

A geometric criterion for optimal measurements in multiparameter quantum metrology

Jing Yang,^{1,2,*} Satoya Imai,^{3,4,†} and Luca Pezzè^{5,6,‡}

¹*Institute of Fundamental and Transdisciplinary Research, Institute of Quantum Sensing, and Institute for Advanced Study in Physics, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310027, China*

²*Nordita, KTH Royal Institute of Technology and Stockholm University, Hannes Alfvénsgatan 12, 106 91 Stockholm, Sweden.*

³*Institute of Systems and Information Engineering, University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-8573, Japan*

⁴*Center for Artificial Intelligence Research (C-AIR), University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-8577, Japan*

⁵*Istituto Nazionale di Ottica del Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche (CNR-INO), Largo Enrico Fermi 6, 50125 Firenze, Italy*

⁶*European Laboratory for Nonlinear Spectroscopy (LENS), University of Florence, 50019 Sesto Fiorentino, Italy*

(Dated: January 30, 2026)

Determining when the multiparameter quantum Cramér–Rao bound (QCRB) is saturable with experimentally relevant single-copy measurements is a central open problem in quantum metrology. Here we establish an equivalence between QCRB saturation and the simultaneous hollowization of a set of traceless operators associated with the estimation model, i.e., the existence of complete (generally nonorthogonal) bases in which all corresponding diagonal matrix elements vanish. This formulation yields a geometric characterization: optimal rank-one measurement vectors are confined to a subspace orthogonal to a state-determined Hermitian span. This provides a direct criterion to construct optimal Positive Operator-Valued Measures(POVMs). We then identify conditions under which the partial commutativity condition proposed in [Phys. Rev. A 100, 032104(2019)] becomes necessary and sufficient for the saturation of the QCRB, demonstrate that this condition is not always sufficient, and prove the counter-intuitive uselessness of informationally-complete POVMs.

The quantum Cramér–Rao bound (QCRB) [1, 2] sets the ultimate precision limit for estimating parameters encoded in quantum states and underpins quantum-enhanced sensing and metrology. This bound proves crucial for quantifying the impact of quantum noise in practical applications such as interferometry, magnetometry, optical imaging, gravitational wave detection, navigation, atomic clocks, and optical phase estimation, see e.g. [3, 4]. While the QCRB is always achievable in single-parameter estimation [5, 6], in multiparameter problems it remains valid but need not be saturable [7–11]. This limitation is intrinsically quantum: the measurements optimal for different parameters may be incompatible, as the corresponding observables need not commute. The incompatibility problem in multiparameter sensing has attracted growing interest recently [12–14].

Compared to other metrological bounds [13, 15–18], the QCRB has a closed form in terms of the quantum state, making it particularly convenient for computations. However, despite recent advances in multiparameter estimation theory, little is known about the optimal measurements that saturate the bound for general states, especially in the experimentally relevant single-copy regime [19–27]. This problem addresses one of the major open questions in quantum information theory [28]. It is also tied to the search for necessary and sufficient saturation conditions, which are still missing in the literature. In particular, it was shown that the QCRB can be saturated at the single-copy level only when a quantum state satisfies the partial commutativity condition (PCC) [29]. Understanding whether also the converse is true, remains outstanding [30].

In this work, we establish the connection between saturating the QCRB and the *simultaneous hollowization* condition of multiple traceless matrices. Here, hollowization refers to the procedure to find a set of complete bases, not necessarily orthogonal, such that the diagonal matrix elements

of a traceless operator vanish. This yields a geometric picture in which optimal measurements are confined to a subspace orthogonal to the space spanned by some linear Hermitian operators solely determined by the density operator, as schematically shown in Fig. 1. Our results imply, among other consequences, that information-complete Positive Operator-Valued Measures (POVMs) are generically ineffective for saturating nontrivial multiparameter QCRB. We also provide an efficient constructive procedure for optimal measurements at the level of each measurement outcome. We finally identify regimes in which PCC becomes sufficient to saturate the QCRB –particularly if the dimension of the Hilbert space is much larger than the rank of the density matrix and the number of estimation parameters, which is particularly relevant for continuous-variable systems.

Optimal measurement conditions.— We consider a state $\rho_{\lambda} = \sum_{a=1}^r p_{a\lambda} |\psi_{a\lambda}\rangle\langle\psi_{a\lambda}|$, in spectral decomposition, that depends on s parameters and denote the estimation parameter by $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s)$, where the coefficients $p_{a\lambda}$ are strictly positive and r is the rank of the density operator. The classical Fisher information matrix (CFIM) that characterize the precision limit associated with the POVM measurement $\{E_{\omega}\}_{\omega=1}^{\Omega}$ is indicated as $[F^C]_{ij} \equiv \sum_{\omega} [F_{\omega}^C]_{ij}$, where $[F_{\omega}^C]_{ij} = \partial_i p(\omega|\lambda) \partial_j p(\omega|\lambda) / p(\omega|\lambda)$ and the probability $p(\omega|\lambda) = \text{Tr}(\rho_{\lambda} E_{\omega})$ is given by the Born rule. The quantum Fisher information matrix (QFIM) is given by $[F^Q]_{ij} \equiv \sum_{\omega} [F_{\omega}^Q]_{ij}$, where $[F_{\omega}^Q]_{ij} = \text{ReTr}(\rho_{\lambda} L_i E_{\omega} L_j)$ and the symmetric logarithmic derivative is defined as $(L_i \rho_{\lambda} + \rho_{\lambda} L_i) / 2 = \partial_i \rho_{\lambda}$, where we suppress the dependence of L_i on λ for simplicity. Focusing on optimal POVMs we can assume, without loss of generality, that E_{ω} is of rank-one. The matrix inequality

$$F_{\omega}^C \leq F_{\omega}^Q \quad (1)$$

holds for every ω [29], where $A \leq 0$ means that A is negative-semi-definite. The QCRB is saturated if and only if Eq. (1)

holds for each POVM element E_ω . Without loss of generality, one can consider rank-one POVM with $E_\omega = |\pi_\omega\rangle\langle\pi_\omega|$, where $|\pi_\omega\rangle$ is not necessarily normalized and therefore E_ω is not necessarily projective. The necessary and sufficient conditions for saturating Eq.(1) are as follows [29]: For regular operators where $\text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda E_\omega) \neq 0$, the inequality (1) is saturated if and only if

$$\langle\pi_\omega|\psi_{a\lambda}\rangle = \xi_{\omega,i} \langle\pi_\omega|L_i|\psi_{a\lambda}\rangle, \forall a, \omega, i, \quad (2)$$

where $\xi_{\omega,i}$ is real coefficient independent of a . For null operators where $\text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda E_\omega) = 0$, the inequality (1) is saturated if and only if

$$\langle\psi_{a\lambda}|L_i|\pi_\omega\rangle = \eta_{\omega,ij} \langle\psi_{a\lambda}|L_j|\pi_\omega\rangle, \forall a, \omega, \quad (3)$$

where $\eta_{\omega,ij}$ is real coefficient independent of a .

Eqs. (2, 3) allow one to check whether a given POVM can saturate the QCRB bound or not without calculating the CFIM and QFIM explicitly. However, the presence of the unknown real coefficients $\xi_{\omega,i}$, $\eta_{\omega,ij}$ still prevents a challenge for both analytical and numerical search of the optimal measurements.

Below, we shall present a new optimal measurement condition that removes these real coefficients.

Theorem 1. [Simultaneous Hollowization Theorem] For a given rank-one POVM operator $E_\omega = |\pi_\omega\rangle\langle\pi_\omega|$, the inequality (1) is saturated if and only if

$$\langle\pi_\omega|W_{ij,ab}|\pi_\omega\rangle = 0, \forall i, j, i \neq j, a, b, \quad (4)$$

and

$$\langle\pi_\omega|M_{i,ab}|\pi_\omega\rangle = 0, \forall a, b, \quad (5)$$

where the indices i, j run from 1 to the number of parameters s , while the indices a, b run from 1 to the rank r of ρ_λ , $P_{ab} \equiv |\psi_{a\lambda}\rangle\langle\psi_{b\lambda}|$, $M_{i,ab} \equiv [L_i, P_{ab}]$ and $W_{ij,ab} \equiv L_i P_{ab} L_j - L_j P_{ab} L_i$. In other words, inequality (1) can be saturated if and only if there exists a POVM measurement basis $\{|\pi_\omega\rangle\}$ such that the operators $W_{ij,ab}$ and $M_{i,ab}$ can be simultaneously “hollowized”, i.e., they can be brought in a matrix form with vanishing diagonal entries (so-called hollow matrices). As a result, we indicate Theorem 1 as the hollowization theorem [31].

Furthermore, given $E_\omega = |\pi_\omega\rangle\langle\pi_\omega|$, if $F_\omega^Q \neq 0$ [32], one can always choose a given estimation parameter λ_i and a corresponding eigenstate $|\psi_{a\lambda}\rangle$ satisfying $\langle\psi_{a\lambda}|L_i|\pi_\omega\rangle \neq 0$, such that the number of constraints on the W and M matrices can be significantly reduced as follows:

$$\langle\pi_\omega|W_{\bar{i},\bar{j},\bar{a}\bar{b}}|\pi_\omega\rangle = 0, \forall j \in [1, s], j \neq \bar{i}, b \in [1, r], \quad (6)$$

and

$$\langle\pi_\omega|M_{\bar{i},\bar{a}\bar{b}}|\pi_\omega\rangle = 0, \forall b \in [1, r]. \quad (7)$$

We call $(\lambda_j, |\psi_{b\lambda}\rangle)$ pair-compatible with $(\lambda_i, |\psi_{a\lambda}\rangle)$ under the rank-one POVM E_ω if Eqs. (4, 5) hold for the index pairs




FIG. 1. (a) Schematic of parameter compatibility under a given rank-one POVM. The yellow dots represent the tuple $(\lambda_j, |\psi_{b\lambda}\rangle)$. The arrows in both directions implies mutually compatibility. (b) Geometric interpretation of the saturation condition. The gray shaded area is the convex hull formed by the rank-one POVM.

(i, a) and (j, b) and E_ω , as indicated by a uni-directional arrow in Fig. 1(a). All the parameters are called compatible under a complete rank-one POVM, if and only if Eq. (1) holds, which is equivalent to the fact that for all the pairs of parameters and eigenstates are pair-compatible. With this definition, we observe that pairs with the same estimations parameter $(\lambda_i, |\psi_{a\lambda}\rangle)$ and $(\lambda_i, |\psi_{b\lambda}\rangle)$ are always compatible under the projective POVM formed by the eigenvectors of the SLD L_i .

As shown in Fig. 1, Eqs. (6, 7) further break the pair compatibility among all the parameters and eigenstates down into the pair compatibility between any pair with a central pair consisting of an estimation parameter λ_i and a central eigenstate $|\psi_{a\lambda}\rangle$. For pure states, there is only one eigenstate, which provides the intuition for the easier construction of optimal measurements when compared to generic mixed states [19, 21].

Theorem 1 is our first main result, which leads to many profound consequences in what follows. The proof can be found in the Sec. S1 and S2 in the Supplemental Material [33]. Next, upon summing over ω in these equations, one can see that the set of operators $\{W_{ij,ab}, M_{i,ab}\}$ are traceless. While $M_{i,ab}$ is traceless by definition, $W_{ij,ab}$ is traceless if and only if the PCC holds

$$\langle\psi_{a\lambda}|[L_i, L_j]|\psi_{b\lambda}\rangle = 0, \forall i, j, a, b, i \neq j. \quad (8)$$

Thus, we thus see that the PCC is necessary for the saturation of the QCRB and it naturally emerges from the simultaneous hollowization Theorem 1. We note that the pure state version of Eq (7) also appears in Ref. [34, 35] in searching for optimal local measurements in single-parameter quantum metrology.

We conclude this section by noting that every single traceless matrix can be always hollowized [34–36] through unitary transformation. As indicated by the hollowization Theorems 1, pair compatibility in multiparameter estimation would imply the existence of common basis (not necessarily orthonormal) such that the set of matrices $\{W_{ij,ab}, M_{i,ab}\}$ can be hollowized simultaneously, which highlights the mea-

surement compatibility problem in multiparameter estimation from a different perspective. As one might expect, like the standard simultaneous diagonalization, with the increasing number of the traceless matrices, the difficulty to hollowize them simultaneously can increase dramatically.

Geometry of the saturation condition — In this section, we give a geometric interpretation of the Hollowization Theorem 1, from which the recipe for optimal measurements can be easily constructed, if it exists. To this end, let us first focus on the case of finite dimensional Hilbert space of dimension d . we choose a set of linearly independent rank-one POVM operators $\{E_\omega \equiv |\pi_\omega\rangle\langle\pi_\omega|\}_{\omega=1}^{|\Omega|}$ such that $\sum_{\omega=1}^{|\Omega|} E_\omega = \mathbb{I}$, where Ω and $|\Omega|$ are the set and the number of measurement outcomes, respectively. Note that the measurement basis $\{|\pi_\omega\rangle\}$ is not necessarily orthonormal. Furthermore, due to the rank requirement and linear independence, we know $d \leq |\Omega| \leq d^2$.

Next, note that while $W_{ij,aa}$ and $M_{i,aa}$ are anti-Hermitian, for $a \neq b$ both $W_{ij,ab}$ and $M_{i,ab}$ are neither Hermitian nor anti-Hermitian. To introduce the geometric interpretation of the saturation condition, we construct hermitian matrices from W and M into two anti-Hermitian matrices. To this end, we define

$$W_{ij,ab} \equiv \frac{1}{2}[W_{ij,ab}^{(x)} + iW_{ij,ab}^{(y)}], \quad M_{i,ab} \equiv \frac{1}{2}[M_{i,ab}^{(x)} + iM_{i,ab}^{(y)}], \quad (9)$$

where $W_{ij,ab}^{(\alpha)} \equiv L_i\sigma_{ab}^{(\alpha)}L_j - L_j\sigma_{ab}^{(\alpha)}L_i$ and $M_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)} \equiv [\sigma_{ab}^{(\alpha)}, L_i]$ with $\alpha = x, y, z$ are anti-Hermitian operators and $\sigma_{ab}^{(\alpha)}$ is defined as $\sigma_{ab}^{(x)} \equiv P_{ab} + P_{ba}$, $\sigma_{ab}^{(y)} \equiv -i(P_{ab} - P_{ba})$. Furthermore, we define $W_{ij,aa}^{(z)} \equiv L_i\sigma_{aa}^{(z)}L_j - \text{h.c.}$ and $M_{i,aa}^{(z)} \equiv [\sigma_{aa}^{(z)}, L_i]$, where $\sigma_{aa}^{(z)} \equiv P_{aa}$.

With above notations, the hollowization conditions Eq. (4) and Eq. (5) can be straightforwardly recast into

$$\langle iW_{ij,ab}^{(\alpha)}, E_\omega \rangle = \langle iM_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)}, E_\omega \rangle = 0 \quad (10)$$

for all $j \in [1, s]$, $j \neq i$, $b \in [1, r]$, $\alpha = x, y, z$ and ω , where the inner product defined on the real vector space $\text{Herm}(d)$ is defined as $\langle A, B \rangle = \text{Tr}(AB)$. As a higher-rank optimal POVM measurement operator can be further refined into several optimal rank-one POVM measurements, Eq. (10) also holds for higher-rank optimal POVM measurement, but is not sufficient in general. We denote

$$\mathcal{V} \equiv \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{iW_{ij,ab}^{(\alpha)}, iM_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)}\}_{a,b,i,j \neq i, \alpha=x,y,z}, \quad (11a)$$

where \mathcal{V} is a subspace $\text{Herm}(d)$ or equivalently the vector space $i\mathcal{V}$ with anti-Hermitian elements is a subspace of $\mathfrak{u}(d)$.

As shown in Fig. 1(b), Eq. (10) leads to the remarkable geometric interpretation of the saturation condition: The optimal rank-one POVM operator E_ω must lie in orthogonal complement of \mathcal{V} in $\text{Herm}(d)$, denoted as \mathcal{V}_\perp . We introduce the convex hull of a rank-one POVM measurement, denoted as $\text{Conv}\{E_\omega\}_{\omega=1}^{|\Omega|}$, which is defined as the convex combination of the all rank-one POVM measurement. The saturation of the QCRB also means that

$$\text{Conv}\{E_\omega\}_{\omega=1}^{|\Omega|} \subseteq \mathcal{V}_\perp. \quad (12)$$

Since $\sum_\omega E_\omega = \mathbb{I}$ therefore, $\mathbb{I} \in \mathcal{V}_\perp$, implying $\text{Tr}W_{ij,ab}^{(\alpha)} = 0$, recovering again the partial commutativity condition.

A few comments in order: (i) $\dim \mathcal{V}$ is upper bounded by the total number of matrices $W_{ij,ab}^{(\alpha)}$, $M_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)}$, which is $s(s+1)r^2/2$, where we recall that r is the rank of ρ_λ and s is the number of the estimation parameter. However, it may be difficult to find simple, yet universal rules that determines $\dim \mathcal{V}$ exactly, as it can vary from case to case. For example, when $[L_i, L_j] = 0$, $W_{ij,ab} = 0$, which renders $\dim \mathcal{V}$ strictly smaller than $s(s+1)r^2/2$. (ii) Nevertheless, by exploiting these structure, some results can still be found on the linear independence or dependence among the matrices $M_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)}$, see Sec. S3 in the Supplemental Material [33].

Let us present central results that follows from Eq. (10).

Observation 1. [No-go theorem for informationally-complete POVMs (IC-POVM)] For $s \geq 2$ and non-singular QFIM, no IC-POVM can saturate the multiparameter QCRB.

The informationally-complete (IC-POVM) or tomographically complete POVM is the rank-one POVM with $|\Omega| = d^2$. In this case, $\{E_\omega\}_{\omega=1}^{|\Omega|}$ spans the real vector space of Hermitian operators denoted as $\text{Herm}(d)$, isomorphic to the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{u}(d)$. For proof of above theorem, see the End Matter. For single parameter estimation where $s = 1$, IC-POVM can saturate the QFI only for states with particular property, see details in Theorem S1 in the Supplemental Material. This observation is particularly relevant because meaningful quantum sensing tasks also involve non-singular QFIM with more than one estimation parameters.

Next we discuss the saturation of the QCRB, when PCC is satisfied. In this case, we know $\mathbb{I} \in \mathcal{V}_\perp$ and the remaining orthogonal basis must be traceless. Thus, without loss of generality, we can choose the basis to be

$$T_0 = \mathbb{I}, \quad \text{Tr}T_k = 0 \quad (k \geq 1), \quad \text{Tr}(T_k T_l) = d\delta_{kl}. \quad (13)$$

Operationally, this basis can be found via the Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization process under the trace inner product, starting from the set of matrices $\{W_{ij,ab}^{(\alpha)}, M_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)}\}$. We denote the linear subspace of the $\mathfrak{su}(d)$ Lie algebra $\mathcal{N} \equiv \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{iT_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ and the dimension of \mathcal{N} as n . Clearly, $n = \dim \mathcal{V}_\perp - 1 \leq d^2 - 1$, where the upper bound can be reached if all the W and M matrices vanish.

Observation 2. If $n < d - 1$, i.e., $\dim \mathcal{V}_\perp < d$, the QCRB cannot be saturated.

The proof is given in the End Matter. Geometrically, this means that the subspace \mathcal{V}_\perp depicted in Fig. 1(b) is below the critical dimension for the rank-one POVM to be complete. Note that Observation 2 holds, independent of whether PCC holds or not. This implies that PCC is not sufficient for the saturation of the QCRB in general.

Theorem 2. [Outcome-wise saturability criterion] When PCC is satisfied, a rank-one projector $\Pi_\omega = |\pi_\omega\rangle\langle\pi_\omega|$ saturates the outcome-wise QCRB, i.e., $F_\omega^C = F_\omega^Q$ if and only if

$$\Pi_\omega = \frac{1}{d}(\mathbb{I} - \mathbf{v}^{(\omega)} \cdot \mathbf{T}), \quad (14)$$

where $\mathbf{v}^{(\omega)}$ is a n -dimensional non-zero real vector such that the spectrum of the $d \times d$ traceless Hermitian matrix $\mathbf{v}^{(\omega)}$. $\mathbf{T} \equiv \sum_{k=1}^n v_k^{(\omega)} T_k$ are $(d-1)$ -fold degenerate with degenerate eigenvalue 1.

The proof is presented in the End Matter. The outcome-wise saturability for generic rank-one POVM is trivial since it can be always renormalized to a rank-one projector through $\Pi_\omega = E_\omega / \text{Tr} E_\omega$. Theorem 2 immediately leads to an efficient numerical algorithm to search for optimal measurements, see the End Matter. Furthermore, by exploring the structure of the optimal rank-one projectors giving (14), we can show more quantitatively when PCC becomes sufficient:

Theorem 3. When $\dim \mathcal{V}_\perp$ is large enough, more precisely,

$$n \geq \max_{\mu \in [1, 2, \dots, d-2]} 2\mu(d + 1/2 - \mu) + (d-2) \quad (15)$$

is satisfied, PCC is necessary and sufficient for the saturation of the Helstrom bound. In particular, PCC ensures the existence of an optimal rank-one *projective* measurements, which can be constructed iteratively.

We prove by constructing the optimal measurements explicitly, see the End Matter and the Supplemental Material for schematica detailed proofs, respectively. A few comments in order: (a) We note that if an optimal rank-one projective measurement exists, it can be always constructed via the iterative procedure we presented in the proof of Theorem 3. (b) It is expected that the lower bound on n in inequality (15) above which PCC becomes sufficient may be further refined if the particular structures or symmetries of ρ_λ and the SLD operators are exploited.

When $d \gg r, s$ and $n \gtrsim d^2$ while the maximum of r.h.s. of (15) scales $d^2/2$. Thus the inequality (15) holds for large dimension of Hilbert space and we have the following observation:

Observation 3. [Asymptotic sufficiency of PCC] When $d \gg r, s$, i.e., the dimension of the Hilbert space is much larger than the rank of the density operator and the number of estimation parameters, PCC becomes necessary and sufficient for the saturation of the QCRB. In particular, if, for continuous-variable systems, ρ_λ is of finite rank and contains a finite number of estimation parameters, then a finite-dimensional d -Lie algebra which contains \mathcal{V} as a subspace can be always constructed with arbitrary large d [37]. As such, PCC is always necessary and sufficient for estimation of finite-rank density matrix with finite number of parameters.

Example: Quasi-pure States.— One might expect that quantum states satisfying PCC may be complicated and not general enough to be of metrological interest. However, it was shown in the context of postselected quantum metrology [38, 39] that for quasi-pure states, which behaves very much like pure states, PCC becomes simple and resembles the one for pure states. In particular, we consider the following class

of quasi-pure states generated via the classical correlations between a primary system and an ancilla:

$$\rho_\lambda = (U_\lambda \otimes \mathbb{I}) \rho_0 (U_\lambda^\dagger \otimes \mathbb{I}) = \sum_{a=1}^r q_a |\phi_{a\lambda}\rangle \langle \phi_{a\lambda}| \otimes |a\rangle \langle a|, \quad (16)$$

where $\rho_0 = \sum_{a=1}^r q_a |\phi_a\rangle \langle \phi_a| \otimes |a\rangle \langle a|$, $|\phi_{a\lambda}\rangle \equiv U_\lambda |\phi_a\rangle$, $|a\rangle$ are orthonormal while $|\phi_a\rangle$ is normalized but not necessarily orthogonal to each other. Remarkably, it was shown in Ref. [38] that the PCC for states given by Eq. (16) reduces to

$$\text{Im} \langle D_i \phi_{a\lambda} | D_j \phi_{a\lambda} \rangle = 0, \forall i, j, a, \quad (17)$$

where $|D_i \phi_{a\lambda}\rangle$ is the covariant derivative defined as $|D_i \phi_{a\lambda}\rangle \equiv (\mathbb{I} - |\phi_{a\lambda}\rangle \langle \phi_{a\lambda}|) \partial_i |\phi_{a\lambda}\rangle$. It can be readily checked that, unless for full rank states, the PCC also holds while the SLD does not mutually commute in general [38]. Thanks to the Hollowization theorem 1, we can show that If the PCC (17) is satisfied, the measurement incompatibility between different eigenstates disappears. Furthermore, the QCRB for the state given by Eq. (16) can be saturated by the local measurements with classical communications (LMCC) $\{|\pi_{v,a}\rangle = |e_v^{(a)}\rangle \otimes |a\rangle\}$, where $\{|e_v^{(a)}\rangle\}$ is the optimal measurement basis for the saturating the QCRB of each of the pure state $\{|\phi_{a\lambda}\rangle\}$, which can be constructed systematically Refs. [19] and [21]. Furthermore, if U_λ in Eq. (16) is generated by commuting Hamiltonian, i.e., $U_\lambda = e^{-i \sum_j \lambda_j H_j}$ with $[H_j, H_k] = 0, \forall j, k$, the QCRB for the state is always saturable for all initial state ρ_0 . The proofs of these results, and their applications to a magnetometry with two-qubit primary system and a qubit ancilla can be found in the End Matter. It is worth noting that for generic quasi-pure states, whether PCC is sufficient or not is still open, as conjectured in Ref. [38].

Discussion and Conclusion.— We solve the open question on single-copy optimal measurement in multi-parameter quantum metrology when PCC holds. There could be several ramifications of our results. First, even when PCC fails, our algorithm can still be used to construct rank-one measurement bases that saturate the QCRB outcome-wise, although they may not satisfy the POVM completeness (closure) relation. This observation suggests a systematic route to practical approximations of the QCRB, which may be of broad interest for applications. Second, our work motivates a more comprehensive mathematical study of simultaneous hollowization for sets of traceless matrices, a topic that appears largely unexplored in the current literature. Progress along these lines would sharpen our understanding of measurement incompatibility in multiparameter sensing and, more broadly, of the geometric constraints imposed by quantum theory.

Acknowledgement.— We thank Wenquan Liu, Yang Wu, Liang Xu for discussions on the experimental relevance of quasi-pure state estimation. J.Y. acknowledges support from Zhejiang University start-up grants, Zhejiang Key Laboratory of R&D and Application of Cutting-edge Scientific Instruments, and Wallenberg Initiative on Networks and Quantum Information (WINQ). S.I. acknowledges support from JST ASPIRE (JPMJAP2339). L.P. acknowledges support from the QuantERA project SQUEIS

(Squeezing enhanced inertial sensing), funded by the European Union's Horizon Europe Program and the Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR-22-QUA2-0006). This publication has received funding under Horizon Europe programme HORIZON-CL4-2022-QUANTUM-02-SGA via the project 10113690 PASQuanS2.1.

* jing.yang.quantum@zju.edu.cn

† satoyaimai@yahoo.co.jp

‡ luca.pezze@ino.cnr.it

[1] C. W. Helstrom, *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory* (Academic Press, 1976).

[2] C. Helstrom, The minimum variance of estimates in quantum signal detection, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **14**, 234 (1968).

[3] C. L. Degen, F. Reinhard, and P. Cappellaro, Quantum sensing, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **89**, 035002 (2017).

[4] L. Pezzè, A. Smerzi, M. K. Oberthaler, R. Schmied, and P. Treutlein, Quantum metrology with nonclassical states of atomic ensembles, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **90**, 035005 (2018).

[5] S. L. Braunstein and C. M. Caves, Statistical distance and the geometry of quantum states, *Physical Review Letters* **72**, 3439 (1994).

[6] S. L. Braunstein, C. M. Caves, and G. Milburn, Generalized Uncertainty Relations: Theory, Examples, and Lorentz Invariance, *Annals of Physics* **247**, 135 (1996).

[7] 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).

[8] J. Liu, H. Yuan, X.-M. Lu, and X. Wang, Quantum Fisher information matrix and multiparameter estimation, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **53**, 023001 (2019).

[9] R. Demkowicz-Dobrzański, W. Górecki, and M. Guță, Multiparameter estimation beyond quantum Fisher information, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **53**, 363001 (2020).

[10] J. Suzuki, Y. Yang, and M. Hayashi, Quantum state estimation with nuisance parameters, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **53**, 453001 (2020).

[11] L. Pezzè and A. Smerzi, *Advances in multiparameter quantum sensing and metrology* (2025), arXiv:2502.17396 [quant-ph].

[12] A. Carollo, D. Valenti, and B. Spagnolo, Geometry of quantum phase transitions, *Physics Reports* **838**, 1 (2020).

[13] M. Tsang, F. Albarelli, and A. Datta, Quantum semiparametric estimation, *Physical Review X* **10**, 031023 (2020).

[14] F. Belliardo and V. Giovannetti, Incompatibility in quantum parameter estimation, *New Journal of Physics* **23**, 063055 (2021).

[15] A. S. Holevo, *Probabilistic and Statistical Aspects of Quantum Theory* (Springer Science & Business Media, 2011).

[16] M. Hayashi, ed., *Asymptotic Theory Of Quantum Statistical Inference* (World Scientific Pub Co Inc, Singapore, 2005).

[17] L. O. Conlon, J. Suzuki, P. K. Lam, and S. M. Assad, Efficient computation of the Nagaoka–Hayashi bound for multiparameter estimation with separable measurements, *npj Quantum Information* **7**, 1 (2021).

[18] F. Albarelli, J. F. Friel, and A. Datta, Evaluating the Holevo Cramér–Rao Bound for Multiparameter Quantum Metrology, *Physical Review Letters* **123**, 200503 (2019).

[19] K. Matsumoto, A new approach to the Cramér–Rao-type bound of the pure-state model, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **35**, 3111 (2002).

[20] S. Ragy, M. Jarzyna, and R. Demkowicz-Dobrzański, Compatibility in multiparameter quantum metrology, *Physical Review A* **94**, 052108 (2016).

[21] L. Pezzè, M. A. Ciampini, N. Spagnolo, P. C. Humphreys, A. Datta, I. A. Walmsley, M. Barbieri, F. Sciarrino, and A. Smerzi, Optimal Measurements for Simultaneous Quantum Estimation of Multiple Phases, *Physical Review Letters* **119**, 130504 (2017).

[22] H. Zhu and M. Hayashi, Universally Fisher-Symmetric Informationally Complete Measurements, *Physical Review Letters* **120**, 030404 (2018).

[23] Y. Yang, G. Chiribella, and M. Hayashi, Attaining the Ultimate Precision Limit in Quantum State Estimation, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **368**, 223 (2019).

[24] X.-M. Lu and X. Wang, Incorporating Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle into Quantum Multiparameter Estimation, *Physical Review Letters* **126**, 120503 (2021).

[25] H. Chen, Y. Chen, and H. Yuan, Information geometry under hierarchical quantum measurement, *Physical Review Letters* **128**, 250502 (2022).

[26] S. Zhou and S. Chen, *Randomized measurements for multi-parameter quantum metrology* (2025), arXiv:2502.03536 [quant-ph].

[27] L. Pezzè and A. Smerzi, Distributed quantum multiparameter estimation with optimal local measurements, *Physical Review Letters* **135**, 10.1103/f2jf-bg7g (2025).

[28] P. Horodecki, Ł. Rudnicki, and K. Życzkowski, Five Open Problems in Quantum Information Theory, *PRX Quantum* **3**, 010101 (2022).

[29] J. Yang, S. Pang, Y. Zhou, and A. N. Jordan, Optimal measurements for quantum multiparameter estimation with general states, *Physical Review A* **100**, 032104 (2019).

[30] S. Imai, J. Yang, and L. Pezzè, To appear soon.

[31] Clearly, Eqs. (4–5) are $U(1)$ gauge invariant under the transformation of the eigenstates $|\psi_{a\lambda}\rangle \rightarrow |\psi_{a\lambda}\rangle e^{i\theta_{a\lambda}}$ and the scaling transformation of the measurement basis $|\pi_\omega\rangle \rightarrow \alpha_\omega |\pi_\omega\rangle$, where α_ω is any complex number.

[32] The case where $F_\omega^Q = 0$ is trivial, which leads to $F_\omega^C = 0$.

[33] See Supplemental Materials.

[34] S. Zhou, C.-L. Zou, and L. Jiang, Saturating the quantum Cramér–Rao bound using LOCC, *Quantum Science and Technology* **5**, 025005 (2020).

[35] J.-X. Liu, J. Yang, H.-L. Shi, and S. Yu, Optimal local measurements in single-parameter quantum metrology, *Physical Review A* **111**, 022436 (2025).

[36] P. A. Fillmore, On similarity and the diagonal of a matrix, *The American Mathematical Monthly* **76**, 167 (1969).

[37] More precisely, we consider the $\mathfrak{su}(d)$ Lie algebra is defined over on the d -dimensional Hilbert space containing the subspace $\text{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{|\psi_{a\lambda}\rangle, |\partial_i \psi_{a\lambda}\rangle\}_{a,i}$.

[38] J. Yang, *Pure State Inspired Lossless Post-selected Quantum Metrology of Mixed States* (2024), arXiv:2405.00405 [physics, physics:quant-ph].

[39] J. Yang, Theory of Compression Channels for Postselected Quantum Metrology, *Physical Review Letters* **132**, 250802 (2024).

End Matter

I. PROOF OF OBSERVATION 1

Proof. We prove by contradiction. We note the fact that IC POVM forms a complete basis on $\text{Herm}(d)$. According to Theorem 1, we have $M_{i,ab} = 0$ for all $i \in [1, s]$, $a, b \in [1, r]$. Then according to Theorem S1 in the Supplemental Material, we know $L_i = \alpha_i \Pi_s$, where Π_s is the project to the support space of ρ_λ and $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}$. This is consistent with the condition that $W_{ij,ab} = 0$, for all $i, j \in [1, s]$, $a, b \in [1, r]$. However, in this case, the QFIM element reads $F_{jk}^Q = \alpha_j \alpha_k$, which is of rank-one and thus non-invertible, which is in contradiction with the premise that the QFIM is non-singular. \square

II. PROOF OF OBSERVATION 2

Proof. Again we prove by contradiction. We first assume there exists one optimal measurements consisting of rank-one measurement operators, which is denoted as $\{E_\omega\}_{\omega \in \Omega}$. Since $|\Omega| \geq d$ and the optimal POVM rank-one operator forms a linearly independent basis on \mathcal{V}_\perp , therefore $\dim \mathcal{V}_\perp$ must be greater or equal to d , which in contradiction to condition that $\dim \mathcal{V}_\perp < d$. \square

III. PROOF OF THEOREM 2

Proof. We first prove the forward direction: if a projector Π_ω saturate the outcome-wise QCRB, then according the geometric interpretation of the saturation condition (10), we know

$$\frac{1}{d}(\alpha \mathbb{I} - \mathbf{v}^{(\omega)} \cdot \mathbf{T}) = |\pi_\omega\rangle \langle \pi_\omega|, \quad (18)$$

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbf{v}^{(\omega)}$ is a real vector. This would immediate imply that

$$\mathbf{v}^{(\omega)} \cdot \mathbf{T} = \alpha \mathbb{I} - d |\pi_\omega\rangle \langle \pi_\omega|. \quad (19)$$

The traceless property of T_k implies that $\alpha = 1$. Then spectrum on the r.h.s. is $\{1 - d, 1, 1, \dots, 1\}$, which completes the proof. The backward direction is obvious: assuming Eq. (14) holds, it apparent satisfies Eq. (10). \square

IV. NUMERICAL ALGORITHMS FOR SEARCHING THE OPTIMAL MEASUREMENTS

1. Choose a set of orthonormal complete traceless basis $\{T_k\}_{k=1}^n$ on \mathcal{V}_\perp that satisfies (13) and impose $d-1$ eigenvalues of $\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{T}$ are equal to 1, where \mathbf{v} is n -dimensional real vector. This amounts to imposing $d-1$ real constraints, which is possible only for $n \geq d-1$, consistent with the Observation 2. The number of distinct ways of

imposing such a $(d-1)$ degeneracy is d , which leads to a set of vectors and optimal rank-one projectors denoted as $\{\mathbf{v}^{(\omega)}, \Pi_\omega\}$.

2. Search for non-negative $\alpha^{(\omega)} \in [0, 1]$ that satisfies $\sum_{\omega=1}^{|\Omega|} \alpha^{(\omega)} = d$, $\sum_{\omega=1}^{|\Omega|} \alpha^{(\omega)} \mathbf{v}^{(\omega)} = 0$. These two conditions guarantees that to the set of optimal rank-one POVM $E_\omega \equiv \alpha^{(\omega)} \Pi_\omega$ is complete, i.e., $\sum_{\omega=1}^{|\Omega|} \alpha^{(\omega)} \Pi_\omega = \mathbb{I}$, see Sec. S4 in [33] for details. If such $\{\alpha^{(\omega)}\}$ does not exists, then the QCRB is not saturable. In particular, to search for projective measurements, $|\Omega| = d$ and $\alpha^{(\omega)} = 1$ and one just need to search for d vectors such that $\sum_{\omega=1}^{|\Omega|} \mathbf{v}^{(\omega)} = 0$.

V. SCHEMATIC PROOF OF THEOREM 3

Proof. We prove by giving a recipe of constructing the optimal rank-one projective measurements. A comprehensive description of the procedure can be found in Sec. S5 in [33]. Here we briefly mention the idea behind the iterative construction. Clearly, the first projector can be constructed via the algorithm above. Assuming first μ rank-one projectors, denoted as $\{\Pi_q\}_{q=1}^\mu$, has been constructed, the $(\mu+1)$ -th can constructed as follows:

1. We denote the orthogonal complement of the linear subspace $\text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{\Pi_q\}_{q=1}^\mu$ in \mathcal{V}_\perp as $\mathcal{V}_\perp^{(\mu+1)}$, with $\dim \mathcal{V}_\perp^{(\mu+1)} = n-\mu+1$. Clearly $\mathbb{I}^{(\mu+1)} \equiv \mathbb{I} - \sum_{q=1}^\mu \Pi_q \in \mathcal{V}_\perp^{(\mu+1)}$. All other basis on $\mathcal{V}_\perp^{(\mu+1)}$, denoted as $T_k^{(\mu+1)}$ with $k = 1, 2, \dots, n-\mu$, that are orthogonal to $\mathbb{I}^{(\mu+1)}$ must be traceless and satisfies

$$\langle T_k^{(\mu+1)}, \Pi_q \rangle = \langle \pi_q | T_k^{(\mu+1)} | \pi_q \rangle = 0, \quad q \in [1, \mu].$$

We choose the normalization

$$\langle T_k^{(\mu+1)}, T_l^{(\mu+1)} \rangle = (d-\mu) \delta_{kl}. \quad (20)$$

2. Clearly $\Pi_{\mu+1}$ lies in $\mathcal{V}_\perp^{(\mu+1)}$. Using a theorem that is analogous to Theorem 2 (see Sec. S4 in [33]), the only possibility to form a rank-one project is that there exists a real vector $\mathbf{v}^{(\mu+1)}$ such that (i) The kernel space of $\mathbf{v}^{(\mu+1)} \cdot \mathbf{T}^{(\mu+1)} \equiv \sum_{k=1}^{n-\mu} v_k^{(\mu+1)} T_k$ is equal to $\text{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{|\pi_q\rangle\}_{q=1}^\mu$ (ii) The $(d-\mu-1)$ of the non-zero eigenvalues must be 1, with the remaining one has to be $-(d-\mu-1)$ due to the traceless property of $T_k^{(\mu+1)}$.

Such an iterative procedure can be carried out until the construction of the $(d-1)$ th rank-one projector, corresponding to $\mu = d-2$. It turns out that for constructing the $(\mu+1)$ -th projector, condition (i) *at most* $2\mu(d-\mu) + \mu - 1$ real constraints while condition (ii) imposes *at most* $(d-\mu-1)$ constraints. On the other hand, we note the number of free parameters is $n-\mu$. Therefore, $(\mu+1)$ -th optimal rank-one projector can be constructed successfully if $n-\mu \geq 2\mu(d-\mu) + d-2$. Imposing such an inequality holds for all $\mu \in [1, d-2]$ leads to the inequality (15). \square

VI. PROOF OF THE RESULTS ON QUASI-PURE STATES

Proof. For the state given by Eq. (16), the SLD can be expressed as [38]

$$L_i = \sum_{a=1}^r L_{i,a} \otimes |a\rangle\langle a|, \quad (21)$$

where $L_{i,a}$ is the SLD for the pure state $|\phi_{a\lambda}\rangle$ defined as

$$L_{i,a} = 2(|D_i\phi_{a\lambda}\rangle\langle\phi_{a\lambda}| + |\phi_{a\lambda}\rangle\langle D_i\phi_{a\lambda}|). \quad (22)$$

Therefore, it can be readily calculated

$$W_{ij,ab} = \mathcal{W}_{ij,ab} \otimes |a\rangle\langle b|, \quad (23)$$

$$M_{i,ab} = \mathcal{M}_{i,ab} \otimes |a\rangle\langle b|, \quad (24)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_{ij,ab} &\equiv L_{i,a} |\phi_{a\lambda}\rangle\langle\phi_{b\lambda}| L_{j,b} - L_{j,a} |\phi_{a\lambda}\rangle\langle\phi_{b\lambda}| L_{i,b} \\ &= 2(|D_i\phi_{a\lambda}\rangle\langle D_j\phi_{b\lambda}| - |D_j\phi_{a\lambda}\rangle\langle D_i\phi_{b\lambda}|), \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{i,ab} &\equiv L_{i,a} |\phi_{a\lambda}\rangle\langle\phi_{b\lambda}| - |\phi_{a\lambda}\rangle\langle\phi_{b\lambda}| L_{i,b} \\ &= 2(|D_i\phi_{a\lambda}\rangle\langle\phi_{b\lambda}| - |\phi_{a\lambda}\rangle\langle D_i\phi_{b\lambda}|). \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Consider the local measurement with classical communications (LMCC) with the measurement basis of the form $|\pi_{v,a}\rangle = |e_v^{(a)}\rangle \otimes |a\rangle$. Note that

$$\langle\pi_{v,a}|W_{ij,cd}|\pi_{v,a}\rangle = \langle e_v^{(a)}|W_{ij,cd}|e_v^{(a)}\rangle \delta_{ac}\delta_{ad}, \quad (27)$$

$$\langle\pi_{v,a}|M_{i,cd}|\pi_{v,a}\rangle = \langle e_v^{(a)}|\mathcal{M}_{i,cd}|e_v^{(a)}\rangle \delta_{ac}\delta_{ad}. \quad (28)$$

Then according to the Hollowization theorem 1, this set of measurements optimal if and only

$$\langle e_v^{(a)}|W_{ij,aa}|e_v^{(a)}\rangle = 0, \langle e_v^{(a)}|\mathcal{M}_{i,aa}|e_v^{(a)}\rangle = 0. \quad (29)$$

Applying the Hollowization theorem again to find the optimal the optimal measurement condition for the pure state $|\phi_{a\lambda}\rangle$, one immediately observe that it is the same as Eq. (29). Since $|\phi_{a\lambda}\rangle$ satisfies the WCC, the optimal measurement $\{|e_{v,a}\rangle\}$ can be constructed systematically from the recipes proposed by Mastumoto and Pezze et al [19, 21]. It is clear that LMCC constructed in this way complete, since

$$\sum_a \sum_v |e_v^{(a)}\rangle\langle e_v^{(a)}| \otimes |a\rangle\langle a| = \sum_a |a\rangle\langle a| = \mathbb{I}. \quad (30)$$

□

VII. APPLICATION TO SYSTEMS CONSISTING OF A TWO-QUBIT PRIMARY SYSTEM AND QUBIT ANCILLA

We consider a two-parameter estimation problem with the primary system being two qubits, where $H_1 = \lambda_1 \sigma_z^{(1)} \sigma_z^{(2)}$ and

$H_2 = \lambda_2 \sigma_x^{(1)} \sigma_x^{(2)}$. Clearly here $[H_1, H_2] = 0$. We consider the initial state

$$\rho_0 = q |0,+\rangle\langle 0,+| \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| + (1-q) |1,\varphi\rangle\langle 1,\varphi| \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|, \quad (31)$$

where $|\varphi\rangle = \cos(\theta/2)|0\rangle + \sin(\theta/2)|1\rangle$. It can be calculated that

$$\rho_\lambda = q |\phi_{0\lambda}\rangle\langle\phi_{0\lambda}| \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| + (1-q) |\phi_{1\lambda}\rangle\langle\phi_{1\lambda}| \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|, \quad (32)$$

where $|\phi_{0\lambda}\rangle = U_\lambda |0,+\rangle$ and $|\phi_{1\lambda}\rangle = U_\lambda |1,\varphi\rangle$. Since this state is a quasi-pure states [38], the QFIM can be calculated as

$$F^Q = q F^Q[|\phi_{0\lambda}\rangle] + (1-q) F^Q[|\phi_{1\lambda}\rangle] = \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 0 & 4q + 4(1-q)\sin^2\theta \end{bmatrix}. \quad (33)$$

Following Matsumoto and Pezze [19, 21], we first construct the regular optimal measurements for the estimation of $|\phi_{0\lambda}\rangle$ and $|\phi_{1\lambda}\rangle$ locally $\lambda = 0$. Optimal projectors for estimating $|\phi_{0\lambda}\rangle$ is

$$|e_1^{(0)}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} (|0+\rangle + i\sqrt{2}|1+\rangle), \quad (34)$$

$$|e_2^{(0)}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \left(|0+\rangle - i\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|1+\rangle + i\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}|0-\rangle \right), \quad (35)$$

$$|e_3^{(0)}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \left(|0+\rangle - i\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|1+\rangle - i\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}|0-\rangle \right), \quad (36)$$

$$|e_4^{(0)}\rangle = |1-\rangle, \quad (37)$$

while the optimal regular projectors for estimating $|\phi_{1\lambda}\rangle$ can be constructed as follows:

$$|e_1^{(1)}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} (|1\varphi\rangle + i\sqrt{2}|0\varphi_X\rangle), \quad (38)$$

$$|e_2^{(1)}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \left(|1\varphi\rangle - i\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|0\varphi_X\rangle + i\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}|1\varphi^\perp\rangle \right), \quad (39)$$

$$|e_3^{(1)}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \left(|1\varphi\rangle - i\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|0\varphi_X\rangle - i\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}|1\varphi^\perp\rangle \right), \quad (40)$$

$$|e_4^{(1)}\rangle = |0\varphi_X^\perp\rangle, \quad (41)$$

where

$$|\varphi^\perp\rangle = \sin(\theta/2)|0\rangle - \cos(\theta/2)|1\rangle, \quad (42)$$

$$|\varphi_X\rangle \equiv \sigma_x |\varphi\rangle = \cos(\theta/2)|1\rangle + \sin(\theta/2)|0\rangle, \quad (43)$$

$$|\varphi_X^\perp\rangle \equiv \sigma_x |\varphi^\perp\rangle = \sin(\theta/2)|1\rangle - \cos(\theta/2)|0\rangle. \quad (44)$$

Following theorem in the main text, we consider the measurements $\{|\pi_{v,a}\rangle \equiv |e_v^{(a)}\rangle \otimes |a\rangle\}$, which is optimal. Indeed, it can be easily verified that the CFIM F^C is always identical to F^Q , although this choice of measurement is meant to be locally optimal at $\lambda = 0$.

Supplemental Materials for "A geometric criterion for optimal measurements in multiparameter quantum metrology"

CONTENTS

S1. Proof of Theorem 1 in the main text

- A. Null POVM basis
- B. Regular POVM basis

S2. Proof of Eq. (6) and Eq. (7) in the main text

- A. Choose a central estimation parameter
- B. Choose a central eigenstate

S3. Results on the linearly (in)dependence of $\{W_{ij,ab}^{(a)}, M_{i,ab}^{(a)}\}$

S4. Details about the efficient numerical search algorithms for global saturation

S5. Detailed proof of Theorem 3

S1. PROOF OF THEOREM 1 IN THE MAIN TEXT

A. Null POVM basis

Our goal is to eliminate the proportionality constant $\eta_{\omega,ij}$ so that Eq. (3) can be recast into a compact form. To this end, we show that for a given pair (i, j) , Eq. (3) is equivalent to

$$\frac{\langle \psi_{b\lambda} | L_i | \pi_\omega \rangle}{\langle \psi_{b\lambda} | L_j | \pi_\omega \rangle} = \frac{\langle \pi_\omega | L_i | \psi_{a\lambda} \rangle}{\langle \pi_\omega | L_j | \psi_{a\lambda} \rangle}, \forall a, b. \quad (\text{S1})$$

Following from Eq. (S1), we find

$$\langle \pi_\omega | W_{ij,ab} | \pi_\omega \rangle = 0, \forall i, j, a, b, \quad (\text{S2})$$

where

$$W_{ij,ab} \equiv L_i | \psi_{a\lambda} \rangle \langle \psi_{b\lambda} | L_j - L_j | \psi_{a\lambda} \rangle \langle \psi_{b\lambda} | L_i. \quad (\text{S3})$$

To see the reverse direction also holds, let us first note when $a = b$, Eq. (S1) indicates that

$$\eta_{\omega,ij}^{(a)} \equiv \frac{\langle \psi_{a\lambda} | L_i | \pi_\omega \rangle}{\langle \psi_{a\lambda} | L_j | \pi_\omega \rangle} \quad (\text{S4})$$

is a real number. Then for $a \neq b$, Eq. (S1) clearly indicates that $\eta_{\omega,ij}^{(a)}$ is independent of a .

B. Regular POVM basis

For given i and ω , Eq. (2) is equivalent to

$$\frac{\langle \psi_{b\lambda} | L_i | \pi_\omega \rangle}{\langle \psi_{b\lambda} | \pi_\omega \rangle} = \frac{\langle \pi_\omega | L_i | \psi_{a\lambda} \rangle}{\langle \pi_\omega | \psi_{a\lambda} \rangle}, \forall a, b. \quad (\text{S5})$$

Follows from Eq. (2) straightforwardly, we obtain

$$\langle \pi_\omega | M_{i,ab} | \pi_\omega \rangle = 0, \quad (\text{S6})$$

where

$$M_{i,ab} \equiv L_i |\psi_{a\lambda}\rangle \langle \psi_{b\lambda}| - |\psi_{a\lambda}\rangle \langle \psi_{b\lambda}| L_i. \quad (\text{S7})$$

For the reverse direction, when $a = b$, Eq. (S5) implies that

$$\xi_{\omega,i}^{(a)} \equiv \frac{\langle \psi_{a\lambda}|L_i|\pi_\omega\rangle}{\langle \psi_{a\lambda}|\pi_\omega\rangle}, \quad (\text{S8})$$

is a real number. For $a \neq b$, Eq. (S5) clearly indicates that $\xi_{\omega,i}^{(a)}$ is independent of a .

Now we take one step further. Note that taking two equations from Eq. (S5) for different i and j respectively and then dividing them, we obtain Eq. (S1). However, the reverse direction is not guaranteed. To elaborate, we rewrite Eq. (S1) as

$$\frac{\langle \psi_{b\lambda}|L_i|\pi_\omega\rangle / \langle \psi_{b\lambda}|\pi_\omega\rangle}{\langle \psi_{b\lambda}|L_j|\pi_\omega\rangle / \langle \psi_{b\lambda}|\pi_\omega\rangle} = \frac{\langle \pi_\omega|L_i|\psi_{a\lambda}\rangle / \langle \pi_\omega|\psi_{a\lambda}\rangle}{\langle \pi_\omega|L_j|\psi_{a\lambda}\rangle / \langle \pi_\omega|\psi_{a\lambda}\rangle}, \forall a, b, \quad (\text{S9})$$

which implies

$$\eta_{\omega,ij}^{(b)} = \frac{\xi_{\omega,i}^{(b)}}{\xi_{\omega,j}^{(b)}} = \left(\frac{\xi_{\omega,i}^{(a)}}{\xi_{\omega,j}^{(a)}} \right)^* = \left(\eta_{\omega,ij}^{(a)} \right)^*. \quad (\text{S10})$$

As before, from this equation, we conclude that $\eta_{\omega,ij}^{(a)}$ is real and independent of a and

$$\frac{\xi_{\omega,i}^{(a)}}{\xi_{\omega,j}^{(a)}} = \eta_{\omega,ij} \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (\text{S11})$$

This means if when Eq. (S1) holds for regular operators, for a given pair (i, j) , it only ensures the ratios between $\xi_{\omega,i}^{(a)}$'s are real and independent of a , not $\xi_{\omega,i}^{(a)}$ themselves. As such, to guarantee the optimality of a regular measurement operator, in addition to imposing Eq. (S1), we also require $\xi_{\omega,i}^{(a)}$ is real and independent of a , which means that Eq. (S5) must hold. Note that when if E_ω is null, Eq. (S5) holds automatically.

To summarize, the optimal condition becomes the following: For measurement operator E_ω of any type, either null or regular, we require Eq. (S1) and Eq. (S5) hold. On the other hand, Eq. (S1) is equivalent to Eq. (4) in Theorem 1 while Eq. (S5) is equivalent to Eq. (5) in Theorem 1. Note that given Eq. (S5) and Eq. (5), there is no need to distinguish whether the measurement operator is null or regular. This concludes the proof of the first part of Theorem 1 in the main text.

S2. PROOF OF EQ. (6) AND EQ. (7) IN THE MAIN TEXT

Before we prove Eq. (6) and Eq. (7), we present a useful observation as follows:

Observation S4. If $F_\omega^Q \neq 0$, i.e., $[F_\omega^Q]_{ij} = \text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda L_i E_\omega L_j) \neq 0$, there must exists an estimation parameter $\lambda_{\bar{i}}$ and an eigenstate $|\psi_{\bar{a}\lambda}\rangle$, called central estimation parameter and central eigenstate respectively, such that

$$\langle \psi_{\bar{a}\lambda}|L_{\bar{i}}|\pi_\omega\rangle \neq 0. \quad (\text{S12})$$

Proof. We prove by contradictions. Assuming $\langle \psi_{a\lambda}|L_i|\pi_\omega\rangle = 0$ for all a and i . Then it can be readily found that

$$[F_\omega^Q]_{ij} = \sum_a p_a \text{Re}[\langle \psi_{a\lambda}|L_i|\pi_\omega\rangle \langle \pi_\omega|L_j|\psi_{a\lambda}\rangle] = 0, \quad (\text{S13})$$

which is in contradiction to the premise that $F_\omega^Q \neq 0$. \square

A. Choose a central estimation parameter

By definition, we know

$$\xi_{\omega,j}^{(b)} = \xi_{\omega,\bar{i}}^{(b)} \eta_{\omega,\bar{i}j}^{(b)}. \quad (\text{S14})$$

Let us assume Eq. (6) and Eq. (7) hold for the estimation parameter $\lambda_{\bar{i}}$ and the central eigenstate $|\psi_{\bar{a}\lambda}\rangle$. Then we know that $\eta_{\omega,\bar{i}}^{(b)}$ and $\xi_{\omega,\bar{i}}^{(b)}$ are real and independent of b . Therefore we conclude that $\xi_{\omega,j}^{(b)}$ must be also real and independent of b , which implies that Eq. (5) holds for all the estimation parameters and eigenstates.

On the other hand, we should avoid $\xi_{\omega,\bar{i}}^{(b)}$ and $\eta_{\omega,\bar{i}}^{(b)}$ being indeterminate, i.e. of the type 0/0. In this case, the constraint given by Eq. (S14) is trivial in that it is not able to constrain $\xi_{\omega,j}^{(b)}$ such that it is real and independent of b . Fortunately, thanks to Observation S4, when Eq. (7) holds, we know $\xi_{\omega,j}^{(b)} = \xi_{\omega,j}^{(\bar{a})}$ is not of the type 0/0. Similar arguments can be applied to conclude that $\eta_{\omega,\bar{i}}^{(b)}$ is not of the type 0/0 when Eq. (6) and hold.

B. Choose a central eigenstate

Given Eq. (6) and Eq. (7) hold, it can be readily shown that for any given pair (i, j) and (a, b) ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\langle \psi_{b\lambda} | L_i | \pi_\omega \rangle}{\langle \psi_{b\lambda} | L_j | \pi_\omega \rangle} &= \frac{\langle \psi_{b\lambda} | L_i | \pi_\omega \rangle \langle \psi_{b\lambda} | L_{\bar{i}} | \pi_\omega \rangle}{\langle \psi_{b\lambda} | L_{\bar{i}} | \pi_\omega \rangle \langle \psi_{b\lambda} | L_j | \pi_\omega \rangle} = \frac{\langle \pi_\omega | L_i | \psi_{\bar{a}\lambda} \rangle \langle \pi_\omega | L_{\bar{i}} | \psi_{\bar{a}\lambda} \rangle}{\langle \pi_\omega | L_{\bar{i}} | \psi_{\bar{a}\lambda} \rangle \langle \pi_\omega | L_j | \psi_{\bar{a}\lambda} \rangle} \\ &= \frac{\langle \psi_{\bar{a}\lambda} | L_i | \pi_\omega \rangle \langle \psi_{\bar{a}\lambda} | L_{\bar{i}} | \pi_\omega \rangle}{\langle \psi_{\bar{a}\lambda} | L_{\bar{i}} | \pi_\omega \rangle \langle \psi_{\bar{a}\lambda} | L_j | \pi_\omega \rangle} = \frac{\langle \pi_\omega | L_i | \psi_{c\lambda} \rangle \langle \pi_\omega | L_{\bar{i}} | \psi_{c\lambda} \rangle}{\langle \pi_\omega | L_{\bar{i}} | \psi_{c\lambda} \rangle \langle \pi_\omega | L_j | \psi_{c\lambda} \rangle} = \frac{\langle \pi_\omega | L_i | \psi_{c\lambda} \rangle}{\langle \pi_\omega | L_j | \psi_{c\lambda} \rangle}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S15})$$

In other words,

$$\eta_{\omega,ij}^{(b)} = \eta_{\omega,\bar{i}i}^{(b)} \eta_{\omega,\bar{i}j}^{(b)} = \eta_{\omega,\bar{i}i}^{(\bar{a})*} \eta_{\omega,\bar{i}j}^{(\bar{a})} = \eta_{\omega,\bar{i}i}^{(\bar{a})} \eta_{\omega,\bar{i}j}^{(\bar{a})} = \eta_{\omega,\bar{i}i}^{(c)*} \eta_{\omega,\bar{i}j}^{(c)*} = \eta_{\omega,\bar{i}i}^{(c)*} \eta_{\omega,\bar{i}j}^{(c)*} = \eta_{\omega,ij}^{(c)*}, \quad (\text{S16})$$

which is equivalent to Eq. (4). Similar with the previous case, if $\eta_{\omega,\bar{i}}^{(b)}$ and $\eta_{\omega,\bar{i}j}^{(b)}$ are of the type 0/0, it will invalidate the above identities. Nevertheless, Observation S4 excludes these singular cases.

S3. RESULTS ON THE LINEARLY (IN)DEPENDENCE OF $\{W_{ij,ab}^{(\alpha)}, M_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)}\}$

In this section, unless otherwise stated, we always focus on real vector space and therefore linear independence or dependence is always defined over the real field.

Lemma S1. The QFIM is non-singular, then the set of $\{L_i\}_{i=1}^s$ are linearly independent in $\text{Herm}(d)$.

Proof. We prove by contradiction. Consider the matrix element of the QFIM $[F^Q]_{jk} = \text{ReTr}(\rho_\lambda L_j L_k)$. If $\{L_i\}_{i=1}^s$ are not linearly dependent, then $\exists k$ such that $L_k = \sum_{l \neq k} c_l L_l$ with $c_l \in \mathbb{R}$ and therefore $[F^Q]_{jk} = \sum_{l \neq k} c_l [F^Q]_{jl}$. That is, the k -column of the QFIM is linear combination of the other column. Therefore the QFIM is rank-deficient and singular, which completes the proof. \square

Lemma S2. If the QFIM is non-singular, then $[F^Q]_{jj} = \text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda L_j^2)$ must be strictly positive.

Proof. We prove by contradiction. If $\exists j$ such that $[F^Q]_{jj} = \text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda L_j^2) = 0$, the using Cauch-Schwarz inequality

$$|\text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda L_j L_k)|^2 = |\langle L_j \sqrt{\rho_\lambda}, L_k \sqrt{\rho_\lambda} \rangle|^2 \leq F_{jj}^Q F_{kk}^Q = 0, \quad (\text{S17})$$

which forces $\text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda L_j L_k) = 0$ for all k . This means that $[F^Q]_{jk} = 0$ for all k , which indicates that the j -row and the j -column of the QFIM vanishes. Therefore the QFIM is rank-deficient and singular, which completes the proof. \square

An immediate consequence of above lemma is the following:

Lemma S3. If the QFIM is non-singular, then for every parameter λ_j , there must exists an eigenstate of ρ_λ corresponding to a positive eigenvalue such that $L_j |\psi_{a\lambda}\rangle \neq 0$.

Proof. It can be readily proved by contraction. We note that $[F^Q]_{jj} = \text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda L_j^2) = \sum_a p_{a\lambda} \|L_j |\psi_{a\lambda}\rangle\|^2$. Thus for given j , if $L_j |\psi_{a\lambda}\rangle = 0$ for all a , then $[F^Q]_{jj} = 0$, which leads to singular QFIM. \square

Before proceeding, let us note that the SLD operator can be rewritten as $L_i = L_i^{\text{ss}} + (L_i^{\text{sk}} + \text{h.c.}) + L_i^{\text{kk}}$, where $L_i^{\alpha\beta} \equiv \Pi_\alpha L_i \Pi_\beta$, Π_s and Π_k are projectors to the support and kernel of ρ_λ , respectively. In particular, it is shown in [29, 38] that

$$L_i^{\text{sk}} = 2 \sum_a |\psi_{a\lambda}\rangle \langle \partial_i \psi_{a\lambda}| \Pi_k, \quad L_i^{\text{kk}} = 0. \quad (\text{S18})$$

Theorem S1. (Vanishing M condition) For a given estimation parameter λ_j , if $M_{j,ab}^{(\alpha)} = 0$ for all a, b, α . Then L_j bears the structure

$$L_j = \alpha_j \Pi_s, \quad (\text{S19})$$

where $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{R}$ and the density matrix satisfies

$$\partial_j \ln p_{a\lambda} = \alpha_j, \quad \forall a \in [1, r], \quad (\text{S20})$$

$$p_{a\lambda} = p_{b\lambda} \text{ or } \langle \partial_j \psi_{a\lambda} | \psi_{b\lambda} \rangle = 0, \quad \forall a, b \in [1, r], a \neq b, \quad (\text{S21})$$

and $|\partial_j \psi_{a\lambda}\rangle$ fully lies the support of ρ_λ .

Proof. We note that the set of matrices $\{\sigma_{ab}^{(\alpha)}\}$ containing r^2 elements forms a basis of the subspace of a Hermitian operators that fully lies on the support of ρ_λ , which is isomorphic to $\text{Herm}(r)$ or $\mathfrak{u}(r)$. Note that $\sigma_{ab}^{(\alpha)}$ is an operator acting on the support of ρ_λ , we know $L_i^{\text{sk}} \sigma_{ab}^{(\alpha)} = \sigma_{ab}^{(\alpha)} L_i^{\text{ss}} = 0$. Therefore, we obtain

$$[\sigma_{ab}^{(\alpha)}, L_i] = [\sigma_{ab}^{(\alpha)}, L_i^{\text{ss}}] + (\sigma_{ab}^{(\alpha)} L_i^{\text{sk}} - \text{h.c.}). \quad (\text{S22})$$

On the other hand, we know $[\sigma_{ab}^{(\alpha)}, L_i^{\text{ss}}]$ is an operator acting on the support of ρ_λ , $\sigma_{ab}^{(\alpha)} L_i^{\text{sk}}$ maps the kernel space to the support space of ρ_λ while its Hermitian conjugate maps support space to the kernel space of ρ_λ , these three terms must be linearly independently. Using Eq. (S18), we obtain

$$L_i^{\text{sk}} = 0, \quad [\sigma_{ab}^{(\alpha)}, L_i^{\text{ss}}] = 0 \quad (\text{S23})$$

On the other hand, $\{i\sigma_{ab}^{(\alpha)}\}_{ab, \alpha}$ is basis of the fundamental representation of the $\mathfrak{u}(r)$ algebra, which is irreducible. According to Schur's lemma, we know

$$L_i^{\text{ss}} \propto \Pi_s. \quad (\text{S24})$$

The Hermiticity requirement imposes the proportionality constant must be real. This concludes the proof. \square

The following theorem states that for a given i , when the set of vectors $\{\Pi_k |\partial_i \psi_{a\lambda}\rangle\}_{a \in [1, r]}$ are linearly independent, the set of matrices $\{M_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)}\}_{a,b \in [1, r], \alpha=x,y,z}$ are also linearly independent.

Theorem S2. (Linear independence among M 's) For a given i , if the set of vectors $\{\Pi_k |\partial_i \psi_{a\lambda}\rangle\}_{a \in [1, r]}$ is linearly independent then the set of matrices $\{M_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)}\}$ must be linear independent.

Proof. We consider the linear combination of the M matrices as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{ab, \alpha} c_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)} M_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)} &= \left[\sum_{ab, \alpha} c_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)} \sigma_{ab}^{(\alpha)}, L_i \right] \\ &= \left[\sum_{ab, \alpha} c_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)} \sigma_{ab}^{(\alpha)}, L_i^{\text{ss}} \right] + \left(\sum_{ab, \alpha} c_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)} \sigma_{ab}^{(\alpha)} L_i^{\text{sk}} - \text{h.c.} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S25})$$

where the coefficient $c_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)} \in \mathbb{R}$. More explicitly, according to Eq. (S18), we find

$$\sum_{ab, \alpha} c_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)} \sigma_{ab}^{(\alpha)} L_i^{\text{sk}} = \left(\sum_{ab, \alpha} c_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)} \sigma_{ab}^{(\alpha)} \right) \sum_c |\psi_{c\lambda}\rangle \langle \partial_i \psi_{c\lambda}| \Pi_k. \quad (\text{S26})$$

Since the set of vectors $\{\Pi_k |\partial_i \psi_{a\lambda}\rangle\}_{a \in [1, r]}$ lie in the kernel of ρ_λ and are linearly independent and $|\psi_{c\lambda}\rangle$ lies on the support of ρ_λ , in order for the commutator $[\sum_{ab, \alpha} c_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)} \sigma_{ab}^{(\alpha)}, L_i]$ to vanish, one must have

$$\left(\sum_{ab, \alpha} c_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)} \sigma_{ab}^{(\alpha)} \right) |\psi_{c\lambda}\rangle = 0, \forall c. \quad (\text{S27})$$

This further leads to

$$\sum_{ab, \alpha} c_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)} \sigma_{ab}^{(\alpha)} = 0. \quad (\text{S28})$$

Since the set of operators $\{\sigma_{ab}^{(\alpha)}\}$ are linearly independent, this means that $c_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)} = 0$, which concludes the proof. \square

On the other hand, if $L_i^{\text{sk}} = 0$, i.e., the SLD L_i fully lies on the support of ρ_λ , the set of matrices $\{M_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)}\}_{a,b \in [1, r], \alpha = x,y,z}$ must be linearly dependent, as stated in the following theorem:

Theorem S3. (Linear dependence among M 's) If $L_i^{\text{sk}} = 0$, i.e., L_i only lies on the support of ρ_λ (including the case of full rank states), $\{M_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)}\}$ is linearly dependent.

Proof. We note that the set of basis $\{\sigma_{ab}^{(\alpha)}\}$ containing r^2 elements now forms a basis of a Hermitian operators that fully lies on the support of ρ_λ . Therefore, there exists a set of real numbers $\{c_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)}\}$, with at least one of them are non-zero, such that

$$L_i = \sum_{ab, \alpha} c_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)} \sigma_{ab}^{(\alpha)}, \quad (\text{S29})$$

which leads to

$$\sum_{ab, \alpha} c_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)} M_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)} = 0. \quad (\text{S30})$$

Therefore in this case $\{M_{i,ab}^{(\alpha)}\}$ are linearly dependent. \square

S4. DETAILS ABOUT THE EFFICIENT NUMERICAL SEARCH ALGORITHMS FOR GLOBAL SATURATION

The numerical search algorithm presented in the main text is justified by the following theorem:

Theorem S4. (Global saturability criterion) When PCC is satisfied, the QCRB is saturable if and only if there exists a tuple $\Lambda \equiv \{\mathbf{v}^{(\omega)}, \alpha^{(\omega)} \in [0, 1]\}_{\omega \in \Omega}$, where $\mathbf{v}^{(\omega)}$ is defined as in Theorem 2, such that

$$\sum_{\omega} \alpha^{(\omega)} = d, \sum_{\omega} \alpha^{(\omega)} \mathbf{v}^{(\omega)} = 0. \quad (\text{S31})$$

Proof. Consider the parameterization of the optimal rank-one POVM given by

$$E_{\omega} = \alpha^{(\omega)} \Pi_{\omega} = \frac{\alpha^{(\omega)}}{d} (\mathbb{I} - \mathbf{v}^{(\omega)} \cdot \mathbf{T}).$$

The completeness relation $\sum_{\omega} E_{\omega} = \mathbb{I}$ implies that

$$\sum_{\omega} E_{\omega} = \frac{1}{d} \left(\sum_{\omega} \alpha^{(\omega)} \right) \mathbb{I} + \frac{1}{d} \sum_{k=1}^n \left(\sum_{\omega} \alpha^{(\omega)} v_k^{(\omega)} \right) T_k = \mathbb{I}. \quad (\text{S32})$$

Taking trace on both sides leads to

$$\sum_{\omega} \alpha^{(\omega)} = d, \quad (\text{S33})$$

which leads to

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \left(\sum_{\omega} \alpha^{(\omega)} v_k^{(\omega)} \right) T_k = 0. \quad (\text{S34})$$

Multiplying above equation from the left by T_l and then taking the trace yields

$$\sum_{\omega} \alpha^{(\omega)} v_k^{(\omega)} = 0. \quad (\text{S35})$$

On the other hand, it can be readily checked that with Eqs. (S33, S35), $\sum_{\omega} E_{\omega} = \mathbb{I}$ is satisfied according to Eq. (S32). Furthermore, for projective measurements, $|\Omega| = d$ and $\alpha^{(\omega)} = 1$, we only require

$$\sum_{\omega=1}^d v_k^{(\omega)} = 0. \quad (\text{S36})$$

□

55. DETAILED PROOF OF THEOREM 3

Lemma S4. Given a projector $\mathbb{I}^{(\mu+1)} \equiv \mathbb{I} - \sum_{q=1}^{\mu} \Pi_q$, where $\Pi_q \equiv |\pi_q\rangle\langle\pi_q|$ and $\{|\pi_q\rangle\}_{q=1}^{\mu}$ is an orthonormal basis where $\mu \leq d - 2$, and a set of traceless Hermitian matrices $\{T_k^{(\mu+1)}\}_{k \geq 1}$, then the *real* linear combination between $\mathbb{I}^{(\mu+1)}$ and $\{T_k^{(\mu+1)}\}_{k \geq 1}$ forms a rank-one projector $\Pi_{\mu+1} = |\pi_{\mu+1}\rangle\langle\pi_{\mu+1}|$ that is orthogonal to $\{\Pi_q\}_{q=1}^{\mu}$ if and only if there exists a real vector v such that (i) The kernel space of $v^{(\mu+1)} \cdot \mathbf{T}^{(\mu+1)} \equiv \sum_k v_k^{(\mu+1)} T_k^{(\mu+1)}$ is $\text{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{|\pi_q\rangle\}_{q=1}^{\mu}$. (ii) 1 is the eigenvalue of $v^{(\mu+1)} \cdot \mathbf{T}^{(\mu+1)}$ with degeneracy $d - \mu - 1$.

Proof. The proof is similar to Theorem 2 in the main text. The backward direction is straightforward to prove. We prove the forward direction. Without loss of generality, we take

$$\Pi_{\mu+1} = \frac{1}{d - \mu} (\alpha \mathbb{I}^{(\mu+1)} - v^{(\mu+1)} \cdot \mathbf{T}^{(\mu+1)}) \quad (\text{S37})$$

with $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, from which we conclude

$$v^{(\mu+1)} \cdot \mathbf{T}^{(\mu+1)} = \alpha \mathbb{I}^{(\mu+1)} - (d - \mu) |\pi_{\mu+1}\rangle\langle\pi_{\mu+1}| = \alpha \mathbb{I} - \alpha \sum_{q=1}^{\mu} \Pi_q - (d - \mu) |\pi_{\mu+1}\rangle\langle\pi_{\mu+1}|. \quad (\text{S38})$$

The traceless property of $T_k^{(\mu+1)}$ implies that $\alpha = 1$, which is then implies

$$v^{(\mu+1)} \cdot \mathbf{T}^{(\mu+1)} = \mathbb{I} - \sum_{q=1}^{\mu} \Pi_q - (d - \mu) |\pi_{\mu+1}\rangle\langle\pi_{\mu+1}|. \quad (\text{S39})$$

The r.h.s gives the spectral properties of $v^{(\mu+1)} \cdot \mathbf{T}^{(\mu+1)}$: The kernel space is spanned by $\{|\pi_q\rangle\}_{q=1}^{\mu}$ while $(d - \mu - 1)$ non-zero eigenvalues are equal to 1. □

Observation S5. Given a set of orthonormal d -dimension complex bases $\{|\pi_q\rangle\}_{q=1}^{\mu}$ and a linear Hermitian operator T satisfying $\langle\pi_q|T|\pi_q\rangle = 0$ for $q = 1, 2, \dots, \mu$. The linear subspace $\text{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{|\pi_q\rangle\}_{q=1}^{\mu}$ becomes the kernel of T if and only if T are μ -fold degenerate and the corresponding eigenvectores lies in $\text{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{|\pi_q\rangle\}_{q=1}^{\mu}$.

Proof. The forward direction is straightforward. To prove the backward direction, we denote the degenerate eigenvalue as λ and a basis in the degenerate subspace as $|\lambda_q\rangle_{q=1}^{\mu}$. It can be readily observed that

$$T \sum_{q=1}^{\mu} |\lambda_q\rangle\langle\lambda_q| = T \sum_{q=1}^{\mu} |\pi_q\rangle\langle\pi_q| = \lambda \sum_{q=1}^{\mu} |\lambda_q\rangle\langle\lambda_q|. \quad (\text{S40})$$

Then taking trace on both sides, one conclude $\lambda = 0$, i.e., $\text{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{|\pi_q\rangle\}_{q=1}^{\mu}$ is the kernel of T . □

Observation S6. Given a set of d -dimensional complex orthonormal basis $\{|\pi_1\rangle, |\pi_2\rangle \dots |\pi_{\mu}\rangle\}$, the effective *real* constraints of requiring a normalized vector $|\lambda\rangle \in \text{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{|\pi_1\rangle, |\pi_2\rangle \dots |\pi_{\mu}\rangle\}$ at most $2(d - \mu)$.

Proof. It can be readily observed that $|\lambda\rangle \in \text{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{|\pi_1\rangle, |\pi_2\rangle \dots |\pi_{\mu}\rangle\}$ is equivalent to $|\lambda\rangle$ is orthogonal to the remaining $d - \mu$ orthonormal vectors $\{|\pi_{\mu+1}\rangle, |\pi_{\mu+2}\rangle, \dots, |\pi_d\rangle\}$, which imposes at most $d - \mu$ complex constraints. □

Now we are in a position to give a comprehensive proof of Theorem 3 in the main text.

Proof. The necessity of PCC has shown in Ref. [29]. Here we demonstrate its sufficiency.

1. The 1st projective rank-one POVM can be constructed according to Theorem 2 in the main text. More specifically,

- (a) Define $\mathcal{V}_{\perp}^{(1)} = \mathcal{V}_{\perp}$ and $T_k^{(1)} = T_k$, $k \geq 1$ and satisfy the normalization condition (13). Denote the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of $\mathbf{v}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{T}^{(1)} = \sum_{k=1}^n v_k^{(1)} T_k^{(1)}$ as $\{\pi_q(\mathbf{v}^{(1)})\}_{q=1}^d$ and $\{|\pi_q(\mathbf{v}^{(1)})\rangle\}_{q=1}^d$ respectively.
- (b) In order for the linear combination between \mathbb{I} and $T_k^{(1)}$ to form a rank-one projector, according to Theorem 2 in the main text, we must impose $(d-1)$ eigenvalues of $\mathbf{v}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{T}^{(1)}$ be equal to 1. With out loss of generality can be taken to be $\pi_q(\mathbf{v}^{(1)}) = 1$ for $2 \leq q \leq d$. Then the first rank-one optimal projector becomes

$$\Pi_1 = \frac{1}{d}(\mathbb{I} - \mathbf{v}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{T}^{(1)}) = |\pi_1(\mathbf{v}^{(1)})\rangle \langle \pi_1(\mathbf{v}^{(1)})|, \quad (\text{S41})$$

with $v_k^{(1)} = -\langle \pi_1(\mathbf{v}^{(1)})|T_k^{(1)}|\pi_1(\mathbf{v}^{(1)})\rangle$ and $\sum_{k=1}^n [v_k^{(1)}]^2 = d-1$.

2. The remaining optimal rank-one projectors can be constructed iteratively. To construct the $(\mu+1)^{\text{th}}$ projective rank-one POVM:

- (a) $\Pi_{\mu+1}$ must lies in the orthogonal complement of the linear subspace $\text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{\Pi_q\}_{q=1}^{\mu}$, which we denoted as $\mathcal{V}_{\perp}^{(\mu+1)}$. We define $\mathbb{I}^{(\mu+1)} \equiv \mathbb{I}^{(\mu)} - \Pi_{\mu} = \mathbb{I} - \sum_{q=1}^{\mu} \Pi_q \in \mathcal{V}_{\perp}^{(\mu+1)}$. The other $n-\mu$ mutually orthogonal bases on $\mathcal{V}_{\perp}^{(\mu+1)}$ are denoted as $T_k^{(\mu+1)}$, where $k = 1, 2, \dots, n-\mu$. It can be readily observed that

$$\langle T_k^{(\mu+1)}, \Pi_q \rangle = \langle \pi_q(\mathbf{v}^{(q)})|T_k^{(\mu+1)}|\pi_q(\mathbf{v}^{(q)})\rangle = 0, \quad q \in [1, \mu]. \quad (\text{S42})$$

Furthermore, they must be traceless since

$$\langle T_k^{(\mu+1)}, \mathbb{I}^{(\mu+1)} \rangle = \langle T_k^{(\mu+1)}, \mathbb{I} \rangle = 0. \quad (\text{S43})$$

We choose the normalization condition

$$\langle T_k^{(\mu+1)}, T_l^{(\mu+1)} \rangle = (d-\mu)\delta_{kl}. \quad (\text{S44})$$

We denote the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of $\mathbf{v}^{(\mu+1)} \cdot \mathbf{T}^{(\mu+1)} = \sum_{k=1}^{n-\mu} v_k^{(\mu+1)} T_k^{(\mu+1)}$ as $\{\pi_q(\mathbf{v}^{(\mu+1)})\}_{q=1}^d$ and $\{|\pi_q(\mathbf{v}^{(\mu+1)})\rangle\}_{q=1}^d$ respectively.

- (b) In order to form a rank-one projector from the linear combinations between $\mathbb{I}^{(\mu+1)}$ and $T_k^{(\mu+1)}$, according to Lemma S4, without loss of generality, we require (i) $\{|\pi_q(\mathbf{v}^{(q)})\rangle\}_{q=1}^{\mu}$ lies in the kernel of $\mathbf{v}^{(\mu+1)} \cdot \mathbf{T}^{(\mu+1)}$ (ii) $(d-\mu-1)$ eigenvalues equal 1. According to Observation (S5), condition (i) can be guaranteed by imposing the μ eigenvalues are equal, i.e.,

$$\pi_1(\mathbf{v}^{(\mu+1)}) = \pi_2(\mathbf{v}^{(\mu+1)}) = \dots = \pi_{\mu}(\mathbf{v}^{(\mu+1)}), \quad (\text{S45})$$

and $|\pi_q(\mathbf{v}^{(\mu+1)})\rangle \in \text{span}\{|\pi_q(\mathbf{v}^{(q)})\rangle\}_{q=1}^{\mu}$ for $1 \leq q \leq \mu$. Condition (ii) can be guaranteed by imposing $\pi_q(\mathbf{v}^{(\mu+1)}) = 1$ for $\mu+2 \leq q \leq d$. Then

$$\Pi_{\mu+1} = \frac{1}{d-\mu}(\mathbb{I}^{(\mu+1)} - \mathbf{v}^{(\mu+1)} \cdot \mathbf{T}^{(\mu+1)}) = |\pi_{\mu+1}(\mathbf{v}^{(\mu+1)})\rangle \langle \pi_{\mu+1}(\mathbf{v}^{(\mu+1)})|, \quad (\text{S46})$$

with $v_k^{(\mu+1)} = -\langle \pi_{\mu+1}(\mathbf{v}^{(\mu+1)})|T_k^{(\mu+1)}|\pi_{\mu+1}(\mathbf{v}^{(\mu+1)})\rangle$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{n-\mu} [v_k^{(\mu+1)}]^2 = d-\mu-1$.

Now let us counter the constraints and free-parameters in the construction of $(\mu+1)$ -th rank-one projectors: According to Observations S5 and S6, it is clear that condition (i) imposes $\mu(d-\mu) + \mu - 1$ real constraints. Condition (ii) imposes $d-\mu-1$ real constraints. On the other hand, the number of real free parameters is $n-\mu$. In order for real free parameters outnumbers the real constraints for the construction of optimal rank-one projectors, up to the $(d-1)$ -th one, the inequality (15) in the main text must hold. \square