In this work, we discuss connections between different theoretical physics communities and their works, all related to systems that act as sources of particles such as photons, phonons, or electrons. Our interest is to understand how a low-dimensional quantum system driven by coherent fields, e.g. a two-level system, Jaynes-Cummings system, or photon pair source driven by a laser pulse, emits photons into a waveguide. Of particular relevance to solid-state sources is that we provide a way to include dissipation into the formalism for temporal-mode quantum optics. We will discuss the connections between temporal-mode quantum optics, scattering matrices, quantum stochastic calculus, continuous matrix product states and operators, and very traditional quantum optical concepts such as the Mandel photon counting formula and the Lindblad form of the quantum-optical master equation. We close with an example of how our formalism relates to quantum cascades for single-photon sources.

I. INTRODUCTION

An open-quantum system consists of a local system, described by a low-dimensional (0-d) Hamiltonian $H$ acting on the Hilbert space $\mathbb{H}_{\text{sys}}$, coupled to one or more 1-d reservoirs or baths of modes in the Hilbert space $\mathbb{H}_{\text{bath}}$ via a Markovian coupling. The coupling is linear in the field operators of the reservoir for most problems in quantum optics. Further, the field operators are usually bosonic to represent photons, but occasionally emission into fermionic reservoirs is also considered. In the main text we will discuss the case with bosonic reservoirs, however, the results are actually identical for fermionic reservoirs so long as the coupling is linear in field operators (see Appendix A).

In the recently developed SLH theory \[1-3\], the system can be fully described by the operator triple $(S, L, H)$. This formalism was developed to understand how networks of quantum systems interact with one another. Here, the operator $S$ represents scattering between different input and output channels from the local system. The operator-valued vector $L$ represents the coupling between the local system and the external baths.

For our specific case, we consider the local system Hamiltonian to be time-varying $H \to H(t)$ so that it injects energy into a reservoir of interest, which we shall henceforth refer to as the waveguide. Such a situation corresponds physically to modeling a semi-classical coherent field driving the local system and causing it to scatter photons into the waveguide \[7\]-\[12\]. This is extremely important for modeling sources of non-classical light \[13\]-\[16\], and it was recently understood that quantum-optical systems can be used as auxiliary systems to generate one-dimensional continuous matrix product states (CMPS) \[17\]-\[21\]. Hence, we take the state of the local system plus waveguide $|\Psi(t)\rangle \in \mathbb{H}_{\text{sys}} \otimes \mathbb{H}_{\text{wg}}$ at time $t=0$ to be $|\Psi(0)\rangle = |\psi\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \equiv |\psi, 0\rangle$, i.e. with the waveguide in its vacuum state. Because there are no particles to scatter between the input and output channels the operator $S$ plays no role in the evolution. Further, there are no particles in the input channels for the local system to absorb.

II. EMISSION INTO A SINGLE WAVEGUIDE

The total Hamiltonian can be written in terms of the local system Hamiltonian, the waveguide Hamiltonian, and their interaction: $H_{\text{tot}} = H(t) \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes H_{\text{wg}} + V$ (and is pictorially shown in Fig. 1b). In an interaction picture with respect to the waveguide evolution

$$H_{\text{tot}}(t) = e^{ih_{\text{wg}}t}H_{\text{tot}}e^{-ih_{\text{wg}}t} = H(t) \otimes \mathbb{1} + i(L \otimes b^\dagger(t) - L^\dagger \otimes b(t)),$$

FIG. 1. The general problem we solve in this manuscript is to compute the field scattered into a unidirectional (chiral) 1-d field (waveguide) from an energy-nonconserving 0-d Hamiltonian. This class of Hamiltonian is often used to represent coherent laser pulses scattering off quantum-optical systems such as a two-level system, Jaynes-Cummings system, or entangled photon pair source. First, we discuss just a single waveguide (a) and later extend to the same system coupled to a bath of modes that induce dissipation (b).
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where \( L \) is the product of a system operator \( \sigma \) and a rate \( \sqrt{\gamma} \). The operator \( b(t) \) is the temporal mode operator for the waveguide, which obeys \([b(t), b^\dagger(s)] = \delta(t - s)\) with \( b(t) | 0 \rangle = 0 \), and hence creates a delta-normalized excitation of the waveguide in time. For a short time increment \( dt \), the evolution operator of the interaction-picture wavefunction can be expanded in a Born approximation. Keeping terms to only \( \mathcal{O}(dt) \) in the system and \( \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{dt}) \) in the waveguide gives rise to a quantum stochastic differential equation (QSDE)—these QSDE’s allow for overcoming the singularities in the Schrödinger equation from the temporal mode operators \([22,27]\). Specifically, the Itô increment for the unitary propagator that describes evolution of \( |\Psi(t)\rangle \) over the interval \([t, t + dt]\) is given by (with \( \hbar = 1 \))

\[
dU(t) = \left\{ -i\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}(t) \otimes 1 \, dt + L \otimes dB^\dagger(t) - L^\dagger \otimes dB(t) \right\} U(t),
\]

where \( U(t + dt) = (1 \otimes 1 + dU(t)) \, U(t) \) and hence the evolution can always be decomposed as

\[
U(t) \equiv U(t, 0) = U(t, s_n) \cdots U(s_1, s_1) U(s_1, 0)
\]

for any \( t > s_n > \cdots > s_1 > 0 \). The non-Hermitian effective ‘Hamiltonian’ is \( \mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}(t) = H(t) - i\frac{1}{\hbar} L^\dagger L \) and the time-integrated quantity \( B(t) = \int_0^t ds \, b(s) \) with \( dB(t) = \int_{t}^{t + dt} ds \, b(s) \) is called the quantum noise or field increment. Hence,

\[
\lim_{dt \to 0} \frac{dB(t)}{dt} = b(t),
\]

the increments commute with each other for non-equal times, and \( dB(t) | 0 \rangle = 0 \). In the derivation of Eq. \([2] \) and later to evaluate products of operators (involving \( U(t) \) and) acting on vacuum, the zero-temperature Itô algebra is used:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\times & dB(t) & dB^\dagger(t) \\
\hline
\frac{dB(t)}{dt} & 0 & dt \\
\frac{dB^\dagger(t)}{dt} & 0 & 0 \\
dt & 0 & 0
\end{array}
\]

The formal solution to the evolution operator is given by integrating Eq. \([5] \)

\[
U(t) = \mathcal{T} e^{\int_{0}^{t} \left\{ -i\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}(s) \otimes 1 \, ds + L \otimes dB^\dagger(s) - L^\dagger \otimes dB(s) \right\}},
\]

where \( \mathcal{T} \) is the chronological operator that time-orders the infinitesimal products of Eq. \([5] \). Then, the wavefunction of the total waveguide and system at time \( t \) is given by

\[
|\Psi(t)\rangle = U(t) |\psi, 0\rangle = (1 \otimes \mathcal{T}) U(t) |\psi, 0\rangle = \sum_{e} \int \, dT \, |e, T\rangle \langle e, T| U(t) |\psi, 0\rangle
\]

where \(|e, T\rangle \equiv |e\rangle \otimes |T\rangle\) given \{|e\}\) and \{|T\}\) form orthonormal bases for states in \( \mathbb{H}_{\text{sys}} \) and \( \mathbb{H}_{\text{wg}} \), respectively. To be concrete about the waveguide states, \( T = \{t_1, \ldots, t_n\} \) is a time-ordered \( N \{|T\rangle = n \) element vector that parameterizes the state \(|T\rangle = b^\dagger(t_1) \cdots b^\dagger(t_n) |0\rangle \) and \(|T'\rangle = \delta(T' - T) \) \([8,28]\). Hence, \( \int dT = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_{t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_n < t} dt_1 \cdots dt_n \).

### A. Connection to scattering theory and CMPS

We briefly relate this expansion to two important formalisms. First, when the Hamiltonian is asymptotically time independent and has at least one well-defined ground state, then the propagator becomes the scattering matrix \( \Sigma \) \([8]\) and its expansion in terms of the temporal modes is given by

\[
\langle e, T \mid \Sigma |\psi, 0\rangle = \lim_{t \to \infty} \langle e, T \mid U(t) |\psi, 0\rangle.
\]

Let \( t_e \) be the time when the Hamiltonian conserves energy again, then these scattering elements may be nonzero if \( \lim_{t \to \infty} U(t) \) can be constructed. Second, when \( U(t) \) operates on vacuum, the result can be simplified to

\[
|\Sigma(t)\rangle = U(t) |0\rangle = T e^{\int_{0}^{t} \left\{ -i\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}(s) \otimes 1 \, ds + L \otimes dB^\dagger(s) \right\}} |0\rangle
\]

This is done by first making use of the fact that \([1 \otimes dB(t), U(t)] = 0\) with \( dB(t) |0\rangle = 0\) to remove the field annihilation operators \([25]\). The equivalence of Eqs. \([8a]\) and \([8b]\) can be seen by expanding each exponential operator with a Dyson series and making use of the definition for \( B(t) \). If \( R = \{e_j\} \{e_j\} \), then a one-dimensional continuous matrix product state \([30,32]\) can be constructed from

\[
|\Psi_{\text{CMPS}}\rangle = \text{tr}_{\text{sys}} \left[ RU(t) |0\rangle \right] = \text{tr}_{\text{sys}} \left[ R T e^{\int_{0}^{t} ds \left\{ -i\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}(s) \otimes 1 + L \otimes b^\dagger(s) \right\}} |0\rangle \right].
\]

We note this is not the most general 1-d CMPS—we would need to allow the coupling operator to vary in time \( L \to L(t) \).

### B. Boundary theory

Evaluating the propagator has previously been reduced to calculating expectations of system operators, through various different means \( e.g. \) \([5,10,20,29,30,33,34]\). In field theory, this result is referred to as the holographic property of CMPS \([35]\) and in quantum optics language, we call this a result of the boundary condition from input-output theory \([24]\). These formulations have been covered extensively, and we will arrive at something like the
CMPS or scattering matrix result but using the language of quantum stochastic differential equations.

Our next step in reducing the complexity of this problem is to turn the expansion of $U(t)$ into vacuum expectation values [8]. To do this, we need the commutation

$$[\mathbb{1} \otimes dB(s), dU(s)] = (L \otimes \mathbb{1}) \, dt \quad \text{and the limit from Eq. 4, which together give us the relation}$$

\[ (10) \]

if $s > t_1 > 0$. Using this commutation and the fact that $b(t)|0\rangle = 0$, we remove the free field annihilation operators from the expectation

$$\langle \psi, 0 | U(t) |\psi, 0 \rangle = \langle \psi, 0 | U(t, t_n) (L \otimes \mathbb{1}) U(t_n, t_{n-1}) (L \otimes \mathbb{1}) \cdots (L \otimes \mathbb{1}) U(t_1, 0) |\psi, 0 \rangle. \quad (11)$$

We note this expression is written in the temporally factorized form

$$\langle 0 | A(t, s + dt) U(s + dt, s) C(s, 0) | 0 \rangle \quad (12)$$

for arbitrary $s$. The field increments from $U(s + dt, s)$ commute towards the vacuum states and annihilate, given that $[dB(s), C(s, 0)] = 0$ and $[dB(t), A(t, s + dt)] = 0$. Hence, in the vacuum expectation the unitary evolution operators cannot create or annihilate particles and we make the replacement $dU(s) \rightarrow -iH_{\text{eff}}(s) \, ds \otimes \mathbb{1}$ for all $s$. Then we define

$$V(t_1, t_0) = \langle 0 | U(t_1, t_0) | 0 \rangle = \mathcal{T} \exp \left[ -i \int_{t_0}^{t_1} ds \, H_{\text{eff}}(s) \right] \quad (13)$$

and write the expectation value in terms of only system operators

$$\langle \psi, 0 | V(t, t_n) L V(t_n, t_{n-1}) L \cdots L V(t_1, 0) |\psi \rangle. \quad (14)$$

This expectation has a very intuitive form, where the non-unitary propagators $V(\cdot)$ correspond to evolution conditioned on no particle emission into the field, and the $L$ operators scatter a particle into the waveguide. (This result is similar as we derived in Refs. [8]—there we also noted that the pure-state calculation of Eq. 14 need only be performed until the time $t_e$, when energy is again conserved, and projected onto the local system’s ground states.)

We can also write the waveguide state’s $U(\cdot)$ evolution as a density matrix $\chi(t) = \text{tr}_{\text{sys}} \text{tr}_{\text{wg}} [\langle \Psi(t) | \langle\Psi(t)\rangle]$, with $\chi(0) = |\Psi(0)\rangle \langle 0 |$. Expanding this density matrix in the temporal mode basis $|T'\rangle \chi(t) |T\rangle = \text{Tr} [T' \langle \Psi(t) | \langle\Psi(t)\rangle]$ and utilizing Eq. 8 and Eq. 14 twice (once for the bra $\langle\Psi(t)\rangle = \langle\Psi(0)\rangle U^d(t)$ and once for the ket $|\Psi(t)\rangle = U(t) |\Psi(0)\rangle$), yields

$$\langle T' | \chi(t) | T \rangle = \text{tr}_{\text{sys}} \left[ V(t, \tilde{r}_R) S_{Q[\tilde{r}_R]} V(\tilde{r}_R, \tilde{r}_{R-1}) S_{Q[\tilde{r}_{R-1}]} \cdots S_{Q[\tilde{r}_1]} V(\tilde{r}_1, 0) \langle\psi | \langle\psi \rangle \right], \quad (15)$$

where we define a chronologically sorted list of times $\{\tilde{r}_1, \ldots, \tilde{r}_R\} = \text{sort}\{T' + T\}$ and $Q[\tilde{r}] \in \{0, 1\}$ depending on whether the time came from $T'$ or $T$. We also use a script letter to mean a super-operator, where $V(t, 0) \chi = V(t, 0) \chi V(0, t), S_0 \chi = L_\chi$, and $S_1 \chi = \chi L^\dagger$. As a reminder, Eq. 15 describes the field state but is written in terms of system superoperators only. Such a density matrix has been coined both a matrix product state [25, 36] or superoperator state [37].

C. Master equation

On the other hand, the quantum-optical master equation for the reduced dynamics of the system is obtained by applying unitary evolution and tracing out the waveguide degrees of freedom [22, 23, 25]

$$\rho(t) = \text{tr}_{\text{wg}} [\langle \Psi(t) | \langle\Psi(t)\rangle] \quad (16a)$$

$$= \text{tr}_{\text{wg}} [U(t, 0) \langle\psi | \langle\psi \rangle \otimes | 0 \rangle \langle 0 |] \quad (16b)$$

Here, $U(t, 0) \rho \equiv U(t, 0) \rho U(0, t)$ is the unitary evolution superoperator. Further, because the system-waveguide coupling is Markovian Eq. 16 can always be written as

$$\rho(t_1) = \text{tr}_{\text{wg}} [U(t_1, t_0) \{\rho(t_0) \otimes | 0 \rangle \langle 0 |] \quad (17)$$

or similarly in the form of a Liouville equation $\dot{\rho}(t) = \mathcal{L}(t) \rho(t)$. Here, the Liouvillian $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$ superoperator (or transfer matrix $T(\cdot)$ in CMPS papers) is defined by

$$\mathcal{L}(t) \rho = -i[H(t), \rho] + \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} L^\dagger L, \rho \right\} + L \rho L^\dagger \quad (18a)$$

$$= -i[H_{\text{eff}}(t), \rho] + \mathcal{J}[L] \rho \quad (18b)$$

where $\mathcal{J}[L] \rho = L \rho L^\dagger = S_0 S_1 \rho$ is the recycling or emission superoperator. We formally will express such a time evolution in terms of the superoperator $\mathcal{M}(\cdot)$ as

$$\rho(t_1) = \mathcal{M}(t_1, t_0) \rho(t_0) \quad (19a)$$

$$= \mathcal{T} \exp \left[ \int_{t_0}^{t_1} ds \mathcal{L}(s) \right] \rho(t_0). \quad (19b)$$
III. ADDITION OF LOSS CHANNELS

Our main contribution in this work is to formalize the effects of loss into other channels, and on how it causes the waveguide to enter a mixed state (shown pictorially in Fig. 1b). Suppose \( L_0 \) represents coupling to the waveguide, whose state we want to keep track of, and the operators \( L_1, \ldots, L_j \) represent coupling to other loss channels or the bath we will trace over. Then,

\[
dU(t) = \left\{ -iH_{\text{eff}}(t) \otimes 1 + i \otimes L_k \right\} U(t)
\]

\( \langle T' | \chi(t) | T \rangle = \text{tr}_{\text{sys}}[\text{tr}_{\text{bath}}[\mathcal{V}(t', \tilde{\tau}_R) S_Q(\tilde{\tau}_R) \mathcal{V}(\tilde{\tau}_R, \tilde{\tau}_{R-1}) S_Q(\tilde{\tau}_{R-1}) \cdots \mathcal{V}(\tilde{\tau}_1) S_Q(\tilde{\tau}_1) \langle \psi | \langle \psi | ]]
\]

\( V(t_1, t_0) \) is the bath we will trace over. Then,

\[
V(t_1, t_0) = T \exp \left[ \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \left\{ -iH_{\text{eff}}(s) \otimes 1_{\text{bath}} ds + \sum_{k>0} L_k \otimes dB_k^*(t) \right\} \right]
\]

Taking the trace over the bath state, which can easily be done according to the standard rules of quantum stochastic calculus,

\[
\langle T' | \chi(t) | T \rangle = \text{tr}_{\text{sys}}[\mathcal{K}(t, \tilde{\tau}_R) S_Q(\tilde{\tau}_R) \mathcal{K}(\tilde{\tau}_R, \tilde{\tau}_{R-1}) S_Q(\tilde{\tau}_{R-1}) \cdots \mathcal{V}(\tilde{\tau}_1) S_Q(\tilde{\tau}_1) \langle \psi | \langle \psi | ]
\]

Here,

\[
\mathcal{K}(t_1, t_0) = \text{tr}_{\text{bath}}[\mathcal{V}(t_1, t_0) \langle \psi | \langle \psi | ] \langle 0 | 0_{\text{bath}}] = T \exp \left[ \int_{t_0}^{t_1} ds \left\{ \mathcal{L}(s) - J[L_0] \right\} \right]
\]

which can be thought of as an unnormalized map that evolves the density matrix conditional on no photon emissions into the 0-th reservoir and

\[
\mathcal{L}(t) \rho = -i[H(t), \rho] + \sum_k \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} L_k^\dagger L_k, \rho \right\} + L_k \rho L_k^\dagger
\]

\[
= -i[H_{\text{eff}}(t), \rho] + \sum_k J[L_k] \rho
\]

is the new Liouvillian including all \( L_0, L_1, \ldots, L_j \). This new \( \mathcal{L}(\cdot) \) with inclusion of the bath is now the generator where the field increments from separate channels trivially commute and now

\[
H_{\text{eff}}(t) = H(t) - \frac{i}{2} \sum_k L_k^\dagger L_k.
\]

A. Waveguide field density operator

Here, we need to use a density operator to keep track of the waveguide state

\[
\chi(t) = \text{tr}_{\text{bath}}[\mathcal{V}(t) \langle \Psi(t) | \langle \Psi(t) | ]
\]

\[
= \text{tr}_{\text{bath}}[\mathcal{U}(t, 0) \{ | \psi \rangle \langle \psi \rangle \otimes | 0 \rangle_{\text{wg}} | 0 \rangle_{\text{bath}}] + | 0 \rangle_{\text{bath}}].
\]

Again, projecting \( \chi(t) \) onto the temporal mode basis like in Eq. 15 of the map \( \mathcal{M}(\cdot) \). It is fairly trivial to extend this work to cases where the bath is in a thermal state, by using a different set of Itô algebra [25]—we simply opted for a more economical exposition here. We now have access to the entire state of the waveguide: we will later calculate quantities such as the trace purity of the emitted states, which is of interest for few-photon sources.

B. Particle counting formula

If \( T' = T \), then \( \langle T' | \chi(t) | T \rangle \) gives precisely the Mandel counting formula [24, 35] for the probability density of \( n \) particle emissions to occur at the times \( t_1, \ldots, t_n \) within the interval \( [0, t] \), i.e.

\[
p(t_1, \ldots, t_n, [0, t]) = \langle T' | \chi(t) | T \rangle
\]

or equivalently

\[
p(T; [0, t]) = \text{tr}_{\text{sys}}[\mathcal{K}(t_1, t_n) J[L_0] \mathcal{K}(t_n, t_{n-1}) J[L_0] \cdots J[L_0] \mathcal{K}(t_1, 0) | \psi \rangle \langle \psi | ]
\]

The photocount distribution, i.e. the probability that \( n \) particles are emitted is given by

\[
P_n = \int_{N[T]=n} dT \ p(T; [0, t]).
\]

C. Correlations between field operators

While it is very useful to compute the precise field state for understanding how a system emits light into the
waveguide, often the only measurable information about the state comes from its normally- and time-ordered correlation functions

$$\langle b(t_1) \cdots b(t_n) b(t'_n) \cdots b(t'_1) \rangle.$$ \hspace{1cm} (31)

In quantum optics, these correlation functions are almost always computed by using the boundary condition from input-output theory to relate the field correlations to correlations between system operators \[25\]. Here, we use our quantum stochastic techniques.

Consider the (first-order coherence or) field-field correlator

$$G^{(1)}(t_1, t'_1) = \text{tr}_{\sys} \text{tr}_{\bath} \left[ \mathcal{U}(t, t_1) (\mathcal{S}_1 \otimes 1) \mathcal{U}(t_1, t'_1) (\mathcal{S}_0 \otimes 1) \mathcal{U}(t'_1, 0) \{|\psi\rangle \langle \psi| \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_{\bath}) \right].$$ \hspace{1cm} (32a)

$$= \text{tr}_{\sys} \text{tr}_{\bath} \left[ (\mathcal{S}_1 \otimes 1) \mathcal{U}(t_1, t'_1) (\mathcal{S}_0 \otimes 1) \mathcal{U}(t'_1, 0) \{|\psi\rangle \langle \psi| \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_{\bath}) \right].$$ \hspace{1cm} (32b)

$$= \text{tr}_{\sys} \left[ \mathcal{S}_1 \mathcal{M}(t_1, t'_1) \mathcal{S}_0 \mathcal{M}(t'_1, 0) |\psi\rangle \langle \psi| \right].$$ \hspace{1cm} (32c)

Equations 32a and 32b are simply definitions, while Eq. 32c is arrived at via the cyclic property of the trace. For this correlation to be nonzero, \(t > t_1, t'_1\). Considering the specific case where \(t > t_1 > t'_1\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\chi_{\infty} &\equiv \lim_{t \to \infty} \chi(t). \\
\text{Then, there are three important quality metrics for how well the source will behave:}
\end{align*}
\]

- **Brightness**, which is given by \(P_1 = \int_0^{\infty} dt_1 \left| \langle \chi | t_1 \rangle \right|^2\) from the photocount distribution and is ideally unity,

- **Error rate**, which is given by \(P_2 = \int_0^{\infty} dt_1 \int_0^{\infty} dt_2 \left| \langle \chi | t_1, t_2 \rangle \right|^2\) from the photocount distribution and is ideally zero (we assume \(P_2\) to dominate the error rate \[7\])

- **Trace purity of the single-photon state**, which is given by

$$\mathbb{P} = \int_0^{\infty} dt_1 \int_0^{\infty} dt'_1 \left| \langle \chi | t_1, t'_1 \rangle \right|^2 / P_1^2.$$ \hspace{1cm} (36)

(Of course this assumes the emission rate is much faster than the repetition rate, but this is always easy to arrange.) The first two metrics have been discussed extensively, though the trace purity has previously been inaccessible due to a lack of theoretical techniques. Instead, the first-order coherence was used as a proxy for the trace purity.

Specifically, imagine sending two of the photons created by such a source into different ports of a Hong-Ou-Mandel (HOM) interferometer, time-multiplexed such that they interfere. In terms of the source’s isolated photon statistics, the interferometer has a normalized correlation between its two outputs \[11\]

$$g^{(2)}_{\text{HOM}}(t_1, t_2) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{G^{(2)}(t_1, t_2)}{\langle n \rangle^2} + 1 - \frac{|G^{(1)}(t_1, t_2)|^2}{\langle n \rangle^2} \right].$$ \hspace{1cm} (37)

\[
\text{IV. EXAMPLE: A SINGLE-PHOTON SOURCE FROM A THREE-LEVEL CASCADE}
\]

Recently, a sole single-photon source was used to create a train of isolated photons that fed into a linear-optical network for boson sampling \[39\], where the photons could interfere and perform a rudimentary type of quantum information processing \[40\]. Being able to use a single high-quality source dramatically simplifies the physical overhead in building such a system. For the system to operate well, the source must convert each laser pulse into a single photon \[7\] \[13\] \[14\] \[41\]. Given a single pulse, we take the limit \(t \to \infty\) where we define the reduced density operator

$$\chi_{\infty} \equiv \lim_{t \to \infty} \chi(t).$$ \hspace{1cm} (35)
FIG. 2. Photon emission from a three-level cascade $|e\rangle \rightarrow |i\rangle \rightarrow |g\rangle$ under excitation by an area $A = \pi$ pulse (temporal width $\tau_p$) that drives a two-photon transition $|g\rangle \rightarrow |e\rangle$. The emission $|e\rangle \rightarrow |i\rangle$ occurs at a rate $\gamma_i$ and the emission $|i\rangle \rightarrow |g\rangle$ at a rate $\gamma_g$, and we take $\gamma_e = 2\gamma_i$ for these subfigures. (a) Photocount distribution $P_n$ for $n$ emissions from either $|e\rangle \rightarrow |i\rangle$ or $|i\rangle \rightarrow |g\rangle$. (b) Trace purity $P$ of single-photon component of emission from either $|e\rangle \rightarrow |i\rangle$ or $|i\rangle \rightarrow |g\rangle$ (solid green curve). Analytic limit for purity of a short pulse $P = 2/3$ (dashed green line). Hong-Ou-Mandel (HOM) interference parameter $v$ (solid blue curve).

where $\langle n \rangle = \sum_n nP_n$ is the expected number of photons in the field. We also define the integrated version

$$g_{\text{HOM}}^{(2)} = \int_0^\infty dt_1 \int_0^\infty dt_2 g_{\text{HOM}}^{(2)}(t_1, t_2) \quad (38a)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} g^{(2)} + \frac{1}{2} (1 - v), \quad (38b)$$

where $v$ is the HOM interference parameter (sometimes referred to as the visibility). If the error rate of the source is zero, i.e. $P_2 = 0$, then the second-order coherence is also zero $g^{(2)} = G^{(2)}(t_1, t_2) = 0$ and the trace purity can be directly extracted from the Hong-Ou-Mandel correlation $P = 1 - 2g_{\text{HOM}}^{(2)} = v$. However, unless the photon source has exactly zero error, this relation is only approximate and, at least from a theoretical perspective, we believe it valuable to understand how to arrive at the trace purity directly. Thus the figure of merit ‘indistinguishability’, which is normally defined in terms of the HOM dip $\langle 11 \rangle$, is only a heuristic for the trace purity of the source and hence the quality of the interference.

Here, we apply these concepts to a single-photon source comprising a three-level cascade from the excited state $|e\rangle$, to the intermediate state $|i\rangle$, and finally the ground state $|g\rangle$ (see Appendix B for a detailed description of the system). An off-resonant two-photon excitation prepares the cascade in its excited state with almost unity probability $|g\rangle \rightarrow |e\rangle$, and then it decays by emitting a cascade of two photons. First a photon is emitted during $|e\rangle \rightarrow |i\rangle$ at a rate of $\gamma_i$, and then a second photon is emitted during $|i\rangle \rightarrow |g\rangle$ at a rate of $\gamma_g$. Because the photons are at different frequencies, i.e. $\Delta \gg 1/\gamma_i$, we can treat each level as emitting into a separate Markovian bath (which is experimentally realized via frequency filtering). In this process, we recently showed that such a source is superior to a two-level system due to significantly lower error rate $P_2$ and hence $g^{(2)}$. Because of the cascade, either reservoir (corresponding to $|e\rangle \rightarrow |i\rangle$ or $|i\rangle \rightarrow |g\rangle$) has the same photocount distribution. This distribution for $P_0$, $P_1$, and $P_2$ is shown in Fig. 2a, as a function of the length of the driving two-photon pulse.

The other important characteristic of the source is how indistinguishable its photons are. We investigate this phenomenon through examining the trace purity of the single-photon state in each reservoir (Fig. 2b). As discussed in Appendix C, the purity of a single-photon emitted from either $|e\rangle \rightarrow |i\rangle$ or $|i\rangle \rightarrow |g\rangle$ is identical due to the general properties of a two-photon state. Further, an upper bound on the purity is given by the ratio $P = \gamma_e/(\gamma_i + \gamma_e)$. If a cavity were used to Purcell enhance the emission rate from the upper transition, then the purity would increase to $P = F\gamma_e/(\gamma_i + F\gamma_e)$ where $F$ is the Purcell factor. As the pulse length increases, the purity rolls off where the critical rate for the upper transition is the pulse bandwidth rather than $\gamma_e$. We also show the comparison to the HOM interference parameter $v$, which again is a function of the normalized first-order coherence, shown as the dashed curves. The trace purity and parameter $v$ are almost identical because the single photon emission probability always dominates the two-photon emission probability, due to the specific system in question and the definition of pulse area. Still, as the error rate $P_2$ increases with pulse length, they deviate. This shows how a HOM experiment would not necessarily provide a good estimate of how the single-photon states emitted from the system would interfere with one another.

Finally, we make a few notes regarding the outlook of this technique. First, from our formalism we suggest that it might be appropriate to use an actual distance metric between two different single-photon sources rather than the Hong-Ou-Mandel dip to quantify their similarity. Even for two ideal but distinguishable single-photon sources, the interference visibility is only indirectly related to any distance metric (most closely the Frobenius norm $\|\|_F$). Calculating the Frobenius norm, e.g., could be easily achieved theoretically with our technique, and it could be experimentally extracted through state tomography $\langle 1 \rangle$ of the two sources. Second, we expect our methods to be useful for modeling other types of dephasing in few-photon sources such as phonon-induced dephasing. It was recently understood that electron-phonon interaction is extremely important for limiting the quality of single-photon sources $\langle 13, 45, 50 \rangle$, so we hope our work might be useful here. Specifically, our techniques are already applicable to power-dependent dephasing $\langle 21 \rangle$, and we think that it might be possible to extend them to a polaron theory $\langle 51, 53 \rangle$ as well.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In summary, we have provided a complete framework for understanding zero-dimensional Hamiltonians as emitters of bosonic particles such as photons or
phonons. Of practical relevance is that our formulation allows for the inclusion of dissipation into the particle emitters’ dynamics. Because dissipation is often present in physical sources of particles it is important to model correctly for applications in quantum information processing. Finally, our formalism ties together nearly all aspects of Markovian open-quantum systems, and reveals the connections between $(0 + 1)$-d field theories, continuous matrix product states, and quantum stochastic calculus.
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Appendix A: Particle emission into fermionic reservoirs

In the main text, we considered the reservoirs to have a bosonic character, meaning that the continuous field mode operators obeyed the commutation relations $[b(t), b\dagger(s)] = \delta(t-s)$. Because the interaction Hamiltonian is linear in field operators, however, we saw that only one particle can be emitted in any time interval $dt$. Hence, the bosonic character of the reservoirs is actually never used in the problem! To emphasize this point, we now consider the case where the reservoirs have a fermionic character so the continuous-mode operators anti-commute $\{b(t), b\dagger(s)\} = \delta(t-s)$, as was done in Haack et al. [54]. The key step that changes is from Eq. [10] the commutator becomes an anti-commutator with the result that $\{1 \otimes b(t_1), U(s,0)\} = U(s,t_1) (1 \otimes U(t_1,0))$ for $s > t_1$. Applying this relation to the expansion of $U(t)$ and using the anti-commutation relations of $b(t)$ yields identical results through the rest of the paper. Finally, we note that in order to distinguish between emission into bosonic or fermionic reservoirs, the system-reservoir coupling must be non-linear in field operators.

Appendix B: Model for the three-level cascade

The three-level cascade we model is based on a biexcitonic system in InAs/GaAs quantum dots—this quantum dot platform has been very successful for single-photon sources [13,14]. We have discussed the precise details of the correspondence between our three-level model and the biexcitonic system elsewhere [42]. In summary, it is not identical but studying the three-level system provides significant insight into the biexcitonic system. Here we mention that we will use three levels labeled as $|e\rangle$, $|i\rangle$ and $|g\rangle$. Since a two-photon transition excites the system $|g\rangle \leftrightarrow |e\rangle$ via the intermediate state $|i\rangle$, the system undergoes Rabi oscillations that scale linearly with the pulse power rather than the field. Hence the interacted pulse area is defined by

$$A(t) = \int_0^t ds \frac{(\mu \cdot E(s))^2}{\hbar \Delta/2} \quad (B1)$$

where $\mu$ is the dipole moment of the transitions, $E(t)$ is the driving electric field, and $\Delta = 2\omega_i - \omega_e$ is the energy difference between $|e\rangle \leftrightarrow |i\rangle$ and $|i\rangle \leftrightarrow |g\rangle$. The corresponding Hamiltonian is

$$H_{3LS}(t) = \frac{(\mu \cdot E(t))^2}{\Delta} (|g\rangle \langle e| + |e\rangle \langle g|) \quad (B2)$$

The cascade has two loss operators $L \in \{\sqrt{\nu_e} |i\rangle \langle e|, \sqrt{\nu_i} |g\rangle \langle i|\}$, which correspond to emission into two separate Markovian baths. The operator $|g\rangle \langle e|$ only appears after adiabatic elimination of the intermediate state. We take the interacted pulse area as $A = \pi$ so that the system is excited to $|e\rangle$ with almost unity probability for short pulses [42], and we use square pulses for simplicity. We also note that we performed all our simulations with the Quantum Toolbox in Python (QuTiP) [55], see Supplemental Material.

We considered each of the reservoirs separately, i.e. if we were interested in the emission into the second reservoir, we would take $L_0 = \sqrt{\nu_i} |g\rangle \langle i|$ and trace over the first reservoir using, e.g., Eqs. or [29,29 or 33].

Appendix C: Entanglement of emitted two-photon state from the three-level cascade

Because we chose the simple example of a three-level radiative cascade, we can also apply pure-state techniques to analyze the output. To be concrete, let us label the mode operator for photons emitted into the reservoir via $|e\rangle \rightarrow |i\rangle$ as $b_i(t)$ and $b_e(t)$ for $|i\rangle \rightarrow |g\rangle$. Then, the two-photon output state containing one photon in each waveguide can be written as

$$|\phi_{1,1}\rangle = \int_0^\infty dt \int_0^\infty dt' f(t,t') \left(b_i^\dagger(t) \otimes b_e^\dagger(t') |0_e\rangle \otimes |0_i\rangle \right) \quad (C1)$$

where $f(t,t')$ is a weighting function that satisfies the normalization $\int_0^\infty dt \int_0^\infty dt' |f(t,t')|^2 = 1$. The Schmidt decomposition of this state is equivalent to expressing it as a sum over a countably infinite set of unentangled two photon states [60]

$$|\phi_{1,1}\rangle = \sum_p \sqrt{\lambda_p} |\alpha_p\rangle \otimes |\beta_p\rangle \quad (C2)$$
with the single-photon Schmidt modes $|\alpha_p\rangle = \int_0^\infty dt h_p(t)|\phi_e(t)\rangle |0_e\rangle$ and $|\beta_p\rangle = \int_0^\infty dt g_p(t)|\phi_e(t)\rangle |0_e\rangle$, as well as the eigenvalues $\lambda_p$. Each Schmidt mode is also appropriately normalized so $\int_0^\infty dt |h(t)|^2 = \int_0^\infty dt |g(t)|^2 = 1$. The trace purity of a given subsystem of the bipartite state $P$ for $\chi_i = \text{tr}_{\text{e}}\left[|\phi_{1,1}\rangle \langle \phi_{1,1}|\right]$ or $\chi_e = \text{tr}_{\text{e}}\left[|\phi_{1,1}\rangle \langle \phi_{1,1}|\right]$ is given by the inverse of the Schmidt number $K = 1/\sum_p \lambda_p^2$:

\[
P = \text{tr}_{\text{e}}[\chi_e^2] = \text{tr}_{\text{e}}[\chi_t^2]
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{K}
\]

which shows how the trace purity of emission for either photon in the cascade is identical. In the short pulse limit where the excited state $|e\rangle$ is prepared instantaneously, it is also straightforward to calculate the trace purity

\[
P = \frac{\gamma_e}{\gamma_i + \gamma_e}
\]

by using the total pure state of emission as calculated using the techniques of Fischer et al. [5].


