Long-lifetime coherence in a quantum emitter induced by a metasurface
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An anisotropic quantum vacuum (AQV) has been predicted to induce quantum interferences during the spontaneous emission process in a V-atomic-transition. However, such effects of AQV are strongly limited by the lifetime of the excited states. Here, we predict a long-lifetime coherence in a Λ-atomic-transition, induced by the spontaneous emission in an AQV, without the need of a coherent laser field. Metasurfaces are used to design the AQV, which present the advantage of remote distant control. Detecting this coherence, in addition to be a new test of quantum electrodynamics, would demonstrate the remote control potential of metasurfaces, paving the way towards the control of interactions — such as coherent coupling — between quantum emitters, which is a key requirement to perform entanglement in quantum technology applications.

I. INTRODUCTION

The control of the spontaneous emission of quantum emitters (QEs) has been investigated principally in confined space by the cavity-quantum electrodynamics (cQED) community [1], whose archetype is a cavity formed by perfect mirrors. The notion of “cavity” has then been generalized to open resonators by the nanophotonics community [2], where large coupling can be achieved. However, it occurs only in the near-field of the photonic nanostructure and vanishes beyond a distance \( d \sim \lambda_0 \), where \( \lambda_0 \) is the emission wavelength of the QE in vacuum.

There are a few other optical systems that can affect the spontaneous emission of QEs in the far-field (\( d \gg \lambda_0 \)). For instance, by covering half of the QE emission solid angle with a spherical mirror, it has been predicted that the vacuum fluctuations can be fully suppressed at remote distances within a volume \( \lambda_0^3 \), leading to a total inhibition of the decay of a two-level atom [3]. In a classical picture, the field reflected by the spherical mirror can fully interfere with the direct field emitted by the atom: if the atom is located at the focus of the spherical mirror such that \( d = n\lambda_0/2 \) with \( n \) an integer number, there is a complete suppression of the spontaneous emission, whereas if the atom is at the position \( d = (n + 1/2)\lambda_0/2 \), the spontaneous emission is enhanced by a factor of 2. Such effects occur as long as the time it takes for the light field to go to the mirror and to be back to the atom is shorter than the atom decay time \( 1/\gamma_0 \) (with \( \gamma_0 \) the decay rate in free space), that is for distances \( d \) smaller than the photonic coherence length \( \lambda_0^2 \equiv c/2\gamma_0 \) [4,5]. Such an alteration of the decay rate over many wavelengths was already reported in Ref. [6], where the authors measured a 1% change in the decay rate of an ion located at 30 cm from a mirror.

Recently, the use of a reflecting metasurface acting as a spherical mirror has been suggested to modify the spontaneous emission of a multilevel QE located at remote distances [7,8]. This new paradigm brings together the quantum optics and the metasurface communities [9,10], and relies on the fact that reflecting metasurfaces, made of nano-resonators, can modify the structure of the vacuum at macroscopic distances. Indeed, such a metasurface can break the isotropy nature of the vacuum by having a polarization-dependent response, thus creating an anisotropic quantum vacuum (AQV). It was already predicted that an AQV can lead to quantum interferences in orthogonal levels of a multilevel QE in a V-configuration, that is two excited states and one ground state [11]. However, the predicted effects, that is a population transfer between the two excited states of 1% [7], and an induced coherence of about 10% [5], only last as long as the atom remains in its excited states, which is a drastic constraint for an experimental confirmation.

While in the literature the V-scheme is most often considered [7,8,11,13], this present work focuses on the spontaneous emission properties of a QE with a Λ-transition, meaning one excited state and two ground states, in the anisotropic quantum vacuum created by a metasurface. We predict the generation of a coherence between the two ground states, which survives after the photon emission. The interest in the ground state coherence arises from its long lifetime, which allows high resolution experiments. Moreover, it was previously known that this coherence could only be generated with an external coherent laser field (see [17], chapter 3). Here, we show that such a coherence can be simply generated by spontaneous emission in an anisotropic vacuum (in the
absence of a laser field).

In Section II, we derive the master equation for the Λ-scheme (Section II A), and we show how an anisotropic vacuum can induce a coherence between the ground states from the process of spontaneous emission (Section II B). We also provide an interpretation of such a result in terms of the dressed-states of the system (Section II C). In Section III, following a phase-mapping approach (presented in Section III A), we propose two designs of metasurfaces to realize the anisotropic vacuum and characterize their performances (Sections III B and III C). Finally, we assess the value of the coherence that can be expected using such metasurfaces, taking into account the limitations due to the finite size of the nano-resonators that compose the metasurfaces (Section III D).

II. THEORETICAL PREDICTIONS: LONG LIFETIME COHERENCE

We consider a three-level system in a so-called Λ-scheme: one single excited state |0⟩, which can decay into two ground states |1⟩ and |2⟩ via two orthogonal dipolar transitions by the emission of circularly polarized photons σ+ and, respectively, σ− (see Fig. 1). By orthogonal transitions, it means that the dipole moments d01 and d02 corresponding to these transitions are orthogonal (i.e. d01 · d02 = 0). They are given by: d01 = +001ε+ and d02 = −002ε− where ε± = (± 1 i)/. We use the z direction as the quantization axis. This scheme appears naturally in NV-centers in diamond, using the states |0⟩ ⊗ | ±1⟩ and |A⟩ as the ground states and excited state, respectively [8]. It also can be found in atoms, using Zeeman manifold with |F, m⟩ ± 1) for the ground states and |F, m = 0) for the excited state [7], where m is the magnetic quantum number and F is the total angular momentum quantum number.

The interaction between the atom (at position r0) and the electromagnetic (EM) environment in the vacuum state (i.e. no photons) is described by the interaction Hamiltonian in the electric dipole approximation: \( \hat{H}_I = -\hat{d} \cdot \hat{E}_v(r_0) \). The electromagnetic field operator \( \hat{E}_v \) can formally be written as a sum of a complex field \( \hat{E}_v^+ \) and its Hermitian conjugate \( \hat{E}_v^- = [\hat{E}_v^+]^* \): \( \hat{E}_v(r_0) = \hat{E}_v^+(r_0) + \hat{E}_v^-(r_0) \). The dipole moment operator \( \hat{d} \) is given by: \( \hat{d} = d_{01} |0⟩⟨1| + d_{02} |0⟩⟨2| + d_{10} |1⟩⟨0| + d_{20} |2⟩⟨0| \). In the interaction picture, and after making the rotating wave approximation, the interaction Hamiltonian reads:

\[
\hat{H}_I(t) = - (d_{01} |0⟩⟨1| e^{i\omega t} + d_{02} |0⟩⟨2| e^{-i\omega t}) \cdot \hat{E}_v^+(r_0, t) - (d_{01}^* |1⟩⟨0| e^{-i\omega t} + d_{02}^* |2⟩⟨0| e^{-i\omega t}) \cdot \hat{E}_v^-(r_0, t),
\]

(1)

where \( \omega \) is the transition frequency associated with the transition \( |i⟩ \leftrightarrow |0⟩ \) (i = 1, 2). We derive in Section II A the master equation for the reduced density matrix of the atom.

A. Master equation for the reduced density matrix

The total system {atom+field} is characterized by the density matrix \( \rho_T(t) \), which obeys the Schrödinger equation written in the interaction picture [19, 20]:

\[
\frac{d\rho_T(t)}{dt} = \frac{1}{i\hbar} [\hat{H}_I(t), \rho_T(t)],
\]

(2)

with \( \hat{H}_I(t) \) given by Eq. (1). The reduced density matrix of the atom is obtained as \( \rho_T(t) = \text{Tr}_e(\rho_T(t)) \), where the trace is taken over the degrees of freedom of the environment. In order to find the master equation governing the evolution of this reduced density matrix, we first assume that there is no correlation between the atom and the EM environment at time \( t = 0 \), so that \( \rho_T(0) \) factorizes as: \( \rho_T(0) = \rho(0) \otimes \rho_e(0) \), with \( \rho_e \) the reduced density matrix of the environment. Moreover, considering that only the state of the atom is affected by the interaction with the environment, we assume that at later times \( t \), \( \rho_T(t) \) factorizes as: \( \rho_T(t) = \rho(t) \otimes \rho_e(0) \). Finally, by making two other major approximations, known as the Born and Markov approximations, we obtain the following master equation for the reduced density matrix of the atom \( \rho(t) \) (where we have considered for simplicity closed-lying states: \( \omega_1 \approx \omega_2 \equiv \omega_0 \); see Appendix A for the details of the derivation):

Figure 1. Three-level quantum emitter with a Λ-structure. The upper level |0⟩ can decay via two transitions: either to the state |1⟩ with the emission of a right circularly polarized photon denoted σ+, or to the state |2⟩ with the emission of a left circularly polarized photon denoted σ−. \( \rho_{12} \) denotes the coherence between the two ground states |1⟩ and |2⟩.
\[
\frac{\partial \rho(t)}{\partial t} = -i\left[\omega_0 + \frac{\gamma_1}{2} + \frac{\gamma_2}{2}\right]|0\rangle\langle 0| \rho(t) + \rho_{00}(t) \left[\frac{\gamma_1}{2}|1\rangle \langle 1| + \frac{\gamma_2}{2}|2\rangle \langle 2| + \frac{\kappa_{11}}{2}|2\rangle \langle 1| + \frac{\kappa_{12}}{2}|1\rangle \langle 2|\right] + \text{H.c.},
\]

where \(\rho_{00}(t)\) denotes the population in the excited state \(|0\rangle\) (defined as \(\rho_{00}(t) = \langle 0| \rho(t) |0\rangle\)). In Eq. (3), we have introduced the coefficients \(\gamma_i\) and \(\kappa_{ij}\) whose expressions are:

\[
\gamma_i = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \mathbf{d}_{0i} \cdot \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{r}_0, \mathbf{r}_0, \omega_0) \cdot \mathbf{d}_{0i},
\]

and

\[
\kappa_{ij} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \mathbf{d}_{0i}^* \cdot \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{r}_0, \mathbf{r}_0, \omega_0) \cdot \mathbf{d}_{0j} \quad (i \neq j).
\]

The coefficient \(\gamma_i\) characterizes the decay of the transition \(|0\rangle\) to \(|i\rangle\), and is called the decay rate; the coefficient \(\kappa_{ij}\) characterizes a cross-coupling between the states \(|i\rangle\) and \(|j\rangle\). These coefficients are defined in terms of the correlation tensor \(\mathbf{C}\):

\[
\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r'}, \omega) \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\tau \left\langle \mathbf{E}^{(+)}_\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}, \tau) \mathbf{E}^{(-)}_\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r'}, 0) \right\rangle e^{i\omega \tau},
\]

where the bracket indicates an ensemble average:

\[
\left\langle \mathbf{E}^{(+)}_\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}, \tau) \mathbf{E}^{(-)}_\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r'}, 0) \right\rangle \equiv \text{Tr} \left( \rho_{\mathbf{v}}(0) \mathbf{E}^{(+)}_\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}, \tau) \mathbf{E}^{(-)}_\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r'}, 0) \right).
\]

This correlation tensor characterizes the amplitude of the fluctuations of the electric field in the vacuum state, which contain all the information about the dynamics of the system. Once they are known, the dynamics of the atom given by Eq. (3) can be in principle solved.

We now integrate Eq. (3) for an atom initially prepared in the excited state with the following initial conditions (at \(t = 0\)): \(\rho_{00}(0) = 1, \rho_{11}(0) = \rho_{22}(0) = 0\) and \(\rho_{ij}(0) = 0\) for \(j \neq i\), where \(\rho_{ij}\) are the atomic populations in the states \(|i\rangle\) and \(|j\rangle\) are the atomic coherences between the states \(|i\rangle\) and \(|j\rangle\). For the steady state \((t \to \infty)\), we find, for the atomic populations, that \(\rho_{00}(\infty) = 0\) and

\[
\rho_{ii}(\infty) = \frac{\gamma_i}{\gamma_1 + \gamma_2} \quad (i = 1, 2),
\]

and, for the atomic coherences, that \(\rho_{10}(t) = \rho_{20}(t) = 0\) \((\forall t)\) and (using the fact that \(\kappa_{12} = \kappa_{12}\))

\[
\rho_{12}(\infty) = \frac{\kappa_{12}}{\gamma_1 + \gamma_2}.
\]

While the result in Eq. (7) simply shows that the populations in the steady state are in a probabilistic distribution either in \(|1\rangle\) or \(|2\rangle\), the result in Eq. (8) for the coherence \(\rho_{12}\) is more surprising: to date, it was thought that a coherence between the two ground states required an external coherent field such as a laser field (Ref. [11], Chapter 3); our result reveals that a coherence between the two ground states can be induced by spontaneous emission, that is without external field. Furthermore, because it involves ground states, this coherence has in principle a long lifetime (which is infinite here, because we have ignored in Eq. (3) the relaxation of the ground state coherence \(\rho_{12}\), which is supposed to be much smaller than the coherences involving the excited state and depends on the system into consideration).

\section{B. Anisotropic quantum vacuum}

We will now find the conditions for the existence of the long-lifetime coherence of Eq. (6). For that, we first apply the fluctuation-dissipation theorem at zero temperature (we do not consider the effect of the temperature, which is indeed very small when one considers an atom emitting at optical frequencies). This theorem links the correlation tensor \(\mathbf{C}\) to the imaginary part of the Green tensor \(\mathbf{G}\) of the Maxwell equations, which describes the dissipation of the electric energy, as [11]:

\[
\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r'}, \omega) = \frac{2\hbar \omega^2}{\epsilon_0 c^2} \text{Im} \left( \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r'}, \omega) \right).
\]

The fluctuation-dissipation theorem shows that the amplitude of the fluctuations are known once the imaginary part of the Green tensor has been calculated. Making use of this theorem, the coefficients \(\gamma_i\) [Eq. (4)] and \(\kappa_{12}\) [Eq. (5)] can be expressed in term of the Green tensor as:

\[
\gamma_i = \frac{2\omega^2}{\hbar \epsilon_0 c^2} \mathbf{d}_{0i} \cdot \text{Im} \left( \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{r}_0, \mathbf{r}_0, \omega_0) \right) \mathbf{d}_{0i},
\]

and

\[
\kappa_{12} = \frac{2\omega^2}{\hbar \epsilon_0 c^2} \mathbf{d}_{01} \cdot \text{Im} \left( \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{r}_0, \mathbf{r}_0, \omega_0) \right) \mathbf{d}_{02}.
\]

Next, we express the Green tensor and the dipole moments appearing in Eqs. (10) and (11) in the Cartesian basis \((\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{z})\) (we recall that a static magnetic field is applied along the \(\hat{z}\) direction, defining the quantization axis). Eq. (3) can then be recast in the following form (using the fact that \(G_{yx} = G_{xy}\)):

\[
\rho_{12}(\infty) = \frac{\mathbf{d}_{01} \mathbf{d}_{02}}{\mathbf{d}_{01}^2 + \mathbf{d}_{02}^2} \times \frac{\text{Im} [G_{xx} - G_{yy}] - \text{i}2\text{Im}[G_{xy}]}{\text{Im} [G_{xx} + G_{yy}]},
\]

where we recall that the Green tensor Cartesian components have to be evaluated at the position of the quantum emitter \(\mathbf{r}_0\) and at the transition frequency \(\omega_0\).

We immediately point out that in the usual isotropic vacuum \((G_{xx} = G_{yy} = 0)\), there is no coherence in Eq. (12). To generate coherence, the vacuum has to be anisotropic. A similar result was first put forward by G.S. Agarwal in Ref. [11] for a V-configuration (two excited states \(|1\rangle\) and \(|2\rangle\), and one ground state \(|0\rangle\)), where he predicted a coherent population transfer between the two orthogonal excited states (i.e. \(\mathbf{d}_{01}^* \cdot \mathbf{d}_{02} = 0\) in an anisotropic quantum vacuum).

The coherence in Eq. (12) is a product of two terms: the coefficients \(R\) and \(V\), characterizing the quantum emitter on one hand, and the anisotropy of the EM environment on the other hand. \(R\) reaches its maximum value
of 0.5 when the two dipole moment amplitudes are equal. The coefficient \( V \), in its general form, is a complex quantity. In this paper, we will only consider situations where \( G_{xy} = 0 \) (which will be justified later), so from now on, \( V \) will be considered as a real quantity and takes the form of a visibility with extremum value \( \pm 1 \). Therefore the extremum values of the coherence are \( \rho_{12}(\infty) = \pm 1/2 \).

C. Interpretation in terms of dressed-states

In situations where the coherence is maximum \( |\rho_{12}(\infty) = \pm 1/2| \), the reduced density matrix of the atom, after spontaneous emission, reads in the basis of the two ground states \( \{ |1\rangle, |2\rangle \} \): \( \rho(\infty) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \begin{array}{cc} 1 & \pm 1 \\ \pm 1 & 1 \end{array} \right] \), which corresponds to a pure state. In contrast, in isotropic vacuum, one would obtain by spontaneous emission a statistical mixture with a reduced density matrix \( \rho(\infty) = \frac{1}{2} I \).

One can interpret this in terms of the dressed-states of the system \{atom+field\}. Everything happens as if, after the emission of a photon \( (t \rightarrow \infty) \), the atom-field “dressed-state” is:

\[
|\psi(\infty)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_{01}^2 + d_{02}^2}} \left( \sqrt{\text{Im}(G_{xx})} |X\rangle + i \sqrt{\text{Im}(G_{yy})} |Y\rangle \right) \]

\[
\times \left[ d_{01} |1\rangle \otimes \left( \sqrt{\text{Im}(G_{xx})} |X\rangle + i \sqrt{\text{Im}(G_{yy})} |Y\rangle \right) \right]
\]

\[
+ d_{02} |2\rangle \otimes \left( \sqrt{\text{Im}(G_{xx})} |X\rangle - i \sqrt{\text{Im}(G_{yy})} |Y\rangle \right),
\]

where \( |X\rangle = 1/\sqrt{2}(|\sigma^+\rangle + |\sigma^-\rangle) \) [resp. \( |Y\rangle = 1/\sqrt{2}(|\sigma^+\rangle - |\sigma^-\rangle) \)] represents the state of photons emitted with a linear polarization along \( \vec{x} \) [resp. \( \vec{y} \)]. Indeed, when tracing over the emitted photon, one gets full agreement with Eq. (12), and one also finds that \( \rho_{ii}(\infty) = d_{0i}^2/(d_{01}^2 + d_{02}^2) = \gamma_i/(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2) \) (for \( i = 1, 2 \), in agreement with Eq. (7).

In isotropic vacuum, and when the two ground states are equally weighted \( (d_{01} = d_{02}, \gamma_1 = \gamma_2) \), it is well-known that the atom and the emitted photons are fully entangled [21]; at the end of the decay process, the atom-field state is of the form:

\[
|\psi(\infty)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( |1\rangle \otimes |\sigma^+\rangle + |2\rangle \otimes |\sigma^-\rangle \right).
\]

The reduced state of each subsystem (atom and field as well) is thus fully incoherent which explains why in isotropic vacuum we obtain a reduced density matrix \( \rho(\infty) = \frac{1}{2} I \). It also explains why in order to observe quantum beats between the emitted photons in the vacuum a V-transition is necessary, and no quantum beats will appear in the case of a Λ-transition (see Ref. [21], Chapter 1.4).

However, if the back reaction of the environment, for example, fully eliminates the X-component of the polarization [that is when \( \text{Im}(G_{xx}) = 0 \), which can achieved with a metasurface as we will see later], the atom-field state at the end of the decay process is of the form:

\[
|\psi(\infty)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( |1\rangle - |2\rangle \right) \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2i}} \left( |\sigma^+\rangle - |\sigma^-\rangle \right).
\]

This atom-field state is factorisable (as it is the case for a V-transition in isotropic vacuum), but here the atom is in a coherent superposition of ground states (while for a Λ-transition, it is the photon which is in a coherent superposition of two different modes). This means that the reduced density matrix of each subsystem is a pure state. In particular, we obtain here an atomic reduced density matrix \( \rho(\infty) \) equal to the 1-D projector: \( \rho(\infty) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \begin{array}{cc} 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{array} \right] \).

Hence, the environment can act as a quantum eraser which erases the entanglement between the atom and the field (emitted photon). According to the very general complementary relation between the entanglement of a system with its environment and the degree of coherence of the reduced density matrix of this system [22, 23], isotropic vacuum corresponds to the situation where atom and field are maximally entangled so that their coherence is minimal (zero); on the contrary, if the environment acts exactly as a polarisation filter, which destroys linear polarisation along \( \vec{x} \), it also destroys the correlations (entanglement) between the emitted photon and the two ground states, which fully restores the atomic coherence. In realistic situations (as we will see in Section III), partial coherence is achieved, in-between these two extreme cases (isotropic vacuum and ideal anisotropic vacuum).

III. METASURFACE DESIGNS

Anisotropy in vacuum appears naturally in the near-field of a material. For instance, anisotropic suppression of spontaneous emission of atoms located between two close mirrors have been reported by W. Jhe et al. [24]. Anisotropy of Casimir-Polder interactions between atoms and planar surfaces has also been investigated [25] leading to atomic level mixing [26]. Resonant nano-structures are also known to show important discrepancies between \( \text{Im}(G_{xx}) \) and \( \text{Im}(G_{yy}) \) in the near-field [27]. Interestingly, if near-field interactions can enhance the QE emission rate because of large \( \text{Im}(G_{yy}) \) values (see e.g. Ref. [28]), they are not a better than far-field interactions to develop anisotropic vacuum environment as we will see.

In the far-field, metasurfaces acting as a spherical mirror with polarization-dependent responses have been proposed to create anisotropic vacuum [27, 28]. As a first example, looking at Eq. (12), one can consider the ideal case of a metasurface that perfectly reflects back to the QE half of its own emission only at a particular polarization, let say the x-component, leading to a perfect destructive interference and thus \( \text{Im}(G_{xx}(r_0, r_0, \omega)) = 0 \). Considering that the other polarization component (the y-component) is not affected and thus \( \text{Im}(G_{yy}(r_0, r_0, \omega)) = 0 \).
\( \gamma_0/2 \), its value in vacuum, such a metasurface might lead to an optimum visibility of \( V = -1 \). This was the strategy followed in Ref. [7] in order to induce the coherent population transfer predicted in Ref. [11] for a \( V \)-configuration.

A second example of metasurface acting on circular polarizations instead can be found. Instead of expressing the quantities appearing in Eqs. [10] and [11] in Cartesian coordinates [as done to obtain Eq. [12]], one can also express the Green tensor and dipole moments in the spherical basis \((\varepsilon_+, \varepsilon_-, \varepsilon_0)\), where \( \varepsilon_\pm = (\hat{x} \pm i \hat{y})/\sqrt{2} \) and \( \varepsilon_0 = \hat{z} \). Then, by plugging these expressions into Eq. [8], one finds the following expression for the coherence:

\[
\rho_{12}(\infty) = \frac{d_01 d_02}{d_01^2 + d_02^2} \frac{\text{Im}(G_{+-})}{\text{Im}(G_{++})}, \tag{16}
\]

where here again the Green tensor spherical components have to be evaluated at the position of the quantum emitter \( r_0 \) and for the transition frequency \( \omega_0 \). This expression is equivalent to Eq. [12], given the following relations: \( G_{+-} = \frac{1}{2}(G_{xx} - G_{yy} - i2G_{xy}) \) and \( G_{++} = G_{--} = \frac{1}{2}(G_{xx} + G_{yy}) \). The form of Eq. [16] suggests that a metasurface that mixes the circular polarizations \( \sigma^+ \) and \( \sigma^- \), and thus leading to \( \text{Im}[G_{+-}(r_0, r_0, \omega_0)] \neq 0 \), might create a coherence. Ideally, if the metasurface totally inverses the absolute rotation direction of the electric field with respect to that of the incident circularly polarized one, one will have \( \text{Im}[G_{+-}(r_0, \omega_0)] = \text{Im}[G_{+-}(r_0, \omega_0)] \), and thus a maximum visibility \( V = 1 \). This strategy was employed in Ref. [8] in order to induce a coherence between the two excited states in a \( V \)-configuration.

In this Part, we present the two designs of metasurface discussed in the above examples, we compare their performances, and we assess the value of the induced coherence, taking into account the limitations of such designs. But first of all, we present in Section III.A the general approach used to make the designs.

### A. Phase-mapping approach

The problem considered here is the interaction between a planar (meta)surface and an electric dipole source of emission wavelength \( \lambda_0 \) located at a distance \( d \) above the surface. For an emitter located at remote distances (in the far-field \( d \gg \lambda_0 \)), the interaction will be efficient only if the metasurface is able to reflect and focus back the light originating from the “point” dipole source. Thus, the metasurface must be optically equivalent to a spherical mirror of focal length \( f = d/2 \), by producing the following spherical phase profile:

\[
\varphi(r) = \pi - 2k_0|r - r_0| \text{ (mod } 2\pi\text{)}, \tag{17}
\]

where \( k_0 = 2\pi/\lambda_0 \), \( r \) are the coordinates of the points of the metasurface, and \( r_0 \) are the coordinates of the QE. We parametrize the problem as the following: the points \( r \) lie in the plan \( z = 0 \): \( r = (x, y, 0) \), and \( r_0 = (0, 0, d) \). In other words, the phase accumulated through propagation should be compensated in each point \( r \) of the flat metasurface — hence the minus sign in Eq. [17] — by a phase-shift corresponding to the phase profile given in Eq. [17]. Such metasurfaces create interferences and a diffraction limited spot (at the position of the QE \( r_0 \)), and are the equivalent in reflection of metalenses [9] [10]. They can be implemented using metallic subwavelength reflect-arrays, made of a metallic mirror, a dielectric spacer and subwavelength structures (also called meta-atoms or nanoantennas) patterned on top (see Fig. 2). By carefully choosing and positionning the meta-atoms, the metasurface can induce local phase-shifts that mimic the spherical phase profile given by Eq. [17]. This is the principle of the phase-mapping approach. Obviously, each design is specific for a couple of parameters \( \{\lambda_0, d\} \), so a modification of one of these parameters leads to a new design. Good reflectance efficiencies were reported for such metasurfaces at normal incidence: about 80% for gold reflectarrays in the range 700 – 1100 nm [29–31] and up to 90% for silver reflectarrays around 640–670 nm [32–34].

In order to design the metasurface, one usually extrapolates its properties from the computations of an infinite periodic grating. Such an approach assumes that locally, the properties of the metasurface are close to the one of a periodic grating, which is valid if the meta-atoms behave independently [9], and is referred to as local-periodicity approach. Adopting this approach, all the numerical simulations in this paper are done using the open-source code Reticolo software for grating analysis [35], which implements a frequency-domain modal method known as the Rigorous Coupled Wave Analysis (RCWA) [34–37]. Moreover, all the meta-atoms considered here are nanorods that respect a mirror symmetry, and therefore throughout this paper: \( G_{xy} = 0 \) [38].

In the next Sections III.B and III.C, we present two designs aiming at creating the coherence in the QE, and we characterize their performances.

---

**Figure 2.** Unit-cell of a reflect-array metasurface made of: a metallic mirror of thickness \( h_1 \), a dielectric spacer of thickness \( h_2 \), and a rectangular nanoantenna of dimensions \( l_x \times l_y \), and of thickness \( h_3 \). The dimensions of the unit-cell are: \( \Lambda_x^{uc} \times \Lambda_y^{uc} \).
B. Design based on resonant-phase delays

In this Section, we design the metasurface discussed in the first example above — inspired from Eq. (12) — that must have the following optical properties: (i) The metasurface acts as a spherical mirror only for a linearly-polarized light along \( \vec{x} \), resulting in \( G_{xx}(r_0, r_0, \omega_0) = 0 \) (destructive interferences); (ii) The metasurface acts as a planar mirror for a linearly-polarized light along \( \vec{y} \), so \( G_{yy}(r_0, r_0, \omega_0) \) is untouched. Such a metasurface can be built from anisotropic resonant nanoantennas, using for example metallic nanorods (like the one represented in Fig. 2) with: Varying lengths along \( \vec{x} \), in order to tune the resonance and to induce different phase-shifts or resonant-phase delays on a \( x \)-polarized light that reproduce the spherical phase profile of Eq. (17). And the same width along \( \vec{y} \), in order to induce a constant phase-shift on a \( y \)-polarized light that produces a flat phase profile [7, 29, 30].

For the simulations, we consider a 2-D grating made of unit-cells of the type presented in Fig. 2 with lateral dimensions of \( \Lambda_x^{sc} \times \Lambda_y^{sc} = 300 \text{ nm} \times 150 \text{ nm} \), and made of a gold mirror and a dielectric film of SiO\(_2\) with respective thicknesses \( h_1 = 130 \text{ nm} \) and \( h_2 = 50 \text{ nm} \), and a gold nanorod patterned on top with fixed width \( l_y = 100 \text{ nm} \) and thickness \( h_3 = 30 \text{ nm} \). The wavelength is chosen at \( \lambda_0 = 852 \text{ nm} \), which corresponds to the D2-line of cesium atom. At this wavelength, the refractive indices are \( n = 3.45 \) for gold and \( n = 2.45 \) for SiO\(_2\). In Fig. 3, we computed the phase-shifts (in green) and the efficiencies in reflection (in purple) of such a 2-D grating, for \( \vec{x} \)- and \( \vec{y} \)-polarized waves at normal incidence, as a function of the length \( l_x \) of the nanorod. One can see that the phase-shift induced on a \( x \)-polarized wave (green crosses) spans over \( 8\pi/5 \) (1.6\( \pi \)), which corresponds to 4/5 of the \( 2\pi \) phase space, while the phase-shift induced on a \( y \)-polarized wave (green circles) is rather flat. We can therefore choose five nanoantennas to sample the entire phase space of \( 2\pi \), with respective phase-shifts of: 0, 2\( \pi/5 \), 4\( \pi/5 \), 6\( \pi/5 \) and 8\( \pi/5 \) (intersection with the dotted black lines spaced by 2\( \pi/5 \), see dimensions in Table 1). Moreover, the reflectance of the \( x \)-polarized wave (purple squares), which is the only one that matters, is relatively good, remaining between 63\% and 97\%, the losses being due to absorption by the metal (we check that the gold mirror is thick enough and that there is no transmission losses).

![Figure 3. Reflection efficiency (reflectance, in purple) and phase-shift \( \varphi \) (in green) of an incident \( x \)-polarized (resp. \( y \)-polarized) wave as a function of the length \( l_x \) of the nanoantenna, computed for a 2-D grating (see main text). The dotted black lines are spaced by \( 2\pi/5 \).](image)

### Table 1. Nanoantennas dimensions for sampling the phase-space from 0 to \( 2\pi \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nanoantenna</th>
<th>( l_x )</th>
<th>( l_y )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>30 nm</td>
<td>100 nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>105 nm</td>
<td>100 nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>125 nm</td>
<td>100 nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>145 nm</td>
<td>100 nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>250 nm</td>
<td>100 nm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The design of the metasurface is achieved after combining these five nanoantennas with the following rules: All nanoantennas must be parallel (the varying length \( l_x \) always oriented along the \( \vec{x} \) axis), and patterned after Eq. (17) according to the phase-mapping approach. This design is illustrated in “1-D” in Fig. 4. In Fig. 4 (a), we plot the ideal unwrapped (resp. wrapped) phase profile of Eq. (17) of a \( x \)-polarized wave in dashed red (resp. full red), and the ideal flat phase profile of a \( y \)-polarized wave in blue, starting from the center of the metasurface at \( r = 0 \). In Fig. 4 (a), we represent a slice of the metasurface where the nanoantennas are distributed into super-cells (one of them is highlighted in the red box) that sample the phase-space of \( 2\pi \), mimicking the phase profiles of Fig. 4 (a). The size of the super-cells is maximum at the center of the metasurface, and it decreases as they are getting further from the center, since the spherical phase profile varies more rapidly.

In addition to the absorption losses, the sampling of the phase by discrete elements in the phase-mapping approach also limits the performances of the metasurface (one talks about discretization losses). In order to assess these discretization losses, we compute the performances in the canonical case of a linear-phase gradient metasurface [29, 30], which behaves as a blazed grating that diffracts entirely into the diffraction order \( m = -1 \) only for an incident \( x \)-polarized wave. Such a gradient metasurface is made of a same super-cell containing nanoantennas that sample the phase regularly from \( 2\pi \) to 0 (and from 0 to \( 2\pi \) to diffract into the order \( m = +1 \)), repeated with periodic boundary conditions.

For the simulations, we consider a linear-phase gradient metasurface made of super-cells of dimensions \( \Lambda_x^{sc} \times \Lambda_y^{sc} = 300 \text{ nm} \times 1500 \text{ nm} \), in which the five nanoantennas previously selected are embedded into unit-cells, with the same dimensions as previously, and repeated twice...
[see inset in Fig. 5 (a)]. The working wavelength is still 852 nm, as previously. The angle of the diffracted order \( m = -1 \) (reflection angle \( \theta_r \)) is given in terms of the angle of the incident wave (incident angle \( \theta_i \)) by the generalized Snell’s law of reflection [10]:

\[
\sin (\theta_r) = \sin (\theta_i) + \frac{2\pi \partial \varphi}{\lambda_0 \partial y}, \tag{18}
\]

where in our case \( \partial \varphi / \partial y = -2\pi / \Lambda_{sc}^x \) with \( \Lambda_{sc}^x = 1500 \) nm. We check that we perfectly recover this law in Fig. 5 (a) for an incident \( x \)-polarized wave. Thus, one can see that the diffraction angle is the same either for a periodic blazed grating or for a smooth linear-gradient metasurface, because it only depends on the period and not on the underlying structure [39].

In Fig. 5 (b), we computed the reflectance of the diffracted order \( m = -1 \) for an incident \( x \)-polarized wave (green circles) as a function of the incident angle \( \theta_i \), and compare it with other dominant orders \( m = 0 \) (blue stars) and \( m = -2 \) (orange triangles). The total reflectance is also shown (dark squares). Firstly, the total reflectance, which varies between 59\% and 77\%, reveals absorption losses between 23\% and 41\%, depending on the incident angle. Secondly, one can see that the reflectance of the order \( m = -1 \) is about 60\% for incident angles \( \theta_i \) up to 30\°, and then decreases until 40\% for an incident angle of 70\°, while mostly the reflectance of the order \( m = 0 \) increases. This reveals that while the reflectance into a given order depends on the incident angle \( \theta_i \), it is relatively robust with the variations of \( \theta_i \) (1/3 decrease of the reflectance of the order \( m = -1 \) over 70°).

The final metasurface is more complex than a linear-phase gradient metasurface since it is made of super-cells of different sizes. One can show from Eq. (17) that the largest super-cell starts at \( r = 0 \) (at the center of the metasurface) and has a length of \( \Lambda_{sc}^{x\text{max}} = \sqrt{d} \lambda_0 \), and that the length of the next super-cells quickly converges towards the minimum length of \( \Lambda_{sc}^{x\text{min}} = \lambda_0 / 2 \). In Table II for a design working at \{\( \lambda_0 = 852 \) nm, \( d = 10 \lambda_0 \}\}, we give: the length \( \Lambda_{sc}^x \) of the first five super-cells represented in Fig. 4 (b) (and labelled \( n = 1, ..., 5 \) starting from the center); the number of unit-cells \( N \) per super-cell, considering a unit-cell of fixed length \( \Lambda_{sc}^x = 300 \) nm (~0.35\( \lambda_0 \)). One can see that the number of unit-cells — and therefore of nanoantennas — quickly drops from 9 (first super-cell) to 2 (forth super-cell). Consequently, the sampling of the phase deteriorates, leading to higher discretization losses. We computed in Table II the reflectance of the

![Figure 4. Illustration of the phase-mapping approach for the 1-D design of the resonant-phase delay metasurface. (a) Phase profiles to be encoded by the metasurface: the wrapped [resp. unwrapped] spherical phase profile \( \varphi_x \) of Eq. (17) (red full line) [resp. red dashed line] desired for the \( x \)-polarization, and the flat phase profile \( \varphi_y \) (blue line) desired for the \( y \)-polarization, starting from the center of the metasurface at \( r = 0 \). (b) Correlation nanoantennas to encode the desired phase-shifts \( \varphi_x \) and \( \varphi_y \). The unit-cells of length \( \Lambda_{sc}^x \) (black dashed box) containing the nanoantennas are encompassed into super-cells of length \( \Lambda_{sc}^x \) (red box), spanning the 2\pi phase-space.](image)

![Figure 5. Diffraction performances of a linear-phase gradient metasurface. The inset shows a super-cell of the gradient metasurface of size \( \Lambda_{sc}^{x\text{max}} \times \Lambda_{sc}^{y\text{max}} \) (see main text). (a) Reflection angle \( \theta_r \) in the diffracted order \( m = -1 \) of an incident plane wave polarized along \( \vec{x} \) as a function of the incident angle \( \theta_i \) (green circles). The generalized Snell’s law of reflection [Eq. (18)] is also plotted (black dashed line). (b) Reflection efficiency (reflectance) in the diffracted orders \( m = 0, -1, -2 \) (blue stars, green circles, and orange triangles, respectively) and total reflection efficiency (black squares) of an incident plane wave polarized along \( \vec{x} \) as a function of the incident angle \( \theta_i \).](image)
order \( m = -1 \) (for an incident \( x \)-polarized wave) for different linear-phase gradient metasurfaces made of these super-cells, and taking into account the incident angle \( \theta_i \) (also shown) at which the light impinges the super-cell in the final metasurface. One can see that the reflectance decreases as the number of unit-cells per super-cell decreases; in other words, the discretization losses increase.

In summary, the performances of the metasurface are reduced for two main reasons: the absorption losses and the discretization losses due to the finite number of unit-cells used to sample the phase; They are better in the center of the metasurface, and deteriorate quickly when getting further from the center (or increasing of the incident angle), which limits the numerical aperture (NA) of the metasurface.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Super-cell</th>
<th>( \Lambda_{sc} (\lambda_0) )</th>
<th>( N )</th>
<th>( \theta_i (\degree) )</th>
<th>Reflectance (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \infty )</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II. Characteristics of the super-cells of the metasurface shown in Fig. 4, labelled by integer \( n = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 \) (starting from the center of the metasurface): length \( \Lambda_{sc} \) (in units of \( \lambda_0 \)), number of unit-cells \( N \) per super-cell, incident angle \( \theta_i \) of the light impinging the super-cell, and reflectance in the order \( m = -1 \) (computed for a linear-phase gradient metasurface made of the super-cell and at the incident angle \( \theta_i \)).

C. Design based on geometric phases

In this Section, we design the metasurface discussed in the second example above — inspired from Eq. (16) — that must have the following properties: (i) The metasurface acts as a spherical mirror; (ii) Upon reflection, the metasurface totally inverses the absolute rotation direction of the electric field with respect to that of the incident circularly polarized one. This inversion of the electric field rotation can be achieved by using nanoantennas which act as half wave plates, as the result of a phase delay of \( \pi \) between the long and short axes of the nanoantennas \([31, 38]\). Moreover, a phase-shift, called geometric phase or Pancharatnam–Berry phase, which depends on the orientation of the antenna, is acquired through this inversion, according to \([40, 41]\):

\[
\varphi = 2\phi ,
\]

where \( \phi \) denotes the angle by which the antenna is rotated (see inset in Fig. 6). This phase-shift is of geometric origin since it is solely due to the orientation of the nanoantenna and not to its resonance properties. Thus, the spherical phase profile can be built by mapping the orientation of the nanoantennas [Eq. (19)] into the spherical phase profile [Eq. (17)].

For the simulations, we consider a 2-D grating made of unit-cells of the type presented in Fig. 2 with lateral dimensions of \( \Lambda_{sc} x \times \Lambda_{sc} y = 300 \text{ nm} \times 300 \text{ nm} \), and made of a gold mirror and a dielectric film of MgF\(_2\) with respective thicknesses \( h_1 = 130 \text{ nm} \) and \( h_2 = 90 \text{ nm} \), and a gold nanorod patterned on top lateral dimensions \( l_x = 200 \text{ nm} \) and \( l_y = 80 \text{ nm} \) and thickness \( h_3 = 30 \text{ nm} \), following Refs. [31, 38]. The working wavelength is 852 nm, and the refractive indices are \( n = 0.16 + 15.34 \) for gold and \( n = 1.37 \) for MgF\(_2\). For such a system, the phase-shift for a light polarized along \( \vec{x} \) and a light polarized along \( \vec{y} \) is \( \pi \) upon reflection, at 852 nm. Thus, the system acts as a half-wave plate working in reflection.

We check in Fig. 6 that we perfectly recover the behaviour of Eq. (19) (shown in dashed black line) by simulating the phase-shift induced by a periodic grating of such nanoantennas all rotated by the same angle \( \phi \) (green circles). We show in Fig. 7 the 3-D drawing of such a metasurface working at \( \lambda_0 = 852 \text{ nm}, d = 10 \lambda_0 \). In this Figure, we also highlight the first super-cell (white box) starting from the center of the metasurface.

Next, in Fig. 8 we compute the conversion efficiency of an incident wave circularly polarized \( \sigma^+ \) into a reflected wave circularly polarized \( \sigma^- \) (cross-polarization reflectance) of the same 2-D grating, as a function of the incident angle \( \theta_i \). One can see that the cross-polarization reflectance remains \( > 40\% \) for \( \theta_i < 45\degree \). This design does not seem to be as good as the first design presented in Section III B for which we recall that the reflectance into the desired order remains \( > 40\% \) up to \( \theta_i = 70\degree \) [Fig. 5 (b)]. Even though the quantities that we compare here are different, both characterize in a way the performances of the metasurface.

Figure 6. Geometric phase \( \varphi \) as a function of the rotation angle \( \phi \) of the nanorods in the plan (\( \vec{x}, \vec{y} \)) (see inset), computed for a 2-D grating (see main text) (green circles). The analytical expression [Eq. (19)] is also plotted (black dashed line).
nanoantennas have a mirror symmetry. By noting that, where we recall that we consider \( \text{Im} \ G^{xx} \), since its performances seem to be better than to do so, we limit the discussion to the first design (Section III B), since its performances seem to be better than the ideal case of an infinite perfect spherical mirror, this value of the induced coherence of \( \rho_{12} = 0.5 \), compared to the ideal case with \( \text{NA} = 0 \). The white box highlights the first super-cell (starting from the center) of size \( \Lambda_1^e = 2.7 \mu m \), made of nine nanorods.

Figure 7. 3-D design of the geometric metasurface, made for a distance of the dipole source \( d = 10 \lambda_0 \) from the metasurface, and an emission wavelength of \( \lambda_0 = 852 \text{ nm} \). The white box highlights the first super-cell (starting from the center) of size \( \Lambda_1^e = 2.7 \mu m \), made of nine nanorods.

Figure 8. Cross-polarization (CP) reflectance, which characterizes the conversion efficiency between a light circularly polarized \( \sigma^+ \) and a light circularly polarized \( \sigma^- \), as a function of the incident angle \( \theta_i \), computed for a 2-D grating (see main text).

D. Discussions on the coherence and limitations

In this Section, we want to assess a realistic value of the ground state coherence \( \rho_{12} \) in the steady state [Eq. (5)]. To do so, we limit the discussion to the first design (Section III B), since its performances seem to be better than for the second design (Section III C).

If the dipole moments of the \( \Lambda \)-transition are equal \( d_01 = d_02 = d \), Eq. (12) [or equivalently Eq. (10)] becomes:

\[
\rho_{12}(\infty) = \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{\text{Im} \ [G_{xx} - G_{yy}]}{\text{Im} \ [G_{xx} + G_{yy}]} ,
\]

where we recall that we consider \( \text{Im} \ [G_{xy}] = 0 \) since the nanoantennas have a mirror symmetry. By noting that, for a two-level atom characterized by a dipole moment \( d \) oriented along the \( x \)-axis, the decay rate is given by [28]:

\[
\gamma_x = \frac{2 \omega_0^2}{\hbar c} |d|^2 \text{Im} (G^{xx}) ,
\]

and similarly for an orientation along the \( y \)-axis, Eq. (20) can be recast in the form:

\[
\rho_{12}(\infty) = \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{\gamma_x + \gamma_y}{\gamma_x + \gamma_y} .
\]

In the case of the metasurface presented in Section III B, the quantity \( \gamma_y \) is not affected, so \( \gamma_y = \gamma_0 \) (we recall that \( \gamma_0 \) denotes the decay rate of a two-level atom in free space), while the quantity \( \gamma_x \) is altered. We want to compute \( \gamma_x \) as function of the reflectance \( R_x \) (the subscript is for a light polarized along \( x \)) of a metasurface with a given numerical aperture \( \text{NA} \). In order to do so, we use the expression of the decay rate of a two-level atom located at the focus of a spherical mirror derived in Ref. [3]:

\[
\frac{\gamma_x}{\gamma_0} = 3 \int_{2\pi} d\Omega \left[ 1 - \frac{|d \cdot \Omega|^2}{|d|^2} \right] \times (1 - R_x) ,
\]

where \( \Omega \) is the vectorial solid angle and \( d\Omega = \sin \theta d\theta d\phi \).

In the case of the metasurface, we take the values of the reflectance \( R_x \) from Table III (\( R_x \) is therefore a piecewise function), and \( R_x = 0 \) for \( \sin \theta > \text{NA} \). In Fig. 8, we show the relative decay rate modifications \( \gamma_x/\gamma_0 \) calculated from Eq. (23) (green circles) and the induced coherence calculated from Eq. (22) (red triangles), as a function of the numerical aperture defined as \( \text{NA} \equiv \sin \theta \). For comparison, we also show the decay rate modifications (resp. the induced coherence) in the case of a perfect reflective spherical mirror (reflectance \( R_x = 1 \)) that would only reflect a polarization along \( x \) [green dashed line (resp. red dashed line)]. In this case, Eq. (23) can be calculated analytically and reads:

\[
\frac{\gamma_x}{\gamma_0} = \sqrt{1 - \text{NA}^2} \times \left( 1 - \frac{\text{NA}^2}{4} \right) .
\]

One can see that for a metasurface of \( \text{NA} = 0.7 \), the decay rate \( \gamma_x \) is reduced by 20% compared to \( \gamma_0 \), with an induced coherence of \( \sim 0.05 \). Compared to the ideal case of an infinite perfect spherical mirror, this value of the coherence is about one order of magnitude smaller (0.5 for an ideal reflector with NA= 1). Larger NA results only in a moderate improvement of the effect because of the rapid drop of the reflectance, contrary to the ideal case. To attain near-unity efficiency in reflection, further optimizations of the antenna geometries that can take into consideration the coupling between neighboring elements are required. Several methods have been proposed including objective-first algorithms [42,43], topology optimization [45] and inverse designs [46,47], which are also applicable to improve our device efficiency notably at large deflection angles, but beyond the scope of the present publication.
applications in a new paradigm [16, 32].
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METHODS

Numerical simulations: The numerical simulations were done using the open-source Reticolo software for grating analysis [33], developed by J.P. Hugonin and P. Lalanne, Institut d’Optique, Palaiseau, France (2005), which implements a frequency-domain modal method known as the Rigorous Coupled Wave Analysis (RCWA) (see Refs. [34–37]).

Computer Aided Design (CAD): The CAD in Fig. 7 was drawn using the software SolidWorks developed by Dassault Systèmes®.

A. MASTER EQUATION DERIVATION

In this Appendix, we present the Master Equation framework, closely following Refs. [19] Chapter 5.6 and Chapter 1, that we used to derive the master equation [Eq. (3)] in Section IV.

Short notations: It will be convenient for the following calculations to rewrite $H_I(t)$ of Eq. (1) in a more compact form:

$$\dot{H}_I(t) = \hat{d}^d(t) \cdot \hat{E}^{(+)\dagger}_v(t) + \hat{d}^s(t) \cdot \hat{E}^{(-)\dagger}_v(t)$$  \hspace{1cm} (25)

where $\hat{d}(t)$ and $\dot{\hat{d}}(t)$ are defined by:

$$\hat{d}(t) \equiv - (d_{01} | 1 \rangle \langle 0 | e^{-i \omega_1 t} + d_{02} | 2 \rangle \langle 0 | e^{-i \omega_2 t})$$  \hspace{1cm} (26)

$$\dot{\hat{d}}(t) \equiv - (d_{01} | 0 \rangle \langle 1 | e^{i \omega_1 t} + d_{02} | 0 \rangle \langle 2 | e^{i \omega_2 t})$$  \hspace{1cm} (27)

Note that for clarity we dropped the label $r_0$ appearing in $\hat{E}^{(+)}(r_0, t)$ and $\hat{E}^{(-)}(r_0, t)$, but one must remember that the fields are evaluated at the position of the atom $r_0$. Remember that this Hamiltonian is written in the electric dipole and rotating-wave approximations.

Derivation of the Master Equation: In the interaction picture, the density matrix $\rho_T(t)$ of the total system \{atom+environment\} obeys the Schrödinger equation [19, 20]:

$$\frac{\partial \rho_T(t)}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{\hbar} [\hat{H}_I(t), \rho_T(t)]$$  \hspace{1cm} (28)
The atomic density matrix ρ(t) is obtained by taking the trace over the degrees of freedom of the environment: ρ(t) = Trₑ(ρₑ(t)), and therefore obeys:
\[ \frac{∂ρ(t)}{∂t} = \frac{1}{\hbar} \text{Tr}[\hat{H}_I(t), ρ_T(t)] \quad (29) \]

We formally integrate Eq. (28):
\[ ρ_T(t) = ρ_T(0) + \frac{1}{\hbar} \int_0^t dt' [\hat{H}_I(t'), ρ_T(t')] \quad (30) \]

and substitute this expression in Eq. (29):
\[ \frac{∂ρ(t)}{∂t} = \frac{1}{\hbar} \text{Tr}[\hat{H}_I(t), ρ_T(0)] \]
\[ - \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \int_0^t dt' \text{Tr} \left[ \hat{H}_I(t'), [\hat{H}_I(t'), ρ_T(t')] \right] \quad (31) \]

Expanding the commutators in Eq. (31) gives 16 terms. Noting that the trace only acts on the field operators and on ρₑ(0), and using the cyclic property of the trace operation and the fact that for instance \( \text{Tr}_c(\rho_c(0))\hat{E}_v^+(t)\hat{E}_v^-(t') = \langle \hat{E}_v^+(t')\hat{E}_v^-(t) \rangle \), we get
\[ \frac{∂ρ(t)}{∂t} = -\frac{1}{\hbar^2} \int_0^t dt' \text{Tr} \left[ \hat{d}^\dagger(t)\hat{E}_v^+(t') + \hat{d}(t)\hat{E}_v^-(t') \right] \quad (32) \]

Assuming that Trₑ([\hat{H}_I(t), ρ_T(0)]) = 0, we make the Born approximation: \( ρ_T(t) = ρ(t) \otimes ρₑ(0) \), so that Eq. (31) reduces to:
\[ \frac{∂ρ(t)}{∂t} = -\frac{1}{\hbar^2} \int_0^t dt' \text{Tr} \left[ \hat{H}_I(t'), [\hat{H}_I(t'), ρ_c(0) \otimes ρ(t')] \right] \quad (33) \]

Next, we make the Markov approximation and replace \( ρ(t') \) by \( ρ(t) \) in the integrand. Therefore, we get a Master Equation for the atomic density matrix \( ρ(t) \) in the Born-Markov approximation:
\[ \frac{∂ρ(t)}{∂t} = -\frac{1}{\hbar^2} \int_0^t dt' \text{Tr} \left[ \hat{H}_I(t'), [\hat{H}_I(t'), ρ_c(0) \otimes ρ(t)] \right] \quad (34) \]

Now, we write \( \hat{H}_I(t) \) explicitly and expand the commutators. Using the compact form Eq. (25) into Eq. (33) one gets:
\[ \frac{∂ρ(t)}{∂t} = -\frac{1}{\hbar^2} \int_0^t dt' \text{Tr} \left[ \hat{d}^\dagger(t)\hat{E}_v^+(t') + \hat{d}(t)\hat{E}_v^-(t') \right] \quad (35) \]

Assuming that Trₑ([\hat{H}_I(t), ρ_T(0)]) = 0, we make the Born approximation: \( ρ_T(t) = ρ(t) \otimes ρₑ(0) \), so that Eq. (31) reduces to:
\[ \frac{∂ρ(t)}{∂t} = -\frac{1}{\hbar^2} \int_0^t dt' \text{Tr} \left[ \hat{H}_I(t'), [\hat{H}_I(t'), ρ_c(0) \otimes ρ(t')] \right] \quad (33) \]

Now, we write \( \hat{H}_I(t) \) explicitly and expand the commutators. Using the compact form Eq. (25) into Eq. (33) one gets:
\[ \frac{∂ρ(t)}{∂t} = -\frac{1}{\hbar^2} \int_0^t dt' \text{Tr} \left[ \hat{d}^\dagger(t)\hat{E}_v^+(t') + \hat{d}(t)\hat{E}_v^-(t') \right] \quad (34) \]

\[ \langle \hat{E}_v^+(t')\hat{E}_v^+(t) \rangle = \langle \hat{E}_v^+(t')\hat{E}_v^+(t) \rangle = \langle \hat{E}_v^+(t')\hat{E}_v^-(t) \rangle = \langle \hat{E}_v^+(t')\hat{E}_v^-(t) \rangle = 0 \]

(32)

\[ \langle \hat{E}_v^+(t')\hat{E}_v^+(t) \rangle = \langle \hat{E}_v^+(t')\hat{E}_v^+(t) \rangle = 0 \]

(33)

Thus, only the first two terms remain in Eq. (35) which reduces to
\[ \frac{∂ρ(t)}{∂t} = -\frac{1}{\hbar^2} \int_0^t dt' \left[ \langle \hat{d}^\dagger(t)\hat{E}_v^+(t') + \hat{d}(t)\hat{E}_v^-(t') \rangle \left( \hat{d}^\dagger(t')\hat{d}(t') - \hat{d}(t')\hat{d}(t) \right) \right] \quad (36) \]

Note: By using the property of the correlation function \( \langle \hat{E}_v^+(t')\hat{E}_v^+(t) \rangle = \langle \hat{E}_v^+(t')\hat{E}_v^+(t) \rangle \), and noting that the fact that \( \langle \hat{d}(t)\hat{d}(t') - \hat{d}(t')\hat{d}(t) \rangle = \langle \hat{d}^\dagger(t)\hat{d}(t') - \hat{d}(t')\hat{d}(t) \rangle \), one can see that the second term in Eq. (36) is actually the Hermitian conjugate (H.c.) of the first one. Therefore, we simply write Eq. (36) as
\[ \frac{∂ρ(t)}{∂t} = -\frac{1}{\hbar^2} \int_0^t dt' \langle \hat{E}_v^+(t')\hat{E}_v^+(t) \rangle \left( \hat{d}^\dagger(t)\hat{d}(t') - \hat{d}(t')\hat{d}(t) \right) + \text{H.c.} \quad (37) \]
Eq. (37) is the starting point to calculate the dynamical evolution of any multilevel atom. Here, we proceed by writing explicitly the terms in the integrand using the expressions for $\hat{d}(t)$ and $\hat{d}^\dagger(t)$ from Eqs. (26) and (27), which corresponds to the $\Lambda$-configuration with orthogonal transitions:

$$
\dot{d}(t)\rho(t) = e^{i\omega_{1}(t-t')}d_{01}|0\rangle\langle 0|\rho(t) + e^{i\omega_{2}(t-t')}d_{02}|0\rangle\langle 0|\rho(t) (38)
$$

and by defining $\rho_{00}(t) \equiv \langle 0|\rho(t)|0\rangle$ to simplify the expressions:

$$
\dot{d}(t)\rho(t)\dot{d}(t') = +e^{i\omega_{1}(t-t')}\rho_{00}(t)d_{01}|1\rangle\langle 1|d_{01}
+ e^{i\omega_{2}(t-t')}\rho_{00}(t)d_{02}|2\rangle\langle 2|d_{02}
+ e^{i\omega_{1}t}e^{-i\omega_{2}t}\rho_{00}(t)d_{02}^*|2\rangle\langle 1|d_{01}
+ e^{i\omega_{2}t}e^{-i\omega_{1}t}\rho_{00}(t)d_{01}^*|1\rangle\langle 2|d_{02}
(39)
$$

Substituting these expressions in Eq. (37) and by factorizing the exponential terms, we get:

$$
\frac{\partial \rho(t)}{\partial t} = -\frac{1}{\hbar^2}\int_{0}^{t} dt' \langle \hat{E}_{\omega_{1}}^+(t-t')\hat{E}_{\omega_{1}}^-(t') \rangle \times
+ e^{i\omega_{1}(t-t')}d_{01}|0\rangle\langle 0|\rho(t) - \rho_{00}(t)d_{01}^*|1\rangle\langle 1|d_{01}
+ e^{i\omega_{2}(t-t')}d_{02}|0\rangle\langle 0|\rho(t) - \rho_{00}(t)d_{02}^*|2\rangle\langle 2|d_{02}
+ e^{i\omega_{1}t}e^{-i\omega_{2}t}\rho_{00}(t)d_{02}^*|2\rangle\langle 1|d_{01}
+ e^{i\omega_{2}t}e^{-i\omega_{1}t}\rho_{00}(t)d_{01}^*|1\rangle\langle 2|d_{02}
+ H.c.
(40)
$$

**Change of variable:**

$$
\langle \hat{E}_{\omega_{1}}^+(t-t')\hat{E}_{\omega_{1}}^-(t') \rangle = \langle \hat{E}_{\omega_{1}}^+(t-t')\hat{E}_{\omega_{1}}^-(0) \rangle (\text{the correlation function only depends on the time difference})
$$

The next approximation is to make the upper limit tend to infinity. Eq. (40) becomes

$$
\frac{\partial \rho(t)}{\partial t} = -\frac{1}{\hbar^2}\int_{0}^{\infty} d\tau \langle \hat{E}_{\omega_{1}}^+(\tau)\hat{E}_{\omega_{1}}^-(0) \rangle \times
+ e^{i\omega_{1}\tau}d_{01}|0\rangle\langle 0|\rho(t) - \rho_{00}(t)d_{01}^*|1\rangle\langle 1|d_{01}
+ e^{i\omega_{2}\tau}d_{02}|0\rangle\langle 0|\rho(t) - \rho_{00}(t)d_{02}^*|2\rangle\langle 2|d_{02}
+ e^{i(\omega_{1}-\omega_{2})\tau}e^{-i\omega_{2}\tau}\rho_{00}(t)d_{02}^*|2\rangle\langle 1|d_{01}
+ e^{i(\omega_{2}-\omega_{1})\tau}e^{-i\omega_{1}\tau}\rho_{00}(t)d_{01}^*|1\rangle\langle 2|d_{02}
+ H.c.
(41)
$$

We finally introduce the positive part of the correlation tensor as:

$$
\hat{C}^+(\omega) = \int_{0}^{\infty} d\tau \langle \hat{E}_{\omega_{1}}^+(\tau)\hat{E}_{\omega_{1}}^-(0) \rangle e^{i\omega\tau} (42)
$$

to get:

$$
\frac{\partial \rho(t)}{\partial t} = -\Gamma_{1} \langle 0|\rho(t) - \rho_{00}(t)|1\rangle\langle 1|
- \Gamma_{2} \langle 0|\rho(t) - \rho_{00}(t)|2\rangle\langle 2|
+ \Gamma_{21} e^{i(\omega_{1}-\omega_{2})\tau}\rho_{00}(t)|2\rangle\langle 1|
+ \Gamma_{12} e^{i(\omega_{2}-\omega_{1})\tau}\rho_{00}(t)|1\rangle\langle 2|
+ H.c.
(43)
$$

with the following definitions of the coefficients:

$$
\Gamma_{i} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} d_{0i}^* \cdot \hat{C}^+(\omega_{1}) \cdot d_{0i}
(44)
$$
and

$$
\Gamma_{ij} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} d_{0i}^* \cdot \hat{C}^+(\omega_{1}) \cdot d_{0j}
(45)
$$

Remember that in the Master Equation above $\rho(t)$ is still in the interaction picture, and we come back to the Schrödinger picture assuming furthermore that the transition energies are about the same $\omega_{1} \approx \omega_{2} \equiv \omega_{0}$

$$
\frac{\partial \rho(t)}{\partial t} = -i\omega_{0} \langle 0|\rho(t) - \rho_{00}(t)|1\rangle\langle 1|
- \Gamma_{1} \langle 0|\rho(t) - \rho_{00}(t)|1\rangle\langle 1|
- \Gamma_{2} \langle 0|\rho(t) - \rho_{00}(t)|2\rangle\langle 2|
+ \Gamma_{21} \rho_{00}(t)|2\rangle\langle 1| + \Gamma_{12} \rho_{00}(t)|1\rangle\langle 2|
+ H.c.
(46)
$$

In Eq. (46), we have introduced the definitions of the coefficients:

$$
\Gamma_{i} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} d_{0i}^* \cdot \hat{C}^+(\omega_{0}) \cdot d_{0i}
(47)
$$
and

$$
\Gamma_{ij} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} d_{0i}^* \cdot \hat{C}^+(\omega_{0}) \cdot d_{0j}
(48)
$$

defined in terms of the positive part of the correlation tensor $\hat{C}^+$ that reads:

$$
\hat{C}^+(\omega) = \int_{0}^{\infty} d\tau \langle \hat{E}_{\omega_{1}}^+(\tau)\hat{E}_{\omega_{1}}^-(\tau) \rangle e^{i\omega\tau}
(49)
$$

where the bracket indicates an ensemble average:

$$
\langle \hat{E}_{\omega_{1}}^+(\tau)\hat{E}_{\omega_{1}}^-(\tau') \rangle \equiv \text{Tr}_{\epsilon} \left( \rho_{\epsilon}(0)\hat{E}_{\omega_{1}}^+(\tau)\hat{E}_{\omega_{1}}^-(\tau') \right)
(50)
$$

Using the mathematical relation:

$$
P \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right) = \frac{1}{\epsilon + i\delta} \text{ with } \epsilon \rightarrow 0
(51)
$$
one can demonstrate that:
\[
\hat{C}^{(+)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', \omega_0) = \frac{1}{2} \hat{C}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', \omega_0) + \frac{i}{2\pi} P \left\{ \int_0^{+\infty} d\omega \, \hat{C}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', \omega) \right\}
\]

where \( \hat{C} \) is the correlation tensor defined as:
\[
\hat{C}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', \omega) \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\tau \left\langle \hat{E}_0^{(+)}(\mathbf{r}, \tau) \hat{E}_0^{(-)}(\mathbf{r}', 0) \right\rangle e^{i\omega \tau}
\]

Therefore, the coefficients \( \Gamma_i \) become:
\[
\Gamma_i = \frac{\gamma_i}{2} + i\Delta \omega_i
\]

with
\[
\gamma_i = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \hat{d}_{0i}^* \cdot \hat{C}(\mathbf{r}_0, \mathbf{r}_0, \omega_0) \cdot \hat{d}_{0i}
\]

and
\[
\Delta \omega_i = \frac{1}{2\pi\hbar^2} P \left\{ \int_0^{+\infty} d\omega \, \hat{d}_{0i}^* \cdot \hat{C}(\mathbf{r}_0, \mathbf{r}_0, \omega) \cdot \hat{d}_{0i} \right\}
\]

where \( \gamma_i \) can be interpreted as the decay rate on the transition \( |0\rangle \rightarrow |i\rangle \), and \( \Delta \omega_i \) is the Lamb shift of the level \( |i\rangle \).

In the following, we recast the Lamb shift into the transition frequency and reduce \( \hat{C}^{(+)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', \omega_0) \) as:
\[
\hat{C}^{(+)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', \omega_0) = \frac{1}{2} \hat{C}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', \omega_0)
\]

Therefore, the coefficients become:
\[
\Gamma_i = \frac{\gamma_i}{2} \quad \text{with} \quad \gamma_i = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \hat{d}_{0i}^* \cdot \hat{C}(\mathbf{r}_0, \mathbf{r}_0, \omega_0) \cdot \hat{d}_{0i}
\]

and
\[
\Gamma_{ij} = \frac{\kappa_{ij}}{2} \quad \text{with} \quad \kappa_{ij} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \hat{d}_{0i}^* \cdot \hat{C}(\mathbf{r}_0, \mathbf{r}_0, \omega_0) \cdot \hat{d}_{0j}
\]

\section*{Solution of the Master Equation:}

From the Master Equation, given in Eq. (46), we obtain the following equations for the atomic populations \( \rho_{ii}(t) \) and atomic coherences \( \rho_{ij}(t) \) with \( j \neq i \)
\[
\dot{\rho}_{ii}(t) = \gamma_i \rho_{00}(t) \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, 2 \quad \text{(60)}
\]

\[
\dot{\rho}_{00}(t) = -\left( \frac{\gamma_1 + \gamma_2}{2} - i\omega_0 \right) \rho_{00}(t) \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, 2 \quad \text{(62)}
\]

\[
\dot{\rho}_{12}(t) = \kappa_{12} \rho_{00}(t) \quad \text{(63)}
\]

where we used the fact that \( \kappa_{12}^* = \kappa_{12} \). Note that these equations are also supplemented by their conjugates.

The atom is initially prepared in the excited state with the following initial conditions (at \( t = 0 \)): \( \rho_{00}(0) = 1 \), \( \rho_{11}(0) = \rho_{22}(0) = 0 \) and \( \rho_{ij}(0) = 0 \) for \( j \neq i \). Solving Eqs. (60) and (61) with the initial conditions above is straightforward. With the initial condition \( \rho_{00}(0) = 1 \), Eq. (61) gives
\[
\rho_{00}(t) = e^{-\left( \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 \right)t} \Rightarrow \rho_{00}(\infty) = 0 \quad \text{(64)}
\]

Substituting it in Eqs. (60) and carrying out the integration with the initial conditions \( \rho_{11}(0) = \rho_{22}(0) = 0 \) gives
\[
\rho_{11}(t) = \frac{\gamma_1}{\gamma_1 + \gamma_2} \left[ 1 - e^{-\left( \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 \right)t} \right] \Rightarrow \rho_{11}(\infty) = \frac{\gamma_1}{\gamma_1 + \gamma_2} \quad \text{(65)}
\]

\[
\rho_{22}(t) = \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1 + \gamma_2} \left[ 1 - e^{-\left( \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 \right)t} \right] \Rightarrow \rho_{22}(\infty) = \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1 + \gamma_2} \quad \text{(66)}
\]

Furthermore, integration of Eq. (62) together with the initial condition \( \rho_{ij}(0) = 0 \) for \( j \neq i \) gives
\[
\rho_{10}(t) = \rho_{20}(t) = 0 \quad \forall t \quad \text{(67)}
\]

Finally, for the coherence \( \rho_{12}(t) \) given by Eq. (63), substituting the expression of \( \rho_{00}(t) \) [Eq. (64)] in Eq. (63) gives:
\[
\dot{\rho}_{12}(t) = \kappa_{12} e^{-(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)t} \quad \text{(68)}
\]

and after integration, together with the initial condition \( \rho_{12}(0) = 0 \), we find
\[
\rho_{12}(t) = \frac{\kappa_{12}}{\gamma_1 + \gamma_2} \left[ 1 - e^{-(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)t} \right] \quad \text{(69)}
\]

and for \( t \rightarrow \infty \)
\[
\rho_{12}(\infty) = \frac{\kappa_{12}}{\gamma_1 + \gamma_2} \quad \text{(70)}
\]