

Retrieving information in sloppy quantum phase estimation

G. Bizzarri,¹ M. Parisi,¹ M. Manrique,¹ I. Gianani,¹ A. Chiuri,²
M. Rosati,³ V. Giovannetti,⁴ M.G.A. Paris,⁵ and M. Barbieri^{1,6}

¹*Dipartimento di Scienze, Università degli Studi Roma Tre, Via della Vasca Navale, 84, 00146 Rome, Italy*

²*Nuclear Department, ENEA, Via E. Fermi 45, 00100 Frascati, Italy*

³*Dipartimento di Ingegneria Civile, Informatica e delle Tecnologie Aeronautiche, Università degli Studi Roma Tre, Via Vito Volterra 62, 00146 Rome, Italy*

⁴*Scuola Normale Superiore, 56126 Pisa, Italy*

⁵*Dipartimento di Fisica "Aldo Pontremoli", Università degli Studi di Milano, Via Celoria, 16, 20133 Milan, Italy*

⁶*Istituto Nazionale di Ottica - CNR, Largo E. Fermi 6, 50125 Florence, Italy*

The description of complex systems requires a progressively larger number of parameters. However, in practice it often happens that a small subset of parameters suffice to describe the dynamics of the system itself in terms of *stiff* combinations, while the remaining *sloppy* combinations provide no information on the system. While this effect can reduce model complexity, it can also limit the estimation precision when the stiff and sloppy combinations are unknown to the experimenter, and one is forced to estimate the potentially sloppy model parameters. We explored how such a sloppy behavior can be controlled and counteracted via quantum weak measurements in the estimation of two sequential phases. We showed that the introduction of a weak measurement of variable strength in-between the two phases allows to switch from a fully sloppy setup to a fully determined one where both phases can be estimated with quantum-limited precision. Our work provides an important insight of sloppiness detection in quantum systems, with promising applications in quantum metrology and imaging, as well as to quantum security and quantum monitoring.

I. INTRODUCTION

Understanding complex systems often demands the availability of a model to guide us through the different aspects of their behaviour. By comparing observations and predictions, one can then infer the value of the relevant parameters appearing in the model and gain further predictive power. As models are made more refined, the number of necessary parameters typically grows. Nevertheless, the actual observations may be dictated by only a small combination of said parameters. For instance, we can include temperature, pressure, concentration, etc., in the list of parameters influencing biological systems, but, in practice, distinct arrangements of their values may lead to identical behaviours, due to the very nature of the phenomenon or because of some active reaction mechanism. Such an occurrence of a model with many parameters being actually governed by fewer combinations is called 'sloppiness' [1, 2], and it is frequently encountered, especially in systems of interest for biology [3, 4].

A sloppy model is characterised by the simultaneous presence of stiff combinations of parameters, which can be retrieved with relatively small uncertainty from the data, along with sloppy combinations that are, conversely, poorly determined. Due to these features, sloppiness can have both positive and negative effects on a metrological model. On one hand, the presence of stiff parameters preserves a model's robustness to perturbations and enables the identification of key physical quantities determining the observed behaviour. This is particularly relevant in complex quantum systems characterized by a massive number of parameters, where quantum metrology generally prohibits the simultaneous estimation of multiple parameters with maximum precision; if

a few stiff parameters are present, one can focus on estimating them with high precision. On the other hand, if the stiff and sloppy combinations are unknown, one attempts the estimation of the initial parameters, resulting in an unavoidable loss of precision. A partial remedy to such an issue is found by altering in a controlled fashion the state of the system, so that it can evolve according to the new, perturbed conditions, rather than the standard ones. This intervention can thus lead to an increase of the available information on the model parameters, and a consequent reduction of its sloppiness. However, there could be instances in which it is advisable to keep such modifications to a small extent, in order to keep the dynamics close to the natural case.




FIG. 1. Scheme of a sloppy two-phase estimation. Left: light in an interferometer acquires phase shifts θ_1 and θ_2 from two consecutive objects. A weak measurement is carried out in-between in order to disambiguate the two phases. Right: the two values of θ_1 and θ_2 can now be retrieved, with a joint uncertainty qualitatively represented as an ellipse. The parameters appear in well determined combination $\theta_1 + \theta_2$ (the stiff parameter) and, crucially, in a poorly determined one (the sloppy parameter).

Sloppiness can emerge in quantum models as well [5–9], due to the same asymmetry in the available information of stiff and sloppy combinations, with the added interplay of quantum incompatibility in parameter estimation. Its scrutiny is engaging not only for answering fundamental questions, but also for designing new protocols for secure quantum sensing. Indeed, sloppiness can be actively pursued as a way of performing distributed sensing in a secure way [10–12]. This makes it possible, for instance, to infer a specific combination of local parameters in a network while keeping each individual parameter secret. A relevant exemplifying case is presented in Fig. 1: two phases θ_1 and θ_2 are accumulated in two distinct processes on one arm of a Mach-Zehnder interferometer (MZI). Any detector would then produce results only depending on the sum $\theta_1 + \theta_2$, the stiff parameter of the system, while the difference $\theta_1 - \theta_2$ is completely undetermined. This makes it impossible to retrieve the values of the individual phases θ_1 and θ_2 , resulting in a completely sloppy model.

Reducing ambiguity through perturbation represents a radical departure from the conventional three-act framework of quantum metrology: state preparation, evolution, and measurement [13, 14]. Traditionally, the evolution step is considered fixed and unmodifiable by the experimentalist, whereas now, an intervention is necessary to eliminate sloppiness. This intervention can take the form of either a supplementary control operation or an intermediate measurement, potentially involving coupling to an ancillary system. In both cases, it is assumed that access to the system is limited, particularly since the interaction time must be kept short relative to other timescales in the evolution. This constraint, along with other potential physical limitations on the interaction and the goal of minimizing perturbation to the natural model, may result in an incomplete measurement of the system.

In this article we propose the use of a weak measurement [15] to tackle model sloppiness with a non-invasive procedure. In our scheme, Fig. 1, a weak measurement is introduced in-between the action of the phases θ_1 and θ_2 , whose estimation constitutes a sloppy model in terms of a two-level quantum system, *i.e.* a qubit. Coding is then performed on the polarisation of a single photon and, thanks to the possibility of measuring it without necessarily destroying it [16], we investigate the consequences of extracting limited information for a two-phase estimation experiment. Our study demonstrates that the degree of sloppiness of the model can be controlled via the strength of the weak measurement, switching continuously from a fully sloppy setting to a perfectly determined one where both phases can be estimated with quantum-limited precision.

II. TWO-PHASE SLOPPY ESTIMATION

In our scheme, a single photon enters a MZI, and it is then split across two orthogonal polarization modes, *viz.* the right-circular $|R\rangle$ and the left-circular $|L\rangle$ orientation. The initial state of our probe can then be written as an equal superposition, *viz.* $|H\rangle = (|R\rangle + |L\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ (H and V stand for the horizontal and vertical polarisation, respectively, with $|V\rangle = (|R\rangle - |L\rangle)/(\sqrt{2}i)$). The problem can then be described as the evolution of a qubit, in particular, the action of each phase-shifter is a rotation $U(\theta) = e^{-2i\theta Y}$. Here Y is the y Pauli operator in the basis $\{|H\rangle, |V\rangle\}$, equivalent to the photon-number unbalance between the two modes. Consequently, the unperturbed evolution of the state yields the output state $U(\theta_2)U(\theta_1)|H\rangle = \cos 2(\theta_1 + \theta_2)|H\rangle + \sin 2(\theta_1 + \theta_2)|V\rangle$, in which the action of the individual elements cannot be isolated. We notice that, in formal terms, the two transformations $U(\theta_1)$ and $U(\theta_2)$ share the same generator, stressing that sloppiness is a problem of classical statistics, and its origin cannot be traced back to aspects like non-commutativity. Nevertheless, these may have an interplay with sloppiness in the presence of multiple parameters.

In order to reduce sloppiness, this evolution is modified by inserting a weak measurement in-between the two phase-shifters. Clearly, in order to have an effect on sloppiness, this ought to be sensitive to the coherence between the two modes, otherwise it would extract no information on the phase. Therefore, the weak measurement should be associated to an unbiased observable with respect to Y , for instance, to the Pauli Z observable of the qubit, corresponding to discriminating the H and the V polarisations. This is realised by coupling the system qubit to a second meter qubit, and then measuring the latter. It is well-known that, due to the correlations established by the coupling, this operation provides information about the original system. There is no guarantee, however, that their interaction is sufficiently strong to extract complete information, which would correspond to a fully projective measurement.

A commonplace model for this measurement scheme employs a logic gate, *e.g.* a control- Z gate C_Z in the basis $\{|H\rangle, |V\rangle\}$, as a template for the interaction. It takes as its inputs the system qubit after the first phase-shifter, $U(\theta_1)|H\rangle$, and the meter in a generic state $|\mu\rangle = \kappa|D\rangle + \sqrt{1 - \kappa^2}|A\rangle$ (with $|D\rangle = (|H\rangle + |V\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, $|A\rangle = (|H\rangle - |V\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$). When $\kappa = 1$, the output of this gate is a maximally entangled state: a measurement of the meter in the D/A basis corresponds to measuring Z on the system in that it leads to the same probability and wavepacket reduction as a direct measurement of this observable on the input of the system. For $\kappa = 1/\sqrt{2}$, the two-qubit state remains separable, thus a measurement on the meter can give no information on the system. In the intermediate cases, the coupling delivers a weak version of a Z measurement, with the coefficient $K = 2\kappa^2 - 1$ quantifying the amount of information avail-

able [16]. Following the measurement, the system goes through the second phase element and is finally measured with an ordinary projective measurement of Z . The overall measurement protocol has thus four outcomes, two for both the intermediate weak measurement and for the final strong measurement.

The metrological capabilities of the scheme are captured by the two-parameter Cramér Rao bound [14, 17], based on the Fisher information matrix F associated with a measurement scheme. Its elements are given by $F_{jk} = \sum_x (\partial_{\theta_j} p(x|\theta_1, \theta_2) \partial_{\theta_k} p(x|\theta_1, \theta_2))^2 / p(x|\theta_1, \theta_2)$, where the index x runs over the four possible outcomes, and the $p(x|\theta_1, \theta_2)$ are the corresponding measurement probabilities. Their knowledge allows us to infer the values of θ_1 and θ_2 repeating the measurement N times, using an estimator linking the outcomes to the parameters. This bounds the covariance matrix Σ of the estimators of θ_1 and θ_2 as $\Sigma \geq F^{-1}/N$, where N is the number of events being recorded. This implies that the individual variances satisfy $\sigma_{\theta_k}^2 \geq (F^{-1})_{kk}/N$. The Fisher information matrix can be maximised by the quantum Fisher information matrix (QFIM) Q , which is a function of the probe state ρ only. It is defined as $Q_{jk} = \text{Tr}[\rho (L_{\theta_j} L_{\theta_k} + L_{\theta_k} L_{\theta_j})]/2$, where the symmetric logarithmic derivatives L_{θ_j} are implicitly given by $\partial_{\theta_j} \rho = L_{\theta_j} \rho + \rho L_{\theta_j}$. For all measurement schemes $Q \geq F$, giving a quantum Cramér-Rao bound $\Sigma \geq Q^{-1}/N$, but these inequalities may not be saturable in the general case.

In our example, the relevant state for the calculation of the quantum Fisher information is the two-qubit state $|\Psi\rangle = (U(\theta_2) \otimes I)C_Z(U(\theta_1) \otimes I)|H\rangle|\mu\rangle$. Explicit calculation of the QFIM yields

$$Q = 16 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \sqrt{1-K^2} \\ \sqrt{1-K^2} & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

Therefore, the single-parameter quantum Cramér-Rao bound is the same for both phases and is given by

$$\sigma_{\theta}^2 \geq \frac{1}{16NK^2}. \quad (2)$$

We thus observe that the single-parameter precision obtained from the second (strong) measurement can be tuned by varying the strength of the first measurement. This is exemplified by the dependence on K , which determines both the amount of information extracted from the first measurement and the amount of coherence made available for the second. The quantum Cramér-Rao bound can be saturated by our choice of measurements on the system and meter qubits. Notably, a fully projective measurement ($K = 1$) would yield the same information as measuring θ_1 and θ_2 in separate setups. Conversely, tuning the strength K affects the *correlation* between the two parameters, meaning the measurement scheme imposes no trade-off on the individual precisions of θ_1 and θ_2 . The diagonalization of F reveals that the sum $\theta_1 + \theta_2$ remains the stiff parameter in the model, with

associated information $F_+ = 16(1 + \sqrt{1-K^2})$, while the difference $\theta_1 - \theta_2$ is the sloppy parameter, with associated information $F_- = 16(1 - \sqrt{1-K^2})$. The sloppiness of the model is well captured by the determinant of $F = F_+ F_- = (16K)^2$ [2].




FIG. 2. The experiment. Photonic qubits at central wavelength $\lambda_0 = 800\text{nm}$ with polarization encoding are generated via a Spontaneous Parametric Down-Conversion (SPDC) source made of a 3mm-thick β -Barium Borate (BBO) crystal pumped by a continuous-wave (CW) laser with typical power $P = 50\text{mW}$. The two photons, playing the role of the probe and the meter qubit in our setup, are then sent to a control- Z gate embedded in a Sagnac loop. The logic gate exploits a partially-polarizing beam splitter (PPBS) featuring different transmittivities for horizontal and vertical polarizations, namely $T_H = 2/3$ and $T_V = 1/3$. Target phases θ_1 and θ_2 , as well as the measurement's strength K and the Hadamard gate, mapping H/V states into D/A states are imparted by the rotation of half-waveplates (HWPs). Photons are then collected by fiber-coupled avalanche photo-diodes (APDs).

III. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

In order to test our predictions, we have performed an experiment with photon pairs, using one particle as the system and the other as the meter, see Fig. 2. The system is first initialised in the $|H\rangle$ state and then traverses the first phase element, a half-waveplate set an angle θ_1 . The C-Z gate is the two-photon device previous demonstrated in [16, 18, 19], and requires to post-select events in which the two photons emerge on distinct arms. In our proof-of-principle demonstration we only consider these in the assessment of N . The strength K of the weak measurement is conveniently set by the polarisation of the meter photon [20]. Finally, a second half-waveplate at an angle θ_2 works as the second phase-shifter.

Our demonstration consists of two parts. First, we calibrate our setup by collecting coincidence counts at different settings of θ_1 (spanned from 0° to 22.5° with uneven spacing), and θ_2 (spanned in steps of 2.5° from 0° to 22.5°). The measurements of the meter photon occur




FIG. 3. Elements of the covariance matrix Σ for the two estimated phases θ_1 and θ_2 . Plots on the same row correspond to the same matrix element, whereas different columns correspond to different measurement strengths, ranging from a very weak ($K = 0.322$), to intermediate ($K = 0.785$), to almost completely projective ($K = 0.934$) measurement. The theory plots are associated to the quantum Cramér-Rao bound, obtained by inverting the Fisher information matrix Q of Eq. 1: $1/(16K^2)$ for the diagonal elements and $-\sqrt{1-K^2}/(16K^2)$ for the off-diagonal ones.

in the D/A basis for all values of K , and in the H/V basis for the probe photon. This calibration is collected at high statistics, in order to get a reliable estimate of the probability $p(x_w, x_s | \theta_1, \theta_2)$ for the outcome $x_s = H, V$ for the strong measurement, and $x_w = D, A$ on the meter for the weak measurement. An interpolation is used to extend the values of the probabilities to arbitrary phase values. This procedure has the advantage of naturally incorporating the genuine response of the setup, thus accounting for imperfections. The second step is the estimation experiment proper: we have collected data corresponding to different pairs (θ_1, θ_2) , not included in the calibration set. The experimental frequencies $f(i, j)$ are used to derive an estimator as

$$(\bar{\theta}_1, \bar{\theta}_2) = \arg \min_{\theta_1, \theta_2} \sum_{i,j} |f(i, j) - p(i, i | \theta_1, \theta_2)|^2 \quad (3)$$

The relative covariance matrix is obtained by repeating the estimation on bootstrapped coincidence counts, varied according to a Poisson distribution with average corresponding to the observed counts. The sample size in the estimation set is lower than for the calibration set (0.1 s vs 5 s acquisition time per outcome combination). This reduces the impact of the precision on this reference [21].

The results on the achieved precisions are reported in Fig. 3. The experimental points correspond to the variance on the first phase $\sigma_{\theta_1}^2$, that on the second phase

$\sigma_{\theta_2}^2$, and their correlation $\sigma_{\theta_1 \theta_2}$. The experimental points show some excess noise with respect to the ideal case, especially for small phase shifts at small strength. We can attribute this partly to the imperfections of the gate (mostly, limited contrast of the nonclassical interference between the two photons), partly to finite sampling of the calibration probabilities. An asymmetry appears in the precision of the two phases, with the error on θ_2 being better estimated, in general. We can attribute this to the fact that information on θ_1 is mostly associated to the first weak measurement, and this is more affected by the imperfections.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In this article we introduced and demonstrated a weak-measurement-based technique to control the sloppiness of a quantum multi-parameter estimation. We showed that, by controlling the strength of the measurement inserted between two parameters encoded in sequence, it is possible to reduce their sloppiness at the cost of increasing the intermediate system-meter interaction. Our results shed light on the interplay between sloppiness and measurement-back-action, demonstrating how an intrinsically quantum phenomenon such as weak measurements can help tackling complex multi-parameter estimation

scenarios in an innovative way.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the PRIN project PRIN22-RISQUE-2022T25TR3 of the Italian Ministry of University. G.B. is supported by Rome Technopole Innovation Ecosystem (PNRR grant M4-C2-Inv). IG acknowledges the support from MUR Dipartimento

di Eccellenza 2023-2027. M.R. acknowledge support from the project PNRR - Finanziato dall'Unione europea - MISSIONE 4 COMPONENTE 2 INVESTIMENTO 1.2 - "Finanziamento di progetti presentati da giovani ricercatori" - Id MSCA 0000011-SQUID - CUP F83C22002390007 (Young Researchers) - Finanziato dall'Unione europea - NextGenerationEU.

Note. During the completion of this work, Ref. [22] has appeared discussing cognate methods in the context of measurements with an insufficient number of outcomes for multiparameter estimation.

-
- [1] K. S. Brown and J. P. Sethna, Statistical mechanical approaches to models with many poorly known parameters, *Physical review E* **68**, 021904 (2003).
- [2] K. S. Brown, C. C. Hill, G. A. Calero, C. R. Myers, K. H. Lee, J. P. Sethna, and R. A. Cerione, The statistical mechanics of complex signaling networks: nerve growth factor signaling, *Physical biology* **1**, 184 (2004).
- [3] J. J. Waterfall, F. P. Casey, R. N. Gutenkunst, K. S. Brown, C. R. Myers, P. W. Brouwer, V. Elser, and J. P. Sethna, Sloppy-model universality class and the vandermonde matrix, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 150601 (2006).
- [4] B. B. Machta, R. Chachra, M. K. Transtrum, and J. P. Sethna, Parameter space compression underlies emergent theories and predictive models, *Science* **342**, 604 (2013).
- [5] L. J. Fiderer, T. Tufarelli, S. Piano, and G. Adesso, General expressions for the quantum fisher information matrix with applications to discrete quantum imaging, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 020308 (2021).
- [6] A. Z. Goldberg, J. L. Romero, A. S. Sanz, and L. L. Sánchez-Soto, Taming singularities of the quantum fisher information, *International Journal of Quantum Information* **19**, 2140004 (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219749921400049>.
- [7] Y. Yang, F. Belliardo, V. Giovannetti, and F. Li, Untwining multiple parameters at the exclusive zero-coincidence points with quantum control, *New Journal of Physics* **24**, 123041 (2023).
- [8] M. Frigerio and M. G. A. Paris, Overcoming sloppiness for enhanced metrology in continuous-variable quantum statistical models, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.02989* (2024), [arXiv:2410.02989](https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.02989).
- [9] J. Wang and G. S. Agarwal, Exact quantum fisher matrix results for distributed phases using multiphoton polarization greenberger-horne-zeilinger states, *Phys. Rev. A* **111**, 012414 (2025).
- [10] L. Bugalho, M. Hassani, Y. Omar, and D. Markham, Private and robust states for distributed quantum sensing, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21701* (2024).
- [11] M. Hassani, S. Scheiner, M. G. A. Paris, and D. Markham, Privacy in networks of quantum sensors, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **134**, 030802 (2025).
- [12] J. Ho, J. W. Webb, R. M. Brooks, F. Grasselli, E. Gauger, and A. Fedrizzi, Quantum-private distributed sensing, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.00970* (2024).
- [13] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, Quantum Metrology, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 010401 (2006).
- [14] M. G. A. Paris, Quantum estimation for quantum technology, *Int. J. Quantum Inf.* **07**, 125 (2009).
- [15] J. Dressel, M. Malik, F. M. Miatto, A. N. Jordan, and R. W. Boyd, Colloquium : Understanding quantum weak values: Basics and applications, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **86**, 307 (2014).
- [16] G. J. Pryde, J. L. O'Brien, A. G. White, S. D. Bartlett, and T. C. Ralph, Measuring a photonic qubit without destroying it, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 190402 (2004).
- [17] F. Albarelli, M. Barbieri, M. G. Genoni, and I. Gianani, A perspective on multiparameter quantum metrology: From theoretical tools to applications in quantum imaging, *Physics Letters A* **384**, 126311 (2020).
- [18] J. Ho, A. Boston, M. Palsson, and G. Pryde, Experimental noiseless linear amplification using weak measurements, *New Journal of Physics* **18**, 093026 (2016).
- [19] G. Bizzarri, S. Gherardini, M. Manrique, F. Bruni, I. Gianani, and M. Barbieri, Quasiprobability distributions with weak measurements, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.06713* (2024).
- [20] The probabilistic behaviour of the gate implies that the input polarisation angles of both system and meter need being rescaled in order to account for extra loss in the vertical polarisation [23].
- [21] V. Cimini, I. Gianani, N. Spagnolo, F. Leccese, F. Sciarrino, and M. Barbieri, Calibration of quantum sensors by neural networks, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 230502 (2019).
- [22] Y. Yang, V. Montenegro, and A. Bayat, Overcoming quantum metrology singularity through sequential measurements, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.02784* (2025).
- [23] R. Okamoto, H. F. Hofmann, S. Takeuchi, and K. Sasaki, Demonstration of an optical quantum controlled-not gate without path interference, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 210506 (2005).