

Probing exciton/exciton interactions with entangled photons:theory

Eric R. Bittner

Department of Chemistry & Department of Physics, University of Houston, Houston, TX 77204 and

Department of Physics, Durham University, Durham, United Kingdom. ^{a)}

Hao Li

Department of Chemistry, University of Houston, Houston, TX 77204

Andrei Piryatinski

Theoretical Division, Los Alamos National Lab, Los Alamos, NM 87545

Ajay Ram Srimath Kandada

School of Chemistry & Biochemistry and School of Physics, Georgia Institute of Technology, 901 Atlantic Drive, Atlanta, Georgia 30332 and

Center for Nano Science and Technology @Polimi, Istituto Italiano di Tecnologia, via Giovanni Pascoli 70/3, 20133 Milano, Italy

Carlos Silva

School of Chemistry & Biochemistry and School of Physics, Georgia Institute of Technology, 901 Atlantic Drive, Atlanta, Georgia 30332

(Dated: 15 January 2022)

Quantum entangled photons provide a sensitive probe of many-body interactions and offer an unique experimental portal for quantifying many-body correlations in a material system. In this paper, we present a theoretical demonstration of how photon-photon entanglement can be generated via interactions between coupled qubits. Here we develop a model for the scattering of an entangled pair of photons from a molecular dimer. We develop a diagrammatic theory for the scattering matrix and show that one can correlate the von Neumann entropy of the outgoing bi-photon wave function to exciton exchange and repulsion interactions. We conclude by discussing possible experimental scenarios for realizing these ideas.

I. INTRODUCTION

As evidenced by recent theoretical and experimental advances, quantum entangled photons provide a sensitive measure of collective and many-body dynamics.^{1–21} The sensitivity stems from the “spooky action at a distance” nature of entangled photons, whereby measurement of one photon gives information about its entangled partner photon. This information can be extracted through either coincidence detection, interference, or quantum state reconstruction.

We recently presented a theoretical basis for how entanglement can be produced in 2-photon scattering from a system of coupled excitonic sites.^{20,21} In our approach, we assume that the bi-photon scattering matrix can be decomposed into a product of two single-photon terms and an irreducible two-photon term of the form

$$S^{(2)}(\omega_1, \omega_2; \omega'_1, \omega'_2) = S^{(1)}(\omega_1, \omega'_1) S^{(1)}(\omega_2, \omega'_2) \times e^{g(\omega_1, \omega_2; \omega'_1, \omega'_2)} \quad (1)$$

where $S^{(1)}$ gives the single photon (Raman or Rayleigh) scattering and $g(\omega_1, \omega_2; \omega'_1, \omega'_2)$ is an irreducible term that can be related to exciton/exciton cross-correlations.²¹ We suggest that by measuring the photon entanglement entropy change, one can deduce a direct measure of exciton/exciton cross-correlations. Here, we perform a theoretical analysis of the two-photon scattering produced

by a simple two-qubit system, coupled by exchange interactions which allow a single excitation to be transferred between qubits and a direct interaction which introduces an energetic cost for double excitation. We show that the bi-photon scattering can be related to the cascade emission from the double-excited system, can be “tuned” by changing the nature of the exchange term.

Significant amounts of theoretical and experimental efforts have been invested to achieve photon pair *polarization* entanglement using photon cascades in semiconductor quantum dots.^{22–26} In that case, special conditions making indistinguishable two alternative emission passes via split intermediate states need to be satisfied.^{23,24} In contrast, below we study the *energy/time* photon entanglement generation which turns out to have much less restrictions to be achieved.

II. THEORETICAL MODEL

Our theoretical approach is to use the Feynman diagram technique to compute the time-integrated two-photon correlation intensity following either 2-photon scattering or 2-photon radiative cascade from a *J*- or *H*-aggregate dimer system. We assume the bi-exciton system can be described by

$$H_{ex} = E_x(\sigma_{z1} + \sigma_{z2} + 1) + J(\sigma_1^+ \sigma_2^- + \sigma_2^+ \sigma_1^-) + U(\sigma_{z1} + 1/2)(\sigma_{z2} + 1/2) \quad (2)$$

where by the first term corresponds to the uncoupled qubits, the second promotes exchange between qubits

^{a)}Electronic mail: Corresponding Author: ebittner@central.uh.edu

and the third introduces two-body interactions corresponding to the energy cost to add a second excitation to the system. Writing this in a $SU(2) \otimes SU(2)$ basis H_{ex} has 3 excitations above its ground-state with energies

$$E_c = 2E_x + U \quad \text{biexciton} \quad (3a)$$

$$E_d = E_x - J \quad \text{dark} \quad (3b)$$

$$E_b = E_x + J \quad \text{bright} \quad (3c)$$

$$E_a = 0 \quad \text{ground} \quad (3d)$$

Figure 1a gives a sketch of relative placement of the energy levels in this system. In the uncoupled system, an excitation can be placed in either the $|10\rangle$ or $|01\rangle$ state. The exchange interaction J splits these states into a symmetric bright state ($|\psi_b\rangle = (|10\rangle + |01\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$) and an anti-symmetric dark state ($|\psi_d\rangle = (|10\rangle - |01\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$) and the anharmonic interaction shifts the energy of the doubly excited ($|\psi_c\rangle = |11\rangle$) U . We add to this the radiation field and coupling so that the full Hamiltonian becomes

$$H = H_{ex} + H_r + H_I \quad (4)$$

Under the rotating-wave approximation H_I would include an exchange term between photons and excitons, and hence $|\psi_d\rangle$ becomes “dark” and all of the photo-physics occurs between the ground-state and states $|\psi_b\rangle$ and $|\psi_c\rangle = |11\rangle$. For a J -aggregate such as anthracene, $J < 0$ such that the dark-state $|\psi_d\rangle$ lies above the lower $|\psi_b\rangle$ state. For H -aggregates, the reverse occurs and the “bright” state is higher in energy than the “dark” state. The coupling term J is mediated by dipole-dipole interactions between transition densities, the coupling itself depends upon both the distance between qubits as well as their relative orientation.

Since the states are embedded in the continuum of photon states, they acquire an energy shift, Δ_n , and a decay rate Γ_n . Accordingly, we denote such dressed states as $|\psi_n\rangle$ and introduce associated complex energy parameter $\tilde{E}_n = E_n + \Delta_n + i\hbar\Gamma_n/2$. While the ground-state is also dressed by the radiation field, it is in fact stable, i.e., $\Gamma_a = 0$. Of the dressed-states, only the ground state is an eigenstate of H . Generally, the energy shifts Δ_n are very small and can be ignored. However, the Γ_n should be retained and evaluated from the inverse radiative lifetimes. For $\pi\pi^*$ transitions in organic materials, radiative

lifetime varies in the interval of 10-100 fs corresponding to the homogeneous linewidth variation of 40-400 meV.

These assumptions allow us to write the resolvent for a given state $n = \{b, c\}$ as

$$G_n(z) = \langle \psi_n | \frac{1}{z - H} | \psi_n \rangle = \frac{1}{z - E_n + i\hbar\Gamma_n/2}. \quad (5)$$

Also, we introduce a transitions matrix elements between the dressed states as $\mu_{nm}(k) = \langle \psi_n | \hat{\mu} | \psi_m; k \rangle$ where k is a photon momentum and 0 denotes photon vacuum. The transition dipole operator is determined as $\hat{\mu}(k) = [H_I, a^\dagger(k)]$. For its the complex (Hermitian) conjugate we use a notation $\mu_{ij}^\dagger(k)$.

Having established the system, we first consider the two photon cascade decay of the upper most, doubly excited state. We shall assume that this state can be prepared by an incoherent pump populating the bi-exciton state. Subsequently, the bi-exciton decays via a two-photon cascade that can be detected by a two-photon coincidence measurement.

A. Entanglement by Radiative Cascade

Before computing the full 2-photon-in $\rightarrow$ 2-photon-out scattering process, we first consider the cascaded radiative decay from the upper bi-exciton state. Referring to the left Feynman diagram in Fig. 1b, we prepare the system in state c and disregard the bottom half of the diagram. In essence, the two photon process preparing state c can be considered as the time-reverse of the 2-photon cascade. Thus, once we have an expression for the cascade, it is trivial to obtain the 2-photon scattering term. Since both b and c are unstable, they acquire a line-shape and the two photon decay from $\tilde{\psi}_c \rightarrow \tilde{\psi}_0$ only needs to pass through the density of states around state b . We start from state $|\tilde{\psi}_c; 0\rangle$, that is the upper state with no free photons, and decay to the ground-state to produce 2 free photons $|\tilde{\psi}_0; k_1, k_2\rangle = a^\dagger(k_1)a^\dagger(k_2)|\tilde{\psi}_0\rangle$. The amplitude for the $|\tilde{\psi}_c; 0\rangle \rightarrow |\tilde{\psi}_b; k_1\rangle \rightarrow |\tilde{\psi}_0; k_1 k_2\rangle$ transition is then given by

$$G(z) = \mu_{0,b}^+(k_2)\mu_{bc}^+(k_1)G_0(z - \hbar\omega_1 - \hbar\omega_2)G_b(z - \hbar\omega_1)G_c(z) \quad (6a)$$

$$= \frac{\mu_{0,b}^+(k_2)\mu_{bc}^+(k_1)}{(z - (\hbar\omega_1 + \hbar\omega_2 + \tilde{E}_0))(z - \hbar\omega_1 - \tilde{E}_b)(z - \tilde{E}_c)}. \quad (6b)$$

Given this, we can calculate the time-dependent amplitude

$$U(\tau) = \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{iE\tau/\hbar} G(E + i\eta) dE. \quad (7)$$

From this we get the integrated intensity $I(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} |U(\tau)|^2$ as a symmetric function of the two frequencies.




FIG. 1. (a) Energy Level Diagram for pair of interacting excitons. In our model system, we assume that $J < 0$ and $U > 0$. To the left are the uncoupled energy levels. The exchange J and anharmonicity U mixes the $|10\rangle$, $|01\rangle$ and $|11\rangle$ configuration; however, one of these ($|10\rangle - |01\rangle$)/ $\sqrt{2}$ with energy $E_x - J$ does not couple to the radiation field within the dipole/rotating wave approximation. Physically, this corresponds to a molecular dimer forming a J -aggregate. (b) Feynman diagrams for double photon scattering. In the left diagram, the upper, double excited state, c is accessed through two photon absorption. Since this state is radiatively unstable, we assume it can decay via two photon emission via the intermediate state b . On the right, only the intermediate state is accessed and the process can be considered to be two independent Raman scattering events.

Taking $\tau \gg \Gamma_b^{-1}$ & Γ_c^{-1} , only the pole around the ground-state contributes to the integral.

$$U(\tau) = e^{i(E_0 + \hbar\omega_1 + \hbar\omega_2)\tau/\hbar} \frac{\mu_{0b}^+ \mu_{bc}^+}{(E_0 - E_b + \hbar\omega_1 + i\hbar\Gamma_b/2)(E_0 - E_c + \hbar\omega_1 + \hbar\omega_2 + i\hbar\Gamma_c/2)}. \quad (8)$$

Furthermore, we need to include the amplitude corresponding to the case where the ω_1 photon is emitted after the ω_2 photon. Consequently, the full amplitude is given by

$$U_{\mathbf{k}_1\mathbf{k}_2}(\tau) = \frac{\mu_{0b}^+ \mu_{bc}^+ e^{i(E_0 + \hbar\omega_1 + \hbar\omega_2)\tau/\hbar}}{E_0 - E_c + \hbar(\omega_1 + \omega_2) + i\hbar\Gamma_c/2} \left(\frac{1}{E_0 - E_b + \hbar\omega_1 + i\hbar\Gamma_b/2} + \frac{1}{E_0 - E_b + \hbar\omega_2 + i\hbar\Gamma_b/2} \right). \quad (9)$$

The last two terms can be combined and we write $\hbar\omega_c = E_c - E_0$ and $\hbar\omega_b = E_b - E_0$ and set $\Gamma_c = 2\Gamma_b = 2\Gamma$.

$$U_{\mathbf{k}_1\mathbf{k}_2}(\tau) = \frac{\mu_{0b}^+ \mu_{bc}^+ e^{i(E_0 + \hbar\omega_1 + \hbar\omega_2)\tau/\hbar}}{\hbar\omega_1 + \hbar\omega_2 - \hbar\omega_c + i\hbar\Gamma} \left(\frac{\hbar\omega_1 + \hbar\omega_2 - 2\hbar\omega_b + i\hbar\Gamma}{(\hbar\omega_1 - \hbar\omega_b + i\hbar\Gamma/2)(\hbar\omega_2 - \hbar\omega_b + i\hbar\Gamma/2)} \right). \quad (10)$$

Hence, one can write the entangled intensity as a normalized probability distribution

$$I(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} |U(\tau)|^2 \quad (11)$$

We here consider a special case where $\omega_c = 2\omega_b$, corresponding to the case that the intermediate level is exactly half way between level c and the ground state. For our model system, this occurs when $J = U/2$. For a J -aggregate in which $J < 0$ and $U > 0$ the condition that $2\omega_b = \omega_c$ can not be satisfied. For an H -aggregate, however, this condition can be satisfied over a range of both J and U . Under this special case condition Eq. 10 can be further factored to

$$U_{\mathbf{k}_1\mathbf{k}_2}(\tau) = e^{i(E_0 + \hbar\omega_1 + \hbar\omega_2)\tau/\hbar} \left(\frac{\mu_{0b}^+ \mu_{bc}^+}{(\hbar\omega_1 - \hbar\omega_b + i\hbar\Gamma/2)(\hbar\omega_2 - \hbar\omega_b + i\hbar\Gamma/2)} \right). \quad (12)$$

In this case, the integrated intensity can be written as a purely separable function of the two frequencies.

$$I(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \frac{|\mu_{0b}|^2 |\mu_{bc}|^2}{\hbar^4} \frac{1}{(\omega_1 - \omega_b)^2 + \Gamma^2/4} \frac{1}{(\omega_2 - \omega_b)^2 + \Gamma^2/4}. \quad (13)$$

In Figure 2(a-c) we show the integrated intensity $I(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ for two-photon emission from a bi-exciton state




FIG. 2. Two-photon cascade emission intensity distributions as varied by exciton/exciton interaction terms, U , and J . (a) Non-interacting qubits. (b) H -aggregate ($U > 0$ & $J > 0$). (c) J -aggregate ($U > 0$ & $J < 0$).

in a model J -aggregate dimer system with $\hbar\omega_x = 1$ setting the energy scale and with U and J indicated on the plots. In each, we assume $\Gamma = 0.6$ which is consistent with a lifetime of about 6fs for an exciton with $\hbar\omega_x = 1\text{eV}$. The line shape is symmetric about the line $\omega_1 = \omega_2$ reflecting the fact that we summed over both photon paths. In the uncoupled case, $U = 0$ and $J = 0$, the distribution is clearly separable into two terms. Increasing either the hopping term J or the repulsion term U leads to intensity distributions that are no longer separable into single photon terms.

B. Double photon scattering

We now consider the case depicted in the left-most Feynman diagram in Fig. 1b. In this case, the two input photons place the system into the doubly-excited $|c\rangle = |11\rangle$ state and are re-emitted leaving the system back in its ground state: $|a\rangle \rightarrow |b\rangle \rightarrow |c\rangle \rightarrow |b'\rangle \rightarrow |a'\rangle$.

For this, we shall write the amplitude in terms of the Møller operators to propagate the initial state $|a, n_1, n_2\rangle$ from $t \rightarrow -\infty$ forward to some intermediate time t , where the system is in the $|c, n_1 - 1, n_2 - 1\rangle$ state, then from $t \rightarrow +\infty$ to $|a, n'_1, n'_2\rangle$. The Møller operator intertwines the asymptotic (i.e. free) observables to those in the fully interacting theory. These are especially important considering the scattering of quantum photons since the atomic/material target is never fully free of the radiation field.²⁷ The operators are defined by writing the interaction picture ket as

$$|\psi(t)\rangle_I = e^{iH_o t/\hbar} e^{-i(H_o+V)t/\hbar} |\psi\rangle \quad (14)$$

where $|\psi\rangle$ is the asymptotic state. Inverting this,

$$|\psi\rangle = e^{i(H_o+V)t/\hbar} e^{-iH_o t/\hbar} |\psi(t)\rangle_I. \quad (15)$$

Upon taking the limits of $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$, one defines the Møller operators^{28,29}

$$\Omega(\pm) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \mp\infty} e^{i(H_o+V)t/\hbar} e^{-iH_o t/\hbar}. \quad (16)$$

Assuming we have two photons in the asymptotic states, the relevant states are

$$|\psi^-(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2)\rangle = a_{\mathbf{k}_1}^\dagger a_{\mathbf{k}_2}^\dagger |a; 0\rangle \quad (17a)$$

$$|\psi^+(\mathbf{k}'_1, \mathbf{k}'_2)\rangle = a_{\mathbf{k}'_1}^\dagger a_{\mathbf{k}'_2}^\dagger |a'; 0\rangle. \quad (17b)$$

Thus we transform the input state $|\psi^-(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2)\rangle$ to the output state

$$|\psi^+(\mathbf{k}'_1, \mathbf{k}'_2)\rangle = \Omega^{(-)\dagger} \Omega^{(+)} |\psi^-(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2)\rangle \quad (18)$$

$$= \hat{S}^{(2)} |\psi^-(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2)\rangle \quad (19)$$

where S is the scattering matrix. Since the initial and final atomic states will be the same ground state, $a = a'$, energy and momentum conservation will require that $\hbar\omega_1 + \hbar\omega_2 = \hbar\omega'_1 + \hbar\omega'_2$ and $\mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2 = \mathbf{k}'_1 + \mathbf{k}'_2$. The final transition amplitude can now be deduced from Eq. 10 by forward propagating the input state and reverse propagating the final state to some intermediate time τ where the system is in $|c\rangle$.

$$S^{(2)} = \iint_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\tau d\tau' U_{k_1 k_2}^\dagger(\tau) U_{k'_1 k'_2}(\tau') \quad (20)$$

Integrating over all intermediate times the energy conservation $\omega_1 + \omega_2 = \omega'_1 + \omega'_2$, and finally one finds that

$$\hat{S}^{(2)}(\omega_1, \omega_2; \omega'_1, \omega'_2) = \frac{\mu_{0b}\mu_{bc}\mu_{0b}^+\mu_{bc}^+}{\hbar^4} \left(\frac{(\omega_1 + \omega_2 - 2\omega_b)^2 + \Gamma^2}{(\omega_1 + \omega_2 - \omega_c)^2 + \Gamma^2} \right) \times \left(\frac{1}{(\omega_1 - \omega_b - i\Gamma/2)(\omega_2 - \omega_b - i\Gamma/2)} \frac{1}{(\omega'_1 - \omega_b + i\Gamma/2)(\omega'_2 - \omega_b + i\Gamma/2)} \right). \quad (21)$$

Since the general form of the two-photon scattering matrix is identical in form to what we arrived at for the cascade (aside from a constant term), the resulting entanglement change reflects the cascade dynamics from state $|c\rangle$.

In Fig. 3 we show the results for scattering an initial input bi-photon Fock state $|\omega_1\omega_2\rangle$ under various parametric conditions. The output bi-photon state is correlated to the input due to the energy and momentum conservation. Therefore, we allow the frequency of one input photon to vary freely but fix the other to be either resonant with the bright state $|b\rangle$, or very much off-resonant by setting $\omega_2 = \omega_b/2$. The value of the exciton transfer term J is deliberately chosen to be large to highlight the effect of resonant coupling between the two qubits. Clearly, dimer interaction has a profound effect upon the scattering behavior. No matter one of the input photons is on-resonance or off-resonance, distinguished scattering can always be observed around $\omega_1 + \omega_2 = \omega_c$, i.e., the input bi-photon state being resonant with the bi-exciton state, whereas the scattering is weak in the case of single photon resonance $\omega_1 = \omega_b$. The outgoing state is always entangled due to the initial entanglement and the photon-photon coupling introduced by interactions with the medium.^{19,30}

C. Entanglement Entropy Generation

The entropy S provides a useful metric for the entanglement carried by the outgoing photons. This can be determined by singular value decomposition of $I(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ in which we write the 2-photon intensity

$$I(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \sum_n r_n f_n(\omega_1) g_n(\omega_2) \quad (22)$$

as a weighted sum over single-component terms determined by Singular Value Decomposition (SVD). Taking r_n to be normalized to unity,

$$S = - \sum_n r_n \ln r_n. \quad (23)$$

The functions $f_n(z)$ and $g_n(z)$ are orthogonal polynomials forming a complete basis.

In Fig. 4 we computed the entropy as function of both J and U over a wide parametric range. The upper half ($J > 0; U > 0$) corresponds to the situation for most H -aggregate systems. Here, the positions of the two middle energy levels are swapped and the (now) upper state is what carries the coupling to the radiation field. In this

regime, we have the possibility for satisfying the $2\omega_b = \omega_c$ criterion for a fully separable two-photon emission spectrum. The lower half ($J < 0; U > 0$) corresponds to the parametric range for J -aggregate systems. Here, because the $2\omega_b = \omega_c$ cannot be satisfied, the entanglements are higher. For comparison, we consider two systems with identical entanglement entropy indicated on Fig. 4 by the letters “B” and “C” corresponding to an H -aggregate (Fig. 2b) and a J -aggregate (Fig. 2c). Since the coupling terms are sensitive to packing and aggregation, it should be possible to control and select the entanglement in the emitted photon state.

The right-most Feynman diagram in Fig. 1b corresponds to two successive Raman scattering processes. In this case, the two processes will be independent in the limit that the line-shape of state b is sufficiently broad.²¹ It is important to distinguish this process from the double-excitation process discussed above. Assuming the two $a \rightarrow b \rightarrow a'$ processes are uncorrelated, the integrated intensity is the product of individual Raman intensities. As we showed in our previous work, even if the second excitation occurs within the homogeneous lifetime Γ_b^{-1} of state b the two events will not produce entangled photons. However, in the limit of slow-modulation the two transition moments can be correlated giving rise to entanglement in the outgoing photon state.

III. DISCUSSION

In this paper we have shown how to construct the transition matrix for 2-photon resonant scattering which produces entanglements within the out-going photon state. We show that such an entanglement can be connected to exciton/exciton interactions occurring via exchange coupling between sites and exciton/exciton repulsion within a binary qubit system that corresponds to a molecular dimer. Since these parameters are exquisitely linked to the local structure of the system and relative orientation of the transition dipoles on each monomer, it should be possible to manipulate the outgoing entanglement via external means.

While we present results for a simple excitonic dimer, the model and methods are easily extendable to systems with multiple excitonic sites and internal vibronic degrees of freedom. Experiments based upon these ideas may offer valuable insights into the correlated dynamics occurring within complex excitonic systems. Our current results are valid only in the limit of low temperature and where vibronic coupling can be ignored. The inclusion of finite temperature and vibronic dynamics will certainly




FIG. 3. Two-photon scattering distributions in terms of output photon frequencies for non-interacting dimer (left column), J and H aggregate systems (center and right columns, respectively). One of the input photon energy ω_1 is free to change whereas the other is set to be either on-resonant ($\omega_2 = \omega_b$, upper panels) or off-resonant ($\omega_2 = \omega_b/2$, lower panels) with the bright state $|b\rangle$. Note that we set $\Gamma = 0.1E_x/\hbar$ and $\omega_{bc} = \omega_c - \omega_b$ for all plots.

muddle the waters by limiting the time-frame over which entanglements can be established. As discussed in our recent paper, entanglement between the outgoing photons is contingent upon the both strength of the interaction and the magnitude of environmental fluctuations.²¹ Our current efforts are to include both implicit and explicit quantized vibronic modes into the bi-photon scattering model.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work at the University of Houston was funded in part by the National Science Foundation (MRI-1531814, CHE-1664971, CHE-1836080) and the Robert A. Welch Foundation (E-1337). ERB also acknowledges the Leverhulme Trust for support at Durham University. AP acknowledges the support provided by Los Alamos National Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD) Funds. CS acknowledges support from the School of Chemistry & Biochemistry and the College of Science of Georgia Tech. The work in Georgia Tech is supported by the National Science Foundation (CHE-1836075). ARSK acknowledges funding from EU Horizon 2020 via Marie Skłodowska Curie Fellowship (Global

(Project No. 705874).

- ¹T. D. Ladd, F. Jelezko, R. Laflamme, Y. Nakamura, C. Monroe, and J. L. O'Brien, *Nature* **464**, 45 (2010).
- ²G. B. Lemos, V. Borish, G. D. Cole, S. Ramelow, R. Lapkiewicz, and A. Zeilinger, *Nature* **512**, 409 (2014).
- ³N. Gisin, G. Ribordy, W. Tittel, and H. Zbinden, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74**, 145 (2002).
- ⁴R. Sewell, *Physics* **10**, 38 (2017).
- ⁵X. Y. Zou, L. J. Wang, and L. Mandel, *Physical review letters* **67**, 318 (1991).
- ⁶O. Roslyak, C. A. Marx, and S. Mukamel, *Phys. Rev. A* **79**, 033832 (2009).
- ⁷F. Schlawin, K. E. Dorfman, B. P. Fingerhut, and S. Mukamel, *Nature Communications* **4**, 1782 (2013).
- ⁸D. A. Kalashnikov, Z. Pan, A. I. Kuznetsov, and L. A. Krivitsky, *Phys. Rev. X* **4**, 011049 (2014).
- ⁹D. A. Kalashnikov, E. V. Melik-Gaykazyan, A. A. Kalachev, Y. F. Yu, A. I. Kuznetsov, and L. A. Krivitsky, *Scientific Reports* **7**, 11444 (2017).
- ¹⁰F. Schlawin, K. E. Dorfman, B. P. Fingerhut, and S. Mukamel, *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 023851 (2012).
- ¹¹O. Varnavski, B. Pinsky, and T. Goodson, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* **8**, 388 (2017), PMID: 28029793, <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jpclett.6b02378>.
- ¹²J. P. Villabona-Monsalve, O. Calderón-Losada, M. Nuñez Portela, and A. Valencia, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A* **121**, 7869 (2017), PMID: 28933852, <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jpca.7b06450>.
- ¹³K. E. Dorfman, F. Schlawin, and S. Mukamel, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **88**, 045008 (2016).




FIG. 4. Entanglement entropy for model interacting binary qubit system as varied by the interaction parameters U and J . Units are such that $E_x = 1$. The white line corresponds to the condition where $2J = U$ whereby the single excitation energy is exactly half the double-excitation energy.

- ¹⁴M. G. Raymer, A. H. Marcus, J. R. Widom, and D. L. P. Vitullo, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry B* **117**, 15559 (2013), pMID: 24047447, <https://doi.org/10.1021/jp405829n>.
¹⁵B. E. A. Saleh, B. M. Jost, H.-B. Fei, and M. C. Teich, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 3483 (1998).
¹⁶L. Upton, M. Harpham, O. Suzer, M. Richter, S. Mukamel, and T. Goodson, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* **4**, 2046

- (2013), pMID: 26283251, <https://doi.org/10.1021/jz400851d>.
¹⁷A. R. Guzman, M. R. Harpham, O. Suzer, M. M. Haley, and T. G. Goodson, *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **132**, 7840 (2010), pMID: 20496892, <https://doi.org/10.1021/ja1016816>.
¹⁸D.-I. Lee and T. Goodson, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry B* **110**, 25582 (2006), pMID: 17181189, <https://doi.org/10.1021/jp066767g>.
¹⁹A. Yabushita and T. Kobayashi, *Phys. Rev. A* **69**, 013806 (2004).
²⁰H. Li, A. Piryatinski, J. Jerke, A. R. S. Kandada, C. Silva, and E. R. Bittner, *Quantum Science and Technology* **3**, 015003 (2018).
²¹H. Li, A. Piryatinski, A. R. Srimath Kandada, C. Silva, and E. R. Bittner, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **150**, 184106 (2019), <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5083613>.
²²E. Moreau, I. Robert, L. Manin, V. Thierry-Mieg, J. Gérard, and I. Abram, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 183601 (2001).
²³N. Akopian, N. Lindner, E. Poem, Y. Berlatzky, J. Avron, D. Gershoni, B. Gerardot, and P. Petroff, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 130501 (2006).
²⁴J. E. Avron, G. Bisker, D. Gershoni, N. H. Lindner, E. A. Meirom, and R. J. Warburton, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 120501 (2008).
²⁵M. Müller, S. Bounouar, K. D. Jöns, M. Glässl, and P. Michler, *Nature Photonics* **8**, 224 (2014).
²⁶D. Huber, M. Reindl, J. Aberl, A. Rastelli, and R. Trotta, *J. Opt.* **20**, 073002 (2018).
²⁷C. Cohen-Tannoudji, J. Dupont-Roc, and G. Grynberg, *Atom-Photon interactions* (Wiley-Interscience, 1992).
²⁸C. MØLLER, *Nature* **158**, 403 (1946).
²⁹C. Møller, D. Kgl. Danske Vidensk. Selsk. Mat.-Fys. Medd. **23** (1945).
³⁰D. A. Kalashnikov, A. V. Paterova, S. P. Kulik, and L. A. Krivitsky, *Nature Photonics* **10**, 98 (2016).