

Bayesian stepwise estimation of qubit rotations

M. Manrique,¹ M. Barbieri,^{1,2,3} A. Di Vizio,¹ M. Parisi,¹ G. Bizzarri,¹ I. Gianani,¹ and M.G.A. Paris⁴

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

²*Istituto Nazionale di Ottica - CNR, Largo E. Fermi 6, 50125 Florence, Italy*

³*INFN, Sezione di Roma Tre, Via Della Vasca Navale 84, 00146 Roma, Italy*

⁴*Dipartimento di Fisica “Aldo Pontremoli”, Università degli Studi di Milano, Via Celoria 16, 20133 Milan, Italy*

(Dated: December 5, 2025)

This work investigates Bayesian stepwise estimation (Se) for measuring the two parameters of a unitary qubit rotation. While asymptotic analysis predicts a precision advantage for SE over joint estimation (JE) in regimes where the quantum Fisher information matrix is near-singular (“sloppy” models), we demonstrate that this advantage is mitigated within a practical Bayesian framework with limited resources. We experimentally implement a SE protocol using polarisation qubits, achieving uncertainties close to the classical Van Trees bounds. However, comparing the total error to the ultimate quantum Van Trees bound for JE reveals that averaging over prior distributions erases the asymptotic SE advantage. Nevertheless, the stepwise strategy retains a significant practical benefit as it operates effectively with simple, fixed measurements, whereas saturating the JE bound typically requires complex, parameter-dependent operations.

INTRODUCTION

Quantum metrology exploits the unique properties of quantum systems to estimate physical parameters with precision beyond classical limits [1–4]. While the ultimate precision bounds for single-parameter estimation are well-established, their multiparameter counterparts present relevant and interesting challenges [5, 6]. The natural approach of joint estimation (JE) is fundamentally limited by two phenomena. The first is quantum in nature, measurement incompatibility, since the optimal measurements for different parameters may not commute, preventing the simultaneous saturation of the quantum Cramer-Rao bound (QCRB) [7, 8].

The second, sloppiness, is a form of classical indeterminacy (or lack of parameter identifiability) that occurs when parameters are not independently encoded, leading to a singular or near-singular Quantum Fisher Information Matrix (QFIM) [9, 10]. In sloppy models, the statistical model depends mostly or only on a combination of the parameters, making their individual estimation nearly or fully impossible.

To circumvent these limitations, stepwise estimation (SE) has been recently proposed as a powerful alternative framework [11, 12]. In SE, the total resources are divided to estimate parameters sequentially: a subset of measurements is used to obtain an estimate for the first parameter, which is then used as prior knowledge to inform the estimation of the second parameter in the remaining rounds. Analytically, it has been shown that this strategy can achieve a total error that is strictly lower than the JE bound in regimes where the QFIM is nearly singular [11]. This advantage is not merely theoretical, Bayesian implementations across diverse platforms, including qubit probes, three-level Landau-Zener systems, and critical many-body Ising chains, where SE can restore a quantum-enhanced scaling advantage often lost

in JE due to singularities [11]. These findings motivate the experimental exploration of SE protocols in realistic scenarios, where resources and prior knowledge are finite.

Concurrently, the fundamental trade-off between sloppiness and incompatibility has been analyzed in two-parameter qubit models incorporating a tunable “scrambling” operation [13]. Results imply that minimizing sloppiness to enhance precision necessarily maximizes incompatibility, and vice versa. Notably, it has been found that for such a qubit model, the asymptotically achievable Holevo bound and the Nagaoka bound (saturable with separable measurements) coincide. This result underscores that the ultimate precision limits for both joint and stepwise strategies are fundamentally set by the degree of sloppiness in the model [13].

In this work, we bridge the gap between these analytical asymptotic bounds and practical experimental implementation. We present a Bayesian stepwise estimation protocol for estimating the two parameters of a unitary rotation on a photonic qubit. While the asymptotic analysis predicts an advantage for SE in sloppy regions, the transition to the Bayesian framework with limited resources and finite prior knowledge introduces new considerations. In our protocol, one parameter is first estimated, and its posterior distribution is then used as prior information for the estimation of the second parameter.

We experimentally implement this protocol using polarisation qubits and find that the achieved uncertainties are close to the classical Van Trees bounds for the stepwise strategy. However, when comparing the total error to the ultimate quantum Van Trees bound for JE, we observe that the potential advantage of SE is mitigated within the Bayesian framework. We conclude that while the asymptotic, local CRB analysis suggests clear regimes where SE outperforms JE, the practical Bayesian implementation averages over prior distributions, often erasing this advantage. Nevertheless, the stepwise strategy

retains a significant practical benefit: it operates effectively with simple, fixed projective measurements (e.g., a Z -basis measurement), whereas saturating the JE bound would typically require complex, parameter-dependent, and often infeasible collective measurements.

Our results provide a crucial reality check on the application of multiparameter quantum metrology theorems, highlighting the interplay between fundamental quantum bounds, practical measurement constraints, and the role of prior information in Bayesian inference.

RESULTS

The system we investigate consists in a collection of qubits undergoing a transformation characterised by a pair of parameters, the estimation of which is our final goal. This is in line with previous efforts aiming at the optimising resources in the assessment of quantum processes [14, 15]. These qubits are encoded in the polarisation of heralded single photons. These are produced by means of parametric downconversion from a 3-mm non-linear crystal (beta barium borate, BBO) illuminated by a pulsed pump ($\lambda_p = 405$ nm, rep. rate 80 MHz, average power 50 mW, obtained from second harmonic generation from a 1 mm BBO). Photons are produced by energy-degenerate type I phase matching, spectrally filtered by an interference filter (full width half maximum 7.5 nm) and by a single-mode fibre.

Photons are prepared at the output of the fibre in the horizontal polarisation, and then reach a birefringent object, a quarter-wave plate for λ_p . This is set with its axis at an angle $\theta/2$ with respect to the horizontal, corresponding to the logic state $|0\rangle$, and imparts a phase shift 2γ between the slow and fast polarisations. Following this transformation, photons are measured in the logical basis, physically implemented by horizontal-vertical discrimination.

The expression of the polarisation transformation is written as

$$U(\theta, \gamma) = \exp[-i\gamma(\cos \theta \sigma_x + \sin \theta \sigma_z)], \quad (1)$$

where σ_x and σ_z are the first and third Pauli operators, defined with respect to the measurement basis. The two parameters to be estimated, based on the measurement statistics, are thus θ and γ . Knowing the expressions of the detection probabilities $p_0 = |\langle 0|U(\theta, \gamma)|0\rangle|^2$ and $p_1 = |\langle 1|U(\theta, \gamma)|0\rangle|^2$, it is thus possible to infer the value of the parameters from the results. In formal terms, there exist functions mapping the collection of the experimental outcomes, here denoted \vec{x} , into estimated values $\hat{\lambda}_1$ and $\hat{\lambda}_2$. These functions are called estimators.

In the standard treatment of quantum metrology, when the two parameters are measured jointly, the minimal attainable variances on $\hat{\lambda}_1$ $\hat{\lambda}_2$ are bound through the QFIM

Q by means of the CRB:

$$\Sigma \geq \frac{1}{N} Q^{-1}, \quad (2)$$

where Σ is the covariance matrix of the two parameters, and N is the number of experimental runs. The bound (2) implies scalar bounds on the individual uncertainty on λ_i ($i = 1, 2$)

$$\sigma_i^2 \geq \frac{1}{N} (Q^{-1})_{ii}. \quad (3)$$

In general, there is no guarantee that the variance at the parameter CRB can actually be achieved in a joint measurement. A tighter inequality is given by the Holevo CRB, defined as

$$N \text{Tr}(\Sigma) \geq N C_H = N \min_{\mathbf{X}} \text{Tr}\{\text{Re}[\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{X})] + \|\text{Im}[\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{X})]\|_1\}. \quad (4)$$

where \mathbf{X} is a list of operators satisfying $\text{Tr}[\partial_\mu \rho X_\nu] = \delta_{\mu\nu}$, $\mathcal{Z}_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{X}) = \text{Tr}[\rho X_\mu X_\nu]$, and $\|A\|_1 = \sqrt{A^\dagger A}$. This is valid for an arbitrary measurement, even collective ones on multiple copies, however, in our case, separate ones are sufficient. In the SE approach, instead, the parameters are estimated one at the time in separate rounds. For the first parameter, the joint CRB is still relevant: now we are already equipped with an estimate for λ_1 , we can make use of single-parameter estimation for the second, thus the individual single-parameter CRBs hold:

$$\sigma_2^2 \geq \frac{1}{(1-\beta)NQ_{ii}}, \quad (5)$$

where β indicates the fraction of repetitions devoted to estimating λ_1 . The performance of the stepwise approach can thus achieve the minimal variance

$$N \text{Tr}(\Sigma) \geq \frac{1}{\beta} (Q^{-1})_{11} + \frac{1}{(1-\beta)Q_{22}}, \quad (6)$$

that is compared to the Holevo bound in order to appraise the relative merits of this strategy. For this purpose, we define the ratio

$$r_\beta = \frac{1}{C_H} \left(\frac{1}{\beta} (Q^{-1})_{11} + \frac{1}{(1-\beta)Q_{22}} \right), \quad (7)$$

as well as its optimised version $r = \min_\beta r_\beta$. These are plotted in Fig. 1 for our case, with the two possible orderings of the estimations [12]: $r_{\theta\gamma}$ corresponds to θ first, then γ , and vice versa for $r_{\gamma\theta}$. A better performance of the stepwise approach is expected in proximity of $\gamma \simeq 0$, *i.e.* when the transformation has little effect on the state. This regime is understood by looking at the determinant of the QFIM

$$\det Q = 16 \sin^2 \theta \sin^4 \gamma. \quad (8)$$

The available information in a JE tends to vanish in this limit.




FIG. 1. Performance of the SE, compared to JE, as captured by the quantity r_β , as well as its optimised version r . The theoretical predictions are reported as a function of the axis θ and of the phase shift γ as the gold surface. The blue surface corresponds to the limit 1. When resources are equally allocated ($\beta = 1/2$), an advantage, identified by $r_\beta < 1$, can be highlighted, depending on the estimation sequence. This is even more relevant when optimising over the allocation of resources.

The discussion above is fully relevant in the asymptotic regime of large N . In order to account for limited resources, the Bayesian perspective is particularly suitable, since it explicitly includes the *a priori* knowledge $A(\theta, \gamma)$ on the parameters, expressed by means of distributions. In our example we consider, for the sake of practicality, normal distributions $P_a(\lambda|\lambda_0, \tau)$ centred on λ_0 with the same variance τ^2 for both parameters: $A(\theta, \gamma) = P_a(\theta|\theta_0, \tau)P_a(\gamma|\gamma_0, \tau)$. A lower bound on the variance is now obtained by considering the quantum version of the Van Trees matrix [4], with elements

$$V_{i,j} = \int A(\theta, \gamma) Q_{i,j} d\theta d\lambda + \frac{1}{N} \int \frac{(\partial_i A(\theta, \gamma) \partial_j A(\theta, \gamma))}{A(\theta, \gamma)} d\theta d\lambda, \quad (9)$$

instead of the simple QFIM. These are the bounds we shall compare our experimental results to for the SE strategy.

The collected counts are reported in Fig. 2 for two repetitions of the experiment. The first one is used for the estimation of γ , using a Bayesian estimator defined as

$$\hat{\gamma} = \int \gamma P_a(\theta|\theta_0, \tau) P_a(\gamma|\gamma_0, \tau) p_0(\gamma, \theta)^{n_0} p_1(\gamma, \theta)^{n_1} d\gamma d\theta, \quad (10)$$

where n_0 and n_1 are the number of events in either outcome within a detection window. This is the first moment of the distribution for γ , updated after the measurements. The associated variance is thus the second moment

$$\Delta^2 \gamma = \int (\gamma - \hat{\gamma})^2 P_a(\theta|\theta_0, \tau) P_a(\gamma|\gamma_0, \tau) \times p_0(\gamma, \theta)^{n_0} p_1(\gamma, \theta)^{n_1} d\gamma d\theta. \quad (11)$$

In the integrals above, we have taken the standard approximation for the binomial as a normal distribution of




FIG. 2. Raw data for the sequential estimation. The counts correspond to measurements along the Z direction: the blue dots correspond to the outcome 0, the golden squares to the outcome 1. The dashed lines are theoretical predictions for p_0 and p_1 for $\gamma = \pi/9$ as a guide to the eye.

mean $Np_0(\gamma, \theta)$ and variance $Np_0(\gamma, \theta)p_1(\gamma, \theta)$, as this allows for a more reliable numerical evaluation. Once the estimation of γ is obtained, we employ its outcome in defining its distribution in the estimation of the second parameter θ :

$$\hat{\theta} = \int \theta P_a(\theta|\theta_0, \tau) P_a(\gamma|\hat{\gamma}, \Delta\gamma) p_0(\gamma, \theta)^{n'_0} p_1(\gamma, \theta)^{n'_1} d\gamma d\theta, \quad (12)$$

and

$$\Delta^2\theta = \int (\theta - \hat{\theta})^2 P_a(\theta|\theta_0, \tau) P_a(\gamma|\hat{\gamma}, \Delta\gamma) \times p_0(\gamma, \theta)^{n_0} p_1(\gamma, \theta)^{n_1} d\gamma d\theta, \quad (13)$$

where now n'_0 and n_1 are the number of events in the second batch. We report in Fig. 3 the results for prior distributions with $\tau = 5^\circ$, with $\gamma_0 = \pi/9$ for all points, and θ_0 set according to the reading on the rotation mount of the target wave plate. The estimation can be judged satisfactory, and the errors are close to those predicted by the *classical* Van Trees limits for the estimators (10) and (12), which define the SE strategy. The same procedure can be followed estimating θ first and then γ , leading to similar results.

Our measurement strategy based on a single projective measurement would pose difficulties in a JE without adopting a Bayesian framework, as the pertaining classical FIM would be singular. We observe that, in the asymptotic regime, modified bounds can be found by employing the pseudoinverse of the FIM [16, 17].

A comparison in terms of the total variance $\Sigma = \Delta^2\gamma + \Delta^2\theta$ can be drawn against the quantum Van Trees limit for JE, considering all resources from the two measurement batches. The corresponding results are shown in Fig. 4, for different widths of the prior distributions, and for both strategies. For $\tau = 2.5^\circ$, the observed Σ

is close to the JE limit, except for the first two points: numerical simulations and comparison with the theoretical stepwise limit reveal these are an artifact due to a slight bias of the estimators. The comparison remains acceptable also for $\tau = 5^\circ$, leading us to conclude that the SE in this Bayesian regime can not show an advantage with respect to the joint strategy, but it does not impose too harsh a penalty either. When the a priori is wider, $\tau = 10^\circ$, the comparison is less favourable, and it should also be noticed that the experimental variance are further from the classical Van Trees limit; this is a known instance, as this is not a tight bound.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Our results demonstrate that the possible advantage from the stepwise strategy can be spoilt when the Bayesian approach is followed. The reason can be traced in the fact that, while the stepwise Cramér-Rao bound is strictly local, in a Bayesian protocol an average is taken over the prior distributions. The final uncertainties are thus affected accordingly. On the other hand, the Bayesian take is most useful in tackling those cases in which the estimators for the individual parameters are mutually dependent, even in the presence of singular Fisher information. It is the case that the *classical* data processing compromises a possible quantum advantage.

Despite these pessimistic observations, the stepwise strategy may still retain a practical advantage since it can work in the presence of simpler measurements: in our example a Z projector is sufficient, whereas the usual joint parameter method would have required a more general POVM. Their implementation and characterisation may be demanding, hence one can trade them for more involved, and careful, data analysis.




FIG. 3. Stepwise two-parameter estimation with prior distributions of width $\tau = 5^\circ$. Top left: estimation of the shift $\hat{\gamma}$ as a function of θ : blue points are for the experimental results, error bars correspond to one standard deviation, while the shaded region indicate the apriori distribution for γ (within two standard deviations). Top right: standard deviation $\Delta\gamma$ as a function of θ . The blue points are the experimental results, the solid line corresponds to the stepwise classical Van Trees limit. Bottom left: results for the estimation of axis $\hat{\theta}$ as a function of the actual angle θ : the dashed line is the diagonal. Bottom right: standard deviation $\Delta\theta$ as a function of θ . The blue points are the experimental results, the solid line corresponds to the stepwise Van Trees limit.

Overall, our results indicate that, although the ultimate quantum advantage of gradual estimation may be reduced in the Bayesian framework, its simplicity and robustness make it a valuable tool for realistic multi-parametric quantum metrology, opening the way for its employ in future quantum technologies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Valeria Cimini, Marco G. Genoni, Matteo Rosati, and Vittorio Giovannetti for useful discussion. This work has been realised with the support of the PRIN project PRIN22-RISQUE-2022T25TR3 of the Italian Ministry of University. G.B. and M.B. are supported by Rome Technopole Innovation Ecosystem (PNRR grant M4-C2-Inv). IG and MB acknowledge

the support from MUR Dipartimento di Eccellenza 2023-2027.

-
- [1] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, Quantum Metrology, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 010401 (2006).
 - [2] 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).
 - [3] C. L. Degen, F. Reinhard, and P. Cappellaro, Quantum sensing, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **89**, 035002 (2017).
 - [4] M. G. Paris, Quantum estimation for quantum technology, *International Journal of Quantum Information* **7**, 125 (2009).
 - [5] M. Szczykulska, T. Baumgratz, and A. Datta, Multi-parameter quantum metrology, *Advances in Physics: X*




FIG. 4. Comparison of the total error Σ for different widths of the prior: $\tau = 2.5^\circ$ (upper), $\tau = 5^\circ$ (middle), $\tau = 10^\circ$ (lower). In all panels, the solid line corresponds to the Van Trees limit for JE. Blue points correspond to estimating γ first, yellow points to estimating θ first.

- 1, 621 (2016).
- [6] R. Demkowicz-Dobrzański, W. Górecki, and M. Guță, Multi-parameter estimation beyond quantum fisher information, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **53**, 363001 (2020).
- [7] S. Ragy, M. Jarzyna, and R. Demkowicz-Dobrzański, Compatibility in multiparameter quantum metrology, *Physical Review A* **94**, 052108 (2016).
- [8] 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).
- [9] 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).
- [10] A. Z. Goldberg, J. L. Romero, Á. S. Sanz, and L. L. Sánchez-Soto, Taming singularities of the quantum fisher information, *International Journal of Quantum Information* **19**, 2140004 (2021).
- [11] C. Mukhopadhyay, A. Bayat, V. Montenegro, and M. G. Paris, Beating joint quantum estimation limits with stepwise multiparameter metrology, arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.06075 (2025).
- [12] G. Fazio, J. He, and M. G. A. Paris, Orders matter: tight bounds on the precision of sequential quantum estimation for multiparameter models (2025), arXiv:2510.14963 [quant-ph].
- [13] J. He and M. G. Paris, Scrambling for precision: optimizing multiparameter qubit estimation in the face of sloppiness and incompatibility, arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.08235 (2025).
- [14] L. A. Rozema, D. H. Mahler, R. Blume-Kohout, and A. M. Steinberg, Optimizing the choice of spin-squeezed states for detecting and characterizing quantum processes, *Phys. Rev. X* **4**, 041025 (2014).
- [15] X.-Q. Zhou, H. Cable, R. Whittaker, P. Shadbolt, J. L. O'Brien, and J. C. F. Matthews, Quantum-enhanced tomography of unitary processes, *Optica* **2**, 510 (2015).
- [16] P. Stoica and T. Marzetta, Parameter estimation problems with singular information matrices, *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **49**, 87 (2001).
- [17] Z. Ben-Haim and Y. C. Eldar, On the constrained cramér-rao bound with a singular fisher information matrix, *IEEE Signal Processing Letters* **16**, 453 (2009).