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Introduction.—Waveguide Quantum ElectroDynamics (QED) is a lively area of quantum optics investigating the coherent interaction between quantum emitters and the one-dimensional (1D) field of a waveguide [1–3]. In such systems, a growing number of unique nonlinear and interference phenomena are being unveiled, the occurrence of which typically relies on the 1D nature of such setups. Among these is the formation of a class of bound states in the continuum (BIC), which are bound stationary states that arise within a continuum of unbound states [4]. Topical questions are how to form and prepare such states so as to enable potential applications such as quantum memory, which requires light trapping at the few-photon level, of interest for quantum information processing [5, 6].

An interesting class of BICs occurs in waveguide QED in the form of dressed states featuring one or more emitters, usually qubits, dressed with a single photon that is strictly confined within a finite region [7–14]. The existence of such BICs relies on the quantum feedback provided by a mirror or the qubits themselves (since a qubit behaves as a perfect mirror under 1D single-photon resonant scattering [15, 16]). A natural way to populate these states is to excite the emitters and then let them decay: the system evolves towards the BIC with amplitude equal to the overlap between the BIC and the initial state. Incomplete decay of the emitter(s) results and, in the case of two or more qubits, stationary entanglement [13, 14, 17–19]. As a hallmark, this approach for exciting BICs is most effective in the Markovian regime where the characteristic photonic time delays, denoted τ, are very short (e.g. the photon round-trip time between a qubit and mirror or between two qubits). Indeed, as the time delay grows, the qubit component of the BIC decreases in favor of the photonic component [10–12], making such decay-based schemes ineffective for large mirror-emitter or interemitter distances. This is a major limitation when entanglement creation is the goal [11].

In order to generate such dressed BICs in the non-Markovian regime of significant time delays, one needs initial states that overlap the BIC’s photonic component, which in practice calls for photon scattering. A single photon scattered off the emitters cannot excite a BIC since the entire dynamics occurs in a sector of the Hilbert space orthogonal to the BIC. For multi-photon scattering, however, this argument does not hold because of the intrinsic qubit nonlinearity. Indeed, the role of two-photon scattering has been recognized previously [20, 21].

FIG. 1. One-qubit setup: a semi-infinite waveguide, whose end lies at \( x = 0 \) and acts as a perfect mirror, is coupled to a qubit at \( x = a \). When a resonant standing wave can fit between the qubit and the mirror (\( k_0a = m\pi \)), an incoming two-photon wavepacket is not necessarily fully scattered off the qubit: a fraction remains trapped in the form of a dressed single-photon BIC.
in the context of exciting normal (i.e., outside the continuum) bound states that occur in cavity arrays coupled to qubits [22–25].

We show that dressed BICs in waveguide-QED setups can be excited via multi-photon scattering in two paradigmatic setups: a qubit coupled to a semi-infinite waveguide (see Fig. 1) and a pair of distant qubits coupled to an infinite waveguide [see Fig. 5(a)]. A perfectly sinusoidal photon wavefunction and stationary excitation of the emitters provides a clear signature of single-photon trapping.

Model and BIC.—Consider first a qubit coupled to the 1D field of a semi-infinite waveguide [Fig. 1(a)] having a linear dispersion \( \omega = v|k| \) (with \( v \) the photon group velocity and \( k \) the wavevector). The qubit’s ground and excited states \(|\psi_g\rangle\) and \(|\psi_e\rangle\), respectively, are separated in energy by \( \omega_0 = vk_0 \) (we set \( \hbar = 1 \) throughout). The end of the waveguide at \( x = 0 \) is effectively a perfect mirror, while the qubit is placed at a distance \( a \) from the mirror. The Hamiltonian under the rotating wave approximation (RWA) reads [15, 26–29]

\[
\hat{H} = \omega_0 \hat{\sigma}^\dagger \hat{\sigma} - iv \int_0^\infty dx \left[ \hat{a}_R^\dagger(x) \frac{d}{dx} \hat{a}_R(x) - \hat{a}_L^\dagger(x) \frac{d}{dx} \hat{a}_L(x) \right] \\
+ V \int_0^\infty dx \left[ (\hat{a}_R^\dagger(x) + \hat{a}_R(x)) \hat{\sigma} + \text{H.c.} \right] \delta(x-a),
\]

with \( \hat{\sigma} = |\psi_g\rangle \langle \psi_e|, \hat{a}_R(L)(x) \) the bosonic field operator annihilating a right-going (left-going) photon at position \( x \), and \( V \) the atom-photon coupling. Due to the RWA, the total number of excitations \( \hat{N} = \hat{\sigma}^\dagger \hat{\sigma} + \sum_{\eta=R,L} \int dx \hat{a}_\eta^\dagger(x) \hat{a}_\eta(x) \) is conserved.

In the single-excitation subspace (\( N = 1 \)), the spectrum of (1) comprises an infinite continuum of unbound dressed states \( \{|\phi_k\rangle\} \) with energy \( \omega_k = v|k| \) [11, 15, 26–29], each a scattering eigenstate in which an incoming photon is completely reflected. Notably, a further stationary state \( |\phi_0\rangle \) exists when the condition \( k_0 a = m\pi \) (with \( m = 0, 1, \cdots \)) is met. This BIC has the same energy \( \omega_0 = \omega_0 \) as the qubit and is given by [30, 31]

\[
|\phi_0\rangle = \varepsilon_b \left[ \hat{\sigma}^\dagger \pm i \sqrt{\frac{v}{2\pi}} \int_0^a dx \left( e^{ik_0 x} \hat{a}_R^\dagger(x) - e^{-ik_0 x} \hat{a}_L^\dagger(x) \right) \right] |\psi(0)\rangle,
\]

with \( \Gamma = 2V^2/v \) the qubit’s decay rate (without mirror). The qubit’s excited-state population (referred to simply as “population” henceforth) is given by

\[
|\varepsilon_b|^2 = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\tau}{\Gamma}},
\]

where \( \tau = 2a/v \) is the delay time. Eqs. (2) and (3) fully specify the BIC. The photonic wavefunction has shape \( |x\rangle = \hat{a}^\dagger(x) |0\rangle \) with \( \hat{a}^\dagger(x) = \left( \hat{a}_R^\dagger(x) + \hat{a}_L^\dagger(x) \right) \)

\[
\langle x | \phi_0 \rangle \propto \sin(k_0 x) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq x \leq a,
\]

while it vanishes at \( x \not\in [0,a] \): the BIC is formed strictly between the qubit and the mirror, where the field profile is a pure sinusoid. When the BIC exists (i.e., for \( k_0 a = m\pi \)) the qubit does not fully decay in vacuum [10, 30, 32]; since the overlap of the initial state \( |e,0\rangle \) with the BIC is \( \varepsilon_b, |\varepsilon_b|^2 \) is also the probability of generating the BIC via vacuum decay. This probability decreases monotonically with delay time [Eq. (3)], showing that vacuum decay is most effective when \( \Gamma \) is small.

BIC generation scheme.—Bound state (2) cannot be generated, however, via single-photon scattering, which involves only the unbound states \( \{|\phi_k\rangle\} \) that are all orthogonal to \( |\phi_0\rangle \): during a transient the photon may be absorbed by the qubit, but it is eventually fully released. We thus send a two-photon wavepacket such that the initial joint state is \( |\Psi(0)\rangle = \int_0^\infty \int dxdy \left[ \varphi^\dagger_1(x) \varphi^\dagger_2(y) + 1 \leftrightarrow 2 \right] \hat{a}_R^\dagger(x) \hat{a}_L^\dagger(y) |g\rangle |0\rangle \),

where \( A \) is for normalization, \( \varphi_1^\dagger(x) \) is the wavefunction of a single left-propagating photon, and the qubit is not excited. The ensuing dynamics in the two-excitation sector (\( N = 2 \)) is given by

\[
|\Psi(t)\rangle = \sum_{\eta,R,L} \int_0^\infty dx \psi_\eta(x,t) \hat{a}^\dagger_\eta(x) \hat{\sigma}^\dagger + \sum_{\eta,\eta'=R,L} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \int_0^\infty dy \int_0^\infty dy \chi_{\eta\eta'}(x,y,t) \hat{a}^\dagger_\eta(x) \hat{a}^\dagger_{\eta'}(y) |g\rangle |0\rangle,
\]

where \( \chi_{\eta\eta'}(x,y,t) \) is the wavefunction of the two-photon component while \( \psi_\eta(x,t) \) is the amplitude that the qubit is excited and a right- (left-) propagating photon is found at position \( x \). We define

\[
P_e(t) = \sum_{\eta=R,L} \int_0^\infty dx |\psi_\eta(x,t)|^2;
\]

\[
P_p(t) = 2 \sum_{\eta,\eta'=R,L} \int_a^a dy \int_0^\infty dy |\chi_{\eta\eta'}(x,y,t)|^2
\]
as, respectively, the qubit population and the probability that one photon lies in region \([0,a]\) and one in \((a,\infty)\).

We first consider for simplicity a two-photon exponential wavepacket (sketched in Fig. 1): \( \varphi_1^\dagger_2(x) = e^{-\Delta k|\pi-a|} e^{-ik_0 x} \theta(x-a) \) where \( v\Delta k \) is the bandwidth, the carrier wavevector \( k_0 \) is resonant with the qubit, and the wavefront reaches the qubit at \( t = 0 \). In Fig. 2, we plot results for the dynamics described by (1) obtained numerically (for details see [33]). As the wavepacket impinges on the qubit, its population \( P_e \) [Fig. 2(a)] exhibits a rise followed by a drop (photon absorption then re-emission) eventually converging to a small — yet finite — steady value. This shows that part of the excitation absorbed from the wavepacket is never released back.

The photon field in the same process is shown in Figs. 2(b) and 2(c) displaying, respectively, the field in-
FIG. 2. BIC generation via two-photon scattering. (a) Qubit population $P_c$ and trapping probability $P_{tr}$ as a function of time in units of $\Gamma^{-1}$. (b) Spatial profile of the field intensity $n(x)$ at the end of scattering. The inset highlights the sinusoidal wavefunction in the range $0 \leq x \leq a$. (c) Two-photon probability density function $|\chi(x,y)|^2$ after scattering is complete ($t = t_f$). The white dashed lines $x=a$ and $y=a$ mark the qubit position. [Panels (b) and (c) are plotted on a log scale and with $t_f=80/\Gamma$. We considered a two-photon exponential wavepacket with $\Gamma = \pi$, $ka_0 = 10\pi$ and $\Delta k = \Gamma/2\tau$.]

The density $n(x) = \langle \Psi(t_f) | \hat{a}^\dagger(x) \hat{a}(x) | \Psi(t_f) \rangle$ and the total two-photon probability density $\sum_{q,y} |\chi_{qy}(x,y,t_f)|^2$ at a time $t_f$ after the scattering process is complete. The wavepacket is not entirely reflected back: a significant fraction remains trapped between the mirror and qubit, forming a perfectly sinusoidal wave with wavevector $k_0$ [Fig. 2(b)]. Remarkably, this stationary wave is of single-photon nature. Indeed, Fig. 2(c) shows that either both photons are reflected (top right corner) or one is scattered and the other remains trapped in the mirror-qubit interspace (top left and bottom right). Note that the probability that both photons are trapped (bottom left) is zero.

These outcomes, in light of the features of the BIC (2), suggest that after scattering the joint state has the form

$$
|\Psi(t_f)\rangle = \int_{a}^{\infty} dx \xi_R(x,t_f) \hat{a}^\dagger_R(x) |\phi_b\rangle + \int_{a}^{\infty} dx dy \beta_{RH}(x,y,t_f) \hat{a}^\dagger_R(x) \hat{a}^\dagger_L(y) |g,0\rangle ,
$$

where in the first line a single photon has left the BIC region, while the last line describes two outgoing photons. Let $P_{tr} = P_c + P_{ph}$ be the probability that either the qubit is excited or a photon is trapped between the mirror and qubit. It then follows from (7) [33] that the asymptotic values of $P_{tr}$ and $P_c$ fulfill

$$
P_{tr}(\infty) = \int_{a}^{\infty} dx \xi_R(x,\infty) \hat{a}^\dagger_R(x) |\phi_b\rangle = (1 + \frac{1}{2} \Gamma\tau) P_c(\infty),
$$

which is naturally interpreted as the probability of generating the BIC, $P_{BIC} = P_{tr}(\infty)$. The time dependence of $P_{tr}$ shown in Fig. 2(a) demonstrates that it reaches a finite steady value satisfying (8), confirming Eq. (7) and thus generation of the BIC. The identity (8) was checked in all of the numerical results presented.

Dependence on time delay.—A substantial delay time is essential for exciting the BIC. The parameter set in Fig. 2, for instance, corresponds to $\Gamma\tau \simeq 3.14$. To highlight this dependence, we report in Fig. 3(a) the steady-state values of $P_c$, $P_{ph}$, and $P_{tr}$, optimized with respect to $\Delta k$, as functions of $\Gamma\tau$. Both photon trapping and stationary qubit excitation are negligible in the Markovian regime $\Gamma\tau \ll 1$, in sharp contrast to vacuum-decay schemes for which this is instead the optimal regime. A delay time $\Gamma\tau \gtrsim 1$ is required to make our BIC generation scheme effective; indeed, each of the three probabilities reaches a maximum at a delay of order $\Gamma\tau \sim 1$. Remarkably, $P_c$ becomes negligible compared to $P_{ph}$ for $\Gamma\tau \gtrsim 10$, and...
showing that the photon component is dominant at large delays as expected from Eqs. (2) and (3): In this regime, we thus get almost pure single-photon trapping.

**Dependence on bandwidth and detuning.**—The efficiency of BIC generation depends on the width, \( \Delta k \), of the injected wavepacket. In Fig. 3(b) the optimal value is close to \( \Gamma / 2 \). Thus, photon absorption is maximum when the wavepacket width is of order the qubit decay rate, in agreement with general expectations [34–36]. The optimal \( \Delta k \) as a function of delay time is given in the supplemental material [33]; for large \( \Gamma / v \), the optimal value saturates near 0.2\( \Gamma / v \).

Non-resonant photons can also be used to generate the BIC: results for a wavepacket of two photons detuned oppositely in energy are shown in Fig. 3(b). The optimal wavepacket width changes but remains of order \( \Gamma \). As the detuning increases, the maximum \( P_{\text{BIC}} \) initially rises and then decays; note that the optimal detuning is \( \delta \approx \Gamma / 2 \). At this value the nonlinear scattering flux was shown to peak [37], confirming that the intrinsic nonlinearity of the emitters is key to generating the BIC.

**Coherent-state wavepacket.**—It is natural to wonder whether, instead of a two-photon pulse, the BIC can be excited using a weak coherent-state wavepacket, which is easier to generate experimentally. In Fig. 3(c) we consider the same setup, parameters, and wavepacket shape \( \varphi(x) \) as in Fig. 2 but for a low-power coherent-state pulse [28] \( | \alpha \rangle = e^{-|\alpha|^2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\alpha^n / n!) \left( \int dx \varphi(x) \hat{a}_{L}^\dagger(x) \right)^n |0\rangle \) with the average photon number given by \( \bar{n} = |\alpha|^2 \). For \( \bar{n} = 2 \), \( P_{\text{tr}}(\infty) \) is comparable to the one obtained with the two-photon pulse, demonstrating the effectiveness of using coherent states.

**Increasing the BIC generation probability.**—We find that the trapping probability depends sensitively on the shape of the incoming wavepacket. While we have mostly used (Figs. 2, 3, 5) the exponential pulse that is standard in the literature [36, 38], Fig. 4 shows how engineering the wavepacket shape strongly enhances \( P_{\text{BIC}} \) [39]. We set here \( \Gamma \tau = 5 \), which roughly corresponds to the maximum of \( P_{\text{tr}}(\infty) = P_{\text{BIC}} \) in Fig. 3(a). The engineered incoming two-photon wavepacket in Fig. 4(a) (for methods see [33]) yields \( P_{\text{BIC}} \approx 80\% \), a value about four times larger.

**Two-qubit BIC.**—A BIC very similar to the one addressed above occurs in an infinite waveguide (no mirror) coupled to a pair of identical qubits [7, 9, 11–14]. With the qubits placed at \( x_1 = -a/2 \) and \( x_2 = a/2 \) and for \( k_0 a = m \pi \) [Fig. 5(a)], there exists a BIC given by

\[
|\varphi_b\rangle = e_b \left[ \hat{\sigma}_\pm + i \sqrt{\frac{\Gamma}{4}} \int_{-a/2}^{a/2} dx \left( e^{i k_0 (x+a/2)} \hat{a}_L^\dagger(x) - e^{-i k_0 (x+a/2)} \hat{a}_L^\dagger(x) \right) |g_1, g_2\rangle |0\rangle ,
\]

where now \( |\varphi_b|^2 = 1/(1+\Gamma \tau / 4) \), \( \hat{\sigma}_\pm = (\hat{\sigma}_1 \pm \hat{\sigma}_2)/\sqrt{2} \), and plus (minus) is used if \( m \) is odd (even). By tracing out the photonic field, Eq. (9) clearly entails entanglement between the qubits. (In the familiar limit \( \Gamma \tau \ll 1 \), for instance, the entangled state is \( \hat{\sigma}_\pm |g_1, g_2\rangle |0\rangle \), namely the sub- or super-radiant, maximally entangled state [17–19, 29, 40–42].) Thus, in the two-qubit setup of Fig. 5(a), our scattering-based approach to exciting the BIC can in particular generate entanglement.

This expectation is confirmed in Fig. 5(b), for which the same injected exponential wavepacket was used as in Fig. 2. In addition to the probability to excite at least one qubit \( P_e \), and the probability to generate a BIC (9), we plot the amount of entanglement between the qubits, as measured by the concurrence \( C \) [43]. As for one qubit, the two-qubit BIC population reaches a steady value after

![Fig. 4. BIC generation scheme for the one-qubit setup using a structured-shape two-photon wavepacket (see [33]). (a) Photon density profile of the incoming wavepacket. (b) \( P_{\text{BIC}} \) and \( P_e \) versus time. For this plot we fixed the distance to \( k_0 a = 20 \pi \) and the time delay to \( \Gamma \tau = 5 \) to maximize the photon trapping probability [see Fig. 3(b)].](image)

![Fig. 5. (a) Two-qubit setup: an infinite waveguide (no mirror) is coupled to a pair of qubits. (b) Probability to excite at least one qubit \( P_e \), trapping probability \( P_{\text{tr}} \), and qubit-qubit concurrence \( C \) versus time in a two-photon scattering process (see [33] for definition of \( P_e, P_{\text{tr}}, \) and \( C \)). The wavepacket and parameters are the same as in Fig. 2. The scheme generates a dressed BIC in a way analogous to the one-qubit setup in Fig. 1, yielding however stationary entanglement between the qubits.](image)
scattering, resulting in an excitation stored in the qubits and hence stationary entanglement. Note the typical [44] “sudden birth” of the entanglement.

Conclusions.—We have shown that dressed BICs occurring in waveguide-QED setups can be generated via multi-photon scattering. This enables single-photon capture and, for multiple emitters, production of stationary entanglement. These BICs differ significantly from purely excitonic subradiant states, as well as from BICs located entirely within the side-coupled quantum system, in that they involve the field of the waveguide itself.

While preparing this work we became aware of a related scheme by Cotrufo and Ali [39]. There however the BIC arises from a single system, comprised of a qubit and two cavities to provide feedback, side-coupled to an infinite waveguide. Here, instead, no cavities are present and the necessary quantum feedback is provided by a mirror [cf. Fig. 1] or the emitters themselves [cf. Fig. 5(a)]. Remarkably, in order to generate the BIC, this feedback needs to be delayed [cf. Fig. 3(a)].

Investigating the non-Markovian effects of non-negligible delays is a new frontier of quantum optics [10, 12, 29, 30, 36, 42, 45–57]. Here we have taken advantage of such delays, demonstrating that their role can be constructive [54, 57]. In particular, within the range considered, as shown in Fig. 3(a), long delays (Γτ ≃ 20) enable almost pure single-photon trapping (instead of hybrid atom-photon excitation). Targets of ongoing investigation include exploring the regime of very long delays (beyond Γτ ≃ 25 in Fig. 3(a) allowed by our current computational capabilities [33]) and deriving a systematic criterion to increase the generation probability by wavepacket engineering (possibly by exploiting time reversal symmetry [34, 39]). We expect this line of research will become important to, for example, long-distance communication over quantum networks.
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S1. COMPUTATIONAL METHODS

In order to solve for various wavefunctions in the waveguide-QED setups that we consider, we have taken two different routes: treating the 1D field as a continuum or discretizing it as an effective coupled-cavity array (CCA) and working in the middle of the band, where band-edge effects are minimized and the dispersion is close to linear. In the main text, results shown in Figs. 2 and 3(a)-(b) were obtained through the continuum approach, while the discrete approach was employed for producing Figs. 3(c), 4 and 5.

A. Continuum approach

For the continuum case, we follow the approach reported in Ref. [36]: Starting from the Schrödinger equation, by tracing out the two-photon part, we arrive at a 1+1 dimensional delay partial differential equation for the wavefunction $\psi(x, t)$ [joint amplitude for qubit and one photon at position $x$; defined in Eq. (4) of the main text], which we solve using a tailored finite-difference time-domain (FDTD) code that has multithreading support [58]. This FDTD code provides the numerically exact solution to the dynamics in the two-excitation sector. For solving the two-photon scattering problem of interest we send in a two-photon exponential wavepacket with the qubit initially unexcited (set initCond=3 in the code).

Our FDTD code is mainly memory bound. For typical cases (such as Fig. 2) we need at least 128 GB of RAM. For the most extreme case that we explored [$\Gamma \tau \approx 25$ in Fig. 3(a), corresponding to $m = k_0 a/\pi = 40$ with $\omega_0 = 10^7$], we use a machine with 450+ GB of RAM in the local cluster. A rule of thumb for estimating the memory usage is to take $16(2N_x n_x + N_y)/1024^4$ (in GB), where $n_x$ is the number of FDTD steps for completing a round trip between the atom and the mirror; all input parameters are explained in detail in [58]. In the aforementioned most demanding case, both $N_x$ and $N_y$ are about $1.2 \times 10^5$ and $n_x \sim 5000$ (such that one resonant wavelength has $n_x/m \sim 100+$ FDTD steps, yielding an accuracy of order $10^{-4}$), so the $\psi$-array alone takes roughly 438 GB. Useful tricks to explore the large $\tau$
regime include reducing \( \omega_0/\Gamma \) [since \( \Gamma \tau = 2m\pi/(\omega_0/\Gamma) \)] and reducing \( n_x/m \). For these reasons we set \( \omega_0/\Gamma = 20 \) for the plots in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3(b) and \( \omega_0/\Gamma = 10 \) for the plot in Fig. 3(a), where, as previously mentioned, we explored the regime of long delay time. In this way, with the same amount of memory, we were able to complete more FDTD steps at the expense of reduced accuracy (obviously careful checks were necessary). Note that the larger \( \tau \) the longer the cutoff time \( t_f \) needs to be because of the multiple bounces of the photon field before escaping.

B. Discrete approach

An alternative approach to simulate the two-photon scattering process consists in modeling it as a CCA comprised of a 1D arrangement of \( N \gg 1 \) identical resonators of frequency \( \omega_c \) with nearest-neighbour coupling rate \( J \), with one resonator coupled to the qubit with coupling rate \( g \). Hamiltonian (1) of the main text is thus discretized as

\[
\hat{H} = \omega_c \sum_{n=1}^{N} \hat{c}_n^\dagger \hat{c}_n - J \sum_{n=1}^{N} (\hat{c}_{n+1}^\dagger \hat{c}_{n} + \hat{c}_{n}^\dagger \hat{c}_{n+1}) + \omega_0 \sigma_z^\dagger \sigma_z + g (\hat{c}_1^\dagger \sigma_x + \hat{c}_1 \sigma_x^\dagger),
\] (S1)

where \( \hat{c}_n (\hat{c}_n^\dagger) \) annihilates (creates) a photon on the \( n \)th mode while \( J = v/(2\ell) \) and \( g = V/\sqrt{l} \) (here \( l \) stands for the longitudinal size of each fictitious cavity). By introducing the momentum operators \( \hat{a}_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_x e^{i k x} \hat{a}_x \), with \( k \in [-\pi, \pi] \) (we are implicitly rescaling the wavevector as \( k := k_l \)), the first two terms of Eq. (S1), which represent the free field Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}_f \), can be arranged in the diagonal form \( \hat{H}_f = \sum_k \omega_k \hat{c}_k^\dagger \hat{c}_k \), with the normal frequencies

\[
\omega_k = \omega_c - 2J \cos k
\] (S2)

forming a band of width \( 4J \) centered at the bare cavity frequency \( \omega_c \). The dispersion law (S2) is approximately linear for \( \omega \approx \omega_c \). Thus, in the weak-coupling regime \( \Gamma \ll 4J \) and for \( \omega_c = \omega_0 \), Hamiltonian (S1) is a reasonable approximation to the physics of the continuous-waveguide Hamiltonian (1) of the main text. The advantage of using this discrete model is that it can be easily handled numerically up to the third-excitation sector of the Hilbert space. In particular, in this work we simulate the time-dependent Schrödinger equation corresponding to Eq. (S1) for \( N \sim 800 \) \((N \sim 100) \) cavities for the two-(three-) excitation subspace and set \( \Gamma/(4J) = (g^2/J)/(4J) \leq 0.1 \) in order to be consistent with the weak-coupling assumption. In particular we have used \( \Gamma/(4J) = 0.075 \) for Figs. 3(c) and 5 and \( \Gamma/(4J) = 0.062 \) for Fig. 4.

It is worth mentioning that, in the present finite-band CCA, even bound states outside the band can occur [23] (in Ref. [20] it was shown that they can be populated via two-photon scattering). However, the assumption \( \omega_0 = \omega_c \) \((k_0 = \pi/2) \) ensures that the BIC lies exactly at the center of the band in a way that processes that excite the bound states outside the continuum are energetically forbidden [see [23]].

Finally, note that the present discrete approach is straightforwardly extended to describe the two-qubit setup in Fig. 5 of the main text. In this case, we place the two emitters far from the CCA edges to avoid unwanted back-reflection from the array’s ends within the considered simulation time.

S2. DERIVATION OF EQ. (8)

The BIC state has the structure (see main text)

\[
|\phi_b\rangle = |e\rangle |\epsilon\rangle + \int_0^a dx \left( f_R(x)\hat{a}_R^\dagger(x) + f_L(x)\hat{a}_L^\dagger(x) \right) |g\rangle |0\rangle
\] (S3)

where

\[
|\epsilon_b|^2 + \int_0^a dx |f_R(x)|^2 + \int_0^a dx |f_L(x)|^2 = 1, \quad |\epsilon_b|^2 = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{2}\Gamma \tau}.
\] (S4)

Based on definitions (5) and (6) of the main text, we thus find that in the case of state (7)

\[
P_e(\infty) = \int_0^\infty dx |\xi(x, t)|^2 |\epsilon_b|^2, \quad P_{ph}(\infty) = \int_0^\infty dx |\xi(x, t)|^2 \sum_{\eta=R,L} \int_0^a dy |f_{\eta}(y)|^2,
\] (S5)
where it is understood that time $t$ is large enough that the scattering is complete. Hence, due to the normalization condition in Eqs. (S4),

$$P_{tr}(\infty) = P_e(\infty) + P_{ph}(\infty) = \int_0^\infty dx |\xi(x,t)|^2 = P_{BIC}.$$  (S6)

Next, combining the last identity in (S4) with the first of Eqs. (S5) yields $\int_0^\infty dx |\xi(x,t)|^2 = P_e(\infty)/|\varepsilon_b|^2 = (1+\frac{1}{2}\Gamma \tau)P_e(\infty)$. Thereby,

$$P_{tr}(\infty) = P_{BIC} = (1 + \frac{1}{2}\Gamma \tau)P_e(\infty),$$  (S7)

which completes the proof of Eq. (8) in the main text.

S3. OPTIMAL WIDTH FOR RESONANT TWO-PHOTON WAVEPACKETS

In Fig. 3(a) of the main text, we plot various probabilities against $\Gamma \tau$, each obtained after an optimization over the wavepacket width $\Delta k$. In Fig. S1, we plot the optimal $\Delta k$, denoted by $\Delta k_{op}$, as a function of $\Gamma \tau$. We find that, for delays such that $\Gamma \tau \lesssim 2\pi$, $\Delta k_{op}$ scales approximately as $\Delta k_{op} \approx \pi/(2v\tau) = \pi/(4a)$. For larger delays, $\Delta k_{op}$ instead saturates to a non-zero value (presumably in order to maximize the atomic absorption during the scattering transient). For each set value of $\Gamma \tau$, the optimization was carried out by interpolating the $P_e$’s data computed on a discrete $\Delta k$-grid (on a log scale) and working out the $\Delta k$ at which the curve $P_e(\Delta k)$ exhibits a local maximum.

![FIG. S1. Optimal wavepacket width $\Delta k_{op}$ as a function of $\Gamma \tau$, which was used to produce Fig. 3(a) in the main text. The behavior in the range $\Gamma \tau \lesssim 2\pi$ is well fitted by the function $\Delta k_{op} = \pi/(2v\tau)$ (red dashed line). Here we set $\omega_0 = 10\Gamma$.](image)

S4. INCREASING THE BIC GENERATION PROBABILITY

Fig. 5 of the main text reports a paradigmatic example showing that $P_{tr}(\infty)$ can be strongly increased (compared to the standard choice of an exponential pulse) by engineering the wavepacket shape. Here, we describe how the wavepacket in Fig. 5 was derived.

The BIC generation process would be perfect ($P_{BIC} = 1$) if, in Eq. (7) of the main text, $\beta_{RR}(x,y,t_f) = 0$, meaning that the incoming two-photon wavepacket deterministically evolves at the end of scattering into the BIC plus a normalized outgoing single-photon wavepacket $\xi_R(x,t)$. The basic idea is to consider the time-reversed version of such ideal process: the system is initially prepared in the dressed BIC $|\phi_b\rangle$ and an incoming single-photon wavepacket $\xi_{op}(x,t)$ undergoes scattering resulting in a normalized outgoing two-photon wavepacket $\beta_{RR,op}(x,y,t)$ at the end of scattering [39]. If such a single-photon wavepacket $\xi_{L,op}(x,t)$ exists, then sending on the initially unexcited qubit the time-reversed version of $\beta_{RR,op}(x,y,t)$ will deterministically yield the BIC (plus an outgoing photon).
FIG. S2. (a)-(b): Scattering of a single-photon wavepacket with wavefunction (S8) for $\Delta x = 2v/\Gamma$ when the system is prepared in the BIC $|\phi_b\rangle$. (a): Photon-density profile before (top panel) and after (bottom panel) scattering. (b): Time behavior of $P_{tr}$ and $P_e$ (see main text) in the same process. (c)-(d): Scattering of the two-photon wavepacket obtained by time-reversing and normalizing the two-photon outgoing component of the previous process. (c): Photon-density profile before and after scattering. (d): Time behavior of $P_{tr}$ and $P_e$ in the same process. Throughout, we set $k_0a=20\pi$ and $\Gamma\tau=5$.

Based on the above, we considered a right-incoming, Gaussian, single-photon wavepacket of the form

$$\xi_L(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi\Delta x^2}} e^{-\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{2\Delta x^2} - i k_0 (x-x_0)},$$  \hspace{1cm} (S8)

where $\Delta x$ is the spatial width and $|x_0 - a| > 3\Delta x$, which is injected toward the qubit-mirror region initially prepared in the BIC [see Fig. S2(a)]. At the end of scattering, as shown in Fig. S2(b), part of the excitation trapped in the BIC is released, while a residual amount remains. Minimizing the latter over the width $\Delta x$ yields $\Delta x = 2v/\Gamma$. The final joint state is of the same form as Eq. (7) in the main text, featuring in particular an outgoing two-photon component. We normalize and time-reverse this two-photon wavefunction, which is then used as the input of our original problem (namely, it is sent to the scattering region with the qubit initially in the ground state) as shown in Fig. S2(c). It turns out [see Fig. S2(d)] that the resulting two-photon-wavepacket is far more effective than the exponential one (see Figs. 2 and 3 in the main text), leading to the BIC generation probability $P_{BIC} = P_{tr}(\infty) \approx 70\%$.

A further improvement can be obtained by repeating the above process, but this time choosing $\xi(x,t)$ as the single-photon outgoing component of Fig. S2(c) (once this is normalized and time-reversed). One more iteration of this procedure yields the results in Fig. 5 of the main text, where we obtain in particular $P_{tr}(\infty) \approx 80\%$ (further iterations do not substantially change this value).

In this paradigmatic instance, we started from a Gaussian-shaped single-photon wavepacket. Deriving a systematic, general optimization criterion that does not rely on such a specific choice is the target ongoing investigation, in particular with goal to assess whether the BIC generation probability can approach 100%.

S5. TWO-QUBIT BIC

In Fig. 5(b) of the main text we plot $P_{tr}$, $P_e$ and the concurrence $C$ for the two-qubit setup of Fig. 5(a). Here, we provide detailed definitions of these quantities.
As in the case of a qubit in front of a mirror [cf. Eq. (5) in the main text], the joint state at time $t$ lives in the two-excitation sector and thus has the general form

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = \left( f(t)\hat{\sigma}_1^1\hat{\sigma}_2^1 + \sum_{\eta=R,L} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \psi_{1\eta}(x,t)\hat{\sigma}_1^1(x)\hat{\sigma}_2^1 + \sum_{\eta=R,L} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \psi_{2\eta}(x,t)\hat{\sigma}_1^1(x)\hat{\sigma}_2^1 \right. \\
+ \left. \sum_{\eta,\eta'=R,L} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx dy \chi_{\eta,\eta'}(x,y,t)\hat{\sigma}_1^1(x)\hat{\sigma}_1^1(y)\right) |g_1, g_2\rangle |0\rangle. \tag{S9}$$

Accordingly, the total probability that at least one qubit is excited reads

$$P_e(t) = |f(t)|^2 + \sum_{\eta} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx |\psi_{1\eta}(x,t)|^2 + \sum_{\eta} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx |\psi_{2\eta}(x,t)|^2, \tag{S10}$$

while the probability that one photon lies between the two qubits and one beyond them is given by

$$P_{ph}(t) = 2 \sum_{\eta,\eta'} \int_{-a}^{a} dx \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dy |\chi_{\eta,\eta'}(x,y,t)|^2 + 2 \sum_{\eta,\eta'} \int_{-a}^{a} dx \int_{a}^{\infty} dy |\chi_{\eta,\eta'}(x,y,t)|^2, \tag{S11}$$

while their sum is called $P_{tr} = P_e + P_{ph}$.

To measure the amount of qubit-qubit entanglement in state (S9), we trace out the field degrees of freedom to get the reduced two-qubit density matrix and next calculate the corresponding Wotters concurrence [43]. This takes the form

$$C(t) = \max \left( 0, 2|C_{12}(t)| - \sqrt{|f(t)|^2 P_{ph}} \right), \tag{S12}$$

where

$$C_{12}(t) = \sum_{\eta} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \psi_{1\eta}^*(x,t)\psi_{2\eta}(x,t) \tag{S13}$$

are the atomic coherences.