We present the point-coupling Hamiltonian as a model for broadband linear optical devices acting on propagating optical modes described as a continua of harmonic oscillators. We formally integrate the Heisenberg equations of motion for this Hamiltonian, calculate its quantum scattering matrix, and show that an application of the quantum scattering matrix on an input state is equivalent to applying the inverse of classical scattering matrix on the annihilation operators describing the optical modes. We show how to construct the point-coupling Hamiltonian corresponding to a general linear optical device described by a classical scattering matrix, and provide examples of Hamiltonians for some commonly used linear optical devices. Finally, in order to demonstrate the practical utility of the point-coupling Hamiltonian, we use it to rigorously formulate a matrix-product-state based simulation for time-delayed feedback systems wherein the feedback is provided by a linear optical device described by a scattering matrix as opposed to a hard boundary condition (e.g. a mirror with less than unity reflectivity).

I. INTRODUCTION

Linear-optical elements are key components in any quantum information processing system [1–3]. They can be used for applying phase shifts, interfering, and splitting quantum light propagating in waveguide modes or collimated optical beams. Consequently, they are traditionally described by scattering matrices [4, 5]. The response of the linear optical element to an incoming state is often calculated by applying the inverse of the classical scattering matrix on the annihilation operators [6, 7]. The dynamics of linear-optical elements has also been captured within the framework of quantum stochastic differential equations [8–10]. However, little effort is made to explicitly define a Hamiltonian that captures the linear-optical element [11–13].

In this paper, we propose a Hamiltonian that can model an arbitrary broadband (frequency-independent) linear optical device acting on propagating optical modes. The Hamiltonian assumes that the optical modes couple to each other at a single-point in space — we therefore call it the point-coupling Hamiltonian. For a given frequency-independent classical scattering matrix implemented by the linear optical device, we provide a recipe to construct a point-coupling Hamiltonian describing the device. We formally integrate the Heisenberg equations of motion for the point-coupling Hamiltonian, and use the resulting solution to calculate its quantum scattering matrix [14–16]. It is shown that an application of the quantum scattering matrix on an incoming quantum state is equivalent to applying the inverse of the classical scattering matrix on the annihilation operators of the optical modes in the incoming quantum state, thereby reproducing the commonly used procedure for analyzing the quantum physics of linear-optical devices.

Finally, in order to demonstrate the utility of the point-coupling Hamiltonian proposed in this paper, we use it to rigorously derive and implement a matrix-product-state (MPS) [17, 18] based update to simulate time-delayed feedback systems with linear optical devices providing feedback [19–22]. Time-delayed feedback systems typically have a low-dimensional quantum system, such as a two-level system, coupling to a well-defined optical mode and the emission from the quantum system is used to re-excite the quantum system via a feedback path. The feedback path can be constructed using a linear-optical device such as a mirror, or using another quantum system. MPS based simulations of such systems were proposed in Ref. [19], although the formulation relied on hard boundary conditions e.g. it assumed that the feedback to the quantum system was provided by an ideal mirror. Using the point-coupling Hamiltonian, we extend the MPS based simulation of this system to account for the situation wherein the mirror is described by a scattering matrix, and thus enable an analysis of the impact of non-ideality in the mirror on the dynamics of the feedback-system. We expect that the point-coupling Hamiltonian proposed in this paper will be of utility in analyzing quantum systems with complicated linear optical devices that can only be described by a full scattering matrix, and cannot be well-approximated by hard boundary conditions.

This paper is organized as follows — Section [1] introduces the point-coupling Hamiltonian and analyzes it in the Heisenberg picture. Using the solution of the Heisenberg equations of motion, we explicitly calculate the quantum scattering matrix for the linear-optical device. It is shown that an application of the quantum scattering matrix on an incoming state is equivalent to applying the inverse of the classical scattering matrix on the annihilation operators in the state. We also provide the point-coupling Hamiltonians corresponding to some commonly used linear optical devices...
devices such as phase shifters, beam splitters and optical circulators. Section III uses the proposed point-coupling Hamiltonian to analyze feedback into a two-level system from a partially transmitting mirror using MPS update.

II. POINT-COUPLING HAMILTONIAN

A. Dynamics in the Heisenberg picture

Consider $N$ propagating optical modes (which can physically be waveguide modes, or collimated optical beams) interacting with each other through a linear-optical device (Fig. 1). Labelling by $s_k(\omega)$ the annihilation operator of the $k^{th}$ optical mode at frequency $\omega$, we propose the following Hamiltonian for describing the dynamics of the system:

$$H = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \omega s_k^\dagger(\omega)s_k(\omega) d\omega + \sum_{k=1}^{N} \sum_{m=1}^{N} V_{k,m} s_k^\dagger(x_k^0)s_m(x_m^0)$$

(1)

where $s_k(x_k)$ is the position-domain annihilation operator for the $k^{th}$ optical mode:

$$s_k(x_k) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} s_k(\omega) e^{i\omega x_k} \frac{d\omega}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$$

(2)

where we have assumed the group velocity corresponding to the optical modes to be 1 and $x_k^0$ is the coordinate of the linear optical device in the coordinate system of the $k^{th}$ optical mode. Note that it is not necessary for the coordinate $x_k$ for different optical modes to be expressed in the same coordinate system — each optical mode can have its own coordinate system (e.g. the $x$ axis for a forward propagating mode will be in a direction opposite to the $x$ axis for a backward propagating mode). We note that $s_k(\omega)$, and consequently $s_k(x_k)$, satisfy the usual bosonic commutation relations:

$$[s_k(\omega), s_m^\dagger(\omega')] = \delta_{k,m} \delta(\omega - \omega'), [s_k(\omega), s_m(\omega')] = 0, [s_k(x_k), s_m^\dagger(x_m')] = \delta_{k,m} \delta(x_k - x_m')$$

It can also be noted from these commutation relations and Eq. 2 that $[s_k(\omega), s_m(x_m)] = \delta_{k,m} \exp(-i\omega x_m)/\sqrt{2\pi}$. Moreover, for $H$ to be Hermitian, the coupling coefficients $V_{k,m}$ satisfy $V_{k,m} = V_{m,k}^*$. We first analyze the time-evolution of this system in the Heisenberg picture. The Heisenberg equations of motion for this system are given by:

$$i\frac{ds_k(\omega; t)}{dt} = \omega s_k(\omega; t) + \sum_{m=1}^{N} \frac{V_{k,m}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} s_m(x_m^0; t)$$

(3)

FIG. 1. Schematic of a linear optical device acting on $N$ optical modes. The frequency-domain and position-domain annihilation operator for the $k^{th}$ optical mode are denoted by $s_k(\omega)$ and $s_k(x_k)$ respectively where $x_k$ is the position of the point under consideration in the coordinate system attached to the $k^{th}$ optical mode (note that we each optical mode to, in general, have its own independent coordinate system with the linear optical device being at $x_k = x_k^0$ in the coordinate system of the $k^{th}$ optical mode.).
This equation can be easily integrated from $t_0$ to $t_0 + \tau$ (where $\tau > 0$) to obtain:

$$s_k(\omega; t_0 + \tau) = s_k(\omega; t_0) \exp(-i\omega\tau) - i \sum_{m=1}^{N} V_{k,m} e^{-i\omega x_0^m} \int_{t_0}^{t_0 + \tau} s_m(x_m^0; t') e^{-i\omega(t_0 + \tau - t')} \frac{dt'}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \quad (4)$$

Therefore, it follows from Eq. 2 that $s_k(x; t_0 + \tau)$ is given by:

$$s_k(x_k; t_0 + \tau) = s_k(x_k - \tau; t_0) - i \sum_{m=1}^{N} V_{k,m} \int_{t_0}^{t_0 + \tau} s_m(x_m^0; t') \delta(x_k - x_k^0 - t_0 - \tau + t') dt'$$

$$= s_k(x_k - \tau; t_0) - i \left[ \sum_{m=1}^{N} V_{k,m} s_m(x_m^0; t_0 + \tau - (x_k - x_k^0)) \right] \Theta(x_k^0 \leq x_k \leq x_k^0 + \tau) \quad (5)$$

where the function $\Theta(x_1 \leq x \leq x_2)$ is defined by:

$$\Theta(x_1 \leq x \leq x_2) = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } x \in (x_1, x_2) \\
0 & \text{if } x \in (-\infty, x_1) \cup (x_2, \infty) \\
\frac{1}{2} & \text{if } x \in \{x_1, x_2\} 
\end{cases} \quad (6)$$

To intuitively interpret the result in Eq. 5, note that if $x_k < x_k^0$, then optical mode annihilation operator at $t = t_0 + \tau$ is simply a propagated version of itself at $t = t_0$. This situation is the same for $x_k > x_k^0 + \tau$ since the optical mode has not had sufficient time to propagate to $x_k$ from the location of the linear optical device (i.e. from $x_k = x_k^0$). For $x_k^0 < x_k < x_k^0 + \tau$, the optical mode annihilation operator at $t = t_0 + \tau$ is a sum of a propagated version of itself, as well as contributions from other optical modes as scattered by the linear optical device. Imposing Eq. 5 at $x_k = x_k^0 \forall k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$, we obtain:

$$s_k(x_k^0; t_0 + \tau) = s_k(x_k^0 - \tau; t_0) - i \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{N} V_{k,m} s_m(x_m^0; t_0 + \tau) \forall k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\} \quad (7)$$

from which we can obtain $s_k(x_k^0; t)$ in terms of operators at $t = t_0$:

$$\begin{bmatrix} s_1(x_k^0; t_0 + \tau) \\
\vdots \\
s_N(x_N^0; t_0 + \tau) 
\end{bmatrix} = \left( I + \frac{i\mathbf{V}}{2} \right)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} s_1(x_1^0 - \tau; t_0) \\
\vdots \\
s_N(x_N^0 - \tau; t_0) 
\end{bmatrix} \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbf{V} = [V_{m,n}]$ and $I$ is the identity matrix. Finally, using Eq. 5, we obtain the optical mode annihilation operators at time $t = t_0 + \tau$ and at a distance $y$ away from the linear optical device in terms of the optical mode annihilation operators at the initial time instant $t = t_0$:

$$\begin{bmatrix} s_1(x_1^0 + y; t_0 + \tau) \\
\vdots \\
s_N(x_N^0 + y; t_0 + \tau) 
\end{bmatrix} = \left[ I - i\mathbf{V} \left( I + \frac{i\mathbf{V}}{2} \right)^{-1} \Theta(0 \leq y \leq \tau) \right] \begin{bmatrix} s_1(x_1^0 + y - \tau; t_0) \\
\vdots \\
s_N(x_N^0 + y - \tau; t_0) 
\end{bmatrix} \quad (9)$$

In particular, note that for spatial points on the optical modes that lie within a distance of the linear optical device that light can propagate to in time $\tau$, Eq. 9 simplifies to:

$$\begin{bmatrix} s_1(x_1^0 + y; t_0 + \tau) \\
\vdots \\
s_N(x_N^0 + y; t_0 + \tau) 
\end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{S} \begin{bmatrix} s_1(x_1^0 + y - \tau; t_0) \\
\vdots \\
s_N(x_N^0 + y - \tau; t_0) 
\end{bmatrix} \quad (10)$$
where

\[ S = I - iV \left( I + \frac{iV}{2} \right)^{-1} \]  

(11)

It can readily be verified that a consequence of \( V \) being Hermitian is that the matrix \( S \) is unitary. Since \( S \) relates the optical mode annihilation operators before and after scattering from the linear optical-device has occurred, it can be interpreted as the classical scattering matrix corresponding to the linear optical-device. Moreover, if \( S \) has the diagonalization \( S = U \text{ diag}[e^{i\phi}] U^\dagger \), it follows from Eq. (11) that:

\[ V = -U \text{ diag} \left[ 2 \tan \left( \frac{\phi}{2} \right) \right] U^\dagger \]  

(12)

Therefore, given the classical matrix \( S \) of a linear-optical device, Eq. (12) allows us to construct the matrix \( V \) and by extension the point-coupling Hamiltonian that can model the device. As examples, we consider some commonly used linear optical devices (Fig. 2) and construct the point-coupling Hamiltonians that describe their dynamics:

(a) **Phase shifter**: The classical scattering matrix \( S \) of the phase-shifter [Fig. 2(a)] is a single-element matrix: \( S = [e^{i\varphi}] \). From Eq. (12) we obtain \( V = [-2\tan(\varphi/2)] \). The Hamiltonian for the phase shifter can thus be written as:

\[ H_{\text{phase-shifter}} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \omega s^\dagger(\omega) s(\omega) d\omega - 2\tan(\varphi/2) s^\dagger(x = 0) s(x = 0) \]  

(13)

where \( s(\omega) [s(x)] \) is the frequency-domain (position-domain) annihilation operator for the optical mode that the phase-shifter is acting on.

(b) **Beam-splitter**: The beam-splitter [Fig. 2(b)] is described by the following classical scattering matrix:

\[ S = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta & \sin \theta e^{i\varphi} \\ -\sin \theta e^{-i\varphi} & \cos \theta \end{bmatrix} \]  

(14)

Again, using Eq. (12) we obtain

\[ V = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2i \tan(\theta/2) e^{i\varphi} \\ -2i \tan(\theta/2) e^{-i\varphi} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \]  

(15)

FIG. 2. Schematic figures showing the action of (a) phase-shifter with imparted phase \( \varphi \) acting on a optical mode denoted by \( s \), (b) beam-splitter with parameters \( (\theta, \varphi) \) acting on optical modes denoted by \( s_1 \) and \( s_2 \) and (c) an optical circulator designed acting on optical modes \( s_1, s_2 \) and \( s_3 \). The relationship between the input and output signals of the linear-optical device are also shown in the diagrams.
from which we can construct the beam splitter Hamiltonian:

$$H_{\text{beam-splitter}} = \sum_{k=\{1,2\}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \omega s_k^\dagger(\omega) s_k(\omega) d\omega + 2i \tan \left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \left[ e^{i\varphi} s_1^\dagger(x_1 = 0) s_2(x_2 = 0) - e^{-i\varphi} s_2^\dagger(x_2 = 0) s_1(x_1 = 0) \right]$$

where $s_{1,2}(\omega) \ [s_{1,2}(x_{1,2})]$ are the frequency-domain (position-domain) annihilation operators for the optical modes that the beam-splitter is acting on.

(c) Optical circulator: The optical circulator [Fig. 2(c)] routes an excitation in optical mode 1 to optical mode 2, optical mode 2 to optical mode 3 and optical mode 3 to optical mode 1. It can thus be described by the following $3 \times 3$ classical scattering matrix:

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

and therefore

$$V = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2i & -2i \\ -2i & 0 & 2i \\ 2i & -2i & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

from which we can construct the optical circulator Hamiltonian:

$$H_{\text{circulator}} = \sum_{k=\{1,2,3\}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \omega s_k^\dagger(\omega) s_k(\omega) d\omega + \sum_{k=\{1,2,3\}} 2i \left[ s_k^\dagger(x_k = 0) s_{k+1}(x_{k+1} = 0) - s_{k+1}^\dagger(x_{k+1} = 0) s_k(x_k = 0) \right]$$

where $s_{1,2,3}(\omega) \ [s_{1,2,3}(x_{1,2,3})]$ are the frequency-domain (position-domain) annihilation operators for the optical modes that the optical circulator acts on, and $s_4(\omega)/s_4(x_4)$ is to be interpreted as $s_1(\omega)/s_1(x_1)$.

B. Quantum scattering matrix of the point-coupling Hamiltonian

While the previous subsection analyzed the point-coupling Hamiltonian in the Heisenberg picture, in this subsection we analyze its dynamics in the Schrödinger picture. In particular, we consider the problem of exciting the broadband linear-optical device with an input state, and attempt to calculate the output state produced by the device.

The key object relating the input state (assumed to be the asymptote $\mathcal{A}$ to the system at $t \to -\infty$) of the system to its output state (assumed to be the asymptote $\mathcal{A}$ to the state of the system at $t \to \infty$) is the quantum scattering matrix $S$:

$$S = \lim_{t_+ \to \infty} e^{iH_0 t_+} e^{-iH(t_+ - t_-)} e^{-iH_0 t_-}$$

where $H_0$ is the Hamiltonian of the optical modes without accounting for the linear-optical device:

$$H_0 = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \omega s_k^\dagger(\omega) s_k(\omega) d\omega$$

Consider now the computation of the following $K$ photon matrix element of the scattering matrix ($x \equiv \{x_1, x_2, \ldots x_K\}$, $x' \equiv \{x'_1, x'_2, \ldots x'_K\}$, $\mu = \{\mu_1, \mu_2, \ldots, \mu_K\}$ and $\mu' = \{\mu'_1, \mu'_2, \ldots, \mu'_K\}$):

$$S(x, \mu; x', \mu') = \langle \text{vac} | \prod_{i=1}^{K} s_{\mu_i}(x_i) \rangle \prod_{i=1}^{K} s_{\mu'_i}(x'_i) \rangle \text{vac}$$

$$S(x, \mu; x', \mu') = \langle \text{vac} | \prod_{i=1}^{K} s_{\mu_i}(x_i) \rangle \prod_{i=1}^{K} s_{\mu'_i}(x'_i) \rangle \text{vac}$$
Note that the relations \( \exp(-iH_0t)s_k(x) \exp(iH_0t) = s_k(x + t) \) and \( \exp(iHt)s_k(x) \exp(-iHt) = s_k(x; t) \) together with \( H_0 |\text{vac}\rangle = H |\text{vac}\rangle = 0 \) immediately imply the following relationship between the scattering matrix element in Eq. 22 and the Heisenberg picture optical mode position-domain annihilation operators:

\[
S(x, \mu; x', \mu') = \lim_{t_+ \to \infty, t_- \to -\infty} \langle \text{vac} | \prod_{i=1}^{K} s_{\mu_i}(x_i + t_+; t_+) \prod_{i=1}^{K} s_{\mu'_i}^\dagger(x'_i + t_-; t_-) |\text{vac}\rangle
\]  

(23)

Using Eq. 9 and in the limit of \( t_+ \to \infty \) and \( t_- \to -\infty \), it follows that:

\[
s_{\mu_i}(x_i + t_+; t_+) = \sum_{\nu_i=1}^{N} S_{\mu_i, \nu_i} s_{\nu_i}(x_i - x_{\mu_i}^0 + x_{\nu_i}^0 + t_-; t_-)
\]  

(24)

where \( S = [S_{i,j}] \). With this, the following explicit expression for \( S(x, \mu; x', \mu') \) as given by Eq. 23 can be obtained:

\[
S(x, \mu; x', \mu') = \sum_{\mathcal{P}_K} \prod_{l=1}^{K} S_{\mu_l, \mathcal{P}_K \mu'_l} \delta((x_l - x_{\mu_l}^0) - (\mathcal{P}_K x'_l - x_{\mathcal{P}_K \mu'_l}^0))
\]  

(25)

where \( \mathcal{P}_K \) is a \( K \)-element permutation. It can immediately be noticed that the quantum scattering matrix elements are completely determined in terms of the classical scattering matrix elements \( S_{i,j} \). From Eq. 25, we can also evaluate the frequency domain scattering matrix elements \( S(\omega, \mu; \omega', \mu') \) \( (\omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \ldots, \omega_K\}, \omega' = \{\omega'_1, \omega'_2, \ldots, \omega'_K\}, \mu = \{\mu_1, \mu_2, \ldots, \mu_K\} \) and \( \mu' = \{\mu'_1, \mu'_2, \ldots, \mu'_K\} \):

\[
S(\omega, \mu; \omega', \mu') = \int_{R^K} \int_{R^K} S(x, \mu; x', \mu') \prod_{l=1}^{K} \frac{e^{i(\omega_l x'_l - \omega_l x_l)}}{2\pi} d^K x d^K x'
\]  

(26)

From Eq. 25 it is easy to see that:

\[
S(\omega, \mu; \omega', \mu') = \sum_{\mathcal{P}_K} \prod_{l=1}^{K} S_{\mu_l, \mathcal{P}_K \mu'_l} e^{-i\omega_l (x_{\mu_l}^0 - x_{\mathcal{P}_K \mu'_l}^0)} \delta(\omega_l - \mathcal{P}_K \omega'_l)
\]  

\[
= \sum_{\mathcal{P}_K} \prod_{l=1}^{K} S_{\mathcal{P}_K \mu_l, \mu'_l} e^{-i\omega_l (x_{\mathcal{P}_K \mu_l}^0 - x_{\mu'_l}^0)} \delta(\mathcal{P}_K \omega_l - \omega'_l)
\]  

(27)

Consequently, the frequency domain quantum scattering matrix is completely determined if the classical scattering matrix elements \( S_{i,j} \) are known. Additionally, note that the frequency domain scattering matrix doesn’t have any connected parts i.e. scattering of a \( K \)-photon wave-packet from the linear optical device conserves the individual input frequencies. This is a direct consequence of the ‘linearity’ of the optical device. To gain more insight into the form of the scattering matrix in Eqs. 25 and 27 consider the calculation of the output state corresponding to a \( K \)-photon input state \( |\psi_{\text{in}}\rangle \):

\[
|\psi_{\text{in}}\rangle = \sum_{\mu} \int_{R^K} \psi_{\text{in}}(\omega, \mu) \prod_{l=1}^{K} s_{\mu_l}^{\dagger}(\omega_l) |\text{vac}\rangle d^K \omega
\]  

(28)

where the amplitude \( \psi_{\text{in}}(\omega, \mu) \) can be chosen, without any loss of generality, to be symmetric with respect to a simultaneous permutation of the indices \( \mu \) and \( \omega \): \( \psi_{\text{in}}(\omega, \mu) = \psi_{\text{in}}(\mathcal{P}_K \omega, \mathcal{P}_K \mu) \forall K\text{-element permutations } \mathcal{P}_K \). The output state is then given by:

\[
|\psi_{\text{out}}\rangle = \sum_{\mu} \int_{R^K} \psi_{\text{out}}(\omega, \mu) \prod_{l=1}^{K} s_{\mu_l}^{\dagger}(\omega_l) |\text{vac}\rangle d^K \omega
\]  

(29)
where $\psi_{\text{out}}(\omega, \mu)$ is given by:

$$
\psi_{\text{out}}(\omega, \mu) = \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\mu'} \int_{R^K} S(\omega, \mu; \omega', \mu') \psi_{\text{in}}(\omega', \mu') d^K \omega'
$$

(30)

Assuming that the coordinate systems of the optical modes are chosen such that $x_k^0 = 0 \forall k \in \{1, 2 \ldots N\}$, from Eqs. 27 and 30 we obtain:

$$
\psi_{\text{out}}(\omega, \mu) = \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\mu'} \int_{R^K} \left[ \sum_{P_K} \prod_{l=1}^{K} S_{P_K \mu, \mu'} \delta(P_K \omega_l - \omega'_l) \right] \psi_{\text{in}}(\omega', \mu') d^K \omega'
$$

$$
= \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\mu'} \sum_{P_K} \left[ \prod_{l=1}^{K} S_{\mu, P_K \mu'} \right] \psi_{\text{in}}(P_K \omega, \mu')
$$

$$
= \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\mu'} \sum_{P_K} \left[ \prod_{l=1}^{K} S_{\mu, P_K \mu'} \right] \psi_{\text{in}}(\omega, P_K \mu')
$$

(31)

Therefore,

$$
|\psi_{\text{out}}\rangle = \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\mu} \sum_{\mu'} \sum_{P_K} \int_{R^K} \left[ \prod_{l=1}^{K} S_{\mu, P_K \mu'} \hat{s}_{\mu_l}(\omega_l) \right] \psi_{\text{in}}(\omega, P_K \mu') d^K \omega
$$

$$
= \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\mu} \sum_{P_K} \int_{R^K} \left[ \prod_{l=1}^{K} \hat{s}_{P_K \mu_l}(\omega_l) \right] \psi_{\text{in}}(P_K \omega, \mu) d^K \omega
$$

$$
= \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\mu} \sum_{P_K} \int_{R^K} \left[ \prod_{l=1}^{K} \hat{s}_{\mu_l}(P_K \omega_l) \right] \psi_{\text{in}}(P_K \omega, \mu) d^K \omega
$$

$$
= \sum_{\mu} \int_{R^K} \psi_{\text{in}}(\omega, \mu) \left[ \prod_{l=1}^{K} \hat{s}_{\mu_l}(\omega_l) \right] |\text{vac}\rangle d^K \omega
$$

(32)

where $\hat{s}_{i}(\omega) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} S_{i,j} S_{j,i}(\omega)$ and in the last step we have made the change of integration variables $\omega \rightarrow P_K \omega$ which leaves $d^K \omega$ unchanged. The application of the quantum scattering matrix of a linear optical device to an input state is equivalent to replacing the annihilation operators in the input state with $S^\dagger$ times the annihilation operators. This is the usual procedure used to analyze the impact of a linear optical element on an input state \cite{6, 7}, and our analysis derives it from a Hamiltonian based description of the linear optical element and thus lends rigor to this procedure.

### III. MATRIX-PRODUCT-STATE BASED SIMULATIONS OF TIME-DELAYED FEEDBACK SYSTEMS

In this section, we use the point-coupling Hamiltonian proposed in the section \cite{1} to develop an MPS update for a two-level system coupled to a waveguide with a partially transmitting mirror. Using the formulated MPS update, we study the impact of the less than unity reflectivity of the mirror on the dynamics of the time-delayed feedback system.

The system under consideration is a two-level system with a time-delayed feedback shown in Fig. 3. The Hamiltonian for this system can be expressed as a sum of a two-level system Hamiltonian, waveguide Hamiltonian and the mirror Hamiltonian (which is modeled as a point interaction between the forward and backward propagating modes):

$$
H(t) = H_{\text{TLS}}(t) + H_{\text{wg}} + H_{\text{mirror}} + H_{\text{wg-TLS}}
$$

(33)

where $H_{\text{TLS}}(t)$ is the Hamiltonian of the two-level system including a coherent drive, $H_{\text{wg}}$ is the Hamiltonian describing the forward and backward propagating waveguide modes, $H_{\text{mirror}}$ is the Hamiltonian of the mirror providing feedback to the two-level system and $H_{\text{wg-TLS}}$ is the interaction Hamiltonian between the two-level system and the
two waveguide modes:

\[
H_{\text{TLS}}(t) = \omega_c \sigma^\dagger \sigma + \Omega(t)(\sigma^e e^{i\omega_c t} + \sigma^d e^{-i\omega_c t})
\]

(34a)

\[
H_{\text{wg}} = \sum_{k \in \{+, -\}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \omega s_{k}^\dagger(\omega)s_{k}(\omega)d\omega
\]

(34b)

\[
H_{\text{mirror}} = 2i \tan\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \left[ e^{i\varphi}s_+(x_+ = 0)s_-(x_- = 0) - e^{-i\varphi}s_-(x_- = 0)s_+(x_+ = 0) \right]
\]

(34c)

\[
H_{\text{wg-TLS}} = \sqrt{\gamma_+} s_+(x_+ = t_d) + \sqrt{\gamma_-} s_-(x_- = -t_d) + \text{h.c.}
\]

(34d)

Here \(\sigma\) is the de-excitation operator for a two-level system with resonant frequency \(\omega_e\), \(s_+(\omega)\) and \(s_-(\omega)\) are the frequency-domain annihilation operators for the forward and backward propagating waveguide modes respectively and \(s_+(x_+\)) and \(s_-(x_-)\) are the position-domain annihilation operators for the forward and backward propagating waveguide modes respectively. Note that the \(x\)-axis for the coordinate systems for the forward and backward propagating waveguide modes are chosen to be in their direction of propagation with the same origin. A mirror, modeled with a beam splitter Hamiltonian between the forward and backward propagating waveguide modes with parameters \((\theta, \varphi)\), is located at \(x_\pm = 0\). The two-level system interacts with the waveguide (with a decay rate \(\gamma_+\) into the forward propagating waveguide mode and \(\gamma_-\) into the backward propagating waveguide mode) at a distance of \(t_d\) from the mirror — this corresponds to the point with coordinates \(x_+ = t_d\) and \(x_- = -t_d\) in the coordinate systems of the forward and backward propagating waveguide modes. Furthermore, the two-level system is driven with a laser pulse at frequency \(\omega_0\) and pulse-shape \(\Omega(t)\).

We first go into a frame rotating as per the Hamiltonian \(H_0\):

\[
H_0 = \omega_0 \sigma^\dagger \sigma + H_{\text{wg}} + H_{\text{mirror}}
\]

(35)

In this frame, the state of the system evolves as per the Hamiltonian \(\tilde{H}(t)\):

\[
\tilde{H}(t) = e^{iH_0 t}(H(t) - H_0)e^{-iH_0 t}
\]

\[
\tilde{H}(t) = \delta_e \sigma^\dagger \sigma + \Omega(t)\sigma_x + (\sqrt{\gamma_+} \sigma^\dagger s_+(x_+ = t_d; t)e^{i\omega_0 t} + \sqrt{\gamma_-} \sigma^\dagger s_-(x_- = -t_d; t)e^{i\omega_0 t} + \text{h.c.})
\]

(36)

where \(\delta_e = \omega_e - \omega_0\) and \(s_\pm(x_\pm = \pm t_d; t)\) are the Heisenberg picture operators corresponding to \(s_\pm(x_\pm = \pm t_d)\) with respect to \(H_{\text{wg}} + H_{\text{mirror}}\) at time \(t\), subject to the initial condition \(s_\pm(x_\pm = \pm t_d; t = 0) = s_\pm(x_\pm = \pm t_d)\). From Eq. 9 and for \(t > 0\), we obtain:

\[
s_+(x_+ = t_d; t) = \begin{cases} 
  s_+(x_+ = t_d - t) & \text{if } t < \tau \\
  s_+(x_+ = t_d - t) \cos \theta + e^{i\varphi} s_-(x_- = t_d - t) \sin \theta & \text{if } t > \tau
\end{cases}
\]

(37a)

\[
s_-(x_- = -t_d; t) = s_-(x_- = -t_d - t)
\]

(37b)

![FIG. 3. Schematic figure of the time-delayed feedback system analyzed in this paper. A two-level system with de-excitation operator \(\sigma\) couples to a waveguide which supports both forward propagating and backward propagating waveguide modes with frequency-domain (position-domain) annihilation operators \(s_+(\omega)\) and \(s_-\) \((s_+(x_+)\) and \(s_-(x_-)\)) respectively. A mirror, modelled as a beam-splitter on the forward and backward propagating waveguide modes with parameters \((\theta, \varphi)\), is located as \(x_\pm = 0\) and the two-level system couples to both the waveguide modes at a distance \(t_d\) from the mirror. The decay rates of the two-level system into the forward and backward propagating waveguide modes are denoted by \(\gamma_+\) and \(\gamma_-\) respectively. Finally, we also consider the dynamics of this system when the two-level system is driven by an external laser pulse — \(\Omega(t)\) denotes the complex amplitude of the laser pulse that drives the two-level system.](image-url)
Finally, we define the operators $S_+(t)$ and $S_-(t)$ via:

$$S_+(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} s_+^{(\omega)} e^{-i(\omega-\omega_0)(t-t_d)} \frac{d\omega}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$$
$$S_-(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} s_-^{(\omega)} e^{-i(\omega-\omega_0)(t+t_d)} \frac{d\omega}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$$

(38a) (38b)

From this and Eq. [37] it follows that:

$$s_+(x_+ = t_d; t) = e^{-i\omega_0(t-t_d)} \begin{cases} S_+(t) & \text{if } t < \tau \\ S_+(t) \cos \theta + e^{i\varphi} S_- (t - 2t_d) \sin \theta & \text{if } t > \tau \end{cases}$$
$$s_-(x_- = -t_d; t) = e^{-i\omega_0(t+t_d)} S_-(t)$$

(39a) (39b)

Therefore, the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}(t)$ defined in Eq. [36] is given by:

$$\hat{H}(t) = \delta_c \sigma^z \sigma + \Omega(t) \sigma_x + \begin{cases} \sigma^+ (\sqrt{\gamma^+ e^{i\omega_0 t_d} S_+(t)} + \sqrt{\gamma^- e^{-i\omega_0 t_d} S_-(t)}) + \text{h.c.} & \text{if } t < t_d \\ \sigma^+ (\gamma^+ e^{i\omega_0 t_d} S_+(t) \cos \theta + e^{i\varphi} S_- (t - 2t_d) \sin \theta) + \gamma^- e^{-i\omega_0 t_d} S_-(t) + \text{h.c.} & \text{if } t > t_d \end{cases}$$

(40)

An MPS update for the state of the system in the rotating frame with respect to $H_{\text{wg}} + H_{\text{mirror}}$ can now be framed using the procedure outlined in Ref. [19] — the first step is to discretize the waveguide Hilbert space. Using a discretization step $\Delta t$, we can define the waveguide bin operators $S_\pm[k]$ in terms of the operators $S_\pm(t)$ via:

$$S_\pm[k] = \int_{k\Delta t}^{(k+1)\Delta t} S_\pm(t) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{\Delta t}}$$

(41)

which satisfy the commutation relations $[S_+^{(i)} S_-^{(j)}] = \delta_{i,j}$ and $[S_-^{(i)} S_+^{(j)}] = \delta_{i,j}$. The state of the entire system, including the waveguide and the two-level system, can be represented by as a matrix-product state with the two-level system corresponding to the first site in the matrix product state, and the subsequent sites corresponding to the waveguide bins. The Hilbert space of the $k^{th}$ waveguide bin is spanned by the tensor product of the Hilbert spaces of the harmonic oscillators whose annihilation operators are $S_+ [k]$ and $S_- [k]$. To compute the time-evolution of the matrix product state, we apply the unitary map $U[k+1, k]$ defined by:

$$U[k+1, k] = e^{-i\hat{H}[k+1,k]}$$

(42)

where

$$H[k+1, k] = \int_{k\Delta t}^{(k+1)\Delta t} \hat{H}(t) \, dt$$

$$= \delta_c \Delta t \sigma^z \sigma + \Omega_k \sigma_x + \begin{cases} \sigma^+ (\sqrt{\gamma^+ e^{i\omega_0 t_d} S_+(k)} + \sqrt{\gamma^- e^{-i\omega_0 t_d} S_-(k)}) + \text{h.c.} & \text{if } k \leq n_d \\ \sigma^+ (\gamma^+ e^{i\omega_0 t_d} S_+(k) \cos \theta + e^{i\varphi} S_- [k - 2n_d] \sin \theta) + \gamma^- e^{-i\omega_0 t_d} S_-(k) + \text{h.c.} & \text{if } k > n_d \end{cases}$$

(43)

where $n_d = \lfloor t_d / \Delta t \rfloor$ and $\Omega_k = \Omega (k\Delta t) \Delta t$. The application of $U[k+1, k]$ on the matrix product state at time step $k$ requires the implementation of a long-range gate, since it acts on the site corresponding to the two-level system, the $k^{th}$ waveguide bin and the $(k-2n_d)^{th}$ waveguide bin. Following the approach introduced in Ref. [19], we implement this long range gate using a sequence of swap operations [24] followed by a short-range gate corresponding to $U[k+1, k]$. The update is implemented using the tensor network state python library tncotrafnct [26] along with qutip [27].

We first validate our MPS update implementation against the implementation introduced in [19] for an ideal mirror (i.e. $\theta = \pi/2$). Fig. 4 shows a comparison between the two implementation for two distinct settings — Fig. 4(a) in which the emitter is initially prepared in its excited state and allowed to decay into the waveguide without any external driving, and Fig. 4(b) in which the emitter is initially in its ground state and then driven by an exponentially decaying pulse ($\Omega(t) = \Omega_0 e^{-\alpha t}$). We simulate both of these settings for different mirror phase $\varphi$ — as is known in such feedback systems with ideal mirrors, a properly chosen mirror phase can result in the emitter not decaying completely.
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FIG. 4. Validation of our MPS update implementation against the implementation introduced in Ref. [19] for an ideal mirror (i.e. \( \theta = \pi/2 \)) for two simulation settings: (a) Simulation of an undriven two-level system (\( \Omega(t) = 0 \)) which is initially in its excited state for different mirror phases \( \varphi \) and (b) simulation of a two-level system initially in its ground state and driven by an exponentially decaying pulse (\( \Omega(t) = \Omega_0 e^{-\alpha t} \) for \( t > 0 \)) for different mirror phases \( \varphi \). \( |\epsilon(t)| \) is the probability amplitude of the two-level system being in the excited state computed using \( |\epsilon(t)|^2 = \langle \sigma^+ \sigma \rangle \). It is assumed that \( \gamma_{\text{e}} = \gamma_{\text{g}} = \gamma / 2, \delta_{\text{e}} = \omega_{\text{e}} - \omega_0 = 0, \omega_{\text{td}} = \pi, \gamma_{\text{t}} = 2, \varphi = 0 \) and \( \alpha = 2 \gamma \). For the discretization into an MPS, we use \( \gamma \Delta t = 0.05 \), and truncate the dimensionality of the Hilbert space of each waveguide bin to 2 for both forward and backward propagating modes. A threshold of 0.01 is used in all the Schmidt decompositions performed while applying the swap gates and the short-range gates.

into the waveguide mode, rather exciting the bound state that exists between the emitter and the waveguide mode. We observe such incomplete decay for \( \varphi = 0 \), and a complete decay of the emitter into the waveguide mode for other mirror phases. Moreover, the MPS update implementation presented in this section agrees perfectly with the MPS update implementation introduced in Ref. [19].

Finally, we study the impact of the non-ideality (i.e. the mirror reflection being less than 1) in the mirror on the dynamics of the feedback system. Since the mirror can no longer be defined using a hard boundary condition, the formalism in Ref. [19] can no longer be used to simulate such a system. However, within our formulation, changing the mirror reflection is equivalent to changing the parameter \( \theta \) of the mirror. Fig. 5 shows the impact of \( \theta \) on the dynamics of the feedback system. Again, we simulate two different settings — Fig. 5(a) in which the emitter is initially prepared
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FIG. 5. Impact of mirror reflectivity on the dynamics of the time-delayed feedback system for two simulation settings: (a) Simulation of an undriven two-level system (\( \Omega(t) = 0 \)) which is initially in its excited state for different mirror reflectivities \( \cos \theta \) and (b) simulation of a two-level system initially in its ground state and driven by an exponentially decaying pulse (\( \Omega(t) = \Omega_0 e^{-\alpha t} \) for \( t > 0 \)) for different mirror reflectivities \( \cos \theta \). \( |\epsilon(t)| \) is the probability amplitude of the two-level system being in the excited state computed using \( |\epsilon(t)|^2 = \langle \sigma^+ \sigma \rangle \). It is assumed that \( \gamma_{\text{e}} = \gamma_{\text{g}} = \gamma / 2, \delta_{\text{e}} = \omega_{\text{e}} - \omega_0 = 0, \omega_{\text{td}} = \pi, \gamma_{\text{t}} = 2, \varphi = 0 \) and \( \alpha = 2 \gamma \). For the discretization into an MPS, we use \( \gamma \Delta t = 0.05 \), and truncate the dimensionality of the Hilbert space of each waveguide bin to 2 for both forward and backward propagating modes. A threshold of 0.01 is used in all the Schmidt decompositions performed while applying the swap gates and the short-range gates.
in its excited state and allowed to decay into the waveguide without any external driving, and Fig. 5(b) in which the emitter is initially in its ground state and then driven by an exponentially decaying pulse ($\Omega(t) = \Omega_0 e^{-\alpha t}$). We note that unlike the case of an ideal mirror, having a less than unity reflectivity implies that there is not bound state that the emitter can decay into. Consequently, the emitter always decays to the ground state — however, as is seen in Fig. 5, the decay rate can be controlled by controlling the reflectivity of the mirror. While this seems reminiscent of the Purcell effect, we note that even with a less than unity reflectivity, the emitter does not decay exponentially into its ground state — this is a consequence of the non-Markovian nature of the feedback system under consideration.

IV. CONCLUSION

This paper resolves the problem of calculating the Hamiltonian for a broadband linear-optical device from its classical scattering matrix. It is shown that an application of the quantum scattering matrix corresponding to the proposed Hamiltonian on an input state is equivalent to applying the inverse of the classical scattering matrix of the linear-optical device on the annihilation operators in the input state. Finally, we demonstrate the practical utility of the proposed Hamiltonian by using it to rigorously formulate an MPS-based update for a time-delayed feedback system wherein the linear-optical device providing feedback is described by a full scattering matrix as opposed to a hard boundary condition.
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