Unconventional quantum optics in topological waveguide QED
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The discovery of topological materials has challenged our understanding of condensed matter physics and led to novel phenomena. This has motivated recent developments to export topological concepts into photonics to make light behave in exotic ways. Here, we predict several unconventional quantum optical phenomena that occur when quantum emitters interact with a topological waveguide QED bath, namely, the photonic analogue of the Su-Schrieffer-Heeger model. When the emitters’ frequency lies within the topological band-gap, a chiral bound state emerges, which is located at just one side (right or left) of the emitter. In the presence of several emitters, this bound state mediates topological, tunable interactions between them, that can give rise to exotic many-body phases such as double Néel ordered states. Furthermore, when the emitters’ optical transition is resonant with the bands, we find unconventional scattering properties and different super/subradiant states depending on the band topology. Finally, we propose several implementations where these phenomena can be observed with state-of-the-art technology.

I. INTRODUCTION

Even though the introduction of topology in condensed matter was originally motivated to explain the integer Quantum Hall effect [1], its implications were more far-reaching than expected. On a fundamental level, topological order resulted in a large variety of new phenomena, as well as new paradigms for classifying matter phases [2]. On practical terms, topological states can be harnessed to achieve more robust electronic devices or fault-tolerant quantum computation [3]. This spectacular progress motivated the application of topological ideas to photonics, for example, to engineer unconventional light behaviors. The starting point of the field was the observation that topological bands also appear with electromagnetic waves [4]. Soon after that, many experimental realizations followed using microwave photons [5], photonic crystals [6, 7], coupled waveguides [8] or resonators [9–11], exciton-polaritons [12] or metamaterials [13], to name a few (see [14] and references therein for an authoritative review). Nowadays, topological photonics is a burgeoning field with many experimental and theoretical developments. Among them, one of the current frontiers of the field is the exploration of the interplay between topological photons and quantum emitters [15–17].

In this manuscript, we show that topological photonic systems cause a number of unprecedented phenomena in the field of quantum optics, namely, when they are coupled to quantum emitters. We analyze the simplest model consisting of two-level quantum emitters (QEs) interacting with a one-dimensional topological photonic bath described by the Su-Schrieffer-Heeger (SSH) model [18] (see Fig. 1). When the QE frequency...
lies between the two bands (green region in Fig. 1B) we predict the emergence of chiral photon bound states (BS), that is, BSs which localize to the left/right side of the QEs depending on the topology of the bath. In the many-body regime (i.e., with many emitters) those BSs mediate tunable, chiral, long-range interactions, leading to a rich phase diagram at zero temperature, e.g., with double Neél-ordered phases. Furthermore, when the QEs are resonant with the bands (blue regions in Fig. 1B), we also find unusual dissipative dynamics. For example, for two equal QEs separated a given distance, we show that the two bands are symmetric with respect to \( \omega \) (with \( \omega(k) > 0 \)) is the coupling in momentum space between the \( A(B) \) modes, \( a_k = \sum_j a_j e^{-i k j} / \sqrt{N} \) \( (b_k = \sum_j b_j e^{-i k j} / \sqrt{N}) \). The bath possesses sublattice (chiral) symmetry [19], such that all eigenmodes can be grouped in chiral-symmetric pairs with opposite energies. Thus, the two bands are symmetric with respect to \( \omega_a \), spanning from \([-2J, -2|\delta|J]\) (lower band) and \([2|\delta|J, 2J]\) (upper band). The middle gap is 4|\delta|J, such that it closes when \( \delta = 0 \), recovering the normal 1D tight-binding model.

- This bath supports topologically non-trivial phases, belonging to the BDI class in the topological classification of phases [20]. More concretely, both bands can be characterized by a topological invariant, the Zak phase [18] \( \mathcal{Z} \), such that \( \mathcal{Z} = 0 \) corresponds to a trivial insulator, while \( \mathcal{Z} = \pi \) implies a non-trivial insulator. For the parametrization we have chosen this occurs for \( \delta > 0 \) and \( \delta < 0 \), respectively. Notice that for an infinite system (i.e., in the bulk), this definition depends on the choice of the unit cell and the role of \( \delta \) can be reversed by shifting the unit cell by one site. In the bulk the band topology manifests in the fact that one can not transform from one phase to the other without closing the gap (as long as the symmetry is preserved).

- With finite systems, however, the sign of \( \delta \) determines whether the chain ends with weak/strong hoppings, which leads to the appearance (or not) of topologically robust edge states [21].

Now, let us finally describe the rest of the elements of our setup. For the \( N_e \) QEs, we consider they all have a single optical transition \( g-e \), with a detuning \( \Delta \) respect to \( \omega_a \), and they couple to the bath locally. Thus, their free and interaction Hamiltonian read:

\[
H_S = \Delta \sum_{m=1}^{N_e} \sigma_{eg}^m, \quad (3)
\]

\[
H_I = g \sum_m (\sigma_{eg}^m c_{x_m} + H.c.), \quad (4)
\]

where \( c_{x_m} \in \{a_{x_m}, b_{x_m}\} \) depends on the sublattice and the unit cell \( x_m \) at which the \( m \)th QEs couples to the bath. We use the notation \( \sigma_{\mu\nu}^m = [\mu]_m [\nu] \) for the \( m \)th QE operator. We highlight that we use a rotating-wave approximation, such that only excitation-conserving terms appear in \( H_I \).

Methods. In the next sections, we study the dynamics emerging from the global QE-bath Hamiltonian \( H = H_S + H_B + H_I \) using several complementary approaches. When one is only interested in the QE dynamics, and the bath can be effectively traced out, the following Born-Markov master equation [22] describes the evolution of the reduced density matrix \( \tilde{\rho} \) of the QEs:

\[
\dot{\tilde{\rho}} = i [\tilde{\rho}, H_S] + \sum_{n,m} J_{nm}^{\alpha\beta} \left[ \rho, \sigma_{eg}^m \sigma_{eg}^{-n} \right]_{\rho}
\]

\[
+ \sum_{n,m} \Gamma_{mn}^{\alpha\beta} \left[ 2 \sigma_{eg}^m \rho \sigma_{eg}^{n} - \sigma_{eg}^m \sigma_{eg}^{n} \rho - \rho \sigma_{eg}^m \sigma_{eg}^{-n} \right]. \quad (5)
\]
depends on the sublattices $\alpha, \beta \in \{A, B\}$ to which the $m$th and $n$th QE couple respectively, as well as on their relative position $x_{mn} = x_m - x_n$. Remarkably, for our model they can be calculated analytically in the thermodynamic limit ($N \to \infty$) yielding:

$$\Sigma_{mn}^{BB}(z) = -\frac{g^2 J [F_{x_{mn}}(y_+\Theta_+(y_+)) - F_{x_{mn}}(y_-\Theta_-(y_+))]}{\sqrt{z^4 - 4J^2(1 + \delta^2)z^2 + 16J^4\delta^2}}.$$  

$$\Sigma_{mn}^{BB}(z) = \frac{g^2 J [F_{x_{mn}}(y_+\Theta_+(y_+)) - F_{x_{mn}}(y_-\Theta_-(y_+))]}{\sqrt{z^4 - 4J^2(1 + \delta^2)z^2 + 16J^4\delta^2}},$$

where $F_n(z) = (1 + \delta)z^{n+1} + (1 - \delta)z^{n+1}, \Theta_\pm(z) = \Theta(\pm 1 \mp |z|), \Theta(z)$ is Heaviside’s step function, and

$$y_\pm = \frac{1}{2J^2(1 - \delta^2)} \left[ z^2 - 2J^2(1 + \delta^2) \pm \sqrt{z^4 - 4J^2(1 + \delta^2)z^2 + 16J^4\delta^2} \right].$$

However, since we have a highly structured bath this perturbative description will not be valid in certain regimes, e.g., close to band-edges, and we will use resolvent operator techniques or fully numerical approaches to solve the problem exactly for infinite/finite bath sizes, respectively. Since those methods were explained in detail in other works, here we focus on the results and leave the details for the Supp. Material.

### III. BAND-GAP REGIME

In this Section we assume that the QEs are in the band-gap regime, that is, their transition frequency lies outside of the two bands of the photonic bath. From here on, we only discuss results in the thermodynamic limit (when $N \to \infty$) such that the edge states play no role in the QE dynamics. We refer the interested reader to Refs. and Supp. Material to see some of the consequences the edge states have on the QE dynamics.

#### A. Single QE: dynamics

Let us start considering the dynamics of a single excited QE, i.e., $|\psi(0)\rangle = |e\rangle|\text{vac}\rangle$, where $|\text{vac}\rangle$ denotes the vacuum state of the lattice of bosonic modes. Since $H$ conserves the number of excitations, the global wavefunction at any time reads:

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = C_e(t)|e\rangle + \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{\alpha=a,b} C_{j,\alpha}(t)\alpha_j^\dagger |g\rangle|\text{vac}\rangle.$$  

In both perturbative and exact treatments, the dynamics of $C_e(t)$ can be shown (see Refs. and Supp. Material) to depend only on the single QE self-energy:

$$\Sigma_e(z) = \frac{g^2 z \text{sign}(|y_+| - 1)}{\sqrt{z^4 - 4J^2(1 + \delta^2)z^2 + 16J^4\delta^2}},$$

obtained from Eq. 6 defining: $\Sigma_e(z) \equiv \Sigma_{nn}^{AA}(z)$. From here, we can already extract several conclusions: i) $\Sigma_e(z)$ is independent of the sign of $\delta$, which means that the spontaneous emission dynamics is insensitive to the topology of the bands. ii) Perturbative approaches, like the Born-Markov approximation of Eq. 5, predict an exponential decay of excitations at a rate $\Gamma_e(\Delta) = -2\text{Im} \Sigma_e(\Delta + i0^+)$, which is strictly zero in the band-gap regime. Thus, one expects that the excitation remains localized in the QE at any time. However, in Fig. 2 we compute the exact dynamics $C_e(t)$ for several $\delta$s and observe that this perturbative limit is only recovered in the limit of $|\delta| \to 1$. On the contrary, when $|\delta| \ll 1$ and $\delta \neq 0$ the dynamics displays fractional decay and oscillations. As it happens with other baths, the origin of this dynamics stems from the emergence of photon bound states (BSs) which localize around the QEs. However, the BSs appearing in the present topological waveguide bath have some distinctive features with no analogue in other systems, and therefore deserve special attention.

#### B. Single QE: Bound states

The energy and wavefunction of the BSs in the single-excitation subspace can be obtained by solving the secular equation $H|\Psi_{BS}\rangle = E_{BS}|\Psi_{BS}\rangle$, with $E_{BS}$ lying out
of the bands, and $|\Psi_{BS}\rangle$ in the form of Eq. (10), but with time-independent coefficients. Without loss of generality, we assume that the QE couples to sublattice $A$ at the $j = 0$ cell. After some algebra, one can find that the energy of the BS is given by the pole equation: $E_{BS} = \Delta + \Sigma e^{(E_{BS})}$. Irrespective of $\Delta$ or $g$, there exist always three BS solutions of the pole equation (one for each band-gap region). This is because the self-energy diverges in all band-edges, which guarantees finding a BS in each of the band-gaps [29, 30]. The main difference with respect to other BSs [26–30] appears in the wavefunction amplitudes, which read

$$C_{j,a} = \frac{gE_{BS}C_e}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dk \frac{e^{ikj}}{E_{BS} - \omega^2(k)},$$

$$C_{j,b} = \frac{gC_e}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dk \frac{\omega(k)e^{ikj - \phi(k)}}{E_{BS}^2 - \omega^2(k)},$$

where $C_e$ is a constant obtained from the normalization condition that is directly related with the long-time population of the excited state in spontaneous emission. For example, in Fig. 2 where $\Delta = 0$, it can be shown to be $|C_e(t \to \infty)|^2 = |C_e|^4 = (1 + \frac{g^2}{4\Delta J})^{-2}$.

From Eqs. 11-12, we can extract several properties of the spatial wavefunction distribution. On the one hand, above or below the bands (outer band gaps) the largest contribution to the integrals is that of $k = 0$, thus all $C_{j,\alpha}$ have the same sign (see left column of Fig. 3A top and bottom row). In the lower (upper) band-gap, $C_{j,\alpha}$ of the different sublattices has the same (opposite) sign. On the other hand, in the inner band gap, the main contribution to the integrals is that of $k = \pi$. This gives an extra factor $(-1)^j$ to the coefficients $C_{j,\alpha}$ (see Fig. 3A middle row). Furthermore, the probability amplitudes of the sublattice which the QE couples to are symmetric with respect to the position of the QE, whereas they are asymmetric in the other sublattice, that is, the BSs are chiral. Changing $\delta$ from positive to negative results in a spatial inversion of the BS wavefunction. The asymmetry...
of the BS wavefunction is more extreme in the middle of the band-gap ($\Delta = 0$). For example, if $\delta > 0$, the BS wavefunction with $E_{BS} = 0$ is given by $C_{j,0} = 0$ and

$$C_{j,h} = \begin{cases} \frac{gC_{j}}{J(1+\delta)} \left( \frac{1-\delta}{1+\delta} \right)^j, & j \geq 0, \\ 0, & j < 0, \end{cases}$$ (13)

whereas for $\delta < 0$ the wavefunction decays for $j < 0$ while being strictly zero for $j \geq 0$. At this point, the BS decay length diverges as $\lambda_{BS} \sim 1/(2|\delta|)$ when the gap closes. Away from this point, the BS decay length shows the usual behavior for 1D baths $\lambda_{BS} \sim 1/\sqrt{\Delta_{edge}}$, with $\Delta_{edge}$ being the smallest detuning between the QE and the band-edge frequencies.

The physical intuition of the appearance of such chiral BS at $E_{BS} = 0$ is that the QE with $\Delta = 0$ acts as an effective edge in the middle of the chain, or equivalently, as a boundary between two semi-infinite chains with different topology. This picture provides us with an insight useful to understand other results of the manuscript: despite considering the case of an infinite bath, the local QE-bath coupling inherits information about the underlying bath topology. In fact, one can show that this chiral BS has the same properties as the edge-state which appears in a semi-infinite SSH chain in the topologically non-trivial phase, for example, inheriting its robustness to disorder. To illustrate it, we study the effect of two types of disorder: one that appears in the cavities bare frequencies (diagonal), and another one that appears in the tunneling amplitudes between them (off-diagonal). The former corresponds to the addition of random diagonal terms to the bath’s Hamiltonian $H_B \rightarrow H_B + \sum_j \left( \epsilon_{a,j}a_j^\dagger a_j + \epsilon_{b,j}b_j^\dagger b_j \right)$ and breaks the chiral symmetry of the original model, while the latter corresponds to the addition of off-diagonal random terms $H_B \rightarrow H_B + \sum_j \left( \epsilon_{1,j}b_j^\dagger a_j + \epsilon_{2,j}a_j^\dagger b_j + H.c. \right)$ and preserves it. We take the $\epsilon_{\nu,j}$, $\nu = a, b, 1, 2$, from a uniform distribution within the range $[-w/2, w/2]$ for each $j$’th unit cell. To prevent changing the sign of the coupling amplitudes between the cavities, $w$ is restricted to $w/2 < (1 - |\delta|)$ in the case of off-diagonal disorder.

In the middle (right) column of Fig. 3, we plot the shape of the three BS appearing in our problem for a situation with off-diagonal (diagonal) disorder with $w = 0.5J$. There, we observe that while the upper and lower BS get modified for both types of disorder, the chiral BS has the same protection against off-diagonal disorder as a regular SSH edge-state: its energy is pinned at $E_{BS} = 0$ as well as keeping its shape with no amplitude in the middle BS compared to the other sublattices. One way to understand the origin of these interactions is that the emitters exchange virtual photons through the bath, which in this case are localized around the emitter. In fact, these virtual photons are nothing but the photon BS that we studied in the previous Section. Thus, these interactions $J_{mn}^{\alpha\beta}$ inherit many properties of the BSs. For example, the interactions are exponentially localized in space, with a localization length that can be tuned and made large by setting $\Delta$ close to the band-edges, or fixing $\Delta = 0$ and letting the middle band-gap close ($\delta \rightarrow 0$). Moreover, one can also change qualitatively the interactions by moving $\Delta$ to different band-gaps: for $|\Delta| > 2J$ all the $J_{mn}^{\alpha\beta}$ have the same sign, while for $|\Delta| < 2|\delta|J$ they alternate sign as $x_{mn}$ increases. Also, changing $\Delta$ from positive to negative changes the sign of $J_{mn}^{AA/BB}$, but leaves unaltered $J_{mn}^{AB/BA}$. Furthermore, while $J_{mn}^{AA/BB}$ are insensitive to the bath’s topology, the $J_{mn}^{AB/BA}$ mimic the dimerization of the underlying bath, but allowing for longer range couplings. The most striking regime is again reached for $\Delta = 0$. In that case $J_{mn}^{AA/BB}$ identically vanish, and thus

C. Two QEs

Let us now focus on the consequences of such exotic BS when two QEs are coupled to the bath. For concreteness, we focus on a parameter regime where the Born-Markov approximation is justified, although we have performed an exact analysis in the Supp. Material. From Eq. 5 it is easy to see that in the band-gap regime, the interaction with the bath leads to an effective unitary dynamics governed by the following Hamiltonian:

$$H_{dd} = J_{12}^{\beta\alpha} \left( \sigma_1^e g_1 g_e + H.c. \right).$$ (14)

That is, the bath mediates dipole-dipole interactions between the QEs. One way to understand the origin of these interactions is that the emitters exchange virtual photons through the bath, which in this case are localized around the emitter. In fact, these virtual photons are nothing but the photon BS that we studied in the previous Section. Thus, these interactions $J_{mn}^{\alpha\beta}$ inherit many properties of the BSs. For example, the interactions are exponentially localized in space, with a localization length that can be tuned and made large by setting $\Delta$ close to the band-edges, or fixing $\Delta = 0$ and letting the middle band-gap close ($\delta \rightarrow 0$). Moreover, one can also change qualitatively the interactions by moving $\Delta$ to different band-gaps: for $|\Delta| > 2J$ all the $J_{mn}^{\alpha\beta}$ have the same sign, while for $|\Delta| < 2|\delta|J$ they alternate sign as $x_{mn}$ increases. Also, changing $\Delta$ from positive to negative changes the sign of $J_{mn}^{AA/BB}$, but leaves unaltered $J_{mn}^{AB/BA}$. Furthermore, while $J_{mn}^{AA/BB}$ are insensitive to the bath’s topology, the $J_{mn}^{AB/BA}$ mimic the dimerization of the underlying bath, but allowing for longer range couplings. The most striking regime is again reached for $\Delta = 0$. In that case $J_{mn}^{AA/BB}$ identically vanish, and thus
the QEs only interact if they are coupled to different sublattices. Furthermore, in such a situation the interactions have a strong directional character, i.e., the QEs only interact if they are in some particular order. Assuming that the first QE at $x_1$ couples to sublattice $A$, and the second one at $x_2$ couples to $B$, we have

$$J^{AB}_{12} = \begin{cases} \text{sign}(\delta) \frac{q^2}{2(1+\delta)} & \text{if } \delta \cdot x_{12} > 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } \delta \cdot x_{12} < 0, \\ \Theta(\delta) \frac{q^2}{2(1+\delta)} & \text{if } x_{12} = 0. \end{cases}$$

(15)

In Fig. 3C we plot the absolute value of the coupling for this case computed exactly, and compare it with the Markovian formula. Apart from small deviations at short distances, it is important to highlight that the directional character agrees perfectly in both cases.

D. Many QEs: Spin models with topological long-range interactions

One of the main interests of having a platform with BS-mediated interactions is to investigate spin models with long-range interactions $\Delta^{12}$. The study of these models has become an attractive avenue in quantum simulation because long-range interactions are the source of non-trivial many-body phases and dynamics, and are also very hard to treat classically.

Let us now investigate how the shape of the QE interactions inherited from the topologically bath translate into different many-body phases at zero temperature as compared to those produced by long-range interactions appearing in other setups such as trapped ions or standard waveguide setups. For that, we consider having $N_e$ emitters equally spaced and alternatively coupled to the $A/B$ lattice sites. After eliminating the bath, and adding a collective field with amplitude $\mu$ to control the number of spin excitations, the dynamics of the emitters (spins) is effectively given by:

$$H_{\text{spin}} = \sum_{m,n} \left[ J^{AB}_{mn} \left( \sigma_{m,A} \sigma_{n,B} + \text{H.c.} \right) - \frac{\mu}{2} \left( \sigma_{m,A} + \sigma_{n,B} \right) \right],$$

(16)

denoting by $\sigma^{n,\alpha}_\nu$, $\nu = x, y, z$, the corresponding Pauli matrix acting on the $\alpha \in \{A, B\}$ site in the $n$'th unit cell. The $J^{AB}_{mn}$ are the spin-spin interactions derived in the previous subsection, whose localization length, denoted by $\xi$, and functional form can be tuned through system parameters such as $\Delta$.

For example, when the lower (upper) BS mediates the interaction, the $J^{AB}_{mn}$ has negative (alternating) sign for all sites, similar to the ones appearing in standard waveguide setups. When the range of the interactions is short (nearest neighbor), the physics is well described by the ferromagnetic XY model with a transverse field $\mu$, which goes from a fully polarized phase when $|\mu|$ dominates to a superfluid one in which spins start flipping as $|\mu|$ decreases. In the case where the interactions are long-ranged the physics is similar to that explained in Ref. 34 for power-law interactions ($\propto 1/r^3$). The longer range of the interactions tends to break the symmetry between the ferro/antiferromagnetic situations and leads to frustrated many-body phases. Since similar interactions also appear in other scenarios (standard waveguides or trapped ions), we now focus on the more different situation where the middle BS at $\Delta = 0$ mediates the interactions, such that the coefficients $J^{AB}_{mn}$ have the form of Eq. (15).

In that case, the Hamiltonian $H_{\text{spin}}$ of Eq. 16 is very unusual: i) spins only interact if they are in different sublattices, i.e., the system is bipartite ii) the interaction is chiral in the sense that they interact only in case they are properly sorted: the one in lattice $A$ to the left/right of that in lattice $B$, depending on the sign of $\delta$. Note that $\delta$ also controls the interaction length $\xi$. In particular, for $|\delta| = 1$ the interaction only occurs between nearest neighbors, whereas for $\delta \to 0$, the interactions become of infinite range. These interactions translate into a rich phase diagram as a function of $\xi$ and $\mu$, which we plot in Fig. 4A for a small chain with $N_e = 20$ emitters (obtained with exact diagonalization). Let us guide the reader into the different parts:

- The region with maximum average magnetization (in white) corresponds to the places where $\mu$ dominates such that all spins are aligned upwards.

- Now, if we decrease $\mu$ from this fully polarized phase in a region where the localization length is short, i.e., $\xi \approx 0.1$, we observe a transition into a state with zero average magnetization. This behaviour can be understood because in that short-range limit $J^{AB}_{mn}$ only couples nearest neighbor $AB$ sites, but not $BA$ sites as shown in the scheme of the lower part of the diagram for $\delta > 0$ (the opposite is true for $\delta < 0$). Thus, the ground state is a product of nearest neighbor singlets (for $J > 0$) or triplets (for $J < 0$). This state is usually referred to as Valence-Bond Solid in the condensed matter literature. Note, the difference between $\delta \geq 0$ is the presence (or not) of uncoupled spins at the edges.

- However, when the bath allows for longer range interactions ($\xi > 1$), the transition from the fully polarized phase to the phase of zero magnetization does not occur abruptly but passing through all possible intermediate values of the magnetization. Besides, we also plot in Fig. 4B the spin-spin correlations along the $x$ and $z$ directions (note the symmetry in the $xy$ plane) for the case of $\mu = 0$ to evidence that a qualitatively different order appears as $\xi$ increases. In particular, we show that the spins align along the $x$ direction with a double periodicity, which we can pictorially represent
by $|\uparrow \downarrow \uparrow \downarrow \ldots \rangle$, and that we label as double Néel order states. Such orders have been predicted as a consequence of frustration in classical and quantum spin chains with competing nearest and next-nearest neighbour interactions [38–40], introduced to describe complex solid state systems such as multiferroic materials [41]. In our case, this order emerges in a system which has long-range interactions but no frustration as the system is always bipartite regardless the interaction length.

To gain analytical intuition of this regime, we take the limit $\xi \to \infty$, where the Hamiltonian \[ (16) \] reduces to
\[
H'_{\text{spin}} = U H_{\text{spin}} U^\dagger \simeq J (S_A^+ S_B^- + \text{H.c.}) , \tag{17}
\]
where $S_{A/B}^+ = \sum_n \sigma_{nA/B}^{z}$, and we have performed a unitary transformation $U = \prod_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\text{odd}}} \sigma_n^{z} \sigma_n^{x} \sigma_n^{y}$ to cancel the alternating signs of $J_{mn}^{AB}$. Equality in Eq. (17) occurs for a system with periodic boundary conditions, while for finite systems with open boundary conditions some corrections have to be taken into account due to the fact that not all spins in one sublattice couple to all spins in the other but only to those to their right/left depending on the sign of $\delta$. The ground state is symmetric under (independent) permutations in $A$ and $B$. In the thermodynamic limit we can apply mean field, which predicts symmetry breaking in the spin $xy$ plane. For instance, if $J < 0$ and the symmetry is broken along the spin direction $x$, the spins will align so that $\langle (S_A^x)^2 \rangle = \langle (S_B^x)^2 \rangle = (N_x/2)^2$, and $\langle S_A^x \rangle^2 = (S_B^x)^2 = (N_x/2)^2$. Since $N_x$ is finite in our case, the symmetry is not broken, but it is still reflected in the correlations, so that $\langle a_{\nu}^{m,A} a_{\nu}^{n,A} \rangle \simeq \langle a_{\nu}^{m,B} a_{\nu}^{n,B} \rangle \simeq 1/2$, with $\nu = x, y$. In the original picture with respect to $U$, we obtain the double Néel order observed in Fig. 4B. As can be understood, the alternating nature of the interactions is crucial for obtaining this type of ordering. Finally, let us mention that the topology of the bath translates into the topology of the spin chain in a straightforward manner: regardless of the range of the effective interactions, the ending spins of the chain will be uncoupled to the rest of spins if the bath is topologically non-trivial.

This discussion shows the potential of the present setup to act as a quantum simulator of exotic many-body phases not possible to simulate with other known setups. The full characterization of such spin models with topological long-range interactions is interesting on its own and we will present it elsewhere.

### IV. BAND REGIME

Here, we study the situation when QEs are resonant with one of the bands. For concreteness, we only present two results where the unconventional nature of the bath plays a prominent role, namely, the emergence of unexpected super/subradiant states, and their consequences when a single-photon scatters into one or two QEs.
A. Dissipative dynamics: super/subradiance

The band regime is generally characterized by inducing non-unitary dynamics in the QEs. However, when many QEs couple to the bath there are situations in which the interference between their emission may enhance or suppress (even completely) the decay of certain states. This phenomenon is known as super/subradiance \[19\], respectively, and it can be used, e.g., for efficient photon storage \[42\] or multiphoton generation \[43\]. Let us illustrate this effect with two QEs: In that case, the decay rate of a symmetric/antisymmetric combination of excitations is \[\Gamma_e \pm \Gamma_{12}\]. When \[\Gamma_{12} = \pm \Gamma_e\], these states decay at a rate that is either twice the individual one or zero. In this latter case they are called perfect subradiant or dark states.

In standard one-dimensional baths \[\Gamma_{12}(\Delta) = \Gamma_e(\Delta) \cos (k(\Delta)|x_{mn}|)\], so the dark states are such that the wavelength of the photons involved, \(k(\Delta)\), allows for the formation of a standing wave between the QEs when both try to decay, i.e., when \(k(\Delta)|x_{mn}| = n\pi\), with \(n \in \mathbb{Z}\). Thus, the emergence of perfect super/subradiant states solely depends on the QE frequency \(\Delta\), bath energy \(\omega(k)\), and their relative position \(x_{mn}\), which is the common intuition for this phenomenon.

This common wisdom gets modified in the bath considered along this manuscript, where we find situations in which, for the same values of \(x_{mn}\), \(\omega(k)\) and \(\Delta\), the induced dynamics is very different depending on the sign of \(\delta\). In particular, when two QEs couple to the \(A/B\) sublattice respectively, the collective decay reads:

\[
\Gamma^{AB}_{12}(\Delta) = \Gamma_e(\Delta) \cos (k(\Delta)x_{12} - \phi(\Delta)),
\]

(19)

which depends both on the photon wavelength mediating the interaction \(k(\Delta) = \arccos \left[ \frac{\Delta^2 - 2 J^2(1 + \alpha^2)}{2 J^2(1 - \alpha^2)} \right]\), an even function of \(\delta\), and on the phase \(\phi(\delta) \equiv \phi(k(\Delta))\), sensitive to the sign of \(\delta\). This \(\phi\)-dependence enters through the system-bath coupling when rewriting \(H_I\) in Eq. 4 in terms of the eigenoperators \(u_k, l_k\). The intuition behind it is that even though the sign of \(\delta\) does not play a role in the bath properties of an infinite system, when the QEs couple to it, the bath embedded between them is different for \(\delta \gtrless 0\), making the two situations inequivalent.

Using Eq. 19, we find that to obtain a perfect a super/subradiant state it must be satisfied:

\[k(\Delta)x_{12} - \phi(\Delta) = n\pi, n \in \mathbb{N}\]. They come in pairs: If \(\Delta_x\) is a superradiant (subradiant) state in the upper band, \(-\Delta_x\) is a subradiant (superradiant) state in the lower band. In particular, it can be shown that when \(\delta < 0\), the super/subradiant equation has solutions for \(n = 0, \ldots, x_{12}\), while if \(\delta > 0\), the equation has solutions for \(n = 0, \ldots, x_{12} + 1\). Besides, the detunings, \(\Delta_x\), at which the subradiant states appear also satisfy that \(J^{AB}_{12}(\Delta_x) = 0\), which guarantees that these subradiant states survive even in the non-Markovian regime (with a correction due to retardation which is small as long as \(x_{12}\Gamma_e(\Delta)/\{2|\nu_0(\Delta)|\} \ll 1\)). Apart from inducing different decay dynamics, these different conditions for super/subradiance at fixed \(\Delta\) also translate in different reflection/transmission coefficients when probing the system through photon scattering, as we show next.

B. Single-photon scattering

The scattering properties of a single photon impinging into one or several QEs in the ground state can be obtained by solving the secular equation with energies \(H|\Psi_k\rangle = \pm \omega_k|\Psi_k\rangle\), with the \(\pm\) sign depending on the band we are probing \[44\]. Here, we focus on the study of the transmission amplitude \(t\) (see scheme of Fig. 5A) for two different situations: i) a single QE coupled to both cavity A and cavity B in the same unit cell with coupling constants \(g\alpha\) and \(g(1 - \alpha)\), such that we can interpolate between the case where the QE couples only to sublattice A (\(\alpha = 1\)) or B (\(\alpha = 0\)), ii) and a pair of emitters in the \(AB\) configuration separated \(x_{12}\) unit cells. After some algebra, we find the exact formulas for the transmission coefficients for the two situations:

\[
t_{1\text{QE}} = \frac{2iJ(1 - \delta)\sin(k)[J(1 + \delta)(\pm \omega_k - \Delta) - g^2\alpha(1 - \alpha)]}{2iJ^2(1 - \delta^2)(\pm \omega_k - \Delta)\sin(k) + g^2\omega_k[2\alpha(1 - \alpha)(e^{-i\phi} \mp 1) \pm 1]},
\]

(20)

\[
t_{2\text{QE}} = \frac{2J^2(1 - \delta^2)(\pm \omega_k - \Delta)\sin(k)}{g^4\omega_k^2 \mp 2iJ^2(1 - \delta^2)(\pm \omega_k - \Delta)\sin(k)}.
\]

(21)

In Fig. 5B, we plot the single-photon transmission probability \(|t|^2\) as a function of the frequency of the incident photon for the single (left) and two QE (right) situations. Let us now explain the different features observed:

Single QE: We first plot in dashed orange the results for \(\alpha = 0, 1\), showing well known features for this type of systems \[44\], namely, a perfect transmission dip (\(|t|^2 = 0\) when the frequency of the incident photon matches exactly that of the QEs. This is because the Lamb-shift induced by the bath in this situation is \(\delta \omega_k = 0\). The dip has a band-width defined by the individual decay
In the single QE scenario since now the responses are also qualitatively different: While the case $\delta > 0$ features a single transmission dip at the QEs frequency, for $\delta < 0$ the transmission dip is followed by a window of frequencies with perfect photon transmission, i.e., $|t_{2\text{QE}}|^2 = 1$. A convenient picture to understand this behaviour is depicted in Fig. 5A, where we show that a single photon only probes the symmetric/antisymmetric states in the single excitation subspace $(S/A)$ with the following energies (linewidths) renormalized by the bath $\omega_{S,A} = \Delta \pm J_{12}^B$ ($\Gamma_{S,A} = \Gamma_e \pm \Gamma_{12}$). For the parameters chosen (see caption) it can be shown that for $\delta > 0$ the QEs are in a perfect super/subradiant configuration in which one of the states decouples while the other one has a $2\Gamma_e$ decay rate. Thus, at this configuration the two QEs behave like a single two-level system with an increased linewidth. On the other hand, when $\delta < 0$ both the (anti)symmetric states are coupled to the bath, such that the system is analogous to a V-type system where perfect transmission occurs for an incident frequency $\pm \omega_{k,EIT} = (\omega_{S,A} - \omega_{A1})/\Gamma_{A1}$ (depicted in dashed black).

In both the single and two QE situations the different response can be intuitively understood as the QEs couple locally to a different bath for $\delta \gtrless 0$. However, this different response of $|t|^2$ can be thought as an indirect way of probing topology in these systems.

V. IMPLEMENTATIONS

One of the attractive points of our predictions is that they can be potentially observed in several platforms by combining tools which, in most of the cases, have already been experimentally implemented independently. Some candidate platforms are:

- **Photonic crystals.** The photonic analogue of the SSH model has been implemented in several photonic platforms \([6, 10–12]\), including some recent photonic crystal realizations \([7]\). The latter are particularly interesting due to the recent advances in their integration with solid-state and natural atomic emitters (see Refs. \([46, 47]\) and references therein).

- **Circuit QED.** Superconducting metamaterials mimicking standard waveguide QED are now being routinely built and interfaced with one or many qubits in experiments \([38, 39]\). The only missing piece is the periodic modulation of the couplings to obtain the SSH model, for which there are already proposals using circuit superlattices \([50]\).

- **Cold-atoms.** Quantum optical phenomena can be simulated in pure atomic scenarios by using state-dependent optical lattices. The idea is to have two different trapping potentials for two atomic metastable states, such that one state mostly localizes, playing the role of QEs, while the other state
propagates as a matter-wave. This proposal has been recently used to explore the physics of standard waveguide baths. Replacing their potential by an optical superlattice made of two laser fields with different frequencies, one would be able to probe the physics of the topological SSH bath. In fact, these cold-atoms superlattices have already been implemented in an independent experiment to measure the Zak phase of the SSH model.

Beyond these platforms, the bosonic analogue of the SSH model has also been discussed in the context of metamaterials or plasmonic and dielectric nanoparticles, where the predicted phenomena could as well be potentially observed.

VI. CONCLUSIONS & OUTLOOK

Summing up, we have presented several phenomena appearing in a topological waveguide QED system with no analogue in other optical setups. When the quantum emitter frequencies are tuned to the middle band-gap, we predict the appearance of chiral photon bound states which inherit the topological robustness of the bath. Furthermore, we also show how these bound states mediate directional, long-range spin interactions, leading to exotic many-body phases, e.g., double-Neel ordered states, which cannot be obtained to our knowledge with other bound-state mediated interactions. Besides, we study the scattering and super/subradiant behaviour when one or two emitters are resonant with one of the bands, finding that transmission amplitudes can depend on the parameter which controls the topology even though the band energy dispersion is independent of it.

Except for the many-body physics, the rest of the phenomena discussed in this article, that is, the formation of chiral bound states and the peculiar scattering properties, could also be observed in classical setups, since these results are derived within the single-excitation regime. Given the simplicity of the model and the variety of platforms where it can be implemented, we foresee that our predictions can be tested in near-future experiments.

As an outlook, we believe our work opens complementary research directions on topological photonics, which currently focuses more on the design of exotic light properties. For example, the study of the emergent spin models with long-range topological interactions is interesting on its own and might lead to the discovery of novel many-body phases. Moreover, the scattering-dependent phenomena found along the manuscript can provide alternative paths for probing topology in photonic systems. On the fundamental level, the analytical understanding develop for one-dimensional systems provides a solid basis to understand quantum optical effects in higher dimensional topological baths.
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Supplemental Material: Unconventional quantum optics in topological waveguide QED.

In this Supp. Material, we provide more details on:
i) the exact integration of the quantum emitter (QE) dynamics using resolvent operator techniques, in Section S1; ii) the study of asymptotic long-time decay, in Section S2; iii) the exact integration of the two QEs dynamics, in Section S3; iv) the derivation of the exact conditions of existence of two QE bound states, in Section S4; v) the effect of the edge states on the QE dynamics when they are coupled to finite size baths, in Section S5; vi) a review of bipartite one-dimensional baths and the properties of the middle bound-states, in Section S6.

S1. INTEGRATION OF THE DYNAMICS

Since the global Hamiltonian \( H \) conserves the number of excitations, if a QE is initially excited with no photons in the bath, i.e., \(|\psi(0)\rangle = |e\rangle|\text{vac}\rangle\), \(|\text{vac}\rangle\) denotes the vacuum state of the lattice of bosonic modes, the wavefunction at any time has the form:

\[
|\psi(t)\rangle = \left[ C_e(t)\sigma_{eg} + \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{\alpha=a,b} C_{j,\alpha}(t)\gamma_{j}^{\dagger}\alpha J \right]|g\rangle|\text{vac}\rangle. \tag{S1}
\]

The probability amplitude \( C_e(t) \) can be computed as the Fourier transform of the Green function of the emitter \( G_e(z) = [z - \Delta - \Sigma_e(z)]^{-1} \):

\[
C_e(t) = \frac{-1}{2\pi i} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE G_e(E + i0^+)e^{-iE t}, \tag{S2}
\]

To compute the integral in (S2), we use residue integration closing the contour of integration in the lower half of the complex plane. Since the QE Green function has branch cuts in the real axis along the regions where the bands of the bath are defined (the continuous spectrum of \( H \)), it is necessary to detour at the band edges to other Riemann sheets of the function, see Fig. S1. The formula for the self-energies presented in the main text, Eq. (10), corresponds to the Green function in the first Riemann sheet \( G^I_e(z) \). We can analytically continue it to the second Riemann sheet \( G^II_e(z) \) by simply changing \( \sqrt{\cdot} \to -\sqrt{\cdot} \) in the denominator of \( \Sigma_e(z) \).

Since the imaginary part of \( G^I_e(E + i0^+) \) and \( G^II_e(E - i0^+) \) is nonzero in the band regions, we should only take into account the real poles of \( G^I_e \) outside the band regions \( (z_{BS}) \) and the complex poles of \( G^II_e \) with real part inside band regions \( (z_{UP}) \). The residue at both the real and complex poles can be computed as \( R(z_0) = 1 - \Sigma_e'(z_0) \), where \( \Sigma_e'(z) \) denotes the first derivative of the appropriate function \( \Sigma^I_e(z) \) or \( \Sigma^II_e(z) \). Finally, we should subtract the detours taken at the branch cuts. Their contribution can be computed as

\[
C_{BC,j}(t) = \pm \frac{1}{2\pi} \times \\
\int_{0}^{\infty} dy \left[ G^I_e(x_j - iy) - G^II_e(x_j - iy) \right] e^{-i(x_j - iy)t}, \tag{S3}
\]

with \( x_j \in \{ \pm 2J, \pm 2|\delta|J \} \). The sign has to be chosen positive if when going from \( x_j + 0^+ \) to \( x_j - 0^+ \) the integration goes from the first to the second Riemann sheet, and negative if it is the other way around.

Plotting the absolute value of the different contributions at time \( t = 0 \), we can deduce the relevant physics involved in the QE dynamics, see Fig. S2(a). Not surprisingly, when the emitter’s transition frequency lays in the bands of allowed bath modes it will decay emitting a photon into the bath. In Fig. S2(b), we compare the actual decay rate with the prediction given by the Markovian approximation. On the other hand, when it lays outside the bands, a bound state will form in which the emitter is mostly in the excited state and part of the photon remains trapped around it. This is what we observe in Fig. 2 in the main text, where the long-term dynamics is dominated by the bound state at zero energy, whose residue can be computed as \( R_0 = [1 + g^2/(J^24|\delta|)]^{-1} \).
The long-time average of the decaying part of the dy-band edges, \( \Delta \), bound state residues \( |R(z_{BS})| \) (circles), unstable pole residues \( |R(z_{UP})| \) (squares) and branch-cut contributions \( |C_{BC,j}(0)| \) (crosses). The system parameters are \( \delta = 0.5 \) and \( g = 0.4J \). (b) Comparison between the exact decay rate given by the imaginary parts as in (a) and the approximate Markovian decay rate (black lines) for the same parameters as in (a).

**S2. SUB-EXPONENTIAL DECAY**

Defining \( D(t) \equiv C_e(t) - \sum_{z_{BS}} R(z_{BS}) e^{i z_{BS} t} \), at long times we have

\[
\lim_{t \to \infty} D(t) \simeq \sum_j C_{BC,j}(t) = \sum_j K_j(t) e^{-i \pi_j t},
\]

with

\[
K_j(t) = \frac{\pm 1}{2\pi} \int_0^\infty dy \frac{2 \Sigma^e(x_j - iy) e^{-yt}}{(x_j - iy - \Delta)^2 - \Sigma^e(x_j - iy)^2}.
\]

The long-time average of the decaying part of the dynamics can be computed as

\[
[D(t)]^2 \equiv \lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t dt' |D(t')|^2 = \sum_j |K_j(t)|^2.
\]

If the emitter’s transition frequency is close to one of the band edges, \( \Delta \simeq x_0 \), then \( [D(t)]^2 \simeq |K_0(t)|^2 \). In the long-time limit, we can expand the integrand in power series around \( y = 0 \),

\[
K_0(t) = \frac{\pm 1}{2\pi} \int_0^\infty dy \left[ 4 \sqrt{\frac{i(2 - x_0^2 + 2\delta^2)}{x_0}} + O(y) \right] y^{1/2} e^{-yt}
\]

\[
\simeq \frac{\pm 1}{\sqrt{2\pi g^2}} \sqrt{\frac{i(2 - x_0^2 + 2\delta^2)}{x_0}} t^{-3/2} + O(t^{-5/2}).
\]

Therefore, to leading order \( |D(t)|^2 \sim t^{-3} \). In Fig. S3 it is shown an example of this algebraic decay when \( \Delta \) is placed at the lower band edge of the bath’s spectrum.

**S3. TWO QE DYNAMICS IN THE NON-MARKOVIAN REGIME**

The dynamics of two emitters are not much harder to analyze than that of a single emitter. It can be shown that the symmetric and antisymmetric combinations \( \sigma_{\pm}^e = [\sigma_{1g}^e \pm \sigma_{2g}^e]/\sqrt{2} \) couple to orthogonal bath modes \( [62] \). Therefore, the two-emitter problem can be split in two independent single-emitter problems. The Green functions associated to the probability amplitudes to find the 1st or the 2nd emitter in the excited state \( C_{1,2}(t) \) can be obtained form the Green functions associated to the symmetric/antisymmetric combination of excitations as \( G_{1,2}(z) = [G_+(z) \pm G_-(z)]/2 \), with \( G_{\pm}(z) = [z - \Delta - \Sigma_{\pm}(z)]^{-1} \).

Rewriting the interaction Hamiltonian in the bath’s eigenmode basis, substituting \( \sigma_{eg}^m \) in terms of \( \sigma_{1g}^e \), and pairing the terms that go with opposite momentum, we obtain for the case where the two QEs are on the sublattice \( A \)

![Graph showing non-Markovian dynamics](image-url)
Here, \( x_n \) refers to the unit cell where the \( n \)’th QE is located, and \( x_{12} = x_2 - x_1 \) is the signed distance between the two QEs. For the case where the two QEs are on a different sublattice

\[
H_I^{AB} = \frac{g}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k>0} \sum_{\beta=\pm} \sqrt{1 + \beta \cos(kx_{12})} \left(\hat{u}_{k,\beta} + \hat{l}_{k,\beta}\right)\sigma_\beta^1 + \text{H.c.}, \quad (S8)
\]

\[
\hat{u}_{k,\pm} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{1 \pm \cos(kx_{12})}} \left[ \left( e^{i(kx_1+\phi)} \pm e^{i(kx_1-\phi)} \right) u_k + \left( e^{-i(kx_1+\phi)} \pm e^{-i(kx_1-\phi)} \right) u_{-k} \right], \quad (S9)
\]

\[
\hat{l}_{k,\pm} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{1 \pm \cos(kx_{12})}} \left[ \left( e^{i(kx_1+\phi)} \pm e^{i(kx_1-\phi)} \right) l_k + \left( e^{-i(kx_1+\phi)} \pm e^{-i(kx_1-\phi)} \right) l_{-k} \right], \quad (S10)
\]

These states are exponentially localized at the edges of the symmetric subspace we have that the lower bound state \( (E_{\mathrm{BS}} < -2J) \) always exists, while the upper bound state \( (E_{\mathrm{BS}} > 2J) \) exists only for \( \Delta > \Delta^\text{out}_c \)

\[
\Delta^\text{out}_c = 2J - \frac{g^2(2x_{12} + 1 - \delta)}{2J(1 - \delta^2)}. \quad (S18)
\]

For the middle bound state there are two possibilities: either the divergence vanishes at \(-2|\delta|J\), in which case the bound state will exist for \( \Delta > \Delta^\text{mid}_c \), or the divergence vanishes at \(2|\delta|J\), then the middle bound state exists for \( \Delta < \Delta^\text{mid}_c \). In both cases \( \Delta^\text{mid}_c \) takes the same form

\[
\Delta^\text{mid}_c = (-1)^{x_{12}} \left\{ 2\delta J + \frac{g^2(2x_{12} + 1 - \delta)}{2J(1 - \delta^2)} \right\}. \quad (S19)
\]

The situation in the antisymmetric subspace can be readily understood realizing that \( \text{Re}\Sigma^AB \sim (-z) \), which implies that if \( z = E_{\mathrm{BS}} \) is a solution of the pole equation for \( \Sigma^AB \) with a particular value of \( \Delta \), then \( z = -E_{\mathrm{BS}} \) is a solution of the pole equation for \( \Sigma^\alpha\beta \) with the opposite value of the emitter transition frequency. Fig. S4 summarizes at a glance the different possibilities and the dependence on the bath’s topology.

\[\text{S4. EXISTENCE CONDITIONS OF TWO QE BOUND STATES}\]

We can integrate the dynamics in the same way as we did for the single QE case, but there are some subtleties particular to the two QE case. First, the cancellation of divergences of \( \Sigma_e \) and \( \Sigma^\alpha\beta \) at some of the band edges results in critical transition frequencies above (or below)

\[\text{which some bound states cease to exist. For example, in the symmetric subspace we have that the lower bound state \( (E_{\mathrm{BS}} < -2J) \) always exists, while the upper bound state \( (E_{\mathrm{BS}} > 2J) \) exists only for \( \Delta > \Delta^\text{out}_c \), \[\Delta^\text{out}_c = 2J - \frac{g^2(2x_{12} + 1 - \delta)}{2J(1 - \delta^2)}. \]\]}

For the middle bound state there are two possibilities: either the divergence vanishes at \(-2|\delta|J\), in which case the bound state will exist for \( \Delta > \Delta^\text{mid}_c \), or the divergence vanishes at \(2|\delta|J\), then the middle bound state exists for \( \Delta < \Delta^\text{mid}_c \). In both cases \( \Delta^\text{mid}_c \) takes the same form

\[\Delta^\text{mid}_c = (-1)^{x_{12}} \left\{ 2\delta J + \frac{g^2(2x_{12} + 1 - \delta)}{2J(1 - \delta^2)} \right\}. \]\]

The situation in the antisymmetric subspace can be readily understood realizing that \( \text{Re}\Sigma^AB \sim (-z) \), which implies that if \( z = E_{\mathrm{BS}} \) is a solution of the pole equation for \( \Sigma^AB \) with a particular value of \( \Delta \), then \( z = -E_{\mathrm{BS}} \) is a solution of the pole equation for \( \Sigma^\alpha\beta \) with the opposite value of the emitter transition frequency. Fig. S4 summarizes at a glance the different possibilities and the dependence on the bath’s topology.

\[\text{S5. FINITE-BATH DYNAMICS}\]

It is well known that a finite bath with open boundary conditions in the topologically non-trivial phase \( \delta < 0 \) supports a pair of edge states \( |\Sigma^\pm\rangle \), with opposite energies \( H_B|\Sigma^\pm\rangle = \pm \epsilon |\Sigma^\pm\rangle \), given by \( \epsilon \sim J(1 - \delta)e^{-N/\lambda} \). These states are exponentially localized at the edges of the bath with the same localization length \( \lambda \) as the BSs at
zero energy mentioned in the main text. So far, our calculations have been done in baths large enough such that the contributions of the topological edge-states could be neglected. In this section, we consider the effect they can have in systems with moderate sizes.

In Fig. S5(a–c) we compare the dynamics of an initially excited QE coupled to a finite bath \((N = 40)\) in the topologically non-trivial and trivial phases with the same \(|\delta| = 0.3\). The induced dynamics is very different: while most of the QE excitation remains localized around the QE for a topologically trivial bath, in the non-trivial case the QE exchanges non-locally the excitation with one of the edges of the bath. This emergent dynamics can be captured by a simple effective Hamiltonian considering only the excited state of the QE and the two edge states (with the QE in the ground state):

\[
H_{\text{eff}} = \begin{pmatrix}
\Delta & \tilde{g}_+ & \tilde{g}_- \\
\tilde{g}_+ & \epsilon & 0 \\
\tilde{g}_- & 0 & -\epsilon 
\end{pmatrix}, \tag{S20}
\]

written here in the basis \(\{|e\rangle|\text{vac}\}, \{|g\rangle|\text{ES}_+\}, \{|g\rangle|\text{ES}_-\}\)\). The coupling constants are \(\tilde{g}_\pm = g\langle \text{ES}_\pm | c_{J1}^\dagger | \text{vac}\rangle (c_{J1}^\dagger \) is equal to \(a_{J1}^\dagger\) or \(b_{J1}^\dagger\) depending on the sublattice to which the emitter is coupled) and satisfy \(|\tilde{g}_-| = |\tilde{g}_+| = \tilde{g}\). Exactly when \(\Delta = 0\), the QE couples more strongly to the edge states. In that case, the excited-state probability amplitude can be computed as

\[
C_e(t) \approx \frac{\epsilon^2 + 2\tilde{g}^2 \cos(\omega_0 t)}{\epsilon^2 + 2\tilde{g}^2}, \tag{S21}
\]

with \(\omega_0 = \sqrt{\epsilon^2 - 2\tilde{g}^2}\). Note that a (anti)symmetric superposition of the edge states corresponds to an exponentially localized state in one of the ends of the chain. Due to this, the photon oscillates between the QE and the edge whose ending mode is in the sublattice to which the QE is coupled [see Fig. S5(a)]. The oscillation frequency given by the effective model overestimates the actual frequency, which can be calculated exactly using the resolvent operator formalism. We do so by extending the bath, adding the two edge states, which are orthogonal to all other bath modes. The emitter Green function becomes now

\[
G_e = \frac{z^2 - \epsilon^2}{(z - \Delta - \Sigma_0)(z^2 - \epsilon^2) - 2\tilde{g}^2 \epsilon^2}. \tag{S22}
\]

The long-term dynamics is given just by the real poles of this modified Green function. In particular, for \(\Delta = 0\) the denominator is an odd function with three real roots around the middle of the band gap: \(z = 0\) and \(z = \pm \tilde{\omega}_0\). It can be shown that the largest contribution to the dynamics comes from these real poles, such that \(C_e(t) \approx R_0 + 2R_\pm \cos(\tilde{\omega}_0 t)\), where \(R_0\) denotes the residue at the pole \(z = 0\), and \(R_\pm = R_{\mp}\) is the residue at the poles \(z = \pm \tilde{\omega}_0\).

In Fig. S5(d, e), we show the QE population dynamics when two QEs are coupled to the \(AB\) lattices symmetrically with respect to the middle of the chain, and for two different situations, i.e., with fixed \(|\delta| = 0.3\) but different sign. As in the individual behaviour, the collective dynamics is very different depending on the topological nature of the bath. In the topologically trivial bath, the BS mediates perfect coherent transfer of excitations between the two QEs [see Fig. S5(d)]. In the topologically non-trivial bath, however, the edge states become largely populated since they are quasi-resonant with the QE oscillation, leading to additional oscillatory behaviour. Interestingly, perfect coherent transfer is still possible at certain times [see Fig. S5(e)], even though the induced dipolar coupling is zero. This dynamics can again be captured by a simple effective Hamiltonian, which written in the basis \(\{|e_1\rangle|\text{vac}\}, \{|g_1\rangle|\text{vac}\}, \{|g_2\rangle|\text{ES}_+\}, \{|g_2\rangle|\text{ES}_-\}\) reads

\[
H_{\text{eff}} = \begin{pmatrix}
\Delta & J_{12}^{AB} & \tilde{g} & \tilde{g} \\
J_{12}^{AB} & \Delta & \tilde{g} & -\tilde{g} \\
\tilde{g} & \tilde{g} & \epsilon & 0 \\
\tilde{g} & -\tilde{g} & 0 & -\epsilon
\end{pmatrix}, \tag{S23}
\]

using the definitions of the edge-states and the coupling constants \(\tilde{g}_\pm\) for each QE that we use in the single QE dynamics. Solving this Hamiltonian with \(\Delta = 0\), and assuming \(\epsilon \ll \tilde{g}\), the excited state occupation probability of the 1st (2nd) emitter can be well approximated by:

\[
C_1(t) \approx \cos(\epsilon t/2) \cos(\sqrt{2}\tilde{g} t), \tag{S24}
\]

\[
C_2(t) \approx \sin(\epsilon t/2) \cos(\sqrt{2}\tilde{g} t). \tag{S25}
\]

which captures qualitatively the double oscillatory behaviour of Fig. S5(e). In order to quantitatively capture
FIG. S5. Finite-size effects. (Left panel) Bath dynamics in the topological, $\delta = -0.3$, (a) and trivial, $\delta = 0.3$ (b) regimes, for a lattice with $N = 40$ unit cells and open boundary conditions. A single QE with $\Delta = 0$ is coupled with strength $g = 0.2J$ to the middle of the bath. The color shows the probability to find the photon in each site of the lattice. Brighter colors correspond to a higher probability. We have used a different logarithmic scale in each case for clarity. Below (c), it is shown the probability to find the emitter in the excited state for both the topological (blue) and trivial (red) cases. The dashed black line is a cosine function with frequency $2 \tilde{\omega}_0$, as obtained by a more precise treatment using Green functions. (Right panel) Dynamics for two QEs coupled to the A/B lattices respectively, placed symmetrically around the middle of the bath ($\Delta = 0$) with parameters $N = 10$, $g = 0.1J$, $x_{12} = 3$, and $\delta = 0.3$ (d), $\delta = -0.3$ (e). The dashed black line is a cosine with a frequency obtained from the exact treatment with Green functions.

the frequencies of the transfer exactly, one can use resolvent operator techniques, which yields the dashed black line of Fig. S5(e). In this case, the extended Green functions are given by

$$G_{\pm} = \frac{z \pm \epsilon}{(z - \Delta - \Sigma_{\alpha\beta})(z \pm \epsilon) - 2g^2}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (S26)

For $\Delta = 0$, the real poles of $G_+$ around the middle of the band gap, $z_{\pm}$, are the same as those of $G_-$ with opposite sign. The residues are the same in both cases, therefore $C_{\pm}(t) \simeq R_+ e^{\mp i\omega_{\pm} t} + R_- e^{\pm i\omega_{\pm} t}$. Since $C_{1,2}(t) = |C_+(t) \pm C_-(t)|/2$, the relevant frequencies are $\omega_{\pm} = |z_+| \pm |z_-|$. It should be noted, however, that for really small systems or situations in which the emitters are placed close to the edges, the results given by these modified Green functions will not be accurate, as they use the thermodynamic self-energies $\Sigma_{\alpha\beta}^{\pm}$, which are obtained for infinite systems.

S6. MIDDLE BOUND STATES IN ONE-DIMENSIONAL BATHS

The central part of the manuscript analyzes the properties and consequences of a peculiar bound state which appears in the middle band-gap when an emitter with energy $\Delta$ couples to the bath. In particular, this bound state has the following properties: A) it is chiral, in the sense that it localizes preferentially in one side of the emitter; B) when $\Delta = 0$, the bound state has its energy in the middle of the gap, $E_{BS} = 0$, being fully directional and with no amplitude in the sublattice to which the QE couples; C) it inherits the topological robustness to disorder from the bath.

To make evident that the photonic SSH model is the simplest one-dimensional model where all these properties are satisfied, and connect it with the topological features of the bath, let us consider a general bipartite bath Hamiltonian defined by:

$$\tilde{H}_B(k) = \begin{pmatrix} G_A(k) & F(k) \\ F^*(k) & G_B(k) \end{pmatrix}. \hspace{1cm} (S27)$$

Depending on the functions $G_{A/B}(k), F(k)$, this Hamiltonian covers a plethora of relevant one-dimensional models with a middle band-gap where an extra bound-state appears. In Table S6 we review the topological properties of several of these models, and whether middle bound states show the features A–C discussed above:

1. When $G_{A/B}(k) = \omega_{\pm} + 2\delta\omega$, $F(k) = -J$, we have the simple coupled-cavity array model with staggered
energies. The staggered energies break the symmetry between the $A/B$ sublattices, opening a middle band-gap. In this case, an extra bound-state can be found in the middle of the bands but with none of the features A–C.

2. Setting
\[ G_{A/B}(k) = \omega_a, \]
\[ F(k) = -J[(1 + \delta) + (1 - \delta)e^{-ik}], \]
we recover the SSH model whose topological and bound state properties were already discussed in the main text.

3. One can combine the SSH model with staggered energies, i.e.,
\[ G_{A/B}(k) = \omega_a \pm \delta \omega, \]
\[ F(k) = -J[(1 + \delta) + (1 - \delta)e^{-ik}], \]
which still shows a middle band-gap but chiral symmetry is broken. The staggered energies allow one to go from one band-configuration to the other without closing the gap, such that the Zak phase is not quantized anymore. The middle bound states can be chiral, but they do not get the robustness to disorder since the model is topologically trivial.

4. Finally, we consider the SSH model adding next-nearest neighbour hoppings, i.e.,
\[ G_{A/B}(k) = \omega_a - 2J_z \cos(2k), \]
\[ F(k) = -J \left[(1 + \delta) + (1 - \delta)e^{-ik}\right]. \]
This model does not preserve chiral symmetry, but it does preserve spatial inversion symmetry. The later still leads to a quantized Zak phase, but bulk-boundary correspondence is not guaranteed any more (the number of edge states is not linked to the topological invariant) \cite{31}. Even though the bound states are chiral, they are not fully directional, and they are only robust to disorder of very restricted type (one which respects spatial inversion symmetry).

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Model & Quantized Zak Phase & Bulk-Boundary Correspondence & A & B & C \\
\hline
Coupled cavity array with staggered energies & No & Not applicable & No & No & No \\
\hline
SSH & Yes & Yes & Yes & Yes & Yes \\
\hline
SSH with staggered energies & No & Not applicable & Yes & Yes & No \\
\hline
SSH with next-nearest neighbours & Yes & No & Yes & No & Yes* \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Topological properties of several one-dimensional baths, and their corresponding bound state features A–C (see text for discussion) when an emitter couples to them.}
\end{table}
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