"Quantum Bounds, Estimation, and Metrology"

lecture III

Vittorio Giovannetti

NEST, Scuola Normale Superiore and Istituto Nanoscienze-CNR



CTP-TRIESTE 2017

QUANTUM METROLOGY

"how to use quantum effects in order to improve our ability in probing reality ..."

parameter estimation

Hellstrom Holevo ... remote detection hypothesis testing

Outlook

- Quantum Measurements
- State Discrimination problem
- Process Discrimination problem
- Parameter
 Estimation
- Heisenberg vs. Shot Noise limit





PROJECTIVE (or von Neumann) **MEASUREMENTS**: (simplest and more fundamental form of quantum measurements)

A Projective Measurement (PM) <u>tries</u> to identify the state $|\psi\rangle$ of the system among a collection of orthonormal configurations (basis of S):



BORN RULE

$$p(j|\psi) = |\langle j|\psi\rangle|^2$$
,

(for mixed state
$$p(j|\rho) = \langle j|\rho|j\rangle$$
).



Beyond PROJECTIVE MEASUREMENTS:











Limitations

TECHNOLOGICAL LIMITS

UNCERTAINTY RELATIONS



NO CLONING

Wootters, Zurek Nature 299 (1982)





THE MOTHER OF ALL PROBLEMS in Q-METROLOGY State Discrimination

Given a finite collection of possible states,

$\rho_1, \rho_2, \cdots, \rho_n$

and a <u>single copy</u> of a state ρ ? extracted randomly from the set of possible states, determine which one correspond to ρ ?.

Find the (optimal) POVM which gives the best chance of success [e.g. the lowest error probability] NB: $ho_?$ is one of the selected states $ho_1,
ho_2,\cdots,
ho_n$ but, a priori, we don't know which one.

 0_{2}

Quantum Communication Transferring Classical Info over a quantum channel





capacity achieved by POVMs which are <u>asymptotically</u> optimal ... (built upon the notion of typical spaces) Two-state discrimination problem with a single copy of the unknown state



THE QUANTUM CHERNOFF BOUND

Two-state discrimination problem with N copies of the unknown state



$$P_{E}^{(N)} = \frac{1 - \|\rho_{1}^{\otimes N} - \rho_{2}^{\otimes N}\|_{1}/2}{2} \lesssim \exp[-N \xi_{QCB}]$$
$$\xi_{QCB} = -\log\left\{\min_{0 \le s \le 1} \operatorname{Tr}[\rho_{1}^{s}\rho_{2}^{(1-s)}]\right\}$$

Audenaert et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. (2007)

Process Discrimination



Noise detection



Quantum Illumination Tan, et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. (2008)







Use input state as a probe....



Find optimal input state of the probe



 $\rho_1 = (\Phi_1 \otimes I)(\rho) \qquad \rho_2 = (\Phi_2 \otimes I)(\rho)$

<u>Choi-Jamiolkowski</u> <u>isomorphism</u>









from State Discrimination to Parameter estimation....



the possible candidates form now a (say) I-parameter continuous family



determining the state is equivalent to determine the value of the parameter....



Figure of merit of the achievable accuracy:

Root Mean Square Error (RMSE)

$$\delta X \equiv \sqrt{\sum_{\vec{\xi}} P(\vec{\xi}|X) \left[X_{\text{est}}(\vec{\xi}) - X \right]^2} = \sqrt{\Delta X_{\text{est}}^2 + (X - \langle X_{\text{est}} \rangle)^2}$$



CRAMER-RAO bound

$$\delta X \geqslant \frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu F(X)}}$$

ACHIEVABLE FOR LARGE ENOUGH \mathcal{V}

$$F(X) \equiv \langle \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial X} \ln p(\xi | X) \right]^2 \rangle$$
 FISHER information

 $1/\sqrt{\nu}\,$ scaling with respect to the number times we repeat the measurement

let us go back to the quantum scenario....



let us go back to the quantum scenario....





For each POVM we can write

$$\delta X_{POVM} \ge \frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu F_{POVM}(X)}}$$

Therefore the optimal estimation error is given by

$$\delta X \geqslant \frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu F_0(X)}}$$

quantum CRAMER-RAO bound

where

$$F_0(X) \equiv \max_{POVM} F_{POVM}(X)$$
maximum with respect to all POVM

Evaluating $F_0(X)$ is difficult.

However, it can be done if the "X-trajectory" of the system is Hamiltonian



space of the d e n s i t y matrices of the system

parametric trajectory induced by X

 $\frac{d\rho(\Lambda)}{d\rho(\Lambda)}$ $-i[h(X), \rho(X)]$ Hermitian generator of

Hermitian generator of the trajectory: we include also the case in which it depends on X. In this case one has

$$F_0(X) \leq 4 \operatorname{Tr} \left[\rho(X) \ \Delta^2 h(X) \right] = 4 \langle \Delta^2 h(X) \rangle_X$$

with

$$\Delta h(X) = h(X) - \langle h(X) \rangle_X$$

variance of the Hamiltonian

and

 $\langle \dots \rangle_X \equiv \operatorname{Tr} \big[\dots \rho(X) \big]$

Braunstein and Caves, (1994)

Helstrom (1976), Holevo (1982)

 $\delta X \ge \frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu F_0(X)}} \ge \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\nu \langle \Delta^2 h(X) \rangle_X}}$

 $\delta X \Delta h \ge \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\nu}}$

Generalized "Energy-Time" uncertainty relation



It relate the precision on the estimation of the "time" X with the spread of the Hamiltonian h, i.e.

 $\Delta h \equiv \sqrt{\langle \Delta^2 h(X) \rangle_X}$

Shot Noise vs Heisenberg

(entanglement as a resource)



The physical mechanism which is responsible for the process is known. What we do NOT know is the value of the phase φ .

 $U(arphi)\equiv \exp[-iHarphi]$ known Hamiltonian

GOAL: determine φ

Which precision can be achieved with N probes?

unknown parameter

 $\rho_{\varphi} = U_{\varphi} \ \rho \ U_{\varphi}^{\dagger}$

Examples - Interferometry

- Positioning
- Clock Sync
- -Transfer of reference frame



Examples - Interferometry

- Positioning
- Clock Sync
- -Transfer of reference frame





In each experimental run we have N probes.



run I



run 2

٠



run ${\cal V}$



SUMMARY:

state discrimination (Helstrom and Chernoff bounds)
 parameter estimation (Cramer-Rao Bound)
 Heisenberg scaling
 Thermal Suscetibility
 Quantum Correlations.

OPEN PROBLEMS:



