but we use these two types of measurement outcomes to define two different quantum information criteria.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we provide a brief overview of classical information criteria. Section 3 derives the proposed quantum information criteria, which is a quantum generalization of the classical information criteria. In particular, we considered two different approaches to compute the quantum information criteria: one focusing on the log-

likelihood in Section 3.1 and the other focusing on the classical shadow in Section 3.2. In Section 4, we present a numerical demonstration of calculating the quantum information criteria for selecting a better quantum model and provide arguments on the practical limitation of their computation. Finally, Section 5 concludes this paper.

2. Classical information criteria: AIC and TIC

In this section, we briefly describe two information criteria for classical statistical models, AIC [8, 19] and TIC [9], both of which are the measure based on the KL divergence. For readers who are interested in the detailed derivation of AIC and TIC, we refer to Ref. [7, 20].

Assume that the data $\mathbf{x}_n = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$, $x_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ are generated from an unknown true model with probability density function $g(x)$. We estimate this target distribution by using the maximum likelihood method with a parametric model $\{f(x|\boldsymbol{\theta}) : \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p\}$ having a p -dimensional vector of parameters. The estimated model with the maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is evaluated by measuring the KL divergence between the true distribution and the model $f(x|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$;

$$KL(g(z)||f(z|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})) = \mathbb{E}_{g(z)} [\log g(Z)] - \mathbb{E}_{g(z)} [\log f(Z|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})]. \quad (1)$$

The KL divergence is 0 when $f = g$, and positive otherwise. Because the first term of the KL divergence is independent of the model f , for the purpose of comparing some candidate models for a certain true distribution, it is enough to evaluate the second term, i.e., the expected log-likelihood or the negative classical cross entropy

$$H(g(z)||f(z|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})) = \mathbb{E}_{g(z)} [\log f(Z|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})]. \quad (2)$$

A good estimator for the expected log-likelihood turns out to be

$$\mathbb{E}_{\hat{g}(z)} [\log f(Z|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \log f(x_\alpha|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = \frac{1}{n} \ell(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}), \quad (3)$$

where $\ell(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \log f(x_\alpha|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ is the log-likelihood and $\hat{g}(z) = (1/n) \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \delta(z - x_\alpha)$ is an empirical probability density function ($\delta(z)$ is the delta function). Note that the above estimator is a biased estimator; hence we correct the bias, and the resulting modified estimator is the information criterion. In the general setting under the regularity assumption, the following information criterion TIC was derived:

$$\text{TIC} = -2\ell(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) + 2 \text{Tr} \left(I(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) J(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})^{-1} \right) \quad (4)$$

with the conventional factor 2, where $I(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ and $J(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ are the $p \times p$ matrices given by

$$I_{ij}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \frac{\partial \log f(x_\alpha|\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_i} \frac{\partial \log f(x_\alpha|\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_j} \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}, \quad (5)$$

$$J_{ij}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \log f(x_\alpha|\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}. \quad (6)$$

Furthermore, if the parametric model includes the true distribution, i.e., $g(x) \in \{f(x|\boldsymbol{\theta}) : \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta\}$, the relation $I(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = J(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ holds and $\text{Tr} \left(I(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) J(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})^{-1} \right)$ is equal to the number of parameters, p . This leads to the information criterion AIC:

$$\text{AIC} = -2\ell(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) + 2p. \quad (7)$$

Hence, AIC enables us to select a valid model, by evaluating the trade-off between the fitting-level of the model to the data (the first term) and the model complexity (the second term). More precisely, assume that we have two parametric models $\{f_1(x|\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) : \boldsymbol{\theta}_1 \in \Theta_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^{p_1}\}$ and $\{f_2(x|\boldsymbol{\theta}_2) : \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 \in \Theta_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^{p_2}\}$, with $p_1 < p_2$. After estimating the parameters and computing AIC for each model, we can validly select the one that takes a smaller value of AIC.

Here we remark that AIC and TIC multiplied by $-1/(2n)$ are asymptotically unbiased estimators of the expected log-likelihood as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{g(\mathbf{x}_n)} \left[-\frac{1}{2n} \text{TIC} \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{g(\mathbf{x}_n)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{g(z)} \left[\log f(Z|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \right] \right] + o(n^{-1}), \\ \mathbb{E}_{g(\mathbf{x}_n)} \left[-\frac{1}{2n} \text{AIC} \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{g(\mathbf{x}_n)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{g(z)} \left[\log f(Z|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \right] \right] + o(n^{-1}),\end{aligned}$$

where the expectation $\mathbb{E}_{g(\mathbf{x}_n)}$ is taken with respect to the joint probability density function, $g(\mathbf{x}_n) = \prod_{\alpha=1}^n g(x_\alpha)$. Also $o(\cdot)$ means that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \cdot o(n^{-1}) = 0$. That is, both AIC and TIC stochastically fluctuate due to the finite number of data. However, it is known that, in the case of a hierarchical series of models $M_1 \subset M_2 \subset \dots$, it has no effect on comparing the model's performance because the fluctuations are common between models and hence they cancel out with each other [21].

Here we give some remarks. First, we note that AIC and TIC cannot be used for singular models. In regular models, the Fisher information matrix does exist and it is positive definite. Thus, the Cramér-Rao framework holds in the asymptotic regime; as a result, the existence of AIC and TIC are theoretically guaranteed. However, in singular models, the Fisher information matrix becomes degenerate and its inverse does not exist. This phenomenon, of course, will appear in the case of quantum statistics. In Section 4, we will actually see how this impact the model selection in practice.

We also note that there are other types of information criteria derived from other theoretical backgrounds, such as the Bayesian information criterion (BIC) [22], which is based on the posterior probability distribution of models, and the minimum description length (MDL) [23], which is designed to minimize the description of the data. As in the classical statistics, there might be possibilities that one can derive other types of quantum information criteria than the ones derived in this paper, but here we focus on AIC and TIC and extend them to quantum statistics reflecting the correspondence between KL divergence and the quantum relative entropy.

Finally, the KL divergence defined in Eq. (1) is not symmetric, and exchanging the role of the two arguments can make significant differences in the model selection. Ref. [24] indicates that the directed KL divergence $KL(g||f)$ may better reflect the error due to overfitting, whereas the alternative directed divergence $KL(f||g)$ may better reflect the error due to underfitting. In Ref. [25], the authors addressed this issue and derived a new information criterion that is an asymptotically unbiased estimator of the symmetrized KL divergence. The quantum version of this proposal, based on the symmetrized quantum relative entropy, is worth investigating as a future work.

3. Quantum information criteria

In this work, we develop the quantum version of the KL-based information criteria, AIC and TIC described in Section 2, by particularly replacing the KL divergence with the quantum relative entropy [26]. That is, we evaluate the quantum relative entropy [27] between a true quantum state ρ and a parametric quantum state $\{\sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}) : \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p\}$;

$$D(\rho||\sigma(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})) = \text{Tr} \left[\rho \left(\log \rho - \log \sigma(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \right) \right]. \quad (8)$$

Here, we implicitly assume $\text{supp}(\rho) \subseteq \text{supp}(\sigma(\hat{\theta}))$. In this paper, we further assume the regularity on $\sigma(\hat{\theta})$, i.e., $\sigma(\hat{\theta})$ is invertible. $\hat{\theta}$ is designed so that $\sigma(\hat{\theta})$ well approximates ρ . Since the first term of quantum relative entropy does not depend on the model $\sigma(\hat{\theta})$, it is enough to evaluate the second term for our purpose; in this paper, we call the second the quantum cross entropy (QCE). In particular, following the idea behind the classical information criteria, we study the negative QCE:

$$S(\rho \parallel \sigma(\hat{\theta})) = \text{Tr} \left(\rho \log \sigma(\hat{\theta}) \right), \quad (9)$$

which corresponds to Eq. (2). Our goal is to derive a good estimator for Eq. (9) and define the quantum information criterion. However, unlike the classical case where the log-likelihood function (3) appears as a natural estimator, it is unclear how to formulate a good estimator of the negative QCE. In this work, we present two variants, the one using the log-likelihood and the other using the classical shadow [18]. The resultant quantum information criterion using the log-likelihood, QAIC_{LL} , will be given in Eq. (16); the quantum information criteria using the classical shadow, $\text{QTIC}_{\text{shadow}}$ and $\text{QAIC}_{\text{shadow}}$, will be given in Eq. (22) and Eq. (25), respectively. To the best of our knowledge, they are the first information criteria that are based on quantum relative entropy. We note that QAIC_{LL} uses the classical log-likelihood, but correcting the bias produces the quantum information-theoretic quantity. Our derivation for these three information criteria is based on Ref. [20]; the details of calculation for the bias is given in Appendix A. The asymptotic normality about estimators of θ , which is central to our derivation, is discussed in Appendix B.

3.1. Estimator of the negative QCE: Log-likelihood approach

The first estimator of the negative QCE (9) is the averaged log-likelihood defined for a classical model distribution with fixed measurement; that is, roughly speaking, we use the classical cross entropy to estimate the quantum cross entropy.

To define an estimator, let us assume that we perform a tomographically complete measurement $\{\Pi_m\}$ on the true state ρ and the measurement outcomes $\mathbf{x}_n = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ are sampled from the true probability mass function $g(x) = \text{Tr}(\Pi_x \rho)$. Because the number of elements in $\{\Pi_m\}$ is assumed to be finite, x is a discrete random variable. The tomographic completeness guarantees that, in general, every parameter in a parametric quantum state is asymptotically determined; conversely, if the measurement is not tomographically complete, some parameters might be impossible to estimate †. As in the classical case, we estimate the parameters using the maximum likelihood $\hat{\theta}_C$ §:

$$\hat{\theta}_C = \underset{\theta \in \Theta}{\text{argmax}} \ell_{\text{LL}}(\mathbf{x}_n; \theta), \quad \ell_{\text{LL}}(\mathbf{x}_n; \theta) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \log \text{Tr}(\Pi_{x_\alpha} \sigma(\theta)). \quad (10)$$

Then we use the log-likelihood

$$\mathbb{E}_{\hat{g}(z)} \left[\log \text{Tr} \left(\Pi_Z \sigma(\hat{\theta}_C) \right) \right] = \frac{1}{n} \ell_{\text{LL}}(\mathbf{x}_n; \hat{\theta}_C) \quad (11)$$

to estimate the negative QCE, where $\hat{g}(z)$ is the empirical probability mass function. As in the classical case, this is a biased estimator in the sense that the expected log-likelihood

† This argument assumes a general parameterization on quantum states. If observables to be measured for estimating parameters are obvious, in the case of QBM for instance, the measurement does not have to be tomographically complete.

§ The subscript C represents "classical" to distinguish the maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\theta}_C$ from an estimator $\hat{\theta}_Q$ (Q represents "quantum"), which will appear in the next subsection of the classical shadow's case. These subscripts represent if the cost function is classical or quantum. For example, $\hat{\theta}_C$ is the maximizer of ℓ_{LL} , which is a consistent estimator of the negative classical cross entropy.

$\mathbb{E}_{g(z)} \left[\log \text{Tr} \left(\Pi_Z \sigma(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C) \right) \right]$ is not equal to the negative QCE, and the bias-corrected estimator is our target quantum information criterion. Now let $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ be a solution to $\text{Tr} \left(\rho \frac{\partial \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right) = 0$. Then, despite the bias, the maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C$ converges to $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ when $n \rightarrow \infty$; see Appendix C for the proof. This is the main motivation to use the log-likelihood $\ell_{\text{LL}}(\mathbf{x}_n; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C)$.

The bias of the estimator using the log-likelihood is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} b(G) &= \mathbb{E}_{g(\mathbf{x}_n)} \left[\ell_{\text{LL}}(\mathbf{X}_n; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C) - n \text{Tr} \left(\rho \log \sigma(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C) \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{g(\mathbf{x}_n)} \left[\ell_{\text{LL}}(\mathbf{X}_n; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C) - \ell_{\text{LL}}(\mathbf{X}_n; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{g(\mathbf{x}_n)} \left[\ell_{\text{LL}}(\mathbf{X}_n; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) - n \text{Tr} \left(\rho \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right) \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{g(\mathbf{x}_n)} \left[n \text{Tr} \left(\rho \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right) - n \text{Tr} \left(\rho \log \sigma(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C) \right) \right] \\ &= D_1 + D_2 + D_3, \end{aligned}$$

where the expectation $\mathbb{E}_{g(\mathbf{x}_n)}$ is taken with respect to the joint probability mass function $g(\mathbf{x}_n) = \prod_{\alpha=1}^n g(x_\alpha)$. To derive an unbiased estimator for the negative QCE, we give an explicit form of the bias. The explicit calculations of D_1 , D_2 , and D_3 , which are detailed in Appendix A.1, conclude that the bias of the estimation of the negative QCE using the log-likelihood is obtained, in the asymptotic regime, as

$$\begin{aligned} b(G) &= D_1 + D_2 + D_3 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left(I_C(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) J_C(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{-1} \right) \\ &\quad + n \left(H(g(z) \| \text{Tr}(\Pi_z \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0))) - \text{Tr}(\rho \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)) \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left(J_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) J_C(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{-1} I_C(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) J_C(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{-1} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $J_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$, $I_C(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$, and $J_C(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ are defined in Eqs. (A.4), (A.6), and (A.7), respectively. The second term of the bias (12) cannot be computed in practice, because it includes the classical and quantum cross entropy between the true state and the optimal parametric state. This prevents us from defining the quantum version of TIC (4) using the log-likelihood. To avoid this issue, we assume that the parametric quantum state $\{\sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}) : \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p\}$ is realizable, meaning that there exists $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ satisfying $\rho = \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$. In this case, using the relation $J_C(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = I_C(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$, the above bias expression is reduced to

$$\begin{aligned} b(G) &= D_1 + D_2 + D_3 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} p + n \left(H(g(z) \| g(z)) - \text{Tr}(\rho \log \rho) \right) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left(J_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) I_C(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{-1} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

The second term of the above reduced bias is independent of the model, and thus it is not necessary to compute when comparing the values of different models. Now note that $J_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ and $I_C(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$, which are defined in Eqs. (A.4) and (A.6) respectively, contain the unknown factors ρ and $g(x) = \text{Tr}(\Pi_x \rho)$. This issue can also be resolved by the realizability assumption, which allows us to replace them by $\sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ and $g(x) = \text{Tr}(\Pi_x \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0))$, respectively. As a result, $J_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ and $I_C(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ can be replaced with their consistent estimators

$$\hat{J}_{Q;ij}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C) = - \text{Tr} \left(\sigma(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C) \frac{\partial^2 \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C} \right), \quad (14)$$

$$\hat{I}_{C;ij}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C) = \mathbb{E}_{h(x)} \left[\frac{\partial \log \text{Tr}(\Pi_X \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}))}{\partial \theta_i} \frac{\partial \log \text{Tr}(\Pi_X \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}))}{\partial \theta_j} \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C} \right], \quad (15)$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{h(x)}$ is the expectation with respect to the probability mass function $h(x) = \text{Tr}(\Pi_x \sigma(\hat{\theta}_C))$. Importantly, $\hat{J}_Q(\hat{\theta}_C)$ is the Bogoljubov Fisher information matrix at $\hat{\theta}_C$ [28, 29, 30]. We give a brief review of quantum Fisher information, including Bogoljubov Fisher information, in Appendix D. From Eqs. (13),(14), and (15), we define the quantum information criterion using the log-likelihood:

$$\text{QAIC}_{\text{LL}} = -2\ell_{\text{LL}}(\hat{\theta}_C) + p + \text{Tr} \left(\hat{J}_Q(\hat{\theta}_C) \hat{I}_C(\hat{\theta}_C)^{-1} \right). \quad (16)$$

Here we omit the second term of Eq. (13), as it is a model-independent constant that is not necessary for comparing different parametric models. Note that $-\text{QAIC}_{\text{LL}}/(2n)$ with this constant asymptotically becomes an unbiased estimator of the negative QCE:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{g(\mathbf{x}_n)} \left[-\frac{1}{2n} \text{QAIC}_{\text{LL}} - (H(g(z)||g(z)) - \text{Tr}(\rho \log \rho)) \right] \\ = \mathbb{E}_{g(\mathbf{x}_n)} \left[\text{Tr}(\rho \log \sigma(\hat{\theta}_C)) \right] + o(n^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

We recall that the quantum Fisher information matrix \hat{J}_Q is equal to or greater than the classical Fisher information matrix \hat{I}_C , i.e., $\hat{J}_Q \geq \hat{I}_C$, with equality if and only if the optimal measurement strategy is performed for estimating the parameters θ . This concludes that the third term of QAIC_{LL} (16) is always equal to or greater than p , meaning $\text{QAIC}_{\text{LL}} \geq \text{AIC}$ in general. Particularly it is interesting to see the case of $\hat{J}_Q = \hat{I}_C$, that leads to $\text{QAIC}_{\text{LL}} = -2\ell_{\text{LL}}(\hat{\theta}_C) + 2p = \text{AIC}$. Now, $\hat{J}_Q = \hat{I}_C$ is achieved only when observables associated with parameters can be simultaneously measured and the corresponding projective measurement is chosen. This is exactly equivalent to the classical scenario, where the computational basis measurement is performed to estimate parameters that are associated with commuting observables. This result coincides with the intuition that the bias of the estimator should be larger if the measurement is not optimal, because the bias originates from the fluctuation from the parameter estimation. This kind of measurement-induced bias, which does not exist in the classical case, should be incorporated in model selection because the optimality of the chosen measurement is different among parametric models.

3.2. Estimator of the negative QCE: Classical shadow approach

The second estimator of the negative QCE (9) is the average of negative QCEs defined for a classical shadow state; that is, roughly speaking, we use the quantum cross entropy with classical shadow, i.e., ‘‘quantum log-likelihood’’, to estimate the quantum cross entropy.

The classical shadow [18] can be used to efficiently estimate observables with a finite number of measurements. In our case, instead of the outcomes $\mathbf{x}_n = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ obtained by measuring an unknown true state ρ , we use the classical shadow $\hat{\rho}_n = \{\hat{\rho}_1, \hat{\rho}_2, \dots, \hat{\rho}_n\}$ to construct an estimator for the negative QCE. Originally, to construct the classical shadow, we repeatedly apply a random unitary U sampled from the set \mathcal{U} to rotate the state and then perform a computational-basis measurement to get the measurement outcome $|\hat{b}\rangle$, $\hat{b} \in \Omega$, where Ω is a computational basis domain. Here we assume that the set of unitaries \mathcal{U} defines a tomographically complete set of measurements so that the inverse of the quantum channel \mathcal{M}^{-1} exists. After the measurement, we apply the inverse of U and \mathcal{M}^{-1} to get a classical snapshot $\hat{\rho} = \mathcal{M}^{-1} \left(U^\dagger |\hat{b}\rangle \langle \hat{b}| U \right)$. Thus, $\hat{\rho}$ is sampled with probability $g(\hat{\rho}) = \langle \hat{b}| U \rho U^\dagger |\hat{b}\rangle$, by definition. This snapshot has a preferable feature for our derivation; it reconstructs the true state in expectation, $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\rho}] = \rho$, and has statistical convergence guarantees [31]. Based on this

property, we define

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q = \underset{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta}{\operatorname{argmax}} \ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_n; \boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad \ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_n; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \operatorname{Tr}(\hat{\rho}_\alpha \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})), \quad (17)$$

and the estimator for the negative QCE, $\operatorname{Tr}(\rho \log \sigma(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q))$, as

$$\mathbb{E}_{\hat{g}(\hat{\rho})} \left[\operatorname{Tr} \left(\hat{\rho} \log \sigma(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q) \right) \right] = \frac{1}{n} \ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_n; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q), \quad (18)$$

where $\hat{g}(\hat{\rho})$ is the empirical probability mass function. However, because Eq. (18) contains $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q$ which is a function of the snapshots, it is not an unbiased estimator for the negative QCE.

The bias of the estimator using the classical shadow is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} b(G) &= \mathbb{E}_{g(\hat{\rho}_n)} \left[\ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_n; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q) - n \operatorname{Tr} \left(\rho \log \sigma(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q) \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{g(\hat{\rho}_n)} \left[\ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_n; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q) - \ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_n; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0) \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{g(\hat{\rho}_n)} \left[\ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_n; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0) - n \operatorname{Tr}(\rho \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)) \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{g(\hat{\rho}_n)} \left[n \operatorname{Tr}(\rho \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)) - n \operatorname{Tr}(\rho \log \sigma(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q)) \right] \\ &= D_1 + D_2 + D_3, \end{aligned}$$

where the expectation $\mathbb{E}_{g(\hat{\rho}_n)}$ is taken with respect to the joint probability density function, $g(\hat{\rho}_n) = \prod_{\alpha=1}^n g(\hat{\rho}_\alpha)$. Also, $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ is the solution to $\operatorname{Tr} \left(\rho \frac{\partial \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right) = 0$. To derive an unbiased estimator for the negative QCE, we give an explicit form of the bias. The explicit calculations of D_1 , D_2 , and D_3 , which are detailed in Appendix A.2, conclude that the bias of the shadow-based estimator of the negative QCE is obtained, in the asymptotic regime, as

$$\begin{aligned} b(G) &= D_1 + D_2 + D_3 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr} (I_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) J_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{-1}) + 0 + \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr} (I_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) J_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{-1}) \\ &= \operatorname{Tr} (I_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) J_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Note now that $I_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ and $J_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$, defined in Eqs. (A.15) and (A.4) respectively, depend on the unknown distribution $g(\hat{\rho})$ and state ρ ; we thus replace these terms with their consistent estimators

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{I}_{Q;ij}^{\text{emp}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q) &= \mathbb{E}_{\hat{g}(\hat{\rho})} \left[\operatorname{Tr} \left(\hat{\rho} \frac{\partial \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_i} \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q} \right) \operatorname{Tr} \left(\hat{\rho} \frac{\partial \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_j} \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q} \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \operatorname{Tr} \left(\hat{\rho}_\alpha \frac{\partial \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_i} \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q} \right) \operatorname{Tr} \left(\hat{\rho}_\alpha \frac{\partial \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_j} \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{J}_{Q;ij}^{\text{emp}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q) &= \mathbb{E}_{\hat{g}(\hat{\rho})} \left[- \operatorname{Tr} \left(\hat{\rho} \frac{\partial^2 \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q} \right) \right] \\ &= - \operatorname{Tr} \left(\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \hat{\rho}_\alpha \right) \frac{\partial^2 \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Using Eqs. (19), (20), and (21), we define the quantum information criterion based on the classical shadow, which is a quantum version of TIC (4):

$$\text{QTIC}_{\text{shadow}} = -2 \ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_n; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q) + 2 \operatorname{Tr} \left(\hat{I}_Q^{\text{emp}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q) \hat{J}_Q^{\text{emp}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q)^{-1} \right). \quad (22)$$

The realizability assumption that the set of parametric quantum states includes the true state allows us to simplify $\text{QTIC}_{\text{shadow}}$. Actually, under this assumption, $I_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ and $J_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ appearing in Eq. (19) are replaced with

$$\hat{I}_{Q;ij}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q) = \mathbb{E}_{h(\hat{\rho})} \left[\text{Tr} \left(\hat{\rho} \frac{\partial \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_i} \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q} \right) \text{Tr} \left(\hat{\rho} \frac{\partial \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_j} \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q} \right) \right], \quad (23)$$

$$\hat{J}_{Q;ij}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q) = - \text{Tr} \left(\sigma(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q) \frac{\partial^2 \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q} \right), \quad (24)$$

where $h(\hat{\rho}) = \langle \hat{b} | U \sigma(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q) U^\dagger | \hat{b} \rangle$, and thus we obtain

$$\text{QAIC}_{\text{shadow}} = -2\ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\rho}_n; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q) + 2 \text{Tr} \left(\hat{I}_Q(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q) \hat{J}_Q(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q)^{-1} \right). \quad (25)$$

Importantly, unlike the conventional AIC, the second term of $\text{QAIC}_{\text{shadow}}$ is not equal to the number of parameters. Note also that $\text{QTIC}_{\text{shadow}}$ and $\text{QAIC}_{\text{shadow}}$ multiplied by $-1/(2n)$ are asymptotic unbiased estimators of the negative QCE:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{g(\hat{\rho}_n)} \left[-\frac{1}{2n} \text{QTIC}_{\text{shadow}} \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{g(\hat{\rho}_n)} \left[\text{Tr} \left(\rho \log \sigma(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q) \right) \right] + o(n^{-1}), \\ \mathbb{E}_{g(\hat{\rho}_n)} \left[-\frac{1}{2n} \text{QAIC}_{\text{shadow}} \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{g(\hat{\rho}_n)} \left[\text{Tr} \left(\rho \log \sigma(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q) \right) \right] + o(n^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

For the rest of this section, we discuss how to compute $\text{QTIC}_{\text{shadow}}$ or $\text{QAIC}_{\text{shadow}}$. As demonstrated above, though the classical shadow is useful for deriving these criteria, it was originally designed to approximate quasi-local observables. In general, $\log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is a global observable and thus we need to carefully choose a parametric quantum state $\sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, because otherwise the estimation might have large variance. In addition, computation of the matrix logarithm $\log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and its derivatives cannot be efficiently conducted via classical means. To mitigate these issues, we choose the quantum model $\sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ from a class of quantum Boltzmann machines (QBM). In particular, a thermal state generated by QBM is represented as

$$\sigma_{\text{QBM}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{\exp(-H_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}/(k_B T))}{Z_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}, \quad Z_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \text{Tr}(\exp(-H_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}/(k_B T))),$$

with k_B the Boltzmann constant, T the system temperature, and $Z_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ the partition function. Here we define a parameterized Hamiltonian $H_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \theta_i P_i$ where $P_i = \otimes_j \sigma_{j,i}$ with $\sigma_{j,i} \in \{I, X, Y, Z\}$ the Pauli operator acting on the j -th qubit. Assuming that $k_B T = 1$ for simplicity, we easily see that

$$\log \sigma_{\text{QBM}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = -H_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \log Z_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}.$$

Thus, the quasi-locality of $\log \sigma_{\text{QBM}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ can be satisfied by choosing appropriate Pauli strings in $H_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$. Also, the computational hardness of the matrix logarithm is now converted to the hardness of the log-partition function $\log Z_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$. Moreover, Ref. [32] proposed a quantum model called the quantum Hamiltonian-based models (QHBM) that have an explicit representation of the exponential form and can be implemented on a quantum-classical hybrid computer. QHBMs can turn the quantum log-partition function into the classical one, which actually mitigates the computational hardness of the partition function. We will use QHBM in the numerical demonstration of Section 4; it will be shown there that we can obtain the analytic form of terms like $\partial_i \log \sigma_{\text{QHBM}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $\partial_i \partial_j \log \sigma_{\text{QHBM}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, as detailed in Ref. [32, 33].

Other than the above-mentioned approach, recently a combination of structural assumptions on quantum states with the classical shadow has been found to achieve better sample complexity for estimating observables. It has been shown that exponential improvements in the sample complexity hold for some specific quantum states such as high-temperature Gibbs states of commuting Hamiltonians or outputs of shallow circuits [34]; quantum Gibbs states of non-commuting Hamiltonians with exponential decay of correlations [35]; ground states of gapped local Hamiltonians [36]. Thus, there is another room for improvements to reduce the variance of the estimation in practice.

4. Numerical demonstration

In this section, we numerically study a quantum state estimation problem using a classical backend, instead of a quantum processing unit, and evaluate the performance of the quantum information criteria for model selection. Among the three quantum information criteria derived in Section 3, we use $\text{QTIC}_{\text{shadow}}$ because the analytical form of the first and second derivatives of ℓ_{shadow} can be obtained for the problem to be investigated. Note that $\text{QAIC}_{\text{shadow}}$ is also calculable, but the matrix \hat{I}_Q given in Eq. (23) takes the expectation with respect to every possible classical snapshot, whose total number is much bigger than the number of samples n for large systems. In addition, $\text{QAIC}_{\text{shadow}}$ assumes that the set of parametric quantum states includes a true state, while $\text{QTIC}_{\text{shadow}}$ does not need this assumption. From here, we simply refer $\text{QTIC}_{\text{shadow}}$ as QTIC. The goal is to test whether QTIC would properly work or not, by comparing it with the negative QCE between the true quantum state ρ and the estimated quantum state $\sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, i.e.,

$$\text{QCE}_{\text{true}} = -\text{Tr}(\rho \log \sigma(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})),$$

which cannot be calculated in practice because the true state is unknown. We note that the value of QTIC is divided by $1/(2n)$ to compare with QCE_{true} in the following numerical results.

To estimate the true state, we use QHBM [32] as a parametric quantum state $\sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. QHBM is a quantum analogue of a classical energy-based model, consisting of classical and quantum parts. The classical part is an energy-based model (EBM) represented by the energy function $E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}(\mathbf{x})$ with latent variational parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$ and a binary string \mathbf{x} . The quantum part is a parameterized quantum circuit (PQC) represented by the unitary operator $U(\boldsymbol{\theta}'')$ with model parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}''$. The variational mixed state is then

$$\sigma_{\text{QHBM}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{Z_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}} \exp(-U(\boldsymbol{\theta}'')K_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}U^\dagger(\boldsymbol{\theta}')), \quad \boldsymbol{\theta} = (\boldsymbol{\theta}', \boldsymbol{\theta}'),$$

where $K_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}$ is called the latent modular Hamiltonian given by

$$K_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'} = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega} E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}(\mathbf{x}) |\mathbf{x}\rangle \langle \mathbf{x}|,$$

with Ω the computational basis domain. Also $Z_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'} = \text{Tr}(\exp(-K_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}))$ is the model partition function. In the numerical simulation, we use the fully-connected Boltzmann machine as EBM.

For the demonstration of calculating QTIC, we consider a 3-qubit system and compare two parametric quantum states represented by QHBM against some fixed true state. To prepare two parametric quantum state models M_1 and M_2 , we use two different PQCs shown by PQC1 and PQC2 in Fig. 1. PQC1 consists of a single layer of R_y rotation gates, each of which is given by $R_y(\theta) = \exp(-i\theta\sigma_y)$; hence PQC1 contains 3 real parameters. PQC2 consists of three layers of R_y gates and some CNOT gates, resulting in 9 real parameters. As for the classical part, we use a standard fully-connected Boltzmann machine with three nodes. Since it has 6 real variational parameters, the parametric quantum state models M_1 and M_2 have 9 and 15 parameters in total,




 Figure 1: PQCs for parametric quantum states M_1 and M_2 .


Figure 2: Procedure of the numerical simulation.

respectively. Note that models M_1 and M_2 constitute a hierarchical series of models such that $M_1 \subset M_2$. We set the true state to be M_1 with randomly chosen parameters; note that the behavior of the value of QTIC depends on the true state, but we observed similar behavior for other true states as the case shown below.

Figure 2 shows the procedure of the numerical simulation. In Step 1, we perform the random Pauli measurement on the true state. The number of measurements, or equivalently the number of classical snapshots, is set to $n = 1000$. In Step 2, the parameters are estimated based on the measurement outcome obtained in Step 1. We use L-BFGS-B in SciPy [37] to minimize $-\ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\rho}_n; \theta)$ for the parameter estimation. In Step 3, QTIC is calculated based on the measurement outcome obtained in Step 1. Note that Steps 2 and 3 are conducted for both models M_1 and M_2 . We use the analytic form of the first and second derivatives of the logarithm of the density matrix, $\partial_i \log \sigma_{\text{QHBM}}(\theta)$ and $\partial_i \partial_j \log \sigma_{\text{QHBM}}(\theta)$, derived in Refs. [32, 33], for these steps. We note that Refs. [32, 33] proposed a method to compute the derivatives via the parameter shift rule on a quantum computer, but the derivatives are supposed to be computed on classical computers in our setting to ensure that all the estimates are based on the same measurement data of n classical snapshots. This computation of derivative is consistent with the definition of the quantum information criteria introduced in Section 3. In Step 4, the model selection is finally performed using the values of QTIC obtained in Step 3. Furthermore, to investigate the effect of deviation caused by the finite number of measurements, we repeat the measurement and estimation procedures 50 times for the same true state.

Before showing the result of model selection, we compute the error of QTIC against QCE_{true} . Figure 3 shows the histogram of the values of $|\text{QTIC} - \text{QCE}_{\text{true}}|$ for the parametric quantum states M_1 and M_2 (green). The horizontal line represents the value of error in the log plot and the vertical line represents the number of counts out of 50 independent experiments. For comparison, the error of the 1st term of QTIC, which is denoted as QTIC_{1st} (i.e., the loss function used for estimating the parameters) against QCE_{true} is shown in the orange histogram. Comparing these two histograms, we find that correcting the bias by the second term of QTIC leads to smaller error, for both cases of M_1 and M_2 . This clearly means that the bias-corrected QTIC works as a valid measure for model selection criterion in terms of the quantum relative entropy.




Figure 3: Error of QTIC against QCE_{true} for the parametric quantum states M_1 and M_2 (green). The horizontal line represents the value of error in the log plot and the vertical line represents the number of counts out of 50 independent experiments. The error of the 1st term of QTIC, denoted as $\text{QTIC}_{1\text{st}}$, against QCE_{true} is shown (orange).

Next, we perform the model selection based on QTIC. Table 1 shows the number of selected models out of 50 experiments, for the cases of using $\text{QTIC}_{1\text{st}}$ and QTIC. For reference, the result when using QCE_{true} , i.e., the generalization error $-\text{Tr}[\rho \log \sigma(\hat{\theta})]$, is also shown; in this case, M_1 is always chosen because M_1 can realize the true state ρ with less parameters than M_2 . On the other hand, $\text{QTIC}_{1\text{st}}$ selects M_2 every time in 50 experiments. This makes sense because $\text{QTIC}_{1\text{st}}$ represents the loss function of the data and thus M_2 , a bigger expressibility function, can lower this value; this is consistent with the general fact that a statistical model with more parameters tends to overfit to the observed data. The information criterion fixes this issue by introducing the penalty term; actually QTIC selects M_1 more frequently, meaning that QTIC can better capture the hidden function generating the data than $\text{QTIC}_{1\text{st}}$.

We can conduct model selection based on AIC as a reference. Because AIC is based on (classical) probability distributions, we measure the true and estimated quantum states and obtain the corresponding distributions. For model selection by AIC, we follow the same procedure depicted in Fig. 2 with some minor changes. More precisely, in Step 2, we use SLSQP to calculate the maximum likelihood estimator for the parameters, unlike the case of QTIC. In Steps 3 and 4, AIC is calculated and used for model selection instead of QTIC. Note that, while the measurement outcomes in Step 1 are used to construct the classical shadow for computing QTIC, the same measurement outcomes are used in Step 1 and represented as the empirical classical distribution in the case of AIC. Table 2 shows the number of selections of the model M_1 or M_2 out of 50 experiments based on the following three criteria. The first one, CE_{true} , is the negative classical cross entropy between the true distribution and the estimated distribution, where those classical distributions are obtained by the measurement of the 3-fold tensor of the Pauli-6 POVM [38] for the true and the estimated states, respectively. The other two are the 1st term of AIC (denoted as $\text{AIC}_{1\text{st}}$) and AIC. The result indicates the similar tendency to the result of QTIC shown in Table 1. That is, CE_{true} chooses M_1 more often than M_2 ; moreover, while $\text{AIC}_{1\text{st}}$ chooses M_2 more often, AIC corrects the bias of this criterion and thereby can choose the correct model M_1 with high probability ($47/50 = 94\%$).

We finally remark that both M_1 and M_2 are singular models. Therefore, by definition, both

Table 1: The number of selecting M_1 or M_2 out of 50 experiments based on QCE_{true} , the 1st term of QTIC ($\text{QTIC}_{1\text{st}}$), and QTIC.

	QCE_{true}	$\text{QTIC}_{1\text{st}}$	QTIC
M_1	50	0	36
M_2	0	50	14

Table 2: The number of selecting M_1 or M_2 out of 50 experiments based on CE_{true} , the 1st term of AIC ($\text{AIC}_{1\text{st}}$), and AIC.

	CE_{true}	$\text{AIC}_{1\text{st}}$	AIC
M_1	29	23	47
M_2	21	27	3

QTIC and AIC are invalid to use, as discussed in Section 2. Actually, in computing QTIC, we observed that the calculated $\hat{J}_Q^{\text{emp}}(\hat{\theta}_Q)$ was degenerate, especially for M_2 . However, we computed QTIC by using the pseudo-inverse of $\hat{J}_Q^{\text{emp}}(\hat{\theta}_Q)$, which is the technique often used in classical statistics. As seen in the above numerical simulation, using the pseudo-inverse did not affect the performance badly for this small-scale experiment. Nevertheless, in general, comparing different information criteria (QTIC and AIC in our case) for singular models does not provide useful information as it is proven that such information criteria are not equal to the unbiased estimate for the generalization error anymore [39]; therefore, although from Tables 1 and 2 it seems that AIC (which chooses M_1 with probability $47/50 = 94\%$) realizes better model selection than QTIC (which chooses M_1 with probability $36/50 = 72\%$), we cannot have such conclusion.

5. Conclusion

In this work, we developed quantum information criteria for statistical model selection, in terms of the quantum relative entropy. This is quantum generalization of the classical information criteria, AIC and TIC, which evaluate an estimated model based on the KL divergence. Those quantum information criteria depend on the type of estimator of the quantum relative entropy; i.e., the log-likelihood (QAIC_{LL}) and the classical shadow ($\text{QTIC}_{\text{shadow}}$ and $\text{QAIC}_{\text{shadow}}$). QAIC_{LL} explicitly incorporates the optimality of the measurement into a model selection criterion, which does not appear in the classical information criteria. Also, $\text{QTIC}_{\text{shadow}}$, which is more suitable for practical use compared to QAIC_{LL} , was examined in the numerical experiment for a simple model selection problem. Recall that the quantum information criteria derived in this paper are the measure for determining a quantum state, while there are other model selection techniques in quantum information technology. For instance, the quantum tomographic transfer function [40] is the measure for determining a tomographically complete measurement.

As a concluding remark, we discuss some practical issues of the proposed quantum information criteria. The first issue is the computational complexity. For instance, $\text{QTIC}_{\text{shadow}}$ requires much computation of $\hat{I}_Q^{\text{emp}}(\hat{\theta}_Q)$ and $\hat{J}_Q^{\text{emp}}(\hat{\theta}_Q)$. As pointed out in Section 4, the derivatives of these matrices have to be computed classically using the n classical snapshots, instead of using the parameter shift rule on quantum computers. However, the complexity of this computation for the derivatives scales exponentially with the system size, and thus $\text{QTIC}_{\text{shadow}}$ faces the practical limit as it is. The second is on the problem of handling singular models. The quantum information criteria derived in this paper cannot be applied to singular models, because the Cramér-Rao framework does not hold in this case, as mentioned in Section 2. Thus, they are likely to be invalid to use for parametric quantum states with many parameters. However, there should be a chance to design a quantum information criterion that can work even for singular models; actually, there already exists a Bayesian-based classical information criterion called WAIC [41] which is applicable for singular models. The last issue is on the measurement procedures. We assume that the measurement data are obtained by tomographically complete measurements, like random Pauli measurements, for simplifying the derivation of the quantum

information criteria. However, it is not optimal for the purpose of parameter estimation. In fact, depending on the models to be compared, the measurement may not need to be tomographically complete, as noted at the beginning of Section 3.1. Furthermore, there is often the case where a tomographically complete measurement is impossible. It is worth investigating if we could compute the quantum information criteria without tomographically complete measurements. By solving the above practical issues, we expect that the proposed quantum information criteria can function as a relevant and practical model selection method for quantum state estimation problems.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by MEXT Quantum Leap Flagship Program (MEXT Q-LEAP) Grants No. JPMXS0118067285 and No. JPMXS0120319794 and JST SPRING Grant No. JPMJSP2123.

Data availability

The data that support the findings of this study are available upon request from the authors.

Appendix A. Details of the bias derivation

We give the detailed calculations of each term of the bias, D_1 , D_2 , and D_3 , for the log-likelihood approach in Appendix A.1, and for the classical shadow approach in Appendix A.2. The symbol \approx , such as in Eq. (A.3), represents the approximation to the second order and ignores the higher order.

Appendix A.1. Log-likelihood approach

Calculation of D_2 : First we find

$$\begin{aligned}
D_2 &= \mathbb{E}_{g(\mathbf{x}_n)} [\ell_{\text{LL}}(\mathbf{X}_n; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) - n \text{Tr}(\rho \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0))] \\
&= n \left(\mathbb{E}_{g(\mathbf{x}_n)} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \log \text{Tr}(\Pi_{X_\alpha} \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)) \right] - \text{Tr}(\rho \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)) \right) \\
&= n \left(\mathbb{E}_{g(\mathbf{x}_n)} \left[\sum_m \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \frac{\delta(m - X_\alpha)}{n} \log \text{Tr}(\Pi_m \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)) \right] - \text{Tr}(\rho \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)) \right) \\
&= n \left(\sum_m \text{Tr}(\Pi_m \rho) \log \text{Tr}(\Pi_m \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)) - \text{Tr}(\rho \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)) \right) \\
&= n (H(g(z) \| \text{Tr}(\Pi_z \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0))) - \text{Tr}(\rho \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0))). \tag{A.1}
\end{aligned}$$

The fourth equality uses the fact that $\mathbb{E}_{g(\mathbf{x}_n)} \left[\sum_{\alpha=1}^n \frac{\delta(m - X_\alpha)}{n} \right] = \text{Tr}(\Pi_m \rho)$, $\forall m$. In the last equality, we use $g(z) = \text{Tr}(\Pi_z \rho)$ and the negative classical cross entropy H defined in Eq. (2).

Calculation of D_3 : Define $\eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \text{Tr}(\rho \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
D_3 &= n \mathbb{E}_{g(\mathbf{x}_n)} \left[\text{Tr}(\rho \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)) - \text{Tr}(\rho \log \sigma(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C)) \right] \\
&= n \mathbb{E}_{g(\mathbf{x}_n)} \left[\eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) - \eta(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C) \right]. \tag{A.2}
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the Taylor expansion of $\eta(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C)$ around $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}\eta(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C) &\approx \eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T \frac{\partial \eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} + \frac{1}{2} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T \frac{\partial^2 \eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^T} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \\ &= \eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) - \frac{1}{2} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T J_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0),\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A.3})$$

where for $i, j = 1, \dots, p$,

$$J_{Q;ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = -\frac{\partial^2 \eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} = -\text{Tr} \left(\rho \frac{\partial^2 \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0} \right).\quad (\text{A.4})$$

Hence, according to Eqs. (A.2) and (A.3),

$$\begin{aligned}D_3 &\approx \frac{n}{2} \mathbb{E}_{g(\mathbf{x}_n)} \left[(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T J_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right] \\ &= \frac{n}{2} \mathbb{E}_{g(\mathbf{x}_n)} \left[\text{Tr} \left(J_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{n}{2} \text{Tr} \left(J_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \mathbb{E}_{g(\mathbf{x}_n)} \left[(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T \right] \right) \\ &\approx \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left(J_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) J_C(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{-1} I_C(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) J_C(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{-1} \right),\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A.5})$$

where

$$I_{C;ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = \mathbb{E}_{g(x)} \left[\frac{\partial \log \text{Tr}(\Pi_X \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}))}{\partial \theta_i} \frac{\partial \log \text{Tr}(\Pi_X \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}))}{\partial \theta_j} \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0} \right],\quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$J_{C;ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = -\mathbb{E}_{g(x)} \left[\frac{\partial^2 \log \text{Tr}(\Pi_X \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}))}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0} \right].\quad (\text{A.7})$$

The last approximation in Eq. (A.5) is obtained by the asymptotic normality of the maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C$; see Appendix B.1.

Calculation of D_1 : Here we focus on

$$D_1 = \mathbb{E}_{g(\mathbf{x}_n)} \left[\ell_{\text{LL}}(\mathbf{X}_n; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C) - \ell_{\text{LL}}(\mathbf{X}_n; \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right].\quad (\text{A.8})$$

The Taylor expansion of $\ell_{\text{LL}}(\mathbf{X}_n; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ around $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}\ell_{\text{LL}}(\mathbf{X}_n; \boldsymbol{\theta}) &\approx \ell_{\text{LL}}(\mathbf{X}_n; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C) + (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C)^T \frac{\partial \ell_{\text{LL}}(\mathbf{X}_n; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} + \frac{1}{2} (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C)^T \frac{\partial^2 \ell_{\text{LL}}(\mathbf{X}_n; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^T} (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C) \\ &= \ell_{\text{LL}}(\mathbf{X}_n; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C) + \frac{1}{2} (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C)^T \frac{\partial^2 \ell_{\text{LL}}(\mathbf{X}_n; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^T} (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C) \\ &\rightarrow \ell_{\text{LL}}(\mathbf{X}_n; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C) - \frac{n}{2} (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C)^T J_C(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C).\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A.9})$$

At the last line, we used the fact that the quantity

$$-\frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial^2 \ell_{\text{LL}}(\mathbf{X}_n; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^T} = -\frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial^2 \left(\sum_{\alpha=1}^n \log \text{Tr} \left(\Pi_{x_\alpha} \sigma(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C) \right) \right)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^T}$$

converges in probability to $J_C(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ defined in Eq. (A.7) when $n \rightarrow \infty$. Using this result, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}D_1 &\approx \frac{n}{2} \mathbb{E}_{g(\mathbf{x}_n)} \left[(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C)^T J_C(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) (\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C) \right] \\ &= \frac{n}{2} \mathbb{E}_{g(\mathbf{x}_n)} \left[\text{Tr} \left(J_C(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) (\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C) (\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C)^T \right) \right]\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{n}{2} \text{Tr} \left(J_C(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \mathbb{E}_{g(\mathbf{x}_n)} \left[(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T \right] \right) \\
&\approx \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left(I_C(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) J_C(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{-1} \right). \tag{A.10}
\end{aligned}$$

At the last approximation we utilize the asymptotic normality of the maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C$, provided in Appendix B.1.

Appendix A.2. Classical shadow approach

Calculation of D_2 : First, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
D_2 &= \mathbb{E}_{g(\hat{\rho}_n)} \left[\ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\rho}_n; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0) - n \text{Tr}(\rho \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)) \right] \\
&= n \left(\mathbb{E}_{g(\hat{\rho}_n)} \left[\text{Tr} \left(\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\rho}_i \right) \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right) \right] - \text{Tr}(\rho \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)) \right) \\
&= n (\text{Tr}(\rho \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)) - \text{Tr}(\rho \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0))) = 0. \tag{A.11}
\end{aligned}$$

Calculation of D_3 : Define $\eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \text{Tr}(\rho \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$. Then D_3 is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
D_3 &= n \mathbb{E}_{g(\hat{\rho}_n)} \left[\text{Tr}(\rho \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)) - \text{Tr}(\rho \log \sigma(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q)) \right] \\
&= n \mathbb{E}_{g(\hat{\rho}_n)} \left[\eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) - \eta(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q) \right]. \tag{A.12}
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the Taylor expansion of $\eta(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q)$ around $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q) &\approx \eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T \frac{\partial \eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} + \frac{1}{2} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T \frac{\partial^2 \eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^T} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \\
&= \eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) - \frac{1}{2} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T J_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0), \tag{A.13}
\end{aligned}$$

where $J_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ is equivalent to Eq. (A.4) obtained in the case of the estimator using the log-likelihood. From Eqs. (A.12) and (A.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
D_3 &\approx \frac{n}{2} \mathbb{E}_{g(\hat{\rho}_n)} \left[(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T J_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right] \\
&= \frac{n}{2} \mathbb{E}_{g(\hat{\rho}_n)} \left[\text{Tr} \left(J(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T \right) \right] \\
&= \frac{n}{2} \text{Tr} \left(J_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \mathbb{E}_{g(\hat{\rho}_n)} \left[(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T \right] \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The covariance matrix of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q$ around $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ appears in the last line; unlike the case of likelihood approach where Eq. (A.5) holds, the estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q$ does not satisfy the standard asymptotic normality for classical maximum likelihood estimators. Instead, using the asymptotic normality for the classical shadow proven in Appendix B.2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
D_3 &\approx \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left(J_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) J_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{-1} I_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) J_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{-1} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left(I_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) J_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{-1} \right), \tag{A.14}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$I_{Q;ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = \mathbb{E}_{g(\hat{\rho})} \left[\text{Tr} \left(\hat{\rho} \frac{\partial \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_i} \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0} \right) \text{Tr} \left(\hat{\rho} \frac{\partial \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_j} \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0} \right) \right]. \tag{A.15}$$

Calculation of D_1 : Next we focus on

$$D_1 = \mathbb{E}_{g(\hat{\rho}_n)} \left[\ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\rho}_n; \hat{\theta}_Q) - \ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\rho}_n; \hat{\theta}_0) \right]. \quad (\text{A.16})$$

Again, the Taylor expansion of $\ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\rho}_n; \theta)$ around $\hat{\theta}_Q$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\rho}_n; \theta) &\approx \ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\rho}_n; \hat{\theta}_Q) + (\theta - \hat{\theta}_Q)^T \frac{\partial \ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\rho}_n; \hat{\theta}_Q)}{\partial \theta} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} (\theta - \hat{\theta}_Q)^T \frac{\partial^2 \ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\rho}_n; \hat{\theta}_Q)}{\partial \theta \partial \theta^T} (\theta - \hat{\theta}_Q) \\ &= \ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\rho}_n; \hat{\theta}_Q) + \frac{1}{2} (\theta - \hat{\theta}_Q)^T \frac{\partial^2 \ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\rho}_n; \hat{\theta}_Q)}{\partial \theta \partial \theta^T} (\theta - \hat{\theta}_Q) \\ &\rightarrow \ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\rho}_n; \hat{\theta}_Q) - \frac{n}{2} (\theta - \hat{\theta}_Q)^T J_Q(\theta_0) (\theta - \hat{\theta}_Q). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.17})$$

The convergence in the last line is guaranteed as follows. That is,

$$\frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial^2 \ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\rho}_n; \hat{\theta}_Q)}{\partial \theta \partial \theta^T} = \frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial^2 \left(n \text{Tr} \left(\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \hat{\rho}_\alpha \right) \log \sigma(\hat{\theta}_Q) \right) \right)}{\partial \theta \partial \theta^T}$$

converges in probability to $J_Q(\theta_0)$ when $n \rightarrow \infty$, based on the fact that $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \hat{\rho}_\alpha$ and $\hat{\theta}_Q$ converges to ρ and θ_0 , respectively. From this approximation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 &\approx \frac{n}{2} \mathbb{E}_{g(\hat{\rho}_n)} \left[(\theta_0 - \hat{\theta}_Q)^T J_Q(\theta_0) (\theta_0 - \hat{\theta}_Q) \right] \\ &= \frac{n}{2} \mathbb{E}_{g(\hat{\rho}_n)} \left[\text{Tr} \left(J_Q(\theta_0) (\theta_0 - \hat{\theta}_Q) (\theta_0 - \hat{\theta}_Q)^T \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{n}{2} \text{Tr} \left(J_Q(\theta_0) \mathbb{E}_{g(\hat{\rho}_n)} \left[(\hat{\theta}_Q - \theta_0) (\hat{\theta}_Q - \theta_0)^T \right] \right) \\ &\approx \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} (I_Q(\theta_0) J_Q(\theta_0)^{-1}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.18})$$

In the last approximation we again utilized the asymptotic normality of the estimator $\hat{\theta}_Q$ proven in Appendix B.2.

Appendix B. Asymptotic normality

In this appendix, the asymptotic properties of the estimators $\hat{\theta}_C$ and $\hat{\theta}_Q$ are investigated, which we utilize for the derivation of quantum information criteria in Section 3.

Appendix B.1. Asymptotic normality for random variables

The data $\mathbf{x}_n = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ are observed according to the distribution $g(x)$. Assume that the regularity condition holds for the density function $f(x|\theta)$ and θ_0 is a unique solution of

$$\int g(x) \frac{\partial \log f(x|\theta)}{\partial \theta} dx = \mathbf{0}.$$

Then, the following statements hold with respect to the maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\theta}_C$:

- (i) The maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\theta}_C$ converges in probability to θ_0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

(ii) When $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \rightarrow_d \mathcal{N}_p(\mathbf{0}, J_C(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{-1} I_C(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) J_C(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{-1}),$$

where \mathcal{N}_p represents the Gaussian distribution for p -dimensional random variables, and $I(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $J(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ are $p \times p$ matrices given by

$$I_{C;ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbb{E}_{g(z)} \left[\frac{\partial \log f(Z|\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_i} \frac{\partial \log f(Z|\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_j} \right],$$

$$J_{C;ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = -\mathbb{E}_{g(z)} \left[\frac{\partial^2 \log f(Z|\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \right].$$

The convergence in distribution is denoted by \rightarrow_d .

Appendix B.2. Asymptotic normality for the classical shadow

The data $\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_n = \{\hat{\rho}_1, \hat{\rho}_2, \dots, \hat{\rho}_n\}$ is the classical shadow of ρ , i.e., $\mathbb{E}_{g(\hat{\rho})}[\hat{\rho}] = \rho$ with probability $g(\hat{\rho}) = \langle \hat{b} | U \rho U^\dagger | \hat{b} \rangle$, as described in Section 3.2. Assume that the regularity condition holds for the function $\text{Tr}(\hat{\rho} \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ is a unique solution of

$$\text{Tr} \left(\rho \frac{\partial \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right) = \mathbf{0}.$$

Then, the estimator

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q = \underset{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta}{\text{argmax}} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \text{Tr}(\hat{\rho}_\alpha \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$$

satisfies the following properties:

- (i) The estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q$ converges in probability to $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
- (ii) When $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \rightarrow_d \mathcal{N}_p(\mathbf{0}, J_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{-1} I_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) J_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{-1}),$$

where $I_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $J_Q(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ are $p \times p$ matrices given by:

$$I_{Q;ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbb{E}_{g(\hat{\rho})} \left[\text{Tr} \left(\hat{\rho} \frac{\partial \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_i} \right) \text{Tr} \left(\hat{\rho} \frac{\partial \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_j} \right) \right],$$

$$J_{Q;ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = -\text{Tr} \left(\rho \frac{\partial^2 \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \right).$$

Proof. (i) Let us define

$$\ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_n; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \text{Tr}(\hat{\rho}_\alpha \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})).$$

Since $\ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_n; \boldsymbol{\theta})/n$ is the sample mean of $\text{Tr}(\hat{\rho} \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$, by the law of large numbers, it holds that

$$\frac{1}{n} \ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_n; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \rightarrow_p S(\rho \| \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})), \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where $S(\cdot \| \cdot)$ is the negative QCE defined in Eq. (9) and \rightarrow_p means the convergence in probability. Therefore, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_Q$ converges in probability to $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = \underset{\boldsymbol{\theta}}{\text{argmax}} S(\rho \| \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$.

(ii) The Taylor expansion of the first derivative of $\ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\rho}_n; \hat{\theta}_Q)$ around θ_0 gives

$$0 \approx \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} \ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\rho}_n; \theta_0) + \sum_{j=1}^p (\hat{\theta}_{Q;j} - \theta_{0;j}) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\rho}_n; \theta_0), \quad i = 1, \dots, p, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where we write $\hat{\theta}_{Q;j}$ and $\theta_{0;j}$ for the j -th element of $\hat{\theta}_Q$ and θ_0 , respectively. Let $\ell'_{\text{shadow}}(\theta_0)$ stand for the vector whose i -th element is $\partial_i \ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\rho}_n; \theta_0)$. Moreover, we will denote by $n\hat{J}_Q^{\text{emp}}(\theta_0)$ the matrix whose (i, j) element is $-\partial_i \partial_j \ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\rho}_n; \theta_0)$. Then, Eq. (B.2) becomes

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_Q - \theta_0) \approx \hat{J}_Q^{\text{emp}}(\theta_0)^{-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \ell'_{\text{shadow}}(\theta_0). \quad (\text{B.3})$$

By the law of large numbers, when $n \rightarrow \infty$, it can be shown that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{J}_Q^{\text{emp}}(\theta_0) &= -\frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial^2 \ell_{\text{shadow}}(\hat{\rho}_n; \theta_0)}{\partial \theta \partial \theta^T} \\ &= -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta \partial \theta^T} \text{Tr}(\hat{\rho}_\alpha \log \sigma(\theta)) \Big|_{\theta=\theta_0} \xrightarrow{p} J_Q(\theta_0), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Moreover, according to the multivariate central limit theorem for a p -dimensional random vector $X_\alpha = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \text{Tr}(\hat{\rho}_\alpha \log \sigma(\theta)) \Big|_{\theta=\theta_0}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \ell'_{\text{shadow}}(\theta_0) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \frac{\partial \ell_{\text{shadow}}(\theta_0)}{\partial \theta} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \text{Tr}(\hat{\rho}_\alpha \log \sigma(\theta)) \Big|_{\theta=\theta_0} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}_p(\mathbf{0}, I_Q(\theta_0)). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Therefore, from Eqs. (B.3), (B.4), and (B.5), we use the Slutsky's theorem to obtain

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_Q - \theta_0) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}_p(\mathbf{0}, J_Q(\theta_0)^{-1} I_Q(\theta_0) J_Q(\theta_0)^{-1}),$$

when $n \rightarrow \infty$. □

Appendix C. Proof of convergence of the maximum likelihood estimator

The motivation for the use of log-likelihood in Section 3.1 is based on the fact that the maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\theta}_C$ given in Eq. (10) converges to θ_0 , which is a solution to $\text{Tr}(\rho \partial_\theta \log \sigma(\theta)) = \mathbf{0}$ and thus can be a maximizer of the negative QCE (9). Here we give a proof for this argument.

The proof consists of two steps. First, we show that θ_0 maximizes the expected log-likelihood or the negative classical cross entropy (2) as well as the negative QCE; second, we use the consistency of $\hat{\theta}_C$. We also refer to Ref. [42] for the first step. Below, we assume the regularity condition on $\sigma(\theta)$ and the realizable case, i.e., there exists θ_0 such that $\rho = \sigma(\theta_0)$.

The maximum of the negative QCE $S(\rho \| \sigma(\theta))$ can be achieved only when $\sigma(\theta) = \rho$ due to the non-negativity of the quantum relative entropy (8); that is, $D(\rho_1 \| \rho_2)$ is zero if and only if $\rho_1 = \rho_2$. Thus,

$$\theta_0 = \underset{\theta \in \Theta}{\text{argmax}} S(\rho \| \sigma(\theta)). \quad (\text{C.1})$$

We next consider the log-likelihood function ℓ_{LL} defined in Eq. (10). In the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \ell_{\text{LL}}(\mathbf{x}_n; \theta) \xrightarrow{p} \sum_m \text{Tr}(\Pi_m \rho) \log \text{Tr}(\Pi_m \sigma(\theta)) \quad (\text{C.2})$$

$$= H(\text{Tr}(\Pi_Z \rho) \| \text{Tr}(\Pi_Z \sigma(\theta))), \quad (\text{C.3})$$

by the law of large numbers, where $H(\cdot\|\cdot)$ is the negative classical cross entropy (2) and \rightarrow_p means the convergence in probability. Similarly, the maximum of H can be achieved only when

$$\text{Tr}(\Pi_m \rho) = \text{Tr}(\Pi_m \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \quad \text{for all } m, \quad (\text{C.4})$$

due to the non-negativity of the KL divergence (1); that is, $KL(p_1\|p_2)$ is zero if and only if $p_1 = p_2$. Because $\{\Pi_m\}$ is the tomographically complete measurement, the above equation implies that $\sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \rho$ for the state which maximizes the negative classical cross entropy H . Since $\rho = \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$, we can conclude that $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ also maximizes the negative classical cross entropy in the asymptotic regime:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = \underset{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta}{\text{argmax}} H(\text{Tr}(\Pi_Z \rho) \|\ \text{Tr}(\Pi_Z \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}))). \quad (\text{C.5})$$

Hence the first step has been done. Now, as the second step, we use the standard consistency property of the maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C$; that is, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C$ converges to $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ satisfying Eq. (C.5) and accordingly Eq. (C.1). Therefore, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C$ converges to $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ that is a solution to $\text{Tr}(\rho \partial_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})) = \mathbf{0}$.

We note that the above discussion assumes the measurement to be tomographically complete. However, even without the tomographically complete measurement, the convergence of the maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_C$ to the same $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ still holds if the measurement is chosen such that the condition (C.4) uniquely determines the state.

Appendix D. Brief review of quantum Fisher information

Here we give a brief review of quantum Fisher information, including the symmetric logarithmic derivative Fisher (SLD) information and the Bogoljubov-Kubo-Mori (BKM) Fisher information. We especially derive a representation (D.6) of the BKM Fisher information, which is used in Eqs. (14) and (24). For further details, we refer to Refs. [28, 29, 30].

The classical Fisher information matrix (the (i, j) -element) is defined as

$$g_{C;ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbb{E}_{f(x|\boldsymbol{\theta})} [l_i(x|\boldsymbol{\theta}) l_j(x|\boldsymbol{\theta})], \quad l_i(x|\boldsymbol{\theta}) f(x|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{\partial f(x|\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_i}, \quad (\text{D.1})$$

for a parametric model $\{f(x|\boldsymbol{\theta}) : \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p\}$, where $l_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ has another form

$$l_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{\partial \log f(x|\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_i}. \quad (\text{D.2})$$

We note that g in this appendix represents a metric, although g in the main article is used to represent the probability distribution.

There are several variants of quantum Fisher information, meaning that we thus need to choose a proper one depending on the purpose. One is the Symmetric Logarithmic Derivative (SLD) Fisher information defined by

$$g_{Q;ij}^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left(\sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}) (L_i^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) L_j^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + L_j^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) L_i^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \right), \\ \frac{1}{2} \left(\sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}) L_i^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + L_i^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right) = \frac{\partial \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_i}, \quad (\text{D.3})$$

for a parametric quantum state $\{\sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}) : \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p\}$. The SLD Fisher information appears in the quantum Cramér-Rao lower bound.

Another quantum analogue is the BKM Fisher information defined by

$$g_{Q;ij}^{(b)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \int_0^1 \text{Tr} \left(\sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})^t L_i^{(b)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{1-t} L_j^{(b)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right) dt, \quad \int_0^1 \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})^t L_i^{(b)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{1-t} dt = \frac{\partial \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_i}. \quad (\text{D.4})$$

Importantly, $L_i^{(b)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ can be represented as

$$L_i^{(b)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{\partial \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_i}. \quad (\text{D.5})$$

For example, see Section 7.3 of [29] for the derivation of this logarithmic derivative. Also, $g_{Q;ij}^{(b)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ has the following representation:

$$g_{Q;ij}^{(b)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \text{Tr}(\sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \partial_i \partial_j \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})). \quad (\text{D.6})$$

To see this, let us consider the following equality:

$$\text{Tr}(\sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \partial_i \partial_j \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})) = \partial_i \{ \text{Tr}(\sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \partial_j \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \} - \text{Tr}(\partial_i \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \partial_j \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})),$$

Note that $\text{Tr}(\sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \partial_j \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$ in the first term of RHS is actually zero:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \partial_j \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})) &= \text{Tr}(\sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}) L_j^{(b)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \\ &= \int_0^1 \text{Tr}(\sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})^t L_j^{(b)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{1-t}) dt \\ &= \text{Tr}(\partial_j \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The first equality uses Eq. (D.5) and the third equality is obtained by Eq. (D.4). This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \partial_i \partial_j \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})) &= - \text{Tr}(\partial_i \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \partial_j \log \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \\ &= g_{Q;ij}^{(b)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}). \end{aligned}$$

The last equality uses Eq. (D.4), and thus we arrive at Eq. (D.6).

An interesting feature is that the BKM metric appears in the limit of the quantum relative entropy [30]. This justifies the use of the BKM metric in the proposed information criteria. Moreover, in terms of information geometry, only the BKM metric introduces a dually flat structure for a family of density matrices, which is the novel property that the classical Fisher information has for a family of probability distributions. As an application, the BKM metric is chosen to develop the quantum generalization of the classical mirror descent algorithm [33].

References

- [1] Paris M and Řeháček J (eds) 2004 *Quantum State Estimation (Lecture Notes in Physics vol 649)* (Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer)
- [2] Gross D, Liu Y K, Flammia S T, Becker S and Eisert J 2010 *Physical Review Letters* **105** 150401
- [3] Cramer M, Plenio M B, Flammia S T, Somma R, Gross D, Bartlett S D, Landon-Cardinal O, Poulin D and Liu Y K 2010 *Nature Communications* **1** 149
- [4] Lanyon B P, Maier C, Holzäpfel M, Baumgratz T, Hempel C, Jurcevic P, Dhand I, Buyskikh A S, Daley A J, Cramer M, Plenio M B, Blatt R and Roos C F 2017 *Nature Physics* **13** 1158–1162
- [5] Carleo G and Troyer M 2017 *Science* **355** 602–606
- [6] Amin M H, Andriyash E, Rolfe J, Kulchytskyy B and Melko R 2018 *Physical Review X* **8** 021050
- [7] Burnham K P and Anderson D R (eds) 2004 *Model Selection and Multimodel Inference* (New York, NY: Springer)
- [8] Akaike H 1973 Information theory and an extension of the maximum likelihood principle *Second International Symposium on Information Theory (Eds. B. N. Petrov and F. Csaki)* (Akademiai Kiado, Budapest) pp 267–281
- [9] Takeuchi K 1976 *Mathematical Science* **153** 12–18
- [10] Bozdogan H 2000 *Journal of Mathematical Psychology* **44** 62–91
- [11] Parzen E, Tanabe K and Kitagawa G (eds) 1998 *Selected Papers of Hirotugu Akaike* Springer Series in Statistics (New York, NY: Springer)
- [12] Usami K, Nambu Y, Tsuda Y, Matsumoto K and Nakamura K 2003 *Physical Review A* **68** 022314
- [13] Yin J O S and van Enk S J 2011 *Physical Review A* **83** 062110
- [14] Schwarz L and van Enk S J 2013 *Physical Review A* **88** 032318
- [15] Kieferová M and Wiebe N 2017 *Physical Review A* **96** 062327

- [16] Wiebe N and Wossnig L 2019 *arXiv:1905.09902*
- [17] Kappen H J 2020 *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **53** 214001
- [18] Huang H Y, Kueng R and Preskill J 2020 *Nature Physics* **16** 1050–1057
- [19] Akaike H 1974 *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* **19** 716–723
- [20] Konishi S and Kitagawa G 2008 *Information Criteria and Statistical Modeling* 29–74
- [21] Murata N, Yoshizawa S and Amari S 1994 *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks* **5** 865–872
- [22] Schwarz G 1978 *The Annals of Statistics* **6** 461–464
- [23] Rissanen J 1998 *Stochastic Complexity in Statistical Inquiry* (WORLD SCIENTIFIC)
- [24] Seghouane A K and Bekara M 2004 *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **52** 3314–3323
- [25] Seghouane A K and Amari S 2007 *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks* **18** 97–106
- [26] Umegaki H 1962 *Kodai Mathematical Seminar Reports* **14** 59–85
- [27] Wilde M M 2017 *Quantum Information Theory* 2nd ed (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- [28] Hasegawa H 1997 *Reports on Mathematical Physics* **39** 49–68
- [29] Amari S and Nagaoka H 2000 *Methods of Information Geometry* vol 191 (American Mathematical Soc.)
- [30] Hayashi M 2002 *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **35** 7689–7727
- [31] Guță M, Kahn J, Kueng R and Tropp J A 2020 *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **53** 204001
- [32] Verdon G, Marks J, Nanda S, Leichenauer S and Hidary J 2019 *arXiv:1910.02071*
- [33] Sbahi F M, Martinez A J, Patel S, Saberi D, Yoo J H, Roeder G and Verdon G 2022 *arXiv:2206.04663*
- [34] Rouzé C and França D S 2021 *arXiv:2107.03333*
- [35] Onorati E, Rouzé C, França D S and Watson J D 2023 *arXiv:2301.12946*
- [36] Lewis L, Huang H Y, Tran V T, Lehner S, Kueng R and Preskill J 2023 *arXiv:2301.13169*
- [37] Virtanen P, Gommers R, Oliphant T E, Haberland M, Reddy T, Cournapeau D, Burovski E, Peterson P, Weckesser W, Bright J, van der Walt S J, Brett M, Wilson J, Millman K J, Mayorov N, Nelson A R J, Jones E, Kern R, Larson E, Carey C J, Polat İ, Feng Y, Moore E W, VanderPlas J, Laxalde D, Perktold J, Cimrman R, Henriksen I, Quintero E A, Harris C R, Archibald A M, Ribeiro A H, Pedregosa F, van Mulbregt P and SciPy 10 Contributors 2020 *Nature Methods* **17** 261–272
- [38] Carrasquilla J, Torlai G, Melko R G and Aolita L 2019 *Nature Machine Intelligence* **1** 155–161
- [39] Hagiwara K 2002 *Neural Computation* **14** 1979–2002
- [40] Řeháček J, Teo Y S and Hradil Z 2015 *Physical Review A* **92** 012108
- [41] Watanabe S 2010 *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* **11** 3571–3594
- [42] Shangnan Z and Wang Y 2021 *arXiv:2102.11887*