Waveguide quantum electrodynamics: collective radiance and photon-photon correlations
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This review describes an emerging field of waveguide quantum electrodynamics (WQED) studying interaction of photons propagating in a waveguide with localized quantum emitters. In such systems, atoms and guided photons are hybridized with each other and form polaritons that can propagate along the waveguide, contrary to the cavity quantum optics setup. Emerging in such a system collective light-atom interactions result in super- and sub-radiant quantum states, that are promising for quantum information processing, and give rise to peculiar quantum correlations between photons. The review is aimed at both experimentalists and theoreticians from various fields of physics interested in the rapidly developing subject of WQED. We highlight recent groundbreaking experiments performed for different quantum platforms, including cold atoms, superconducting qubits, semiconductor quantum dots, quantum solid-state defects and at the same time provide a comprehensive introduction into various theoretical techniques to study atom-photon interactions in the waveguide.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Arrays of atoms coupled to photons present a paradigmatic system for quantum optics. The fundamental discoveries of the Lamb shift (Lamb and Retherford, 1947), Purcell effect (Purcell, 1946), Dicke superradiance (Dicke, 1954) and groundbreaking experiments on quantum nature of light and on light-trapped atoms have entered the advanced physics curriculum decades ago. Such quantum optical devices as lasers are now common in our everyday life. Indeed, recent development of quantum technologies (Arute et al., 2019; Barredo et al., 2016, 2018; Bekenstein et al., 2020; Chang et al., 2014; Endres et al., 2016; Hammerer et al., 2010; Sipahigil et al., 2016; Thyrrestrup et al., 2018; Yan et al., 2019) has lead to emergence of novel experimental platforms of atoms, coupled to propagating photons in a waveguide. These platforms can be based on natural or artificial atoms, such as superconducting qubits, or solid state quantum dots and defects, and can employ different types of optical and microwave waveguides (Chang et al., 2018; Kuznetsov et al., 2016; Lodahl et al., 2017; Nieddu et al., 2016; Roy, 2011). The resulting emerging field of research is termed waveguide quantum electrodynamics (WQED) and offers novel opportunities both for fundamental physics and for quantum information processing.

Waveguides with atoms can be also viewed as artificial media, quantum metamaterials or quantum photonic crystals depending on the spacing between atoms, with strong optical nonlinearities at the single-photon level (Chang et al., 2013; Corzo et al., 2016; Goban et al., 2014; Kuznetsov et al., 2016; Lodahl et al., 2017; Nieddu et al., 2016). The WQED setup is quite different from both free space quantum optics and cavity quantum optics. On one hand, due to the spatial confinement of light, atom-photon interactions in a waveguide are much stronger than in free space. On the other hand, since photons can propagate along the waveguide, WQED systems differ strongly from the more widely studied structures with cavities where photons are confined in all spatial directions. Traveling photons can carry information, so the WQED structures can be viewed as building blocks for on-chip quantum networks and even ”quantum internet” (Kimble, 2008). Specific near-future applications include slow quantum light, quantum memory, generation and detection of quantum light.

There already exists a number of excellent topical reviews related to the waveguide quantum electrodynamics, in particular Roy et al. (Roy et al., 2017), Chang et al. (Chang et al., 2018) and Türschmann et al. (Türschmann et al., 2019), as well as extensive reviews on circuit quantum electrodynamics (Blais et al., 2020; Carusotto et al., 2020; Gu et al., 2017), quantum optics with atoms and fibers (Nieddu et al., 2016), quantum light-matter interfaces (Hammerer et al., 2010; Lodahl et al., 2015), quantum simulations and many-body physics with light (Noh and Angelakis, 2016). State-of-the-art single photon quantum structures and their prospects are discussed in a review (Uppu et al., 2021).

The goal of the current review is twofold. First, we discuss in detail very recent groundbreaking experiments in the WQED setup and beyond, including demonstrations of tunable photon bunching and antibunching from atomic arrays, (Prasad et al., 2020), generation and detection of collective entangled atom-photon states (Corzo et al., 2019) and subradiant atom-made mirrors (Rui et al., 2020). We also compare different state-of-the-art experimental WQED platforms. Second, we provide a comprehensive theoretical background in the collective emission effects for atomic arrays coupled to light, starting from the basics and proceeding to the advanced theoretical techniques adopted from condensed matter physics (the Bethe ansatz) and quantum field theory (functional integral approach). Surprisingly, while this problem goes back at least as early as the Dicke’s proposal of superradiance (Dicke, 1954), it is still far from being completely understood despite significant theoretical progress in the very last couple of years. In particular, the combination of strong atom-photon interaction with the light-mediated long-ranged coupling between the atoms makes the system quite unusual from the points of view of both circuit QED and condensed matter physics. Waveguide QED platform can act as a quantum simulator of many-body physics ranging from superfluid-Mott insulator transitions (Shi et al., 2018) to topological states of matter (Kim et al., 2021) to associative memory (Fiorelli et al., 2020). As such, we hope that this review might be useful to both experimentalists and theorists already working on WQED or coming to WQED from other fields of physics.

The structure and main topics of the review are schematically illustrated in Fig. 1. We start with Sec. II from comparison of various experimental platforms for the waveguide quantum electrodynamics, differing by the
II. Light-matter interactions in a waveguide

We start from the artificial atoms, semiconductor quantum dots (QDs) (Foster et al., 2019; Le Jeannic et al., 2021; Thyrrstrup et al., 2018; Versteegh et al., 2014), that operate in the near infrared or visible spectra range. The main advantage of the QD platform is the fact that they are incorporated in the bulk of the photonic structure, which results in the relatively high coupling factors $\beta$ which may reach 99% at cryogenic temperatures (Scarpelli et al., 2019). Precise control over the position of the quantum dot within the photonic structure allows for the flexible tuning of the local field properties at the dot position which facilitates effective Purcell factor engineering (Liu et al., 2018; Lodahl et al., 2004) and enables the chiral light-matter interaction (Coles et al., 2016; Javadi et al., 2018). Chiral properties of light transport is another interesting direction in quantum optics which can be realized in WQED (Coles et al., 2016; Corzo et al., 2016; Lodahl et al., 2017; Mahmoodian et al., 2020; Scheucher et al., 2016) and will be discussed in our review as well. The challenges of the QD-based platform are the numerous decoherence mechanisms present in any solid state system, including charge and spin fluctuations and phonon mediated decoherence, and strong inhomogeneous broadening usually exceeding the radiative broadening. While the decoherence mechanisms can be relatively effectively suppressed by a combination of specific techniques (Dreessen et al., 2018; Kuhlmann et al., 2015) the inhomogeneous broadening and decoherence still constitute the major challenge for the scaling of the QD-based systems.

An alternative solid state platform is presented by solid state defects, such as silicon vacancies (Sipahigil et al., 2016) or germanium vacancies (Bhaskar et al., 2017). The defects can be selectively placed in the diamond waveguides using the focused ion beam implantation. Inhomogeneous broadening seems to be less of an issue.
than for the quantum dot system: generation of entangled state of two excited qubits has already been demonstrated (Sipahigil et al., 2016). However, the coupling efficiency is lower than for the quantum dots. The reasons may involve complex energy structure of individual vacuum with many optical transitions of close energies as well as the interaction with the phonon environment.

One more type of platform is presented by organic molecules such as dibenzoterrylene (DBT) (Faez et al., 2014) or terrylene (Skoff et al., 2018), coupled to a waveguide. Somewhat similarly to the quantum dots, the molecule arrays exhibit strong inhomogeneous broadening, limiting the scalability of the system. About 5000 spectral lines, corresponding to different molecules, have been revealed in the experiment of Ref. (Faez et al., 2014) where the DBT molecules were put in naphthalene, filling a nanocapillary waveguide. Individual lines could be resolved spectrally and demonstrate relatively high coupling efficiency and strong antibunching.

We now turn to superconducting transmon qubits, operating at microwave frequencies. In a nutshell, such qubit presents a high-quality transmission-line resonator with Josephson junction providing strong nonlinearity on a single-photon level (Jung et al., 2014; Koch et al., 2007). At the first glance, they seem to be an ideal platform for waveguide QED. The coupling efficiencies can exceed 99.9% (Mirhosseini et al., 2019). It is possible to fabricate high quality arrays with tens of qubits. Inhomogeneous broadening is not an issue since the frequencies of the qubits can be tuned electrically. The ability of individual access to every qubit is also very important advantage for generation and detection of complex quantum states. It is however still not clear how well the theoretical two-level atom model applies to a real qubit. Most of the experimental studies of waveguide QED with superconducting qubits have focused on single-excited states. It is however still not clear how well the theoretical two-level atom model applies to a real qubit. Most of the experimental studies of waveguide QED with superconducting qubits have focused on single-excited states that do not involve highly excited states of the qubit array (Brehm et al., 2021; Kim et al., 2021; Mirhosseini et al., 2019). Detection of two-photon quantum walks of a 12-qubit superconducting processor, that does not have waveguide-mediated couplings, has been reported only in (Yan et al., 2019). Still, the record Google chip, claiming quantum supremacy, already has $N = 54$ qubits (Arute et al., 2019). The potential challenges, limiting the performance of state-of-the-art circuits include individual defects such as charged two-level systems residing in the tunnel barrier of the Josephson junction or weakly coupling defects on the surfaces and interfaces of circuit electrodes (Barends et al., 2013; Bilmes et al., 2020; Burnett et al., 2019). Moreover, the low frequency of the reso-
nant photons leads to the inevitable population of the thermal photons close to the resonant frequencies, which limits the coherence time of the qubits (Rigetti et al., 2012).

Another waveguide quantum electrodynamical platform is presented by arrays of laser-cooled cesium (Corzo et al., 2016; Goban et al., 2012; Sorensen et al., 2016; Vetsch et al., 2010) or rubidium (Solano et al., 2017) atoms trapped in the vicinity of the optical nanofiber, see also the dedicated review (Nieddu et al., 2016). The trap consists of two pairs of counter-propagating beams in the fiber, one attractive red-detuned and another repulsive blue-detuned, operating at the specific wavelengths and is overlapped with a magneto-optical trap (Le Kien et al., 2004). The disadvantage of the atomic system is relatively low waveguide coupling efficiency $\beta \sim 1\%$ and inability to control and access atoms individually. On the other hand, the traps can include thousands of atoms and strong quantum optical effects can be observed already for $N \sim 1/\beta \sim 100$ (Prasad et al., 2020). The coupling efficiency can be increased to $\beta \sim 50\%$ by using a photonic crystal alligator waveguide instead of a nanofiber illustrated in Fig. 2(f). The tradeoff however is that the number of cold atoms is smaller, Ref. (Goban et al., 2015, 2014) reported the atomic number up to 3 on average. As such, in the parameter space of Fig. 2(a) the alligator waveguide platform seems to be closer to solid-state quantum emitters.

One more interesting waveguide QED platform is based on giant atoms, i.e. atoms that couple to a waveguide at multiple points which can be wavelength distances or more (Frisk Kockum, 2021; Gustafsson et al., 2014). The main advantage of such a WQED system is that the multiple coupling points of giant atoms give rise to interference effects that are not present in quantum optics with point-like atoms. These interference effects can lead to a coherent exchange interaction between atoms mediated by the waveguide, and it can result in suppression of relaxation of one or more atoms into the waveguide (Frisk Kockum et al., 2014; Guo et al., 2020; Kockum et al., 2018). Such systems can be implemented both with superconducting qubits coupled either to microwave transmission lines or surface acoustic waves (Kannan et al., 2020) [see Fig. 2(g)], and cold atoms (Frisk Kockum, 2021).

More details on the specific experiments for different platforms can be found in Sec. IV. To conclude this section, despite tremendous achievements in waveguide QED technology, there is still a room for improvement. As demonstrated by the diagram Fig. 2(a), there seems to be a tradeoff between the individual emitter coupling efficiency and the number of emitters, so that their product for state-of-the-art structures is roughly the same (see the shaded region). There is still a lack of structures with large number of resonant emitters $N \gtrsim 20$ that have at the same time high coupling efficiency on the order of unity so a lot of progress can be expected. We also note that there exist other platforms closely related to WQED, besides those considered in this review. For example, a photonic quantum circuit based on microring resonators integrated with thermo-optic phase shifters on a nanophotonic chip has recently been demonstrated in Ref. (Arrazola et al., 2021).

### III. LIGHT-MATTER INTERACTIONS IN A WAVEGUIDE

The regimes of light-matter interaction in a waveguide setup and corresponding quantum optical effects are determined by many parameters. Three of the most important of those are the number of atoms $N_{\text{atoms}} \equiv N$, the number of photons $N_{\text{phot}}$, and the ratio of characteristic interatomic distance $d$ to the light wavelength at the atomic resonance $\lambda_0$. The corresponding bird-eye view on the waveguide quantum electrodynamics according to such schematic classification is given in Fig. 3.

A schematic plan of this section is sketched in the middle part of Fig. 1. We start our consideration in Sec. III.A with the simplest case of just one atom coupled to a waveguide. We discuss single-photon resonant reflection and transmission (Sec. III.A.1), formulate basic equations of input-output theory and consider photon-photon correlations (Sec. III.A.2). When the number of photons is large, there occurs a transition from the deeply quantum regime to the regime of semiclassical optics. In such a case, the individual quantum properties of photons become less distinct and the electromagnetic field can be described by the semiclassical Maxwell-Bloch equations (MacGillivray and Feld, 1976). This is the domain of lasing, the Mollow triplet, resonance fluorescence and electromagnetically induced transparency (EIT). In addition to the simplified model of idealized two-level atom coupled only to the waveguide and not interacting with free space photons, we also discuss a more realistic situation when atom has a multilevel structure, and is coupled both to the waveguide photons and to the freely propagating photons outside the fiber waveguide, Sec. III.A.3.

Next, in Sec. III.B, we proceed to the original Dicke problem (Dicke, 1954; Gross and Haroche, 1982) of very closely-spaced identical atoms that is paradigmatic for a quantum optics, see Fig. 3(a). In this case, the light probes only symmetrically excited states of the atomic array and spontaneous emission rate for these states is enhanced due to the constructive interference between optical transitions at different atoms.

The full quantum Dicke problem can be solved exactly for an arbitrary number of photons and features quite rich physics. Since a single atom can not resonantly absorb two identical photons at the same time due to the Pauli exclusion principle, there appears an effective photon-photon repulsion. This leads to nontrivial quantum correlations in the scattered light, photon bunching.
FIG. 3 Different regimes in waveguide quantum optics classified by the number of photons and number of atoms. Panels (a), (b), (c) correspond to different distances between atoms $d/\lambda_0 \ll 1$, $d/\lambda_0 \ll 1$ and Bragg distances $2d/\lambda_0 = 1, 2, \ldots$, respectively. Here $d$ is the array period and $\lambda_0$ is the light wavelength at the atomic resonance.

and antibunching. We discuss these quantum correlations and present a comprehensive overview of different theoretical techniques to consider the two-photon scattering, ranging from the Bethe ansatz method to the functional integral techniques and to various diagrammatic Green function theories, and discuss their advantages and shortcomings (Sec. III.B.2).

The situation becomes even more interesting as soon as the nonzero spacing between the atoms is taken into account, see Fig. 3(b) and Sec. III.C. In this case, asymmetric collective states of atomic ensemble, being fully dark in the original Dicke problem, become subradiant, i.e. acquire nonzero radiative decay rates. Despite the long history of the problem, the structure of subradiant quantum states is still not fully understood. For example, in realistic fiber-coupled atomic arrays it is important to consider the dipole-dipole interactions between the atoms in addition to the waveguide-mediated interactions. Careful tuning of such interactions allows one to suppress unwanted decay channels (Asenjo-Garcia et al., 2017b) and realize long-living subradiant states, promising for quantum memory applications (Kornovan et al., 2019), as discussed in Sec. III.C.1.

A special case of spatially-separated arrays is presented by Bragg-spaced atomic arrays, where the ratio $2d/\lambda_0$ is integer, Fig. 3(c). Such structures can be viewed as (quantum) resonant photonic crystals, i.e. they demonstrate Bragg diffraction and the Bragg condition is realized close to the atomic resonances. Hence, the interference between waves reflected from different atoms is constructive and the Dicke superradiant states can form as well, similarly to the case of very closely spaced atoms. In the Bragg case, superradiance has been studied in very different setups and we review the historical development of this problem and very recent experiments in the following section Sec. IV.E (Corzo et al., 2016; Sørensen et al., 2016).

There has also been significant progress in the theoretical studies of two-photon states in the atomic arrays in the last couple of years, including the structure of two-photon subradiant states (Albrecht et al., 2019; Zhang and Mølmer, 2019), an existence of bound two-photon states (Zhang et al., 2020) and in a chain of randomly positioned atoms (Song et al., 2021). We try to put these results in a universal perspective. The atomic array with nonzero spacings can be viewed as an artificial resonant quantum medium, a quantum metamaterial. The reason behind unusual many-body physics in this regime is the long-ranged waveguide-mediated coupling between atoms. This makes the effects of interactions quite different from typical condensed matter systems or circuit quantum electrodynamics setups, see Sec. III.C.2.

In the most part of this section we consider reciprocal symmetric waveguides, when atom is equally coupled to forward and backward propagating photons. However, under application of external magnetic field it is also possible to make coupling to forward and backward propagating photons asymmetric. This very special chiral regime is reviewed in Sec. III.D where we proceed from the basics of chiral coupling (Sec. III.D.1, Sec. III.D.2) to the collective polariton eigenstates (Sec. III.D.3) to the advanced experiments on tunable photon bunching and antibunching in this setup (Sec. III.D.4).
A. Single atom coupled to a waveguide

Here, we start the consideration with the simplest WQED setup consisting of a single atom coupled to a waveguide, schematically illustrated in Fig. 4(a). This textbook quantum optical problem will serve as a pedagogical introduction into discussion of more advanced setups with many atoms in Sec. III.B and Sec. III.C. We consider first reflection and transmission for very weak light intensity in Sec. III.A.1 and then proceed to an input-output formalism for a more general quantum problem in Sec. III.A.2.

1. Single-photon reflection and transmission

Reflection and transmission of light in the regime of weak light intensities are in fact similar to the regime of linear classical optics, since the photon-photon interaction is not manifested. Thus, the quantum scattering theory in a single photon regime yields results identical to light scattered from e.g. a semiconductor quantum well (Ivchenko et al., 1994) or a ring resonator coupled to a waveguide (Fan, 2002). Electric field to the left and right from the atom is presented as

\[
E(z) = \begin{cases} E_L^r e^{i\omega z/c} + E_L^t e^{-i\omega z/c}, & (z < 0), \\ E_R^r e^{i\omega z/c} + E_R^t e^{-i\omega z/c}, & (z > 0) \end{cases}
\]

(1)

(we assume the \(e^{-i\omega t}\) time dependence). The scattering can be readily described by the transfer matrix method (Corzo et al., 2016), i.e. the fields to the left and right of the atom are linked

\[
\begin{pmatrix} E_R^r \\ E_R^t \end{pmatrix} = M_{\text{atom}} \begin{pmatrix} E_L^r \\ E_L^t \end{pmatrix}
\]

(2)

by the transfer matrix

\[
M_{\text{atom}} = \frac{1}{i} \begin{pmatrix} t^2 - r^2 & r \\ -r & 1 \end{pmatrix},
\]

(3)

where the reflection and transmission for a single atom are given by

\[
r = \frac{i\Gamma_{\text{ID}}}{\omega_0 - \omega - i(\gamma + \gamma_{\text{ID}})},
\]

(4)

\[
t = 1 + r = \frac{\omega_0 - \omega}{\omega_0 - \omega - i(\gamma + \gamma_{\text{ID}})}.
\]

(see also Appendix C for derivation for a general case of \(N\) atoms). Here, \(\omega_0\) is the resonant frequency of the transition, \(\gamma_{\text{ID}} \equiv \Gamma_{\text{ID}}/2\) is the radiative decay rate characterizing the strength of the coupling between a single atom and the waveguide modes, \(\gamma \equiv \Gamma/2\) is the phenomenological damping rate taking into account all the other decay channels, such as nonradiative decay and emission into the free space. In this section, we consider a case when the atom is symmetrically coupled to the right- and the left-going photon modes. The case of asymmetric (chiral) coupling is examined in detail in a dedicated Sec. III.D.

Figure 4(b) presents the reflection and transmission spectra calculated according to Eqs. (4). One can see, that away from the resonance the waveguide is transparent. There is a dip in transmission and a corresponding peak maximum in reflection spectrum for the light incident at atom resonance frequency and the half-width at half-maximum of the dip is equal to \(\gamma + \gamma_{\text{ID}}\). For vanishing nonradiative decay channel \(\gamma = 0\), we obtain the energy conservation law \(|r|^2 + |t\_\perp|^2 = |r|^2 + |t\_\perp|^2 = 1\).

2. Input-output formalism

An interaction of coherent light with a single two-level atom can be most easily performed using a conventional input-output theory of the quantum optics (Astafiev et al., 2010; Caneva et al., 2015). We start with the Hamiltonian describing the interaction of the continuum of the propagating photonic modes with the single atom,

\[
H = H_{\text{phot}} + H_{\text{atom}} + H_{\text{atom-phot}}
\]

\[
= \sum_k \omega_k a_k^\dagger a_k + \omega_0 \sigma^\dagger \sigma + \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_k (g_k a_k^\dagger \sigma + g_k a_k \sigma^\dagger).
\]

(5)
Here, $\omega_k = c|k|$ is the frequency of the photonic mode with the wave vector $k$, $c$ is the light speed in the waveguide. We assume $\hbar = 1$ and the summation over $k$ means $\sum_k \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk/(2\pi)$, where $L$ is the normalization length. Operators $a_k^\dagger$ and $\sigma^\dagger$ describe creation of photon in the waveguide and excitation of the atom. For a two-level atom we have $\sigma = \left( \begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{smallmatrix} \right)$ in the basis of ground and excited states. Parameter $g_k$ describes light-atom coupling in the dipole approximation. Here and in the rest of the review we consider a point-like atom. There also exist “giant atoms”, based on superconducting qubits, that are connected to the waveguide in multiple distant points, see the review (Frisk Kockum, 2021).

We also introduce the rotating wave approximation, assuming that the frequencies of the relevant photons are close to the atomic resonance. In this case the right- and left- propagating states ($\rightarrow$ and $\leftarrow$) in the rotating wave approximation.

Using Eq. (6) for the field emitted by the atom and $a_{0,\rightarrow} = -\Omega\sqrt{L/(c\gamma_{1D})}/2$, we find the coherent light reflection coefficient as

$$r e^{-i\epsilon} \equiv \frac{a_{\leftarrow}(z = 0)}{a_{0,\rightarrow}} = \frac{2\pi\omega_0 d(\sigma(t))}{cS E_0}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

Eq. (7) has a transparent meaning also in the classical optics: it describes the amplitude of the electric field emitted by the source with the polarization density $P(z) = d\langle \sigma(t) \rangle \delta(z)/S$, normalized to the incident field $E_0$.

The input-output relations Eq. (6) together with the expression for the reflection coefficient Eq. (4) already provide certain information about photon-photon correlation functions at low incident power. Namely, by taking the average square of Eq. (6) at $z \rightarrow +0, t = 0$, we find

$$\langle a_{\rightarrow}\rangle = \left\langle a_{0,\rightarrow}^2 - 2ia_0 \frac{ig\sqrt{L}}{c} \sigma + \left( \frac{ig\sqrt{L}}{c} \right)^2 \sigma^2 \right\rangle = \langle a_{0,\rightarrow}^2 \rangle (1 + 2r), \hspace{1cm} (8)$$

where we assume $\sigma^2 \equiv 0$ so that the last term in the first line vanishes. Using the same approach, we find that the second-order correlation function reads as

$$\langle a_{\rightarrow}^1 a_{\rightarrow}^2 \rangle = \langle a_{\rightarrow}^2 \rangle^2 = \langle a_{0,\rightarrow}^2 \rangle^2 |1 + 2r|^2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

and the normalized second-order photon-photon correlation function is

$$g_{2\rightarrow}^2(0) \equiv \frac{\langle a_{\rightarrow}^1 a_{\rightarrow}^2 \rangle}{\langle a_{\rightarrow}^2 \rangle^2} = \frac{|1 + 2r|^2}{|1 + r|^2}. \hspace{1cm} (10)$$

Using the same logic, we find that the equal-time correlation for the reflected photons is zero,

$$g_{2\leftarrow}^2(0) \equiv \frac{\langle a_{\leftarrow}^1 a_{\leftarrow}^2 \rangle}{\langle a_{\leftarrow}^2 \rangle^2} = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

Eq. (11) tells us that two photons can not be reflected from the atom at the same time (photon antibunching). This happens because (i) no incident left-propagating photons, $\langle a_{0,\leftarrow} \rangle = 0$, and (ii) the two-level atom can not accommodate two photons at the same time, $\sigma^2 = 0$. Thus, it is impossible to emit two photons simultaneously. On the other hand, there is a strong photon bunching for forward propagating photons at the atomic resonance, when the reflection coefficient from Eq. (4) is close to $-1$. Indeed, the atom can emit one photon to the right and there is one incident right-propagating photon. Thus, single photon can not pass through the atom, $\langle a_{\rightarrow}^1 a_{\leftarrow} \rangle = 0$, which a pair of photons can pass. Scattering of single- and two- photons on an atom are schematically illustrated in Fig. 6, where we show incident, intermediate and output states, assuming that nonradiative damping $\gamma$ is vanishing and the
atom is excited exactly at resonance, so \( r(\varepsilon) \approx -1 \). The two-output state is an entangled state of two photons propagating to the right and two photons propagating in opposite directions, \( \langle a_1^\dagger a_2^\dagger \rangle = \langle a_4 a_3 \rangle = 1 \).

The goal of this review is to provide a simple introduction in the origin of photon bunching and antibunching in the simplest setup. More possibilities to manipulate the statistics of transmitted photons are opened, for example, for multilevel atoms (Zheng et al., 2011) or for atoms coupled to a toroidal cavity, that is in turn coupled to a waveguide (Aoki et al., 2009).

We emphasize that this information about equal-time photon bunching and antibunching has been obtained using only linear reflection and transmission coefficients and general input-output relations, without solving the Heisenberg equations for the atom operators \( b(t) \) explicitly. However, in order to obtain reflection coefficient at higher powers and the spectrum of atom emission, one should study the evolution of the operators \( b(t) \) that is governed by the Hamiltonian

\[
H = \frac{\Omega}{2}(b^\dagger b) + (\omega_0 - \varepsilon)b^\dagger b \equiv \left( \begin{array}{cc} 0 & \frac{\Omega}{2} \\ \frac{\Omega}{2} & \omega_0 - \varepsilon \end{array} \right). \tag{12}
\]

Here, we have made the unitary transformation \( b \rightarrow e^{i\varepsilon t} b \) in order to get rid of the time dependence of the incident field and write the Hamiltonian in the basis of atomic ground and excited states. We have also introduced the Rabi frequency according to \(-2dE_0 = \Omega\) that characterizes the amplitude of the incident field.

The stationary density matrix \( \rho \) of the atom can be found from the master equation

\[
\frac{d\rho}{dt} = \mathcal{L}\rho \equiv i[\rho, H] + \mathcal{L}\rho = 0, \tag{13}
\]

where the Lindblad operator

\[
\mathcal{L}\rho = \gamma_\Sigma \begin{pmatrix}
2\rho_{11} & -\rho_{12} \\
-\rho_{21} & -2\rho_{22}
\end{pmatrix} \tag{14}
\]

describes both nonradiative and spontaneous radiative decay of the atomic excitations with the rates \( \gamma \) and \( \gamma_{1D} = g^2/c \equiv \Gamma_{1D}/2 \), respectively. Here, \( \gamma_\Sigma = \gamma + \gamma_{1D} \).

The stationary density matrix elements are given by

\[
\rho_{12} = \rho_{21}^* = \frac{i\gamma_\Sigma \Omega [i(\varepsilon - \omega_0) + \gamma_\Sigma]}{2\gamma_\Sigma^2 + 2(\varepsilon - \omega_0)^2 + \Omega^2}, \tag{15}
\]

\[
\rho_{22} = 1 - \rho_{11} = \frac{-2\gamma_\Sigma^2 + 2(\varepsilon - \omega_0)^2 + \Omega^2}{2\gamma_\Sigma^2 + 2(\varepsilon - \omega_0)^2 + \Omega^2}. \tag{16}
\]

Thus, the coherent light reflection coefficient can be obtained in the following form:

\[
r = -\frac{i(\varepsilon - \omega_0) + \gamma_\Sigma}{\gamma_\Sigma^2 + (\varepsilon - \omega_0)^2 + \frac{\Omega^2}{2}}. \tag{17}
\]

In a case of low incident power, when \( \Omega \rightarrow 0 \), this expression reduces to Eq. (4). At large frequencies, the coherent reflection is suppressed because the atomic transition is saturated, \( r \propto \rho_{12} \rightarrow 0 \) and \( \rho_{11} = \rho_{22} = 1/2 \).

Another important characteristic is the spectrum of resonance fluorescence. The total number of photons emitted by an atom per second can be found using the quantum regression theorem as

\[
S(\omega) = -\frac{2\gamma_{1D}}{\pi} \text{Re} \int_0^\infty dt e^{-i\omega t} \text{Tr}(b^\dagger e^{Lt} \rho b), \tag{18}
\]

and describes both coherent and incoherent scattering of light (the total number of incident photons per second can be expressed as \( \Omega^2/(4\gamma_{1D}) \)).

At large intensities, the coherent scattering is relatively weak and the incoherent scattering spectrum becomes a famous resonance fluorescence triplet (also known as a Mollow triplet) (Mollow, 1969; Rautian and Sobel’man, 1962)

\[
S(\omega) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \left[ \frac{1}{\left(\frac{\omega - \omega_0}{\gamma_{1D}}\right)^2 + 1} + \frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{\left(\frac{\omega - \omega_0 + \Omega}{\gamma_{1D}/2}\right)^2 + 1} + \frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{\left(\frac{\omega - \omega_0 - \Omega}{\gamma_{1D}/2}\right)^2 + 1} \right]. \tag{19}
\]

Here, we have assumed that the nonradiative damping is absent, atom is a 2-level one and it is excited exactly at the resonance, \( \gamma = 0 \), \( \varepsilon = \omega_0 \). The spectrum given by Eq. (19) consists of three peaks, one at the atom frequency and two satellites with three times smaller peak heights shifted from the resonant frequency to the left or to the right by the Rabi frequency. The resonance fluorescence spectrum from a single artificial atom, a superconducting qubit, coupled to a waveguide has been first measured in Ref. (Astafiev et al., 2010), and it is illustrated in Fig. 7. The triplet in the spectrum results from the splitting of the atomic states by the Rabi frequency \( \Omega \), see the right inset of Fig. 7.

The total rate of photon emission is given by \( \int d\omega S(\omega) \). It can also be found as \( \Gamma_{1D} (b^\dagger b) \), where \( (b^\dagger b) = \frac{1}{2} \) is the
atomic population in the case of strong excitation: the atom is half populated and spontaneously emits with the rate $\Gamma_{1D} = 2\gamma_{1D}$. The same rate of photon emission is also equal to the difference of the photon incidence rate $\Omega^2/(4\gamma_{1D})$ and the rate of coherent reflection and transmission $\Omega^2(|r^2| + |t|^2)/(4\gamma_{1D})$.

3. Spontaneous emission of a real atom near a fiber

So far we have considered an idealized situation of a two-level atom coupled to a single propagating waveguide mode with a 100% efficiency. This description is reasonable for artificial atoms, superconducting qubits. However, it should be modified to describe experiments when real atoms are coupled to a fiber waveguide. First, the atoms interact both with the guided modes of a nanofiber and the free-space modes. Second, the multilevel structure of a real atom significantly affects its spontaneous decay rate in the vicinity of a waveguide. For the first time, spontaneous emission of a multilevel atom in the vicinity of an optical nanofiber was calculated by Fam Le Kien et al. in Ref. (Le Kien et al., 2005). Here, we briefly summarize results of this paper.

Let’s start describing the scattering process by considering a single atom of $^{133}$Cs trapped close to a cylindrical nanofiber of radius $a$. We assume that the cesium atom is initially prepared at its hyperfine structure level $F_g = 4$ of the ground state $6S_{1/2}$ and the photon propagates through the nanofiber with a frequency close to the atomic resonance of $|F_g = 4 \rightarrow F_e = 5 \rangle$ in $D_2$-line of $^{133}$Cs, see the level structure in Fig. 8 (a). Here, $F_g$ and $F_e$ are the total atomic angular moments of $6S_{1/2}$ ground state and $6P_{3/2}$ excited state, respectively. Consideration of this transition allows to avoid additional influence of the hyperfine structure of the excited state due to the selection rule. Therefore, the magnetic sublevels $e_{f\mu}$ and $g_{f\mu}$ of the hyperfine excited $F' = 5$ and ground $F = 4$ states form a closed set. We assume that the nanofiber has a silica core with refractive index $n_1 = 1.45$ and an infinite vacuum clad of refractive index $n_2 = 1$.

For consistency with the fiber geometry, it is convenient to use cylindrical coordinates $(r, \varphi, z)$ with $z$ being the axis of the fiber. The quantization procedure for such a system was developed in Ref. (Domokos et al., 2002). The positive-frequency part of the electric field can be decomposed into the contributions from the guided and radiation modes as

$$E^{(+)} = E^{(+)}_{1D} + E^{(+)}_{rad}. \quad (20)$$

We assume that the field is in a single-photon state with the frequency $\omega$ close to the atomic resonant frequency $\omega_0$. The guided mode is characterized by an index $\mu = (\omega, f, p)$, where $f = +, -$ denotes forward (+z) and backward (−z) propagation direction, and $p = +, -$ denotes counter-clockwise or clockwise rotation of polarization, respectively. Then, the quantized field in the guided mode can be described as

$$E^{(+)}_{1D} = i \sum_{fp} \int_0^\infty d\omega \sqrt{\hbar \omega} a_\mu e^{(\mu)} e^{-i(\omega t - f\beta z - p\varphi)}. \quad (21)$$

Here, $\beta$ is the longitudinal propagation constant, $\beta' = d\beta/d\omega$, $a_\mu$ is the respective photon annihilation operator, satisfying the continuous mode bosonic commutation rules $[a_\mu, a^\dagger_{\mu'}] = \delta(\omega - \omega')\delta_{f f'}\delta_{pp'}$. Electric field profile function of the guided mode $\mu$ in the classical problem $e^{(\mu)} = e^{(\mu)}(r, \varphi)$ is given in Appendix B, where we also present the fiber eigenvalue equation for the propagation constant $\beta(k)$.

Unlike the guided modes, the longitudinal propagation constant $\beta$ of radiation modes can vary continuously for each value of $\omega$ from $-n_2k$ to $n_2k$ (with $k = \omega/c$). Moreover, each radiation mode is characterized by the index $\nu = (\omega, \beta, m, p)$, where $m$ is the mode order and $p$ is the mode polarization. Radiation modes of the quantized field can be expressed as

$$E^{(+)}_{rad} = i \sum_{mp} \int_0^\infty d\omega \int_{-n_2k}^{n_2k} d\beta \sqrt{\hbar \omega} a_\nu e^{(\nu)} e^{-i(\omega t - \beta z - mp\varphi)}. \quad (22)$$

Here, $a_\nu$ is the respective photon annihilation operator, and $e^{(\nu)} = e^{(\nu)}(r, \varphi)$ is the electric-field profile function of the radiation mode $\nu$ in the classical problem (see Appendix B). The operators $a_\nu$ and $a^\dagger_\nu$ satisfy the continuous mode bosonic commutation rules $[a_\nu, a^\dagger_{\nu'}] = \delta(\beta - \beta')\delta_{m m'}\delta_{p p'}$.

In the interaction picture, the atomic dipole operator is given by

$$\mathbf{D} = \sum_{eg} (d^*_e \sigma^* g e^{-i\omega_0 t} + d^*_g \sigma^* e e^{i\omega_0 t}). \quad (23)$$
Here, $d_{eg} = \langle e|D|g\rangle e^{-i\omega_0 t}$ is the dipole matrix element and operators $\sigma_{ge} = \langle g|e\rangle$ and $\sigma_{eg}^\dagger = \langle e|g\rangle$ describe the downward and upward transitions, respectively. We also introduce notations $d^{(-1)} = (d_x - id_y)/\sqrt{2}$, $d^{(0)} = d_z$, and $d^{(+1)} = -(d_x + id_y)/\sqrt{2}$ for the spherical tensor components of the dipole vector $d$. We label the spherical tensor components with the index $l = 0, \pm 1$. Using this notation, the spherical dipole moment component for the transition $|e_{M'}\rangle \rightarrow |g_M\rangle$ is given by

$$d^{(l)}_{e_{M'}g_M} = (-1)^{l+M'}|J'\rangle|D||J\rangle\sqrt{(2F+1)(2F'+1)}\times\begin{pmatrix} J' & F' & 1 \\ F & J & 1 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} F & 1 & F' \\ M & l & -M' \end{pmatrix},$$

(24)

where the array in the curly braces is a 6j symbol, the array in the parenthesis is a 3j symbol, $J$ is the total electronic angular momentum, $I$ is the nuclear spin, and $\langle J'\rangle|D||J\rangle$ is the reduced electric-dipole matrix element in the $J$ basis.

The Hamiltonian for the atom-field interaction in the dipole and rotating wave approximations is given by

$$H_{int} = -i\hbar\sum_{fpg} \int_0^\infty d\omega G_{meg} \sigma_{meg}^\dagger a_{fpg} e^{-i(\omega-\omega_0)t}$$

$$- i\hbar\sum_{mpg} \int_0^\infty d\omega \int_{-n_2k}^{n_2k} d\beta G_{meg} \sigma_{meg}^\dagger a_{pg} e^{-i(\omega-\omega_0)t} + H.c.$$  

(25)

We assume that the atom is located at a point with $(r, \varphi, z)$. Here, the coefficients $G_{meg}$ and $G_{meg}$ characterize the coupling of the atomic transition $|e\rangle \rightarrow |g\rangle$ with the guided mode $\mu = (\omega, f, p)$ and the radiation mode $\nu = (\omega, \beta, m, p)$, respectively. They could be expressed as

$$G_{meg} = \sqrt{\frac{\omega_0^3}{\hbar}} (\langle d_{eg}, e^{(l)} \rangle e^{(l)fz+\varphi e})$$

$$G_{meg} = \frac{\omega_0^3}{\hbar} (\langle d_{eg}, e^{(l)} \rangle e^{(l)fz+m\varphi})$$  

(26)

Solutions of the Heisenberg equations for the photon operators $a_\mu$ and $a_\nu$ can be written as

$$a_\mu(t) = a_\mu(t_0) + \sum_{eg} G_{meg}^{(1D)} \int_{t_0}^t df' \sigma_{ge}(t') e^{i(\omega-\omega_0)t'},$$

(27)

and similarly for $a_\nu(t)$. Applying the Markovian approximation $\sigma_{ge}(t') = \sigma_{ge}(t)$, one can obtain the Heisenberg-Langevin equations for $\sigma_{ij} = |i\rangle\langle j|$

$$\dot{\sigma}_{ge} = -\frac{\hbar}{2} \sum_{e'} \Gamma_{ee'}^{tot} \sigma_{ee'} + \hat{\xi}_{ge},$$

$$\dot{\sigma}_{ee'} = -\frac{\hbar}{2} \sum_{e''} \Gamma_{ee''}^{tot} \sigma_{ee''} + \Gamma_{ee'}^{tot} \sigma_{ee''} + \hat{\xi}_{ee'},$$

$$\dot{\sigma}_{gg'} = \sum_{ee''} \Gamma_{ee''}^{tot} \sigma_{ee''} + \hat{\xi}_{gg'},$$

(28)

Here, the coefficients

$$\Gamma_{ee'}^{tot} = \Gamma_{ee'}^{1D} + \Gamma_{ee'}^{rad},$$

$$\Gamma_{ee''}^{tot} = \Gamma_{ee''}^{1D} + \Gamma_{ee''}^{rad},$$

(29)

characterize the total spontaneous emission and the noise operators $\hat{\xi}_{ij}$. The coefficients $\Gamma_{ee'}^{1D}$ and $\Gamma_{ee'}^{rad}$ describe spontaneous emission into the guided modes $\mu_0 = (\omega_0, f, p)$. The coefficients $\Gamma_{ee'}^{1D}$ and $\Gamma_{ee'}^{rad}$ describe spontaneous emission into the radiation modes $\nu_0 = (\omega_0, \beta, m, p)$. Here,

$$\Gamma_{ee'}^{1D} = \sum_g \Gamma_{ee'}^{1D}$$

$$\Gamma_{ee'}^{rad} = \sum_g \Gamma_{ee'}^{rad}$$  

(30)
Using the symmetry properties of the mode functions and the selection rules, one can obtain:

\[
\Gamma_{ee}^{1D} = \frac{8\pi\omega_0\beta'_0}{\hbar} \sum_{g} |(d_{eg} \cdot e^{(\omega_0,+,+)}_{\mu})|^2, \quad (31)
\]

\[
\Gamma_{ee}^{rad} = \frac{8\pi\omega_0}{\hbar} \sum_{g} \sum_{m} \int d\beta |(d_{eg} \cdot e^{(\omega_0,\beta,m,+)}_{\mu})|^2.
\]

Here, \(e^{(\omega_0,+,+)}_{\mu}\) is the mode function of the fundamental guided mode \(\mu = (\omega, f, p)\) with \(\omega = \omega_0\) (resonant atomic frequency), \(f = +\) (forward direction), and \(p = +\) (counterclockwise polarization), while \(e^{(\omega_0,\beta,m,+)}_{\mu}\) is the mode function of the radiation mode \(\nu = (\omega, \beta, m, p)\) with the frequency \(\omega = \omega_0\) and the polarization \(p = +\). The total decay rate of the population of one Zeeman sublevel of the excited state is given by a sum \(\Gamma_{ee}^{\text{tot}} = \Gamma_{ee}^{1D} + \Gamma_{ee}^{rad}\).

In Fig. 8 (b), one can see the spatial dependence of the spontaneous emission rates for various magnetic sublevels \(|e⟩ = |6P_{3/2}F' = 5⟩\) into the guided modes, radiation modes and both types of modes.

We should mention here that off-diagonal elements such as \(\Gamma_{ee}^{\text{tot}}\) with \(e \neq e'\) and \(\Gamma_{ee}^{\text{tot}}\) with \(e \neq e'\) or \(g \neq g'\) do not exist in the case of two-level atoms. They describe the decay rate of the cross-level coherences and arise only in the framework of a multi-level atom model. The knowledge of both diagonal and off-diagonal types of decay characteristics is important for the studies of absorption and emission properties of the multi-level atom.

B. Array of closely spaced atoms coupled to a waveguide

1. Single-photon reflection and transmission

We now proceed to the problem of a single photon scattering from an array of \(N\) identical closely spaced atoms coupled to a waveguide. We assume that a distance between atoms is much smaller than the light wavelength, so that only the collective superradiant Dicke state is excited. In this case, the situation is very similar to the problem of a single photon scattering from one atom, considered in Sec. III.A.1.

Namely, the transfer matrix for \(N\) closely spaced atoms is

\[
M = (M_{\text{atom}})^N, \quad (32)
\]

where \(M_{\text{atom}}\) is given by Eq. (3). The amplitudes of reflection and transmission coefficients are found from the transfer matrix according to the general expressions:

\[
r_N = \frac{M_{12}}{M_{22}}, \quad t_N = \frac{1}{M_{22}} \quad (33)
\]

and read as

\[
r_N = \frac{iN\gamma_{1D}}{\omega_0 - \omega - i(\gamma + N\gamma_{1D})}, \quad (34)
\]

\[
t_N = 1 + r_N = \frac{\omega_0 - \omega}{\omega_0 - \omega - i(\gamma + N\gamma_{1D})}.
\]

Comparing Eq. (34) with Eq. (4) for a single atom, we find that the only one difference is that the single-atom radiative decay rate \(\gamma_{1D} = \Gamma_{1D}/2\) is now multiplied by a number of atoms \(N\). This is the manifestation of the radiative decay rate of the collective Dicke superradiant state where the atoms are excited symmetrically. Thus, the reflection and transmission spectra still look as those in Fig. 4(b) but the spectral width of the transmission dip (reflection peak) scales linearly with the number of atoms.

2. Two-photon reflection and transmission

a. Model and historical overview

We now proceed to consider a more general quantum problem of a photon pair scattering on an ensemble of \(N\) identical closely spaced atoms, coupled to a waveguide, see Fig. 9. The waveguide is characterized by the photon Hamiltonian:

\[
H_{\text{phot}} = \sum_k \omega_k a_k\dagger a_k, \quad (35)
\]

where \(\omega_k = \epsilon|k|\) is the frequency of the photonic mode with the wave vector \(k\), and \(\epsilon\) is the light speed in the waveguide. The summation over \(k\) means \(\sum_k \equiv L \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk/(2\pi)\), where \(L\) is the normalization length and the operators \(a_k\dagger\) describe creation of photon in the waveguide. The atomic array is described by the Hamiltonian

\[
H_{\text{atoms}} = \omega_0 \sum_j b_j\dagger b_j + \frac{U}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{N} b_j\dagger b_j (b_j\dagger b_j - 1) \quad (36)
\]

where \(b_j\dagger\) is the bosonic operator creating an excitation in a single atom, and \(U\) is the anharmonicity parameter. In the case when \(U \to \infty\), we recover a two-level atom result, see the inset in Fig. 9. The following light-atom coupling

\[
H_{\text{atom–phot}} = \frac{g}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_k \sum_{j=1}^{N} (a_k b_j + a_k b_j\dagger) \quad (37)
\]

is expressed in the dipole approximation with the coupling strength \(g\). In what follows, we focus on the case of a resonant excitation, \(ck \approx \omega_0\), when the rotating wave approximation is justified and the counter-rotating terms \(\propto a_k b_j\dagger a_k b_j\) can be ignored. We refer the readers to a recent review (Kockum et al., 2019) on the regime of ultrastrong light matter coupling when the rotating wave approximation is broken. To the best of our knowledge, the
ultra-strong light matter coupling has been mostly explored in the cavity setup and much less is known on the possible generalizations of this regime in case of waveguide quantum electrodynamics.

Since a single two-level atom can not be excited by two identical photons at the same time due to a Pauli exclusion principle, the photon-photon interactions become crucial in such a setup. The study of photon-photon interactions and nonlinearity of the Maxwell’s equations in vacuum due to the excitation of virtual electron-positron pairs is a cornerstone problem of quantum electrodynamics, see for example the reviews (Liang and Czarnecki, 2012; Scharnhorst, 2019). However, in relativistic quantum electrodynamics the solution is obtained perturbatively since the electron-photon interaction constant $\alpha = e^2/\hbar c \approx 1/137$ is a small parameter. The advantage of the nonrelativistic quantum optical problem Eqs. (35)–(37) is the existence of an exact analytical solution in all orders in the light-atom coupling parameter $g$. One of the reasons why this is possible is that the light excites only symmetricDicke states of the atomic ensemble of the type

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_j b_j^\dagger |0\rangle, \quad \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j,m} b_j^\dagger b_m^\dagger |0\rangle$$

etc.

The quantum problem of photons interacting with an atomic array has become a perfect testing ground for different theoretical techniques, and we try to review the development below. Historically, the quantum Dicke problem has been first diagonalized exactly by Rupasov and Yudson in 1984 using the Bethe ansatz technique, that was initially developed in the context of condensed matter physics (Rupasov and Yudson, 1984; Yudson, 1985; Yudson and Reineker, 2008). Rupasov and Yudson have noticed, that the problem Eqs. (35)–(37) is very similar to the Kondo problem of electrons interacting with a single impurity, that has been independently solved in 1980 by Andrei (Andrei, 1980) and Vigman (Vigman, 1980) using the Bethe ansatz. The Kondo problem in turn has certain similarities to the problem of one-dimensional boson gas with contact interaction, that was solved by Lieb and Liniger in 1963 by an analogous Bethe ansatz approach (Lieb and Liniger, 1963), see also recent reviews of the Bethe ansatz (Batchelor, 2007; Faddeev, 2013). The details of the Bethe ansatz used in (Rupasov and Yudson, 1984) are given in Appendix G. Much later, the same answer as in Refs. (Rupasov and Yudson, 1984; Yudson, 1985) has been obtained by Shen and Fan (Shen and Fan, 2007a,b) for the particular case of the two-photon scattering. Shen and Fan have solved the Schrödinger equation directly in the Hilbert subspace with only two excitations. We present an analogous derivation in Appendix D. Next, (Liao and Law, 2010) have considered a generalized system with a two-level atom replaced by a nonlinear cavity characterized with the Hamiltonian of the type Eq. (36) with $N = 1$. Later on, this approach has been extended to several photons using the path integral formalism (Shi et al., 2015, 2011; Shi and Sun, 2009) that is discussed in Appendix F. The scattering has been also analyzed using the conventional input-output theory (Shi et al., 2015; Lalumière et al., 2013). In both approaches (Caneva et al., 2015; Shi et al., 2011; Shi and Sun, 2009), the photon degrees of freedom are effectively traced out and the solution is carried out in the atomic subspace of the full Hilbert space. The disadvantage of such a technique is that it is valid only in the Markovian approximation. Such approximation seems reasonable for closely spaced atoms, but can fail in a spatially separated array, that will be considered in the following Sec. III.C. Namely, the Markovian approximation sets all the phases gained by light when traveling the distance $d$ between any two atoms $\omega_d/c$ to $\omega_0 d/c$, and the introduced phase error $|\omega_d - \omega_0| d/c$ can become important for a large spacing (Fang et al., 2014; Zheng and Baranger, 2013). However, the path integral formalism also allows to take into account the non-Markovian effects (Shi et al., 2015).

It is also important to address the chiral situation, when the given atomic resonance is coupled only to the photons propagating through the waveguide in one direction, either forward or backward. The problem of a photon pair scattering on a single two-level atom chirally coupled to a waveguide has been solved by Kojima et al. in Refs. (Kojima et al., 2003; Koshino and Ishihara, 2004). Interestingly, it is formally very similar to the problem of photon reflection from a one-sided cavity with a single-atom in the weak coupling regime, that is well known in quantum optics (Rice and Carmichael, 1988). Much later, these results were generalized to the chiral waveguide with multiple atoms (Mahmoodian et al., 2018). A very important milestone in theoretical research has

FIG. 9 Schematics of two-photon scattering on an ensemble of $N$ closely spaced multilevel atoms characterized by the Hamiltonian Eq. (36).
been achieved quite recently in Ref. (Mahmoodian et al., 2020). The Dicke problem for a chiral waveguide with multiple photons and multiple atoms has been solved exactly by means of the Bethe ansatz and the connection to classical nonlinear solutions in the regime of large photon numbers has been made. A groundbreaking experiment of Ref. (Prasad et al., 2020) has demonstrated that it is possible to control photon-photon correlations and continuously tune them from antibunching to bunching by increasing the number of atoms chirally coupled to a waveguide. We discuss these results in more detail below in Section III.D.

The photon scattering problem on an atomic array has also been attacked by the diagrammatic Green function techniques (Kocabaş, 2016; Fang et al., 2014; Laakso and Pletyukhov, 2014; Schneider et al., 2016; Zheng and Baranger, 2013). These can also be separated into two types. The first type is based on the electron representation, being inspired by the original Feynman approach from the quantum electrodynamics. In such technique, a photon absorption is viewed as a transition of an electron from a lower atomic state |1⟩ to the upper one |2⟩, as described by the Hamiltonian of the following type: $a_k c_2 c_1 + H.c.$, where $c_{1,2}$ are corresponding electron creation operators. The perturbation series for $N$ closely spaced atoms can be summed exactly and the original answer by Rupasov and Yudson can be recovered, see Appendix G. However, this approach fails for spatially separated atoms due to an appearance of extra diagrams (Kocabaş, 2016) and a closed-form solution can not be obtained. The most practical technique to date for the photon scattering, in our opinion, is the Green’s function approach in the exciton representation, developed by Zheng and Baranger in (Fang et al., 2014; Zheng and Baranger, 2013). In this representation, the absorption of a photon by an atom leads to a creation of an exciton, as described by the Hamiltonian Eq. (37). It can work both for closely spaced and spatially separated atoms and is not restricted by the Markovian approximation. Another advantage is that it naturally handles multilevel atoms characterized by the anharmonicity parameter $U$, and the two-level atom case is recovered for $U \to \infty$. Very recently, the Green’s function technique has also been generalized to the consider the multi-photon scattering (Piasotski and Pletyukhov, 2021).

Potentially, the most powerful method for the waveguide quantum electrodynamics problems could become the matrix product state (MPS) approach that has been very recently proposed in (Regidor et al., 2020). The matrix product states technique is an established and very powerful method to consider many-body effects in one-dimensional condensed matter systems (Örüş, 2014). It is based on the representation of the wavefunction of many-body quantum state as a product of auxiliary matrices $A$:

$$\psi(s_1, s_2, s_3 \ldots) = A_{\alpha_1 \alpha_2}(s_1) A_{\alpha_2 \alpha_3}(s_2) A_{\alpha_3 \alpha_4}(s_3) \ldots$$

(39)

where the indices $\alpha$ run in a finite range, $\alpha = 1 \ldots M$ and the indices $s_1, s_2 \ldots$ describe quantum states of different particles 1,2,3,4... In the case when $M = 1$, the wavefunction factorizes, which means that the particles are independent. In the case when $M > 1$, the quantum states of different particles become entangled with each other. It has been proven that the ansatz Eq. (39) converges quite fast for the nondegenerate ground state of quantum systems with nearest-neighbor interactions, such as spin chains. At the first glance, one may conclude that the MPS approach is not suitable for WQED setups that feature long-range photon-mediated interactions between the atoms. Regidor et al. have shown how to circumvent this issue by discretizing the problem in space and time (Regidor et al., 2020). This technique also automatically handles the non-Markovian effects, and hopefully it will become a widely used powerful and practical tool.

b. Photon-photon scattering and correlations We will now present explicit results for the two-photon wave function describing light scattered from an atomic array and refer the reader to Appendices D–H for different equivalent derivations. We consider coherent state of light exp$(-\alpha^2/2 + \alpha a_1^\dagger)|0\rangle$ with the frequency $\varepsilon$ incident from the left upon the atomic ensemble and weak excitation amplitude $\alpha \ll 1$. The scattered two-photon state can be then presented as (Poshakinskiy and Poddubny, 2016)

$$\psi_{\text{scat}} = e^{-\alpha^2/2} \left\{ |0\rangle + \alpha t(\varepsilon) a_{\varepsilon/c}^\dagger |0\rangle + \alpha r(\varepsilon) a_{-\varepsilon/c}^\dagger |0\rangle \right\}$$

$$+ \frac{\alpha^2}{2} \left[ t^2(\varepsilon) a_{\varepsilon/c}^\dagger a_{\varepsilon/c}^\dagger + r^2(\varepsilon) a_{-\varepsilon/c}^\dagger a_{-\varepsilon/c}^\dagger + 2r(\varepsilon) t(\varepsilon) a_{\varepsilon/c}^\dagger a_{-\varepsilon/c}^\dagger \right] |0\rangle$$

$$+ \frac{\alpha^2}{4} \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} M(\varepsilon - \omega, \varepsilon)$$

$$\times \left( a_{(\varepsilon+\omega)/c}^\dagger + a_{-(\varepsilon+\omega)/c}^\dagger \right) (a_{(\varepsilon-\omega)/c} + a_{-(\varepsilon-\omega)/c}^\dagger) |0\rangle \right\}.$$  

(40)

The first line in Eq. (40) describes the superposition of the vacuum state and the states where a single photon is either reflected or transmitted. Second line describes independent coherent scattering of the two photons. The last two lines in Eq. (40) are the most interesting and correspond to the incoherent scattering. Namely, one of the two scattered photons has the frequency $\varepsilon - \omega$ and the other one has $\varepsilon + \omega$. The total energy $2\varepsilon$ is conserved and equal to that of the incident photon pair. Such process
is described by the following scattering matrix:

\[
M(\omega_1', \omega_2' \leftrightarrow \omega_1, \omega_2) = \frac{4UN_{\gamma_{1D}}}{\gamma_{1D}} \frac{s(\omega_1)s(\omega_2)s(\omega_1')s(\omega_2')}{[\varepsilon - \omega_0 + i\gamma][\varepsilon - \omega_0 + i(N\gamma_{1D} + \gamma)]}
\]

\[
\times [\varepsilon - \omega_0 + i(N\gamma_{1D} + \gamma)] \left(2\varepsilon - \omega_0 + 2i\gamma - U\right) + iU\gamma_{1D},
\]  

(41)

where \(s(\omega) = \gamma_{1D}/[\omega_0 - \omega - i(N\gamma_{1D} + \gamma)]\). One can immediately see that the incoherent two-photon scattering process vanishes if the anharmonicity \(U\) is equal to zero. Indeed, if the atom is described as a harmonic oscillator, the whole Hamiltonian Eqs. (35)–(37) corresponds to a problem of linearly coupled non-interacting bosons. Such the Hamiltonian can be diagonalized exactly in the single-excitation subspace where different single-excited states are independent, hence, incoherent scattering vanishes.

Another regime, when the two-photons scattering is partially suppressed, is when the array is excited exactly at the atomic resonance, so that the factor \(\varepsilon - \omega_0 + i\gamma\) in Eq. (41) is at minimum. Such a cancellation can be qualitatively understood by analyzing the destructive interference of two different quantum pathways for a related process, absorption of two photons by two different atoms (Muthukrishnan et al., 2004), schematically illustrated in Fig. 10. The process goes through an intermediate virtual state, where only one of the two atoms is excited, either the first one or the second one. The sum of matrix elements of these two processes is proportional to

\[
\frac{1}{\omega_1 - \omega_0} + \frac{1}{\omega_2 - \omega_0}
\]

and vanishes for \((\omega_1 + \omega_2)/2 = \varepsilon = \omega_0\).

The wavefunction in Eq. (40) also allows one to calculate coherent photon reflection and transmission coefficients up to the linear order in the incident light power \(\sim c\alpha^2/L\). The transmission coefficient is given by

\[
T_{\text{coh}} = |t|^2 - \frac{c\alpha^2}{L} \Im \left[ M(\varepsilon, \varepsilon \leftarrow \varepsilon, \varepsilon) t^* (t^* + r^*) \right]
\]

(42)

where \(t\) and \(r\) are coherent single-photon amplitudes of transmission and reflection coefficients, respectively. Coherent reflection coefficient \(R_{\text{coh}}\) is obtained by replacing \(t\) by \(r\) in Eq. (42). It can be checked that in a case of vanishing non-radiative decay, the energy flux conservation holds \(R_{\text{coh}} + T_{\text{coh}} + I_{\text{incoh}} = 1\), where

\[
I_{\text{incoh}} = \frac{c\alpha^2}{L} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} |M(\varepsilon - \omega, \varepsilon + \omega \leftarrow \varepsilon, \varepsilon)|^2.
\]

(43)

is the total incoherent scattering rate.

More detailed insight in the two-photon scattering process can be obtained from the photon-photon correlation function, which is given by

\[
g^{(2)}(\tau)
\]

\[
= \left| 1 + \frac{i}{2t(\varepsilon)^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} e^{-i\omega\tau} M(\varepsilon - \omega, \varepsilon + \omega \leftarrow \varepsilon, \varepsilon) \right|^2
\]

(44)

in transmission geometry and in the correlation function \(g^{(2)}(\tau)\) in reflection geometry is obtained by replacing \(t(\varepsilon)\) with \(r(\varepsilon)\). The integrals can be straightforwardly evaluated analytically using the Cauchy theorem. We do not present explicit expressions here since they are too cumbersome, but at zero delay \(\tau = 0\) and for \(U \rightarrow \infty\), they are in agreement with Eqs. (10), (11), obtained before using more simple approach. The calculated time dependence of the correlation function depending on the anharmonicity parameter \(U\) is shown in Fig. 11. In the limit of two-level atom, \(U \gg \gamma, \gamma_{1D}\), the atom is occupied after the first photon absorbed and becomes transparent for the second photon. Thus, two photons can be
transmitted at the same time (bunching) but can not be reflected at the same time (antibunching). This is the essence of the photon blockade effect.

It is also instructive to analyze the equal-time photon-photon correlation function $g^{(2)}(0)$ depending on the number of photons in the array. For resonant excitation ($\varepsilon = \omega_0$) and strong anharmonicity, it is given by

$$g^{(2)}_{\text{ref}}(0) = \left(\frac{1 - 1/N}{1 - \Gamma_{\text{1D}}/(\Gamma + N\Gamma_{\text{1D}})}\right)^2,$$

$$g^{(2)}_{\text{tr}}(0) = \left(\frac{1 - \Gamma/\Gamma_{\text{1D}}}{1 - \Gamma_{\text{1D}}/(\Gamma + N\Gamma_{\text{1D}})}\right)^2.$$

The dependence of photon-photon correlation functions Eq. (45) on the atom number $N$ and the ratio of the decay rates is plotted in Fig. 12. One atom in reflection geometry demonstrates full antibunching $g^{(2)}_{\text{ref}}(0) = 0$ independent of the value of $\Gamma$, see Fig. 12(a). However, this antibunching is fully suppressed already for $N = 2$ atoms, $g^{(2)}_{\text{ref}}(0) \approx 1$. The naive physical explanation is very simple: the array of $N > 1$ atoms can host two photons so the photon blockade is not manifested. In transmission geometry the dependence on $N$ is weak. The transmitted photons are bunched (anti-bunched) for small (large) values of $\Gamma \ll \Gamma_{\text{1D}}$, see Fig. 12(b).

### C. Spatially-separated array

In this section, we discuss in more detail the periodic atomic array with nonzero spacings. If the distance between atoms is nonzero, the dark states become subradiant, and they are manifested as sharp resonances in the optical spectra. Fully analytical treatment of subradiant states in the quantum case is not feasible, but it is still possible to obtain closed-form answers for the scattering involving only single-excited states of the array and only double-excited states. We review the corresponding regimes in Sec. III.C.1 and Sec. III.C.2, respectively.

#### 1. Single-photon regime

##### a. Superradiant and subradiant collective modes

Probably, the easiest way to calculate single-photon reflection and transmission coefficients from an arbitrarily spaced atomic array coupled to the waveguide, is offered by the transfer matrix method. This method through an individual atom is given by Eq. (3), and the transfer matrix through the free part of the waveguide with the length $d$ can be expressed as

$$M_d = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\omega_d/c} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\omega_d/c} \end{pmatrix}.$$

By multiplying these matrices, we obtain the total transfer matrix through an array of $N$ atoms with the period $d$ in the following form:

$$M_N = (M_d M_{\text{atom}})^N,$$

that allows to find reflection and transmission coefficients as

$$r_N = -\frac{[M_N]_{2,1}}{[M_N]_{2,2}}, \quad t_N = \frac{\det M_N}{[M_N]_{2,2}}.$$

It is also possible to obtain an analytical expression for Eqs. (48) that reads (Ivchenko, 2005)

$$r_N = \frac{\tilde{r} \sin N Kd}{\sin N Kd - \tilde{r} \sin (N-1) Kd}, \quad t_N = \frac{\tilde{t} \sin Kd}{\tilde{r} \sin N Kd},$$

where $\tilde{r} = r e^{i\omega_d/c}$ are the transmission and reflection coefficients through one period of the array. Here,

$$\cos Kd = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(M_{\text{atom}} M_{\text{period}})$$

$$= \cos \frac{\omega d}{c} - \frac{\gamma_{\text{1D}}}{\omega_0 - \omega - i\gamma} \sin \frac{\omega d}{c},$$

is the wave vector of the polaritonic excitations, propagating in the infinite array. The polariton dispersion law in Eq. (50) has been apparently obtained for the first time in Ref. (Mahan and Obermair, 1969) where the light reflection from a crystal formed by resonant point dipoles has been considered. In the case when the period of the atomic array is much smaller than the wavelength, $\omega d/c \ll 1$, Eq. (50) can be approximately written as

$$\varepsilon(\omega) = 1 + \frac{2\gamma_{\text{1D}}}{q d (\omega_0 - \omega - i\gamma)},$$

is the effective permittivity of the array. The polariton dispersion law Eq. (50) calculated exactly and from the
effective permittivity \( \varepsilon \) is plotted in Fig. 13 by solid and dotted curves, respectively. The dispersion curve manifests a characteristic avoided crossing of the free light dispersion \( K = \omega/c \) with the atomic resonance. The polaritonic band gap is located in the frequency range

\[
\omega_0 - \gamma_{1D} \tan \frac{\omega_0 d}{2c} < \omega < \omega_0 - \gamma_{1D} \cot \frac{\omega_0 d}{2c},
\]

(52)

illustrated by the dashed area in Fig. 13.

Yet another equivalent approach to calculate the reflection and transmission spectra is based on the non-Hermitian Hamiltonian (Caneva et al., 2015; Ivchenko, 2005)

\[
H_{mn} = (\omega_0 - i\gamma)\delta_{mn} - i\gamma_{1D}\omega|z_m - z_n|/c \quad (53)
\]

for the single-excited atomic states. Here, \( z_m \) are the coordinates of atoms along the waveguide. The non-Hermitian part of the Hamiltonian Eq. (53) describes the spontaneous decay due to the emission into the waveguide. Crucially, the Hamiltonian Eq. (53) features distant long-ranged couplings between atoms mediated by the waveguide modes. The reflection coefficient can be found from the Hamiltonian as

\[
r_{N}^0 = i\gamma_{1D} \sum_{m,n=1}^{N} G_{mn}(\omega)\frac{e^{i\omega(z_m - z_n)/c}}{c},
\]

(54)

and the transmission coefficient \( t_{N}^0 \) is obtained by replacing \( z_m \) in Eq. (54) with \( -z_m \). Here, \( G \equiv [1 - \hat{H}]^{-1} \) is the matrix Green’s function of atomic excitations, satisfying to

\[
(\omega_0 - i\gamma)G_{mn} = i\gamma_{1D} \sum_{n=1}^{N} e^{i\omega|z_m - z_n|/c}G_{mn} = \delta_{m,n}. \quad (55)
\]

An explicit answer for the Green’s function Eq. (55) of the finite periodic array can be found in Ref. (Voronov et al., 2007).

The advantage of the approach based on the non-Hermitian Hamiltonian Eq. (53) is that it allows transparent qualitative understanding of the eigenmodes of the atomic array in the case when the Markovian approximation holds, i.e. the phases \( \omega|z_m - z_n|/c \) can be replaced by \( \omega_0|z_m - z_n|/c \). Physically, this approximation assumes the infinite speed of light. For example, the red dotted line in Fig. 13, showing the light dispersion at the atomic resonance, would become exactly vertical in the Markovian approximation. In case of photon scattering on a single atom or on an array of atoms in the same point, the Markovian approximation is typically valid. However, non-Markovian effects are still possible in this case. For example, they arise due to the finite bandwidth of the infinite photon wavepacket, as has been studied in Ref. (Fang et al., 2018).

Moreover, in the Markovian case, the Hamiltonian Eq. (53) has precisely \( N \) eigenvectors \( P_{n}^{\nu} \) satisfying equation

\[
\sum_{n=1}^{N} H_{mn}P_{n}^{\nu} = \omega^{\nu}P_{m}. \quad (56)
\]

and has resonances at the eigenfrequencies \( \omega_{\nu} \). The eigenfrequencies are complex, and the decay rates of the corresponding modes is equal to \(-2\text{Im} \omega^{\nu}\). In a case when all atoms are located in one point, we obtain a single superradiant mode with \( P_{SR,n} = 1/\sqrt{N} \) and the eigenfrequency \( \omega_{SR} = \omega_0 - i(N\gamma_{1D} + \Gamma) \), is in agreement with Eqs. (4) for the reflection and transmission spectra. All the other \( N - 1 \) modes are degenerate for \( d = 0 \) with the eigenfrequency \( \omega_0 - i\gamma \). Their eigenvectors are found from the condition \( \sum_{n=1}^{N} P_{n} = 0 \) and all these modes are dark, i.e. can not be excited by the waveguide mode. When the spacing between atoms increases, \( d \neq 0 \), the dark modes stop being degenerate and acquire finite radiative lifetime, as it is shown in Fig. 14. The center of mass of the eigenmodes does not depend on the spacing and is equal to \( \omega_0 - i(\gamma + \gamma_{1D}) \).

The lifetimes of the eigenmodes depend periodically on the array period, as shown in Fig. 14. The situation with one superradiant mode and \( N - 1 \) dark modes is also realized for the Bragg-spaced arrays with \( 2d/\lambda_0 = 1, 2, \ldots \). In this case, the polariton band gap is enhanced, but should be calculated beyond the Markovian approxima-
Ref. (van Loo et al., 2013). Spectrum of light reflection from two superconducting qubits with the spacing 3λ(ω0)/4 coupled to the waveguide. Different curves correspond to different pumping strengths characterized by the Rabi frequencies ΩR.

We also present in Fig. 16 the dependence of the reflection, transmission and absorption spectra on the period of the 10-atoms array, calculated according to Eq. (49). The spectral features reflect the eigenfrequencies of the array, shown before in Fig. 14: positions of the features correspond to real parts of the eigenfrequencies, shown by thin wide lines in Fig. 16(a–c). Spectral widths of the features correspond to the imaginary part. Thus for vanishing array period, the reflection spectrum is given by the Lorentzian Eq. (34) with the half-width at half-maximum Nγ1D + γ, corresponding to the excitation of a single superradiant mode. Increase of the spacing leads to suppression of the reflection and the optical spectra acquire narrow resonant features corresponding to the excitation of subradiant modes. The reflection is at minimum at the anti-Bragg condition d = λ(ω0)/4, when the interference between waves reflected from different atoms is destructive. Further increases of this period revives the reflection spectrum, and for the Bragg condition d = Nλ(ω0)/2 it is again determined by a single superradiant mode. More theoretical details and review of the state-of-the art experiments for the Bragg-spaced structures are presented in Sec. IV.E.

Eigemodes of the the finite array can be presented as a superposition of two Bloch waves (Voronov et al., 2007):

\[ P_n \propto \rho e^{iK_n} + e^{-iK_n} \propto e^{iK(n-N-1)} + e^{-iK(n-N-1)}, \]  

where ρ = -(1 − e^{i(ϕ-K)})/(1 − e^{i(ϕ+K)}) is the reflection coefficient of polaritons from the internal boundary of the array. Two representations in Eq. (60) are
the radiative decay rate further decreases et al. see (Vladimirova et al., 1998; Zhang and Mølmer, 2019). Hence, the radiative decay rate is suppressed by the factor on the order of $d/\lambda_0$). Moreover, when the array size increases, the radiative decay rate further decreases as $1/N^3$ (Albrecht et al., 2019). Such the scaling law is universal for periodic atomic arrays as it has been recently proofed in Ref. (Zhang and Mølmer, 2020). Physically, the $1/N^3$ suppression of the radiative decay happens because polaritons have nowhere to escape from the infinite array. For subradiant eigenmodes from Eq. (61), one can simplify Eq. (60) to

$$P_n \approx (-1)^N \sqrt{\frac{2}{N}} \sin[\pi/(N-k)(n-\frac{1}{2})], \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots, N,$$

where $k = \pi - \pi/N, \pi - 2\pi/N, \ldots$, which means that there are standing waves with the wave vectors close to the edge of the Brillouin zone. Since the polariton wave vector is much larger than the wave vector of light, the coupling of these modes to photons and the radiative decay are strongly suppressed.

In order to obtain analytical expressions of the type of Eq. (61), it is instructive to note that the inverse to the shifted matrix Eq. (53) is a tri-diagonal one (Poddbny, 2020),

$$\tilde{H} \equiv (H - \omega_0 + i\gamma)^{-1} \quad (63)$$

Identity of (63) allows one to reduce the eigenvalues with the infinite-range Hamiltonian Eq. (53) to the usual tight-binding problem with nearest-neighbor couplings with the “Hamiltonian” $\tilde{H}$ and the eigenvalues $1/(\omega - \omega_0 + i\gamma)$. The only nonzero imaginary elements of the matrix Eq. (63) are at the corners. This agrees with

$$H_{nm} = \begin{cases} 
-\frac{1}{2} \cot \varphi + \frac{i}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \sin \varphi & 0 & \cdots \\
\frac{1}{2} \sin \varphi & - \cot \varphi & \frac{1}{2} \sin \varphi & \cdots \\
0 & \frac{1}{2} \sin \varphi & - \cot \varphi & \frac{1}{2} \sin \varphi \\
\cdots & \frac{1}{2} \sin \varphi & - \cot \varphi & \cdots \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & \frac{1}{2} \cot \varphi + \frac{i}{2}
\end{cases}.$$
the fact that the radiative decay rate vanishes for an infinite array: radiative losses are only through the array edges. It can be seen from Eq. (62) that the edge values of the wave function are on the order of $P_1 = P_N \propto 1/N^{3/2}$. The radiative decay rate is obtained in the first order of perturbation theory in the imaginary matrix elements of Eq. (63). Namely, it is proportional to $P_k^2 \propto 1/N^3$. This explains the scaling $\sim 1/N^3$ of the radiative decay rate. Recently, it has been proved in Ref. (Zhang and Mølmer, 2020) that such scaling law is universal for regular arrays if the dispersion of the Bloch modes near the edge of the Brillouin zone is quadratic in the wave vector, $\omega(k) \propto (k - \pi)^2$. In the case of band edges with quartic degeneracy when $\omega(k) \propto (k - \pi)^4$, the scaling can be different, see (Kornovan et al., 2019) and discussion of Fig. 18.

b. Dipole-dipole interaction and selective radiance. So far, we have considered the interaction between atoms only through the waveguide mode, as described by the effective Hamiltonian Eq. (53). This model is reasonable for superconducting qubits, but it is only a qualitative approximation for real atoms coupled to a fiber waveguide. The problem is that besides long-range atom-atom interaction through the waveguide, atoms can have strong dipole-dipole interaction in vacuum if the distance between them is less than atomic wavelength. Moreover, they can emit cooperatively into the free space which will present an additional channel of losses for the modes, propagating through the waveguide. We would like here to illustrate a new theoretical concept of selectively radiant states (Asenjo-García et al., 2017b) that allows one to suppress free space emission losses. More generally, it is possible to engineer the interference of the cooperative emission in a special way, such that the states are superradiant to a preferred photonic mode and subradiant to all others. The overall emission rate might not be small, but the branching ratio into preferable versus non-preferable channels could be extremely high (Asenjo-García et al., 2017b). Qualitatively, for sufficiently small lattice constants $d < \lambda_0/2$, there emerges a set of single-excited collective states with associated wave vector $|k_2| > k_0 = \omega_0/c$ along the fiber. Such states radiate inefficiently into the free space since the wave vector lies beyond the light line (Kornovan et al., 2016). However, as an optical mode guided by a high-index dielectric itself has a wave vector $|k_2| < k_0$, one can show that it is possible that a set of spin-wave excitations simultaneously experiences an enhanced emission rate into the guided modes while being subradiant to free space. We will now discuss the results of calculation in Ref. (Asenjo-García et al., 2017b) without much theoretical details and a rigorous formalism how to describe this setup will be presented in the next section.

We start with the simplified situation when the dipole-dipole interaction through the non-guided modes is negligible. In this case, the effect of non-guided modes can be reduced to the complex energy shift $J' - i\gamma'$ of all the atom frequencies, where $J'$ is the single atom Lamb shift modified by the presence of the fiber and $\Gamma' = 2\gamma'$ is the corresponding decay rate. In such approximation, the free-space mediated coupling between the atoms is neglected. Thus, the reflection and transmission spectra can be calculated according to the model in the previous section, taking into account only the interaction with the waveguide mode with the effective losses due to free-space emission. We will examine the situation with the anti-Bragg spacing between atoms, when the reflection is minimized (see also Fig. 16). The results of calculation in the simplified model are presented in Fig. 17 by the red curve. For a large number of atoms, and for a small single-atom coupling efficiency into the waveguide ($\gamma_{1D} < \gamma'$), the transmittance can be approximated by the following expression:

$$T_{\text{ind}} \sim \exp \left[ -\frac{\text{OD}}{1 + (\Delta - J')^2/\gamma'^2} \right],$$ (64)

where $\Delta \equiv \omega - \omega_0$ is the detuning of the probe light frequency from the atomic resonance. From this expression, at the resonance ($\Delta - J' = 0$), one can determine the important figure of merit, an optical depth as $\text{OD} = N\gamma_{1D}/\gamma'$. This parameter gives information about how much of the light is transmitted by the atomic ensemble. The transmittance spectrum of a chain of $N = 20$ atoms obtained from the Eq. (64) is shown in Fig. 17 (a) by the red curve. In Fig. 17 (b), one can see the corresponding reflectance spectrum, which shows a very small bump, as the anti-Bragg distance $d = \lambda_0/4$ minimizes reflection due to destructive interference. As both transmission and reflection are small at resonance, the dominant process is a photon loss due to atom-mediated scattering into free space. The loss probability $\kappa = 1 - R - T$ is shown in Fig. 17 (c). It has been demonstrated in Fig. 17 that these losses can be strongly suppressed by a judiciously engineered destructive interference.

Namely, since the separation between atoms is less than the atomic wavelength, the above simplified model of independent free-space emission is not valid anymore. One should add to the Hamiltonian Eq. (53) the terms corresponding to the atom-atom coupling mediated by non-guided modes and it assumed the following form:

$$H_{mn} = -i\gamma_{1D} e^{ik_{1D}|z_m - z_n|} \frac{3\pi\Gamma_0}{k_0} G'_{mp}(r_m, r_n, \omega_p),$$ (65)

where $G'_{mn}$ is the corresponding non-guided part of the full Green’s function and $\Gamma_0$ is the decay rate of a single atom in free space, $\omega_p$ is the probe light frequency. The red curves, which are correspond to neglecting atom-atom interaction, have been calculated with the second
gaussian modes significantly reduces the probability result in Fig. 17 (c) is that cooperative emission into non-tained within the single atom emission approach. Main resonance, reflectance is significantly larger than that ob-
erved between different collective atomic modes, whose response due to the diminished photon loss. Close to the
together, many sharp peaks that are not observed within the simplified approach. These peaks correspond to the inter-
face the transmittance spectrum dis-
cussed with the scattering matrix:

\[
T = \hat{V} \hat{G}(E + i0) \hat{V},
\]

(c) Microscopic quantum theory of light scattering allows one to go beyond the single-atom interaction and take into account dipole-dipole interaction between atoms (Cohen-Tannoudji et al., 1998). Nonetheless, the presence of a waveguide drastically modifies the picture of light scattering. The transform of the initial state \( |i \rangle \) of the quantum system into its final state \( |f \rangle \) can be described with the scattering matrix:

\[
S_{fi} = \delta_{fi} - 2\pi i T_{fi}(E_i + i0) \delta(E_f - E_i).
\]

Here, \( T_{fi} \) are elements of the T-matrix, which has following form:

\[
\hat{G} = (z - H)^{-1}
\]

where \( \hat{G} \) is the resolvent operator (the Green’s function) of the total Hamiltonian.

The coupling through the waveguide mode can be correctly taken into account by modifying the outer opera-
tor \( \hat{V} \) in the initial definition of the T-matrix (67). This outer operator is responsible for the absorption of the in-
cident photon and emission it back into the same guided mode. The electric field \( \hat{E}_\mu \) of the guided mode \( \mu \) in the cylindrical coordinates has the following form:

\[
\hat{E}_\mu(r) = i \sqrt{\frac{2\pi \rho_k \omega_k}{L}} \hat{E}_\mu(\rho, \varphi)e^{i \beta_\mu z + i m \varphi}.
\]

Here, \( \beta_\mu \) is the propagation constant, \( L \) is the quantization length, and \( \hat{E}_\mu(\rho, \varphi) \) is the electric field amplitude normalized according to \( \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{\infty} |\hat{E}_\mu(\rho, \varphi)|^2 \rho d\rho d\varphi = 1 \). The guided mode \( \mu \) is characterized by \( (\beta_\mu, f, m) \) where \( f \) and \( m \) describe the direction of the photon propagation \((+1/−1)\) and the mode angular momentum \((+1/−1)\), respectively.

Additionally, the waveguide affects the self-energy operator \( \hat{\Sigma} \) and leads to additional level shift and modification of the atomic decay rate. As it was mentioned above, the excitation transfer between atoms can proceed either through the waveguide or in free space due to dipole-
dipole interaction. This can be taken into account by modifying the Hamiltonian (Gruner and Welsch, 1996):

\[
H_0 = \sum_n \hbar \omega_0 \sigma_n^+ \sigma_n^- + \int dr' \int_0^{\infty} d\omega' \hbar \omega' \hat{f}(r', \omega') \hat{f}^\dagger(r', \omega')
\]

\[
V = - \sum_n d\hat{E}(r_n),
\]

where \( \hat{f}(r', \omega') \) and \( \hat{f}^\dagger(r', \omega') \) are the bosonic vector local-field operators, which obeys the following commutation relations:

\[
[\hat{f}(r', \omega'), \hat{f}_k^\dagger(r, \omega)] = \delta_{kk} \delta(r' - r) \delta(\omega' - \omega)
\]

\[
[\hat{f}_k(r', \omega'), \hat{f}^\dagger_k(r, \omega)] = 0
\]
In terms of these bosonic operators, the positive-frequency part of the total electric field can be written as follows
\[
\hat{E}^+(\mathbf{r}) = 2i \int \mathcal{D}r' \int d\omega \frac{\omega^2}{c^2} \sqrt{\hbar\epsilon_{f}(\mathbf{r}',\omega)} G(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{r}',\omega) \hat{f}(\mathbf{r}',\omega),
\]
where \(\epsilon_{f}(\mathbf{r}',\omega)\) being the imaginary part of the dielectric permittivity of the media and \(G(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{r}',\omega)\) is the Green’s tensor of the electric field.

Finally, in the presence of the waveguide the Green’s tensor can be decomposed into sum of vacuum component and the guided component:
\[
G(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{r}',\omega) = G_0(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{r}',\omega) + G_s(r, r', \omega).
\]  
(72)

Details of Green’s tensor calculations can be found in Ref. (Kornovan et al., 2016) and in a similar approach in Ref. (Pivovarov et al., 2018). At the lowest nonvanishing order, the matrix element of the level-shift operator can be written as:
\[
\langle f | \hat{\Sigma}(E) | i \rangle = -4\pi \frac{\omega^2}{c^2} d_m^* G(\mathbf{r}_m, \mathbf{r}_n, \omega_0) d_n.
\]  
(73)

Renormalized level-shift operator (73) allows to find the \(T\) – and \(S\)–matrix elements. However, in the chosen quantization scheme, one should include summation over final states into Eq. (66), going to the limit \(L \to \infty\), which means that the propagation constant \(\beta\) can be continuous. This limit will be equivalent to \(\sum_{n,a} \to \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{\infty} d\omega\). This leads to the following expression for the scattering matrix:
\[
S_{ki} = \delta_{ki} - \frac{i}{\hbar v_g} T_{ki}(E).
\]  
(74)

Here, \(v_g = c\beta/dk\) is the group velocity of the guided mode. Finally, the transmission and reflection coefficients can be found from the scattering matrix as:
\[
T(\omega) = \sum_{i,k>0} |S_{ki}|^2,
\]
\[
R(\omega) = \sum_{i,k<0} |S_{ki}|^2.
\]  
(75)

Here, the forward (transmission) and backward (reflection) scattering channels are distinguished by the signs of the longitudinal wave number \(k' = k\) and \(k' = -k\), respectively.

d. Highly subradiant states. Subradiant states might be useful for many purposes, for example to accumulate interactions without dissipation in order to realize strongly correlated states. In work (Kornovan et al., 2019), it was shown that it is possible to achieve a strong suppression of the collective emission rate for a some lattice period of 1D-atomic array.

The effect of subradiance can be analyzed by solving the light scattering problem and considering the eigenstates of the system. For this, one need to diagonalize the matrix of the self-energy operator \(\Sigma(\omega_0)\). In a non-reciprocal problem, the matrix \(\Sigma\) is not symmetric and it has different right and left eigenvectors. However, the diagonalization of the problem can be simplified by choosing for instance the right vectors:
\[
\Sigma(E_0)v_j^{(r)} = \lambda_j v_j^{(r)},
\]
\[
\left(S^{(r)}\right)^{-1} \frac{1}{\hbar \Delta \bar{I} - \Sigma(E_0)} S^{(r)} = \frac{1}{\hbar \Delta \bar{I} - \Lambda},
\]  
(76)

where the matrix \(S^{(r)}\) is the transformation matrix to the eigenspace the columns of which are the right eigenvectors \(v^{(r)}(\Sigma(E_0))\), \(\Delta\) is the photon detuning from the atomic resonance, and \(\Lambda\) is a diagonal matrix having the corresponding eigenvalues \(\lambda_j\) at its entries.

In this special symmetry, the \(S\) matrix element corresponding to forward scattering (74) can be rewritten as:
\[
S_{ii} = 1 - i\hbar \gamma_{1D}^{(t)} \sum_j f_j^{(t)} \frac{1}{\hbar \Delta \bar{I} - \lambda_j},
\]  
(77)

where \(f_j^{(t)}\) is complex-values constants which are dimensionless and carry information only about the phase in the case of equal coupling strengths for all atoms. Here, the spontaneous emission rate into the forward-propagating guided mode has the following form:
\[
\gamma_{1D}^{(t)} = \frac{2\pi k_0}{\hbar} \frac{d\beta}{dk} \sum_m |d_{mg} \hat{E}_{f=-1,m}|^2.
\]  
(78)

Additionally, in order to characterize the collective effects in the system, one can introduce a nearest-neighbor correlation function:
\[
\langle f_{i+1}^{f} \rangle = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \cos(\varphi_i^{+} - \varphi_i^{f}).
\]  
(79)

Here, a phase angle of the \(i\)-th eigenvector \(\varphi_i^{f} = \text{arg}(c_i^f)\) corresponds to a probability amplitude \(c_i^f\) to have the excited atom \(i\) for the eigenstate \(f\). The function \(\langle f_{i+1}^{f} \rangle\) gives the information about the phase correlation between neighbouring dipoles: it is equal to +1 for the neighboring dipoles with the same phase, and −1 for the neighboring dipoles with opposite site phase. This correlation function provides useful information for a few-atoms case, and allows distinguishing states with different symmetry. One should note also that a state with the smallest value of \(\langle f_{i+1}^{f} \rangle\) is characterized by the smallest emission rate \(\gamma_i\) due to the state symmetry. One can assume that by further tuning the lattice period of a one-dimensional atomic chain, it is possible to achieve a very small decay rate \(\gamma_i\).
The calculation of two-photon scattering can be performed using the generalization of the Green’s function method (Zheng and Baranger, 2013) described in detail in Appendix H. The two-photon wavefunction is obtained by replacing the last term in Eq. (40) by (Poshakinskiy and Poddubny, 2016)

\[
\sum_{\mu,\nu=\pm}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} M_{\mu\nu}(\omega; 2\varepsilon - \omega \leftrightarrow \varepsilon, \varepsilon) a^\dagger_{\mu\omega/c} a_{\mu(2\varepsilon-\omega)/c} |0\rangle,
\]

where the scattering kernel is given by

\[
M_{\mu\nu}(\omega_1', \omega_2') = -2i\gamma_{1D}^2 \sum_{m,n=1}^{N} s_m^+(\omega_1') s_n^+(\omega_2') Q_{mn} s_m^-(\varepsilon) s_n^-(\varepsilon)
\]

with

\[
Q = -\frac{iU}{1-iU\Sigma}, \quad \Sigma_{mn} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} G_{nm}(\omega) G_{nm}(2\varepsilon - \omega).
\]

Eq. (81) is valid beyond the Markovian approximation. However, in the Markovian approximation it can be simplified further. Specifically, the poles \(\varepsilon\) of the two-photon scattering matrix correspond to the complex energies of the double-excited states

\[
|\psi\rangle = \sum_{m,n=1}^{N} \psi_{mn} b^\dagger_m b^\dagger_n |0\rangle
\]

\((\psi_{mn} = \psi_{nm})\) of the effective non-Hermitian atomic Hamiltonian

\[
H_{\text{atoms}} = \sum_{mn} H_{mn} b^\dagger_m b^\dagger_n + \frac{U}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{N} b^\dagger_m b^\dagger_m (b^\dagger_m b^\dagger_m - 1),
\]

with \(H_{mn}\) given by Eq. (53) evaluated at \(\omega = \omega_0\). The corresponding two-photon Schrödinger equation for the amplitude \(\psi_{nm}\) can be obtained by substituting the

In Fig. 18 (a)-(b), one can see the spontaneous emission rate of each eigenstate of the periodic chain of \(N = 75\) atoms into the guided nanofiber mode for the transverse and longitudinal polarizations, respectively. Moreover, one can see that the strong subradiance appears only for the transverse polarization with the atomic chain period \(\Delta z/\lambda_0 \approx 0.24\lambda_0\), see Fig. 18 (a). Furthermore, from Fig. 18 (b) it can be seen that interaction of the atomic chain with longitudinally polarized dipole moments leads to subradiance as well. However, the dependence of the eigenvalue decay rate in this case is rather smooth and without any special features. These two resonances presented for both transverse and longitudinal polarizations correspond to the first Bragg resonance for the nanofiber guided mode and to a resonance which is a result of an interplay between the vacuum and guided mode interaction channels.

The scaling of subradiant states for transverse and longitudinal polarizations with the number of atoms \(N\) is shown in Fig. 18 (c)-(d). One can see that for sufficiently large number \(N\), all three curves follow to the scale \(\sim N^\alpha\) with \(\alpha \approx -8.2\) for the most subradiant state, unlike the known so far \(\sim N^{-3}\) scaling Eq. (61).

In this work, it was shown that there exists a specific interatomic spacing that allows to achieve a strong suppression of the collective emission of the atomic array trapped in the vicinity of an optical nanofiber. It was found that the corresponding period has an asymptotic value \(\sim 0.24\lambda_0\) for a large number of atoms \(N\).

### 2. Two-photon scattering and eigenstates

We now proceed to describe the photon pair scattering from a spatially-separated atomic array.

#### a. Two-photon scattering

The calculation of two-photon scattering can be performed using the generalization of the Green's function method (Zheng and Baranger, 2013) described in detail in Appendix H. The two-photon wavefunction is obtained by replacing the last term in Eq. (40) by (Poshakinskiy and Poddubny, 2016)

\[
\sum_{\mu,\nu=\pm}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} M_{\mu\nu}(\omega; 2\varepsilon - \omega \leftrightarrow \varepsilon, \varepsilon) a^\dagger_{\mu\omega/c} a_{\mu(2\varepsilon-\omega)/c} |0\rangle,
\]

where the scattering kernel is given by

\[
M_{\mu\nu}(\omega_1', \omega_2') = -2i\gamma_{1D}^2 \sum_{m,n=1}^{N} s_m^+(\omega_1') s_n^+(\omega_2') Q_{mn} s_m^-(\varepsilon) s_n^-(\varepsilon)
\]

with

\[
Q = -\frac{iU}{1-iU\Sigma}, \quad \Sigma_{mn} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} G_{nm}(\omega) G_{nm}(2\varepsilon - \omega).
\]

Eq. (81) is valid beyond the Markovian approximation. However, in the Markovian approximation it can be simplified further. Specifically, the poles \(\varepsilon\) of the two-photon scattering matrix correspond to the complex energies of the double-excited states

\[
|\psi\rangle = \sum_{m,n=1}^{N} \psi_{mn} b^\dagger_m b^\dagger_n |0\rangle
\]

\((\psi_{mn} = \psi_{nm})\) of the effective non-Hermitian atomic Hamiltonian

\[
H_{\text{atoms}} = \sum_{mn} H_{mn} b^\dagger_m b^\dagger_n + \frac{U}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{N} b^\dagger_m b^\dagger_m (b^\dagger_m b^\dagger_m - 1),
\]

with \(H_{mn}\) given by Eq. (53) evaluated at \(\omega = \omega_0\). The corresponding two-photon Schrödinger equation for the amplitude \(\psi_{nm}\) can be obtained by substituting the
ansatz Eq. (83) into the general Schrödinger equation $H_{\text{atoms}}|\psi\rangle = 2\varepsilon|\psi\rangle$. More details are presented in Appendix H.

b. Double-excited states We will now discuss in more detail the spatial structure of the double-excited states in the limit of two-level atoms, $U \to \infty$. This problem turns out to be surprisingly rich. It is still an object of active studies despite the long history that can be traced back at least to the original work of Dicke (Dicke, 1954). Qualitatively, this is because of the very unusual regime with long-ranged light-mediated coupling between different atoms. Looking from a little different angle, the single-polariton dispersion, shown in Fig. 13 is strongly nonlinear. The group velocity of polaritons decreases when their energy approaches the atomic resonance, which is a familiar slow light effect (Alexandrov and Zapasskii, 2008). The interaction of two particles with the resonant dispersion law shown in Fig. 13 is very different from the interaction of particles with parabolic dispersion, usually studied in condensed matter physics. Moreover, due to the open nature of the problem, the states are quasistationary and can have very different radiative decay rates $-\text{Im} \varepsilon$ depending on their spatial profile. The possible two-polariton states are also very sensitive to the length of the array. We try to present a general simplified phase diagram distinguishing domains of different double-excited states in Fig. 19. Moreover, Fig. 20 shows characteristic wavefunctions of these states that we discuss in detail below.

Similar to the single-photon states, if the distance between atoms is vanishing, the only double-excited state probed by light is the symmetric superradiant state (top left corner of Fig. 19). The wavefunction $\psi_{nm}$ for this state is constant if $n \neq m$ and $\psi_{nn} = 0$ due to the photon blockade, as can be seen in Fig. 20(a). The double-excited superradiant state has the complex eigenfrequency $\varepsilon = \omega_0 - i(N - 1)\gamma_{11} - i\gamma$ that can be also found from the resonance of Eq. (41).

When the distance between atoms becomes nonzero, other states with more interesting spatial profile become accessible by light. Probably, the simplest one is the scattering state of two polaritons, shown in Fig. 20(b). Typically, scattering states are realized when the wave vectors of both polaritons $k$ are much smaller than the edge of the Brillouin zone $\pi/d$, see schematics in the bottom panel of Fig. 20(b). In this case, both polaritons have relatively high group velocity, so the role of their interaction is weak. Such two polaritons can be thought of as quasi-independent. The wave function of a single-polariton state in a finite array is a standing wave $P_n^\xi$ with the wave vector $k_\xi = \pi \xi/N$, given by Eq. (62). Hence, the wavefunction of the two-polariton scattering state is approximately described by a symmetrized product of two standing waves, slightly modified by the interaction that sets $\psi_{nn} = 0$, namely

$$\psi_{mn} \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (P_m^\xi P_n^\xi + P_m^\xi P_n^\xi)(1 - \delta_{mn}).$$

(85)

For example, the state in Fig. 20(b) corresponds to $k_\xi = k_\xi' = \pi/N$.

In the case of zero spacing between atoms, $d = 0$, all the states excepting the superradiant one are fully dark and degenerate, $\varepsilon = \omega_0 - i\Gamma$ (bottom left corner of Fig. 19) and they become subradiant for $d > 0$. Contrary to well-known single-excited subradiant states, the spatial structure of double-excited subradiant states has been revealed only very recently, in Refs. Albrecht et al., 2019 and Zhang and Mølmer, 2019. We remind that single-excited subradiant states are just standing waves the wave vectors $k$ close to the edge of the Brillouin zone, see Eq. (62). The polaritonic dispersion law given by Eq. (50) in the vicinity of the Brillouin zone edge is parabolic, $\omega(kd) = \omega(\pi) \approx -\varphi k_\xi d_\xi$, with $\varphi = \omega d/c$, see also Fig. 13. The two polaritonic excitations described by the Schrödinger equation (H14) exhibit contact repulsion due to the photon blockade. The problem of interacting bosons with parabolic dispersion and contact repulsion is well known in the condensed matter physics and has been solved by Lieb and Liniger (Lieb and Liniger, 1963) by means of the Bethe ansatz. In the limit of strong interaction, the bosonic excitations exhibit fermionization, i.e. the two-particle wavefunction is proportional to the antisymmetric combination of two single-particle wave functions, i.e.

$$\psi_{mn} \propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( (P_m^\xi P_n^\xi - P_m^\xi P_n^\xi), (m \geq n) \right) \left( -(P_m^\xi P_n^\xi - P_m^\xi P_n^\xi), (n \leq m) \right).$$

(86)

(compare with the bosonic state Eq. (85)). Top panel of Fig. 20 (c) shows the probability distribution for the most-subradiant state calculated numerically in the array.
of $N = 51$ qubits. Its spatial structure is well captured by the ansatz Eq. (86) with $k_\xi = -\pi/N$, $k_{\xi'} = \pi - 2\pi/N$. Bottom panel of Fig. 20 (c) illustrates schematically the origin of this fermionic state as a result of interaction of two polaritons with the wave vectors close to the edge of the Brillouin zone.

There also exists an interesting mesoscopic regime when the length of the array is on the order of its wavelength, $N\omega d/c \sim 1$. It has been predicted that the interaction between the two polaritons can make one of them localized, even though all single-polariton states are delocalized and the structure has no disorder (Zhong et al., 2020). Specifically, the first polariton forms a standing wave that drives localization of the second polariton in the node (or in the antinode) of this wave. Since the two polaritons are indistinguishable, at the same time the second polariton drives localization of the first one and the two-polariton wave function can be approximately described by the ansatz

$$
\psi_{mn} \propto \psi_{\text{loc}}(n)\psi_{\text{free}}(m) + \psi_{\text{loc}}(m)\psi_{\text{free}}(n).
$$

Here, the state $\psi_{\text{loc}}(n)$ is localized just at several atoms and the state $\psi_{\text{free}}(n)$ is a standing wave. The localization is so strong because of the low group velocity of the polaritons with large wave vectors, i.e. light is slow close to the resonance. In another words, polaritons with $k \gg \omega_0/c$ have large effective mass and are easy to be localized by interaction. More details on the localization mechanism are given in Ref. (Zhong et al., 2020). It has been also predicted, that the state $\psi_{\text{loc}}(n)$ can be localized not in the center of the structure but at its edge (Poshakinskiy et al., 2021). This can be interpreted a topological two-polariton edge state, driven by the interaction, and is similar to the Aubry-André-Harper model in the noninteracting case (Kraus et al., 2012; Poshakinskiy et al., 2014).

Another type of two-polariton states, realized in relatively long structures with the thickness of many wavelengths, is a state, where two polaritons form a bound pair that can propagate as a whole and is characterized by a certain center-of-mass momentum $K$. In the finite array, such a pair forms a standing wave,

$$
\psi_{mn} \approx \cos \left( K \frac{m+n}{2} \right) \psi_{\text{bound}}(m-n) .
$$

where the relative motion wavefunction $\psi_{\text{bound}}(m-n)$ decays exponentially with distance. An example of such state is shown in Fig. 20(e). There exist two types of bound two-photon states (Zhang et al., 2020). The first type corresponds to one of the two polaritons in the upper polaritonic branch and one in the lower polaritonic branch, as shown in the lower panel of Fig. 20(e). Its center of mass dispersion is very sensitive to the ratio of the array period to the light wavelength at the atomic resonance $d/\lambda(\omega_0)$. Namely, there exists a "magic value" $d = \lambda(\omega_0)/12$ where the center-of-mass dispersion depends on the wave vector near the edge of the Brillouin zone as $(K - \pi/d)^4$, and the quadratic term vanishes (Podlubny, 2020). This means that the bound pair acquires infinite mass and it is hard for photons to escape the array, so their radiative lifetime increases dramatically (Zhang et al., 2020). Another type of bound pair states is formed by both polaritons in the upper branch. Generalization of two-photon states from Fig. 20 for the three-photon case has recently been done in Ref. (Zhong and Podlubny, 2021).

The bound photon states exist also for the one-way chiral waveguides coupled to the atomic arrays (Mah-
moodian et al., 2020), see also the discussion in the following Sec. III.D. It is the interaction with these states that drives unusual non-monotonous dependence of the photon-photon correlation function on the number of atoms \( N \), observed experimentally in Ref. (Prasad et al., 2020) and discussed in Sec. III.D.4. In Ref. (Mamoodian et al., 2020) the chiral multi-photon bound states have been predicted. It was also examined how they transform to the classical nonlinear solitons in the regime when the number of photons is large.

D. Chiral atomic arrays

So far, we have considered a situation where an atom is symmetrically coupled to forward- and backward-propagating photons in the waveguide. In this section we will discuss the chiral setup, when this symmetry is broken. We start by discussing the microscopic origins of the chiral coupling and spin-momentum locking in Sec. III.D.1. Next, we consider radiative decay of a single atom in Sec. III.D.2. Section III.D.3 is devoted to the polariton excitations in the array of chirally coupled emitters. To conclude this section, we discuss recent experiments on tunable photon bunching and antibunching in the chiral setup, Sec. III.D.4.

1. Spin-momentum locking

Nanophotonic waveguides provide a unique platform for reaching the directional emission of photons due to spin-locking effect, thus, realizing the one-way interactions between the quantum emitters. The spin-locking effect can be understood by analyzing the coupling of circularly polarized optical transition to the guided mode of the planar waveguide, as shown in Fig. 21(a–c). The main observation is that the polarization of the guided mode is in general elliptical. Indeed, the electric field \( E \) outside the waveguide is a transverse plane wave, i.e. \( \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{E} = 0 \), where \( \mathbf{k} = k_x \mathbf{e}_x + k_z \mathbf{e}_z \) is the wave vector. Since the guided wave is by definition evanescent outside the waveguide, the wave vector component \( k_z = \sqrt{(\omega/c)^2 - k_x^2} \), transverse to the waveguide surface, is pure imaginary, \( k_x = ik_z \). Thus, the guided wave assumes the form \( \mathbf{E}(x, z) \sim \exp(-ik_x x) \exp(ik_z z) \). The polarization state of the field is fully defined by the dispersion of the mode \( k_z(\omega) \) and varies from linear polarization close to a light line \( k_z = \omega/c \) to circular polarization for strongly evanescent waves when \( k_z \to \infty \), see Fig. 21(b).

We can introduce the polarization parameter \( s \in [0, 1] \) such that \( \mathbf{E}(x, z) = E_0 \sqrt{s^2 + 1}(\mathbf{e}_x - ise_z)e^{ik_z z} \), with \( s = 0 \) and \( s = 1 \) corresponding to linear and circularly polarized field, respectively. Crucially, the sign of circular polarization is determined by the sign of the wave vector \( k_z \); it is opposite for forward and backward going waves, \( s \propto \text{sign} k_z \). Such spin-momentum locking is a very general effect for guided and surface waves (Sinev et al., 2017). It exists for planar waveguides, for nanofibers, for surface plasmon polaritons (Rodriguez-Fortuno et al., 2013; Spitzer et al., 2018), see more details in the dedicated reviews on the chiral quantum optics (Aiello et al., 2015; Lodahl et al., 2017). Intuitively, spin-momentum locking can be understood as a “photonic wheel” effect. The wheel rotation (light circular polarization) leads to the translational motion along the surface under the wheel (wave vector \( k_z \)) and oppositely rotating wheels travel in opposite directions.

2. Radiative decay rates

The spin-momentum locking drives asymmetric coupling of transverse circularly polarized emitters with the dipole matrix elements \( \mathbf{d}_\mp = d_0 \sqrt{2}(\mathbf{e}_x \mp ise_z) \). Micro-
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FIG. 21 (a) The evanescent field at a waveguide interface. (b) Schematics of the waveguide mode dispersion with different electric field polarization states. (c) Directional coupling of the emission for right and left circularly polarized atomic dipole transition. (d) Polariton dispersion in a chiral waveguide depending on the coupling asymmetry \( \xi \). Calculation has been performed following Eq. (95) for a regular array of circularly polarized \( d_\pm \) atoms and separated with the phase \( \varphi = \omega_0 d/c = \pi/2 \).
scopically, circularly polarized emitters can be realized by applying magnetic field, that leads to Zeeman splitting of optical transitions and changes selection rules. The emitters can be natural atoms (see also Sec. III.A.3) as well as solid state emitters, quantum dots (Coles et al., 2016) or quantum wells (Spitzer et al., 2018). In the fully chiral setup $|s| = 1$, the circularly polarized emitter will be coupled either only to forward- or only to backward- propagating waves. In the case of general elliptic polarization the couplings can be characterized by $\{(\Gamma^\rightarrow = 2\gamma^\rightarrow)\) and backward-\( (\Gamma^\leftarrow = 2\gamma^\leftarrow)\) propagating photons, that are proportional to $|E^s(k_z) \cdot d|^2$ and $|E^s(-k_z) \cdot d|^2$, respectively. Explicitly, the emission rates are given by (Asenjo-Garcia et al., 2017a; Gruner and Welsch, 1996)

$$\gamma^\rightarrow = \gamma_{1D}(1 \pm |s|^2) / (s^2 + 1), \quad \gamma^\leftarrow = \gamma_{1D}(1 \mp |s|^2) / (s^2 + 1),$$

$$\gamma_{1D} = \gamma^\rightarrow + \gamma^\leftarrow = 4\pi(\omega/c)^2|d|^2 G(r, r, \omega_0) d,$$

where $G$ is the electromagnetic tensor Green function satisfying $\text{rot} \, \text{rot} \, G_{\alpha\beta} = (\omega/c)^2 \varepsilon(r) G_{\alpha\beta} + \delta_{\alpha\beta} \delta(r - r')$. In the fully one dimensional case, when only one guided mode $E^s(r)$ is taken into account, the Green function has a simple form of

$$G_{\alpha\beta}(r, r') = i\delta_{0}(E_\alpha(r)E_\beta(r') \text{e}^{ik_z(z - z')}, \ z > z', \ E_\alpha(r)E_\beta(r') \text{e}^{-ik_z(z - z')}, \ z < z'. $$

One can note that for a circular polarized mode with $s = 1$, the rate $\gamma^\rightarrow (\gamma^\leftarrow)$ is equal to zero for $d_-$ ($d_+$) which means fully chiral one-way coupling. We also introduce the interaction asymmetry parameter $\xi = \gamma^\leftarrow / \gamma^\rightarrow = (1 \mp |s|^2) / (1 \pm |s|^2)$ that varies from $0$ to infinity for ideal right or left coupling, correspondingly. From now, we assume that the Zeeman splitting is large enough so that left- and right-circularly polarized transitions can be spectrally separated. We restrict the consideration to left-circularly polarized transitions and, thus, the asymmetry parameter will vary from $\xi = 1$ for symmetric coupling to $\xi = 0$ for fully asymmetric (chiral) coupling.

It is also instructive to consider scattering of guided photons on the asymmetrically coupled atom. The scattering is characterized by the amplitude reflection coefficient $r$ and forward and backward amplitude transmission coefficients $t_\rightarrow, t_\leftarrow$, given by (Lodahl et al., 2017)

$$r = \frac{2i\sqrt{\gamma^\leftarrow/\gamma^\rightarrow}}{\omega_0 - \omega - i(\gamma + \gamma_{1D})},$$

$$t_\rightarrow/ t_\leftarrow = 1 + \frac{2\gamma^\rightarrow/\gamma^\leftarrow}{\omega_0 - \omega - i(\gamma + \gamma_{1D})},$$

where the constant $\gamma$ describes all other decay channels. The absolute values of transmission coefficients $t_\rightarrow$ and $t_\leftarrow$ are the same, and for vanishing losses $\gamma = 0$ we obtain the energy conservation law $|r|^2 + |t_\rightarrow/ t_\leftarrow|^2 = 1$.

In the symmetric case, when $\gamma^\rightarrow = \gamma^\leftarrow = \gamma_{1D}/2$ the reflection and transmission coefficients Eq. (90) reduce to Eqs. (4). In the fully chiral setup, $\gamma^\rightarrow = 0$, and for vanishing losses, $\gamma = 0$, the reflection coefficient vanishes and the transmission coefficient is equal to 1 by the absolute value. At the resonance we obtain $t_\rightarrow = -1$, so that light obtains $\pi$ phase shift when resonantly passing an atom.

3. Arrays of chirally coupled emitters

An array of several emitters asymmetrically coupled to the waveguide can be described using the transfer matrix method. To this end, the transfer matrix Eq. (3), can be generalized to (Corzo et al., 2016; Poddubny and Ivchenko, 2010)

$$M_{\text{atom}} = \frac{1}{t_\rightarrow} \begin{pmatrix} t_\rightarrow t_\leftarrow - r^2 & r \\ -r & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (92)$$

Alternatively, the waveguide-mediated chiral coupling between emitters can be considered using an effective non-Hermitian Hamiltonian with traced out electromagnetic field, similarly to Eq. (53). Namely, the coupling constant between two emitters $m$ and $n$ with the dipole moments $d_{m,n}$ is expressed through the Green function as $V_{m,n} = -4\pi(\omega/c)^2 d G(r_m, r_n, \omega_d) d_1$ and reads

$$V_{m,n} = \begin{cases} -i\gamma^\rightarrow e^{i\omega(z_m - z_n)/c} & \text{for } z_m > z_n, \\ -i\gamma^\leftarrow e^{i\omega(z_m - z_n)/c} & \text{for } z_m < z_n, \end{cases} \quad (93)$$

where $z_m$ and $z_n$ are emitter coordinates along the waveguide. The effective Hamiltonian then assumes the form

$$H_{mn} = (\omega_0 - i\gamma_{1D})\delta_{mn} + V_{mn}, \quad (94)$$

Using this Hamiltonian, one can obtain the dispersion of polaritonic Bloch waves, $\psi_m \propto e^{iKdz}$ in a periodic array atoms with the spacing $d$ (Fedorovich et al., 2020):

$$\omega - \omega_0 = \frac{\gamma_{1D}}{1 + \xi} \left[ \cot \frac{K_z d - \varphi}{2} + \xi \cot \frac{K_z d + \varphi}{2} \right], \quad (95)$$

where $\varphi = \omega/c$. The two terms in the square brackets describe avoided crossing of forward and backward propagating photons dispersion with the atomic resonance. For purely symmetric coupling $\xi = 1$, the dispersion relation transforms into Eq. (50). The dependence of dispersion on the asymmetry parameter $\xi$ is plotted in Fig. 21 and it demonstrates strongly unidirectional character of polariton propagation for $\xi \rightarrow 0$, that is $\omega(K_z) \neq \omega(-K_z)$. The effects of chiral coupling can be also observed in the spectrum of eigenmodes of the finite atomic array. Figure 22 compares polariton energy spectra calculated by numerically diagonalizing the Hamiltonian Eq. (94)
4. Photon bunching and antibunching in a chiral waveguide

Here, we examine the correlations between photons in a waveguide chirally coupled to an array of closely spaced atoms. We consider a fully chiral setup, $\xi = \gamma^{-} = 0$. In this case, the photons are transmitted by atoms one by one. The reflection is absent and the transmission coefficient through $N$ atoms is just a product of transmission coefficients of individual atoms,

$$t_N = t_1^N, \quad t_1 = 1 + \frac{2i\gamma^{-}}{\omega_0 - \epsilon - i(\gamma + \gamma^{-})}. \quad (96)$$

for a fully chirally coupled arrays of $N = 400$ atoms in Ref. (Fedorovich et al., 2020). As discussed in Sec. III.C, the eigenstates are just standing waves with the frequencies satisfying the dispersion law for the infinite structure Eq. (95). Hence, the calculated eigenfrequencies for the finite structure lie on the dispersion curve for the infinite structure that is strongly asymmetric in the chiral case. Similarly to the symmetric case of Fig. 13, the radiative decay rate is at maximum for the eigenstates with the wave vector $K_{\parallel}$ closest to the wave vector of light $\pm \omega_0/c$ and when the polariton wave vector is strongly detuned from the light wave vector, the polariton states become subradiant. We also refer the reader to Ref. (Jones et al., 2020) for a detailed theoretical analysis of superradiant chiral emission from atomic arrays into the nanofiber. It is predicted there that near-perfect chirality can be achieved already for arrays containing 10 to 15 atoms, by phase matching a superradiant collective guided emission mode via an external laser field.

Here, the radiative decay rate $\gamma^{-}$ is linked to the matrix element of the atom coupling to the right-going photon mode $g$ as $\gamma_{1D} = g^2/(2c)$.

The photon-photon correlation function for a single resonantly excited two-level atom chirally coupled to the waveguide is given by

$$g^{(2)}(0) = \frac{(\gamma + \gamma^{-})^2(\gamma - 3\gamma^{-})^2}{(\gamma - \gamma^{-})^4}. \quad (97)$$

It can be obtained by standard input-output techniques of quantum optics (Kojima et al., 2003). Equation (97) demonstrates that the photon-photon correlations are very sensitive to the ratio of the decay rates $\gamma$ and $\gamma_{1D}$ and it is possible to realize both bunching and antibunching. Specifically, for $\gamma = 0$ one has $g^{(2)}(0) = 9$. Increasing the value of $\gamma$ leads to an even stronger antibunching. The value of $\gamma = \gamma_{1D}$ when the single-photon transmission is suppressed, $t_1 = 0$, corresponds to a perfect antibunching, $g^{(2)}(0) = \infty$. Further increase of $\gamma$ leads to the perfect bunching at $\gamma = 3\gamma_{1D}$. However, in practice the coupling of a single atom to a waveguide is very weak, $\gamma_{1D}/\gamma \sim 1\%$. This means that photons transmitted through one atom are almost uncorrelated. The correlations can be enhanced by either putting an atom in cavity (Aoki et al., 2009; Dayan et al., 2008; Scheucher et al., 2016) or by increasing the number of atoms $N$(Prasad et al., 2020).

Before proceeding to the results of the experiment (Prasad et al., 2020), we will first discuss the theoretical problem of chiral photon pair scattering from an $N$-atomic array. Physically, one can expect interesting effects when the number of atoms reaches $N \sim \gamma/\gamma^{-} \sim 100$. However, making calculation in such a setup is not
easy. It is significantly more involved than the non-chiral Dicke problem for the closely spaced atoms (Rupasov and Yudson, 1984), discussed above. The reason is that all the atoms in the non-chiral problem are equivalent to each other, while in the chiral case they are ordered from left to right and hence are not equivalent. However, the problem can be still solved exactly. This has been first done recently in Ref. (Mahmoodian et al., 2018) by using the technique from (Shen and Fan, 2007a). In Appendix I, we present an alternative equivalent derivation using the Green’s function technique from Refs. (Fang et al., 2014; Poshakinskiy and Poddubny, 2016; Zheng and Baranger, 2013). In a case when \( \gamma \gg \gamma^* \), the photon-photon correlation function is well described by the approximate equation

\[
\begin{align*}
\langle g_N^{(2)} \rangle (0) & \approx \left( 1 - \frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{2\gamma} \exp \left( \frac{4N\gamma}{\gamma} \right) \right)^2 \quad (98)
\end{align*}
\]

and its dependence on the number of atoms \( N \) and on the decay rate \( \gamma \) is shown in Fig. 23. The result is significantly more interesting than in the non-chiral situation, compare Fig. 23 and Fig. 12. Specifically, the dependence of the correlation function on the number of atoms is non-monotonous: increase of \( N \) leads first to the antibunching and then to the bunching. The bunching threshold corresponds to \( N^* \sim \gamma/\gamma^* \), or, more precisely, one has \( \langle g_N^{(2)} \rangle (0) = 1 \) at

\[
N^*(\gamma) \approx \frac{\gamma}{8\gamma^*} \left( 3 \ln 2 + 2 \ln \frac{\gamma}{\gamma^*} \right) \quad (99)
\]

(black curve in Fig. 23). Qualitatively, the non-monotonous behavior of the correlation function is caused by the interference of two contributions to the photon pair transmission coefficient (first and second term in Eq. (98)). The two terms correspond to an independent transmission of a photon pair and to the transmission of the bound photon state, are of the opposite sign. The bound state contribution becomes dominant at larger \( N \), when the single photon transmission is suppressed, leading to the photon bunching. The transition from independent photon propagation to antibunching to bunching with increase of the atom number has been first observed in Ref. (Prasad et al., 2020). The experimental dependence \( \langle g_N^{(2)} \rangle (0) \) on \( N \) from Ref. (Prasad et al., 2020) is presented in Fig. 24. The measured value of correlation function has been tuned from \( \langle g_N^{(2)} \rangle (0) \approx 0.37 \pm 0.12 \) for \( N \approx 160 \) atoms to \( \langle g_N^{(2)} \rangle (0) \approx 24 \pm 7 \) for \( N \approx 200 \) atoms. In the experiment, the antibunching was not perfect due to the fluctuations of the optical density resulting from the uncertainty in the preparation of an atomic ensemble and from the photon shot noise. This can be seen by comparing green and orange curves in Fig. 24. While the dash-dotted green curve has been calculated in Ref. (Prasad et al., 2020) for an idealized situation and corresponds to Eq. (98), the solid orange curve takes the uncertainties into account and describes the experiment quantitatively.

The correlated photon transport has been also studied for arrays of three-level atoms coupled to a symmetric (Song et al., 2017) and a chiral waveguide (Iversen and Pohl, 2021). For the chiral waveguide it has been predicted that in conditions of electromagnetically induced transparency EIT of the three-level medium, a high degree of antibunching and photon transmission can be maintained in the presence of moderate losses (Iversen and Pohl, 2021). While in this section we focused on a fully chiral setup, the behavior of quantum photon-photon correlations in the case of general asymmetric coupling is a standing problem despite some recent progress in this field (Jen, 2021).

IV. EXPERIMENTAL DEMONSTRATIONS

We will now discuss experimental demonstrations, highlighting potential applications of the waveguide quantum electrodynamics platform. Since this field is rapidly evolving, covering all relevant works does not seem feasible. Instead, we chose to consider in detail several experiments representing major research directions. We start in Sec. IV.A by discussing superradiance in the waveguide-coupled atomic arrays measured in Ref. (Solano et al., 2017) and proceed to the generation of collective atomic excitations and quantum light in this setup (Sec. IV.B), focusing on the experiment of Ref. (Corzo et al., 2019). Next, we consider the slow light effect under conditions of the electromagnetically induced transparency reported in (Gouraud et al., 2015;
A. Superradiance and subradiance in waveguide-coupled atomic arrays

In this section, we discuss the context and significance of the observations of superradiance and subradiance for waveguide-coupled atomic clouds, made in the experiment of Ref. (Solano et al., 2017).

We start with a very brief reminder about the concept of free-space superradiance that goes back to a seminal work of Dicke (Dicke, 1954), see also a brief review in (Scully and Svidzinsky, 2009) and references therein. The main idea is that the photon-mediated coupling between the atoms leads to formation of collective states, where atoms radiate in phase, with the radiative decay rate enhanced by interference as compared to that of an individual atom. Similarly, there exist subradiant states where the decay rate is suppressed. However, experimental observation of collective emission effects for realistic atomic clouds is challenging. Indeed, the light-mediated coupling is proportional to free-space photon Green’s function, that has both short-range and long-range terms. When the inter-atomic distances are much smaller than the wavelength, the collective super- and subradiant states due to long-range terms can be suppressed by short-range (dipole-dipole) interactions, or a so-called ”van der Waals dephasing” (Guerin et al., 2016). On the other hand, when the distances \( R \) become much larger than the wavelength, the light-induced coupling, scaling as \( \sin(\omega R/c)/R \) is also suppressed (here \( \omega \) is the emission frequency). One of the representative experiments have been performed in Ref. (DeVoe and Brewer, 1996), where two Ba\(^{+}\) ions have been controllably trapped by radio-frequency field at the distance \( R \sim 1.5 \, \mu m \). In such a case, the short-range interactions are already negligible. By tuning the phase \( \omega R/c \), it is has been possible to switch the radiative coupling between the superradiance and the subradiance. This has been observed directly by studying the spontaneous emission kinetics after an optical excitation. Another important milestone has been reported in Ref. (Guerin et al., 2016) for a very large atomic cloud with the size on the order of \( R \sim 1 \, mm \), and \( N = 10^8 \) atoms. The cloud was very dilute with the density of approximately one atom per wavelength in cube. The main result was the observation of the long subradiant tails of emission at the lifetimes \( \approx 100 \sim N/(\omega_R/c)^2 \) times longer than the lifetime of an individual atom.

Waveguides offer new opportunities to control the interactions between atoms. It is potentially possible to

![FIG. 25 Reproduced from Ref. (Solano et al., 2017). (a) Experimental spontaneous emission kinetics of photons in a nanofiber. Time is normalized to natural atom lifetime \( (\tau_0 = 1/\Gamma_0 = 26.24 \, ns) \). Inset schematically illustrates the setup and the waveguide-mediated coupling between distant atoms. (b) Dependence of the spontaneous decay rate on the average number of atoms and corresponding optical density (OD) for two distant atomic clouds, shown by the fluorescence image in the inset. The blue circles correspond to the signals from a single cloud of atoms. Blue circles, dotted dark green diamonds, and the solid red square correspond to the right atomic cloud, left atomic cloud, and the combination of both clouds, respectively. The red dashed line is the theoretical prediction.](image-url)
place atoms far enough so that the dipole-dipole interaction becomes irrelevant, and realize collective superradiant or subradiant states mediated by long-ranged waveguide-mediated coupling. An important milestone has been reported in Ref. (Goban et al., 2015, 2014) for cesium atoms near an alligator photonic crystal waveguide (see Sec. II for more details of this structure). The total spontaneous emission rate has been found to scale linearly with the number of trapped atoms. However, the number of the atoms was relatively small, $N \sim 1 \pm 3$, and their distance along the waveguide was on the order of 10 $\mu m$ and not controllable. Thus, it was an important milestone to observe the controllable superradiant coupling between distant clouds of atoms, separated by about 0.3 nm along the waveguide (Solano et al., 2017). The main experimental results from this work are reproduced in Fig. 25. Instead of the alligator photonic crystal fiber in Ref. (Goban et al., 2015, 2014), Solano et al. have used an optical nanofiber overlap magneto-optical trap, that contained $^{87}$Rb atoms. Fig. 25(a) shows an example of measured spontaneous emission kinetics for an atomic cloud after initial excitation probe has been turned off. The average number of atoms for this realization was about $N = 6$ with the optical density $\approx 0.7$. The initial faster component of the signal has been fitted as an exponential decay (red dashed line). The dependence of this decay constant on the array geometry is presented in Fig. 25(b) depending on the number of atoms in the system. All the measured decay rates scale linearly with the number of atoms which is a manifestation of a superradiant collective behavior. Blue circles correspond to a single atomic cloud and solid red square correspond to atoms split into two separated clouds separated by about 400 wavelengths (see the fluorescence image in the inset). This measurement satisfies the same linear scaling law and provides an unambiguous proof of long-range waveguide-mediated interactions for distant clouds. We note however, that the overall modification of the radiative decay rate as compared to that of a single atom in vacuum is not large, on the order of 10%. It has been limited by the coupling efficiency of atomic emission into the waveguide mode that has been estimated as $\beta \approx 13\%$. Interestingly, Fig. 25(a) also reveals a slower decaying tail, attributed to subradiant modes of the cloud.

Importantly, here we have focused only on single-photon superradiance, resolved in the weak excitation regime. There also exists an opposite regime, considered in the original Dicke proposal, when all the atoms of the array are initially in the excited state and then rapidly emit light. We refer the reader to the recent theoretical work (Masson et al., 2020), studying many-body signatures of collective decay in atomic arrays, and references therein for more details of this regime. The phenomenon of superradiance can also be studied theoretically in a more complicated setups. For example, Ref. (Wang et al., 2020) considered theoretically the quantum emitters coupled to a waveguides formed by an array of coupled cavities. There also exists an interesting proposal of superradiant lattices in reciprocal momentum space, realized for an array of 3-level atoms coupled to an external wave (Wang et al., 2015). Such a setup might be useful as a simulator of solid-state physics in a quantum optical setup.

### B. Generation of collective atomic excitations

Generation of collective quantum states of atoms coupled to light presents one of the main potential applications of the WQED platform. Previously, in Sec. III.D.4 we have discussed in detail how arrays of atoms weakly chirally coupled to the waveguide have been used to experimentally demonstrate both photon bunching and antibunching depending on the photon number (Prasad et al., 2020). There exist also preliminary reports on the two-photon entanglement and squeezing from the same setup (Hinney et al., 2020). One more important result is the recent demonstration of Schrödinger cat states for an array of atoms coupled to an optical waveguide (Leong et al., 2020).

We will now discuss in more detail another important result, a demonstration of single collective atomic excitation generated in a nanofiber waveguide (Corzo et al., 2019). This stored collective state can be efficiently read out with an external laser pulse, leading to a single photon emission into the guided mode. The collective atomic excitation can be transferred into a single photon state by using Duan-Lukin-Cirac-Zoller (DLCZ) protocol (Duan et al., 2001). To implement this protocol, the authors of (Corzo et al., 2019) trapped 2000 atoms along the optical nanofiber, see the top panel of Fig. 26. The single-atom coupling around $\gamma_{1D}/\Gamma \approx 10^{-2}$ was achieved, where $\gamma_{1D}$ and $\Gamma$ are the radiative decay rates into the guided mode and into free space. Initially, $^{133}$Cs atoms were prepared in the ground state $|g\rangle = |S_{1/2}, F = 4\rangle$. An external to the nanofiber weak pulse in $y$-polarization and detuned by $\Delta = -10$ MHz from the $|g\rangle \rightarrow |e\rangle$ atomic transition creates a single collective excitation. This excitation in the chain of $N$ atoms was heralded by detecting a single photon in the Field-1 mode. This mode is selected to be guided mode of the nanofiber and quasi-linearly polarized along $x$-axis. After a programmable delay, external read pulse resonant with $|s\rangle \rightarrow |e\rangle$ atomic transition was sent to the ensemble. The read pulse maps the collective excitation into a Field-2 photon that escapes the atomic ensemble and propagates in the opposite direction of the Field-1. One can notice that the Field-2 is also a guided mode, but it has a quasi-linear polarization along the $y$-axis.

After the implementation of the DLCZ protocol, the non-classical correlations between the Field-1 and the Field-2 should be characterized. This can be done
with the normalized cross-correlation function $g_{12} = p_{12}/(p_1 p_2)$, where $p_{12}$ is the joint probability of detecting a pair of photons and $p_1$, $p_2$ are the probabilities of detecting a photon in fields 1 and 2. The dependence of $g_{12}$ on the probability $p_1$ is shown in the Fig. 26 (a). One can see, that the value of $g_{12}$ increases when the excitation probability is reduced. For efficient retrieval of the stored collective excitation, the conditional retrieval efficiency is a crucial parameter. It can be found via a measurement of the conditional probability of detecting a guided photon in the Field-2 after retrieval $p_c = p_{12}/p_1$. The efficiency can be found as a ratio $q_c = p_c/\eta_2$, with $\eta_2$ being the overall detection efficiency. Fig. 26(b), displays the retrieval efficiency as a function of $p_1$. One can observe here three different regimes. In the first one, characterized by the large value of $p_1$, $q_c$ increases with $p_1$, and corresponds to a multi-excitation process in the write field. The second region with a plateau in the $q_c$ corresponds to a single-excitation regime. And the third region corresponds to low excitation probability, where the noise background creates false heralding events becoming predominant.

Finally, the single photon character of the heralded excitation can be confirmed by measuring the degree of suppression $w$ of the two-photon component of the retrieved Field-2 compared to a coherent state. This value can be found from the ratio $w = (p_1 p_{2a,2b})/(p_{1,2a} p_{1,2b})$, where $p_{1,2a,2b}$ indicates the probability for triple coincidences and $p_{1,2a}$ and $p_{1,2b}$ are probabilities for coincidences between detectors. In Fig. 26(c), one can see the antibunching value $w$ as a function of the cross-correlated parameter $g_{12}$. The temporal mode of the guided single photon is given in the inset of Fig. 26(c).

These experimental achievements demonstrate preferentially coupled collective excitations in waveguide QED platforms. It was shown that the collective entangled state can be characterized by the subsequent on-demand emission of a guided single photon and that this non-classical state can be preferentially coupled to a waveguide.

**FIG. 26 Reproduced from Ref. (Corzo et al., 2019). Waveguide coupled collective excitation in an atomic register. The top panel: DLCZ scheme (Duan et al., 2001). External to the waveguide write pulse, that is detuned from the atomic $|g\rangle \rightarrow |e\rangle$ transition, creates one single-flip excitation in a chain of $N$ atoms trapped in the vicinity of an optical nanofiber. This process is heralded by the detection of a photon in the guided Field-1 mode. Later, a read pulse resonant to $|s\rangle \rightarrow |e\rangle$ atomic transition converts the excitation into a single photon in the guided Field-2 mode. Lower panel: Characterization of the collective excitation. (a) Normalized cross-correlation function $g_{12}$ between the Field-1 and the Field-2. (b) Conditional retrieval efficiency $q_c$ as a function of the probability $p_1$ to detect a heralding photon in the Field-1. (c) Suppression of the two-photon component of the Field-2.

**C. Slow guided light and quantum memory**

Interfacing guided light with an atomic array has been foreseen as a promising alternative, enabling longer interaction length, large optical depth which are crucial for the quantum memory effect. In an optical nanofiber, a propagating single-mode field experiences a dispersion due to the dispersive material contents of the core and clad. The group velocity of the envelope of such a propagating fiber mode is $v_g = \beta c/\beta \omega$ with $\beta$ being the propagation constant of the fiber mode. The group velocity of the fiber mode can be significantly reduced under conditions of electromagnetically induced transparency (EIT). The light delay propagating in an optical nanofiber was theoretically studied by Hakuta in Ref. (Patnaik et al., 2002) and Kwek in Ref. (Song et al., 2017) and the first experimental demonstrations were done by groups of J. Lauriat in Ref. (Gouraud et al., 2015) and A. Rauschenbeutel in Ref. (Sayrin et al., 2015). The main difference of these two experiments consists in prepared atomic systems. Thus, in (Gouraud et al., 2015), a cloud of laser-cooled atoms overlapped with a nanofiber, while in (Sayrin et al., 2015) laser-cooled cesium atoms were confined in a one-dimensional optical lattice realized in the evanescent field surrounding an optical nanofiber.

Guided light propagating through an optical nanofiber has a complex polarization pattern, including a signifi-
FIG. 27 Reproduced from (Gouraud et al., 2015). (a) A nanofiber with a diameter 400 nm is overlapped with an ensemble of cold atoms of $^{133}$Cs. The signal pulse is a guided mode field, the control pulse is external to the nanofiber. (b) Transmitted pulses for different control powers. The reference is measured without atoms. (c) Storage and retrieval of the guided light with an exponentially-rising profile with a full width at half-maximum of 60 ns. In the absence of the control field, the blue and purple points give the transmitted pulse without and with atoms. The red data corresponds to the memory sequence, showing leakage and retrieval. The black line indicates the control timing. (d) EIT for the guided light. The control field is on resonance with the $|s\rangle \to |e\rangle$ transition but the signal is detuned by $\Delta$ from the $|g\rangle \to |e\rangle$ atomic resonance.

FIG. 28 Reproduced from (Sayrin et al., 2015). (a) Slow guided light. A light delay with respect to a reference pulse (dark green) is clearly visible. The solid lines correspond to Gaussian fits of the experimental data. (b) Storage of light in a nanofiber-trapped ensemble of cold atoms. A pulse duration $\tau = 0.2 \mu s$ that contains $0.8$ photons on average. The storage time was chosen as $1 \mu s$. The green data is reference recorded without atoms, black line is simulated time trace. The homogeneous magnetic field is $B_{\text{off}} = 15$ G.

The transmission coefficient of light propagating through a dilute atomic cloud with the optical depth $OD$ has an exponential dependence $\sim \exp[-OD/(1 + (2\Delta/\Gamma_{\text{tot}})^2)]$, where $\Delta$ and $\Gamma_{\text{tot}}$ are detuning from the atomic resonance and the total decay rate of the atomic excited state. The transmission coefficient of the guided light in a nanofiber-mediated atomic cloud is shown by blue in Fig. 27(d). The fitting of the experimental data with the exponential profile yielded $OD = 3$ and $\Gamma_{\text{tot}}/2\pi = 6.8$ MHz. One can notice that this value is 30% larger than the natural linewidth in free space $\Gamma_0/2\pi = 5.2$ MHz, resulting from the finite temperature, surface interactions and modification of the spontaneous emission rate in the vicinity of the fiber. The authors of Ref. (Sayrin et al., 2015) obtained $OD = 6$ and $\Gamma_{\text{tot}}/2\pi = 6.4$ MHz with the similar fitting.

It is well known that a strong control field changes the transmission characteristics of the probe field. Figure 27(d) shows an example of the transmission profiles of the signal as a function of its spectral detuning $\delta$ from the resonance of the atomic transition $|g\rangle \to |e\rangle$ for different values of control field power, taken from Ref. (Gouraud et al., 2015). When the control field is applied, a transparency window appears, providing a first signature of EIT in this evanescent-field configuration. Transparency close to 80% was achieved in both experiments. After having EIT transparency, the slow-light effect resulting from the guided light propagation under EIT condition can be measured. As a signal pulse, a weak laser pulse at a single-photon level was used. Results of light delay are demonstrated in Fig. 27(b) for (Gouraud et al., 2015) and in Fig. 28(a) for (Sayrin et al., 2015). One can see that larger delays are obtained when the control field is decreased due to the narrower transparency window. For a 0.5 mW control field power, the light delay in 60 ns was observed in (Gouraud et al., 2015) and the light delay in 5µs was achieved with the control field power 0.7 pW in (Sayrin et al., 2015).

Also, the storage of the guided light can be demon-
strated by switching off the control field. This corresponds to implementation of the dynamical EIT protocol. While the light is slowed down, the control is ramped down to zero and the signal pulse is converted into a collective atomic excitation. Later after a controllable delay, the control field can be switched on again and the light can be retrieved back in a well-defined spatio-temporal mode due to the collective enhancement provided by the atomic ensemble. Figure 27(c) and Figure 28(b) demonstrate the storage results for a signal with a mean photon number per pulse equal to 0.6 and 0.8, respectively. Due to the limited delay, the pulse cannot be contained entirely in the ensemble, and a leakage is observed before the control pulse is switched off. The crucial parameter characterizing the memory is its efficiency, which could be defined as a ratio of the photodetection events in the retrieved pulse to the ones in the reference. The efficiency $\eta = 10\%$ and $\eta = 3\%$ were obtained in these experiments. These efficiencies are compatible with the limited OD used in the experiments.

These two experiments have demonstrated that the interaction of the evanescent field propagating through an optical nanofiber with the surrounding atoms provides an intrinsically-fibered memory that has potential applications.

D. Subradiant excitations in the qubit array

So far we considered experiments probing symmetric superradiant modes of the atomic array. However, as has been discussed above in the context of Fig. 16–Fig. 18, there also exist subradiant modes with radiative decay strongly suppressed as compared to a single atom. The lifetime of the darkest subradiant modes tends to increase with the number of atoms $N$, either as $N^3$ [Eq. (61), (Zhang and Mølmer, 2020)] or even faster, (Kornovan et al., 2019). This promises applications for storing quantum correlations. However, the large radiative lifetime also means that it is hard to address subradiant states in experiments. We will illustrate this by discussing the state-of-the-art experiment Ref. (Brehm et al., 2021) for an array of artificial atoms, superconducting qubits, coupled to the waveguide. The structure considered of 8 transmon qubits as it is illustrated in Fig. 29(a). The spacing of the qubits was approximately 40 times smaller than the electromagnetic wavelength at the qubit resonance, so that the array can be viewed as a quantum metamaterial. In the experiment, the amplitude transmission coefficient of the electromagnetic wave through the metamaterial $S_{21} \equiv |\eta(\omega)|$ has been measured. The main advantage of the qubit setup is the possibility to tune the resonant frequencies of all the qubits independently by applying external voltage. Thus, by tuning a given number of the consecutive qubits $N < 8$ to the resonance and detuning the remaining qubits, it has been possible to study the dependence of the transmission spectra on $N$. The experimental results are presented in Fig. 29(b). The experiment has been performed for low excitation powers. For $N = 1$ the transmission spectrum has a dip at the qubit resonance frequency. The slight asymmetry of the spectrum is an experimental artifact related to reflections of light from the edges of the waveguide. Figure 29(b) demonstrates that increase of the number of qubits leads to suppression of the transmission around the qubit resonance. This reflects the formation of the polariton band gap for the coupled photon-qubit excitations. At the same time, additional peaks appear with the increase of $N$ below the qubit resonance. These peaks correspond to subradiant excitations of the array. Unfortunately, only up to two brightest subradiant modes have been resolved in the experiment. This is due to the quality of the sample, the ratio of nonradiative to radiative decay rates $\gamma_c/\gamma_{1D}$ was on the order of 10%. Thus, the darkest subradiant modes decay mostly nonradiatively and are not resolved in transmission spectra. Still, the experiment of Ref. (Brehm et al., 2021) reveals...
the potential of the superconducting qubit arrays. Natural extension of this work would be the demonstration of the slow light effect due to lower group velocity of polaritons near the resonance. It is also potentially possible to further increase both the quality and the number of qubits which will enable slowing and storing microwave pulses, propagating through the array (Leung and Sanders, 2012).

E. Bragg-spaced arrays

So far in this review, we considered close-spaced atomic arrays. In this Section, we discuss in more detail the situation when the spacing is on the order of the wavelength, such that the atomic resonance frequency and period \( d \) are chosen to satisfy the resonant Bragg condition,

\[
\frac{\omega_0 d_{\text{Bragg}}}{c} = m \pi, \quad m = 1, 2 \ldots . \tag{100}
\]

The wave, incident upon the array, will then exhibit not only resonant reflection from each individual atom, but also the Bragg diffraction. Waves reflected from different atoms will interfere constructively. Bragg diffraction in arrays, where each individual scatterer has an electromagnetic resonance, is a known phenomenon that has been considered in very different setups. Probably, historically the first platform is presented by natural crystals, such as iron, where sharp resonances with the widths on order of neV exist for γ-rays \((\hbar \omega \approx 14 \text{ keV})\) exhibiting Mössbauer scattering on the nuclei. Such crystals are experimentally studied since the 1960s, see the reviews Refs. (Hannon and Trammell, 1999; Kagan, 1999) for more details. One has also considered artificial Bragg lattices for γ-rays, made from alternating layers of different isotopes (Chumakov et al., 1993).

In the 1990s, it has been independently proposed to use Bragg-spaced lattices of semiconductor quantum wells (Ivchenko et al., 1994; Ivchenko et al., 1994) and optical lattices of cold atoms (Deutsch et al., 1995) for light. Such Bragg-spaced atomic arrays are in stark contrast to incommensurate arrays, where it is well-known that the interference between forward and backward scattered light leads to its absorption and destroys reflection. Some other examples of Bragg-spaced lattices with resonant scatterers include ring resonators (Yanik et al., 2004), metallic gratings with plasmonic resonances (Taubert et al., 2012) and dielectric cylinders with Mie resonances (Rybin et al., 2015). A detailed comparison between cold atom systems, semiconductor lattices and Mössbauer isotopes can be found in the review (Poddbuny and Ivchenko, 2013). It has also been theoretically proposed to consider Bragg lattices of atoms (Haakh et al., 2016) and superconducting qubits coupled to the waveguide (Greenberg et al., 2021). The modification of Bragg conditions for scattering of light from an array of atoms into the guided modes of a waveguide has been analyzed in Ref. (Olmos et al., 2021).

Recently, it has been experimentally demonstrated that coupling of an atomic array to a nanoscale waveguide leads to a variety of remarkable cooperative phenomena. Namely, the groups of J. Laurat in (Corzo et al., 2016) and E. Polzik in (Sørensen et al., 2016) achieved a large Bragg reflection from atomic arrays trapped near a one-dimensional waveguide. We will first analyze the general phenomenon of the enhancement of polariton band gap in the Bragg structures and then review the experiment (Corzo et al., 2016) in detail in the end of this section.

Calculation in Fig. 14(b) indicates that the width of the polariton band gap increases when the array period approaches the resonant Bragg condition Eq. (100). Thus, the Bragg case deserves a special attention and we examine it in Fig. 30. Figures 30(a),(b),(c) present the polariton dispersion law \( \omega(K) \) calculated for the periods close to the Bragg value for \( m = 1 \). The first panel corresponds to the situation when the period is smaller than the Bragg value. The dispersion features two band gaps: the polariton band gap Eq. (52) below the atomic resonance, and the usual photonic band gap at the frequency satisfying the Bragg condition \( \omega/d/c = \pi \). Figure 30(c) presents an opposite scenario where the Bragg band gap is located below the polariton one. In the Bragg case, illustrated in Fig. 30(b), the two band gaps fuse with each other and form a wide Bragg polariton band gap around the atomic resonance. The polariton dispersion
Thus, the Markovian approximation breaks down in long interaction between the atoms stops being instantaneous. et al. (Poshakinskiy, 2012) and the waveguide-mediated time of flight of photons can no longer be ignored when the time of flight of photons through the array is equivalent to the array with a lattice constant \( d \) smaller than the inverse of the polariton band gap \( N \gamma_{1D} / \lambda_0 \). However, such analysis assumes the validity of the Markovian approximation when the time of flight of photons through the array \( N d/c \) is smaller than the inverse lifetime of the superradiant mode \( 1/(N \gamma_{1D}) \). When the number of atoms exceeds the value given by Eq. (103), the time of flight of photons can no longer be ignored (Poshakinskiy et al., 2012) and the waveguide-mediated interaction between the atoms stops being instantaneous. Thus, the Markovian approximation breaks down in long interactions.

The gap half-width \( \Delta_{\text{Bragg}} \) exceeds the radiative linewidth of the atomic resonance of \( \gamma_{1D} \) by the large factor \( \sim \sqrt{\omega_0 / \gamma_{1D}} \). Hence, the light incident upon the Bragg-spaced array will exhibit strong reflection in the wide spectral range \( \omega_0 - \Delta_{\text{Bragg}} < \omega < \omega_0 + \Delta_{\text{Bragg}} \).

However, this Bragg band gap will be manifested in reflection only if the number of atoms of the array is large enough, exceeding

\[
N \sim \sqrt{\omega_0 / \gamma_{1D}}.
\]

In shorter arrays, the reflection spectrum is also described by Eq. (34) as for the atoms located in one point. Namely, it is a Lorentzian with a half-width \( \Delta \omega \), with \( \Delta \omega = \omega_0 - \omega_0^* \) for a guided probe field with quasilinear polarization (indicated by the arrow). Theoretical reflection spectra for a probe quasilinearly polarized along the \( y \) direction (symmetric decay rates) and \( x \) direction (asymmetric decay rates). The spectra are given for different distances between the atoms, with values close to the commensurate case. \( \Delta \lambda \) stands for the trap detuning of the waveguide chirality arising from the complex polarization pattern. Namely, each atom exhibits a radiative decay rate \( \Gamma^\text{forward} \) into the right and left propagating modes, respectively, and \( \Gamma^\text{backward} \) into all other modes.

We will now discuss in more detail the results of Ref. (Corzo et al., 2016) for a waveguide-coupled atomic array. In this experiment, the array of \( N = 2000 \) trapped atoms of \(^{133}\)Cs were prepared in the evanescent field of a 400 nm diameter nanofiber with a lattice constant \( d \) close to \( \lambda_0/2 \), where \( \lambda_0 \) is the wavelength of the atomic transition. While previously in this section, we considered a symmetric non-chiral situation, the experiment of Ref. (Corzo et al., 2016) has also demonstrated the effect of the waveguide chirality arising from the complex polarization pattern. Namely, each atom exhibits a radiative decay rate \( \Gamma^\text{forward} \) into the right and left propagating modes, respectively, and \( \Gamma^\text{backward} \) into all other modes, with \( \Gamma_0 \) being the free space radiative decay rate, see Fig. 32 (a). For a guided probe field quasilinearly polarized along the \( y \) direction, the two decay rates are equal, \( \Gamma^\text{forward} = \Gamma^\text{backward} = \Gamma/2 \). In contrary, for an orientation of the array along the \( x \) direction, the couplings to the waveguide become strongly asymmetric.
In the case of asymmetric coupling, the forward decay rate is increased by sixfold while the backward decay rate is suppressed by about one order of magnitude. In order to examine the effect of asymmetric coupling in experiment, one can compare the light reflection spectra in $x$- and $y$-polarizations.

Fig. 32 (c) and Fig. 32 (d) provide theoretical reflection spectra calculated for different small detunings $\Delta \lambda$ of the trap wavelength to atomic resonance and for the two orthogonal polarizations. The calculations have been performed using the transfer matrix formalism discussed above. For atoms separated exactly by $\lambda_0/2$, the reflection spectrum has a broadened Lorentzian profile in the symmetric coupling case while the reflectance is strongly suppressed in the chiral case. Indeed, the amount of chirality and number of atoms result in a finite bandwidth around resonance where reflection is suppressed. One can see, that close to commensurate array, the Bragg condition is fulfilled out of the resonance. This leads to a maximum reflectance shifted to the blue but also results in an increased reflectance for the chiral case. Large reflectance values can be then obtained for both polarizations as the single-atom reflection coefficients are similar in the chosen configuration.

The measured reflection spectra for both $x$- and $y$-polarization profiles are shown in Fig. 33 (a). The trap detuning here was fixed at $\Delta \lambda = 0.2$ nm. One can see, that the reflection spectrum is significantly shifted and broadened in the asymmetric case of $x$ polarization (red curves). These features are compelling signatures of the chiral character of the waveguide on the reflection, as confirmed by the associated simulations shown in Fig. 33 (b). One can notice that the maximal observed reflectance of $(0.75 \pm 0.06)$ was obtained in the asymmetric case at a probe detuning of 25 MHz. Beyond their fundamental significance, the observation of the chiral character of the nanofiber demonstrates key ingredients for the exploration of a variety of emerging and potentially rich protocols based on 1D reservoirs coupled to atoms.

F. Beyond the waveguides: atom-made metasurfaces

Here, we digress from the atom-in-a-waveguide setup considered in most of the review to examine a novel and very promising platform that has emerged quite recently and is illustrated in Fig. 34: an artificial quantum mirror made from a two-dimensional array of atoms, confined in the nodes of optical lattice (Rui et al., 2020). Reflection of light from the planar array of scatterers is a well-known problem in classical optics (de Vries et al., 1998; Gippius and Tikhodeev, 2009; Ivchenko et al., 1992; Ivchenko and Kavokin, 1992; Khitrova and Gibbs, 2007). It has been extensively studied in the field of metasurfaces, artificial two-dimensional arrays of resonant scatterers with the spacing smaller than the light wavelength. Such scatterers can be metallic nanoparticles with plasmonic resonances (Decker et al., 2011), dielectric and semiconductor particles, e.g. made of silicon, that have the Mie optical resonances (Kivshar, 2018; Kuznetsov et al., 2016; Limonov et al., 2017). The advantage of the all-dielectric platform is the absence of Joule nonradiative losses that allows to achieve narrow optical resonances. Very recently, it has become possible to assemble high-quality defect-free atomic arrays in an optical lattice (Barredo et al., 2016) containing up to $N \sim 50$ atoms. Such systems can be viewed as quantum metasurfaces. Similarly to classical metasurfaces, they manifest tunable collective optical response (Rui et al., 2020) but their unique feature are strongly optical nonlinearities at the single-quantum level (Bekenstein et al., 2020; Bettles et al., 2020). We will now discuss light reflection from atomic arrays in more detail.

A theory of light reflection from a square array of scatterers exists at least for 30 years since the seminal work (Ivchenko et al., 1992; Ivchenko and Kavokin, 1992) where it has been predicted that the square array of semiconductor quantum dots with the period $a$ that is smaller than the light wavelength $\lambda$ acts as a resonant mirror with the radiative linewidth:

$$\gamma_{2D} = \gamma_0 \frac{3\lambda^2}{4\pi a^2},$$

where $\lambda$ is the light wavelength and $\gamma_0 \equiv \Gamma_0/2$ is the radiative decay rate of a single atom in vacuum. Hence, similarly to the classical Dicke formula for three-dimensional array, where $\gamma_{2D}/\gamma_0 \sim (\lambda/a)^3$, the decay rate of the two-dimensional array exhibits cooperative enhancement with the factor of the order of number of atoms per wavelength square. This enhancement has been observed experimentally for the quantum wire arrays (Ivchenko et al., 1992) and quantum dot arrays (Khitrova and Gibbs, 2007), but detailed studies of collective light-matter coupling were prevented by the
is the so-called interaction constant describing light-induced coupling between the given atom and all the other atoms in the array. Hence, the coefficient $\tilde{a}$ in Eq. (108) is the polarizability, renormalized by collective coupling between the atoms. The amplitude light reflection and transmission coefficients from the array are given by (Ivchenko et al., 2000; Yugova et al., 2009)

$$r = \frac{2 \pi i \omega}{c a^2} \tilde{a}, \quad t = 1 + r.$$  \hspace{1cm} (110)

We consider the array with $a < \lambda$, when all the diffracted waves are evanescent. The reflection and transmission coefficients can be then presented in the form

$$r = \frac{i \gamma_{2D}}{\omega_0 - \omega - i(\gamma_{2D} + \gamma)}, \quad t = \frac{\tilde{\omega}_0 - \omega - i\gamma}{\omega_0 - \omega - i(\gamma_{2D} + \gamma)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (111)

that reminds reflection and transmission coefficients Eq. (4) of one atom, coupled to a waveguide. Here, $\gamma_{2D}$ is the collective radiative decay rate of the atomic array and $\tilde{\omega}_0$ is the resonance frequency modified by the collective coupling with light (that can be viewed as cooperative Lamb shift), given by

$$\tilde{\omega}_0 = \omega_0 - \frac{3\gamma_0 \lambda_0^3}{16\pi^3} \text{Re} \ C', \quad \gamma_{2D} = \gamma_0 + \frac{3\gamma_0 \lambda_0^3}{16\pi^3} \text{Im} \ C'.$$  \hspace{1cm} (112)

The sum in Eq. (109) for arrays with tens of atoms, occurring in practice (Bekenstein et al., 2020; Rui et al., 2020), can be readily evaluated directly. In the theoretical limit of infinite array the convergence of the sum is quite slow due to the far-field interactions. The lattice summation can be still carried out efficiently either using the Ewald summation approach or using the Floquet summation developed in the theory of metamaterials. More details on the Floquet technique can be found in Refs. (Belov and Simovski, 2005; Collin, 1960; Simovski et al., 1999) or in Appendix J. In the limit when the spacing between the atoms is much smaller than the light wavelength, one can show that

$$C \approx \frac{2 \pi \omega}{ca^2} + \frac{S + (\omega/c)^2 S'}{2},$$  \hspace{1cm} (113)

where $S \approx 9.03/a^3$ and $S' \approx -3.90/a$. Substituting Eq. (113) into Eq. (112) we recover Eq. (104) for the collective radiative decay rate.

Figure 35(a) shows the dependence of the collective radiative decay rate on the ratio of the array period to the light wavelength $a/\lambda_0$. Since $a/\lambda_0 < 1$, the diffraction is impossible and all the waves excepting the one transmitted forward and the one reflected backward are evanescent. Hence, only the normally propagating waves contribute to the radiative decay and the decay rate is given by Eq. (104). For small period, the array exhibits a superradiant behavior, $\gamma_{2D} > \gamma_{1D}$, but the radiative linewidth quickly decays with the growth of lattice spacing and for $a/\lambda_0 > \sqrt{3/(4\pi)} \approx 0.5$ the structure becomes a subradiant one, $\gamma_{2D} < \gamma_{1D}$.
FIG. 35 (a) Collective radiative decay rate of an atomic array depending on the ratio of the array period $a$ to the light wavelength at the atomic resonance $\lambda_0$. (b) Light reflection spectra depending on the ratio $a/\lambda_0$. Thick black line shows the collective resonance frequency $\tilde{\omega}_0$ Eq. (112), solid red line shows the analytical answer found using Eq. (113). Calculated neglecting the nonradiative decay rate $\Gamma$.

Figure 35(b) shows the reflection spectrum depending on the array period (we have recalculated it after Ref. (Shahmoon et al., 2017)). While the linewidth of the reflection resonance decreases monotonously for larger spacing, following Fig. 35(a), the behavior of the resonance frequency $\tilde{\omega}_0$ is more subtle and non-monotonous. For small spacings the cooperative Lamb shift diverges for $a \to 0$ as $\tilde{\omega}_0 - \omega_0 \propto -\gamma_{1D}(\lambda_0/a)^3$ as follows from Eq. (113), red line in Fig. 35(b). Qualitatively, the Lamb shift is determined by the near-field dipole-dipole interactions between the atoms. However, the value of the Lamb shift crosses zero for $a \approx 0.2\lambda_0$ due to the destructive interference of the two terms $S$ and $S'(\omega/c)^2$ in Eq. (113). This point corresponds to the perfect reflection when $|r(\omega_0)| = 1$. Another special point when the Lamb shift vanishes and $|r(\omega_0)| = 1$ is $a \approx 0.8\lambda_0$ (Bettles et al., 2016; Shahmoon et al., 2017).

Subradiant behavior of the planar array of Rb$^{87}$ atoms with the period $\approx 0.7\lambda_0$ has been recently demonstrated in Ref. (Rui et al., 2020). The measured linewidth of optical resonance depending on the filling factor of the lattice is shown in Fig. 36. As the filling factor increases, the measured linewidth becomes smaller and approaches the theoretical prediction $\gamma_{2D} \approx 0.5\gamma_{1D}$, corresponding to this spacing.

We note, that the term “quantum metasurface” is also used in literature to describe metasurfaces made of classical scatterers, that are used to control the quantum properties of propagating light (Li et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2018), see also a review (Solntsev et al., 2020). These structures can be naively understood as very advanced and efficient generalizations of classical beam splitters. Here, on the other hand, we focus only on the quantum metasurfaces made of quantum emitters, such as atomic arrays. This field is now also rapidly developing and we can identify at least two possible directions of future research. One is the engineering of advanced linear optical properties using more complicated atomic arrangements (Alaee et al., 2020a). For example, it has been suggested to consider bilayer quadratic arrays with four atoms per unit cell (Ballantine and Ruostekoski, 2020a). The unit cell with a quadrumer of atoms, each of those has the electric dipole optical transition, exhibits both electric and magnetic dipole response (Ballantine and Ruostekoski, 2020b). The interference of electric and magnetic dipole emissions is constructive in the forward direction and destructive in the backward direction. As a result, the bilayer atomic array acts as a Huygens surface: it transmits light with the $\pi$ phase shift while the light reflection is suppressed. The directional scattering by atomic arrays, so-called Kerker effect, has also been considered in Ref. (Alaee et al., 2020b). Other judicious atomic arrangements realizing toroidal multipole electromagnetic moments have been suggested (Ballantine and Ruostekoski, 2020c). Such a research direction is inspired by the recent dramatic progress in conventional metamaterials in classical optics (Kivshar, 2018). The atomic arrays feature high quality resonances with vanishing inhomogeneous broadening and could be ideal for realization of complicated optical states. It seems to be only a matter of time before optical bound states of continuum (Hsu et al., 2016) or high-quality subradiant
states (Koshelev et al., 2020) are realized on the atomic platform.

Second research direction, distinct in conventional metamaterials, is based on harnessing the quantum properties of the atomic arrays (Bettes et al., 2020). Collective subradiant states have been proposed to store and manipulate the quantum correlations (Ballantine and Ruostekoski, 2020c; Facchinetti et al., 2016) and engineer entanglement (Guimond et al., 2019). Another important milestone in this field is the recent proposal of quantum atom-made metasurfaces for generation of highly entangled photon states (Bekenstein et al., 2020). Generation and manipulation of Schrödinger cat states has been recently demonstrated experimentally in Rydberg atom arrays (Omran et al., 2019) and superconducting qubit arrays (Song et al., 2019a) and atom-made metasurfaces present a natural step in this direction. The advantage of the metasurface platform, according to Ref. (Bekenstein et al., 2020), is the possibility to parallelize quantum operations on different atoms. According to this proposal, ancillary atoms can be placed near the metasurface to control its quantum states via the Rydberg interactions. We also refer the reader to recent reviews (Chang et al., 2018; Noh and Angelakis, 2016) and original theoretical works on quantum simulators based on the planar atomic arrays (Douglas et al., 2015; González-Tudela et al., 2015; Hung et al., 2016). Based on our own experience with one-dimensional arrays, discussed in Sec. III.C.2, quite complicated effects involving interaction-induced localization, interaction-induced topological states and quantum chaos manifest themselves already in the subspace of two interacting excitations. Even more exciting physics could be expected and will hopefully be tested soon for the two-dimensional quantum atom-made metasurfaces.

G. Topological quantum optics

In this section, we briefly review another novel research direction, the topological quantum optics based on waveguide quantum electrodynamics setup and related platforms. Topological photonics has emerged relatively recently in classical optics being inspired by the concepts from the condensed matter physics (Khanikaev and Shvets, 2017; Ozawa et al., 2019). The central idea was to create disorder-robust electromagnetic states that can carry information along the edge of the structure and are immune to imperfections, similar to the topological edge states of electrons in the quantum Hall phase and in topological quantum spin Hall phase (Bernevig and Hughes, 2013). The field of topological photonics with classical light has exploded in the early 2010s (Hafezi et al., 2011; Khanikaev et al., 2013; Kraus et al., 2012; Rechtsman et al., 2013) and multiple demonstrations of topological electromagnetic states are now available.

Different approaches, proposed to engineer such states, can be based on direct application of magnetic field to an optical structure (Bahari et al., 2017; Haldane and Raghu, 2008; Wang et al., 2009), see Fig. 37(a) or on engineering sophisticated lattices with artificial analogues of spin-orbit interactions in solids (Khanikaev et al., 2013). The most simple and celebrated example is the one-dimensional Su-Schrieffer-Heeger model, describing an array of tunneling-coupled cavities with alternating long and short spacings, similarly to the polyacetylene molecule \( \ldots C-C=C-C=C \ldots \). Such a structure features localized states at the edges that are terminated by the long link where tunneling is weaker, see Fig. 37(b). It is also possible to realize more sophisticated one-dimensional structures with localized edge states, for example in the the chain of cavities with periodically modulated spacing, \( z_n - z_{n-1} = d_0 + \cos(\beta n + \varphi) \), where \( n \) is the cavity number, described by the Aubry-André-Harper model (Kraus et al., 2012; Poshakinskiy et al., 2014). In a case when the modulation period is incommensurate with the main period, such a structure is similar to a quasicrystal and topological properties of quasicrystals are briefly reviewed in Ref. (Zilberberg, 2020).

More advanced approaches have been developed to create propagating edge states of light in two-dimensional structures (Hafezi et al., 2011; Khanikaev et al., 2013; Wu and Hu, 2015). Generally, topological edge states are mathematically guaranteed to appear at the structure edges if its bulk states are characterized by so-called discrete topological invariants, that can be Chern numbers, spin Chern numbers, Pfaffians, etc. (Bernevig and Hughes, 2013). This is termed bulk-boundary correspondence. However, one should keep in mind that if the time reversal symmetry is not broken (i.e. external magnetic field is not applied), the topological protection of topological photonic structures is very far from universal.

![Fig. 37](image_url)

**FIG. 37** (a) Schematic illustration of propagating topological photonic states coupled to a magnetized two-dimensional array of atoms, proposed in (Perczel et al., 2017). (b) Schematic illustration of the edge states in the one-dimensional Su-Schrieffer-Heeger array of coupled cavities with alternating long and short spacing, considered in (Bello et al., 2019).
The states are protected only against very special kinds of disorder. For example, for most models based on lattices of coupled cavities, such as the Su-Schrieffer-Heeger model in Fig. 37(b), there is some protection against the fluctuation of tunneling couplings, but the states are not protected against the fluctuations of resonant frequencies of the cavities. In another words, a simple defect where one of the cavities has a slightly different size, acts as a magnetic impurity in solid-state topological insulators and leads to backscattering of "protected" topological edge states.

Currently, the research in topological photonics is gradually shifting to the nonlinear, tunable and active topological structures, see the review (Smirnova et al., 2020). One of the important milestones in this field is the demonstration of the on-chip coupling of quantum emitter, semiconductor quantum dot, to the topological states propagating along the interface of two photonic crystals (Barik et al., 2018). Generation of entangled photon pairs via spontaneous four-wave mixing in topological photonic crystal made of coupled ring cavities has been demonstrated in Ref. (Mittal et al., 2018). This could be potentially useful to protect quantum correlations. There have also been proposals to create topological states of bound photon pairs in one- (Gorlach et al., 2018; Gorlach and Poddubny, 2017; Ke et al., 2020) and two-dimensional topologically nontrivial structures (Salerno et al., 2018). At the moment, there is no complete understanding of topological states of composite particles. One of the standing problems is the breakdown of the conventional concept of bulk-boundary correspondence for the composite particle because of its possibility of dissociation into two independent ones (Gorlach and Poddubny, 2017; Salerno et al., 2018). Topological biphoton states in the Su-Schrieffer-Heeger array of coupled linear waveguides, that are localized in one direction and propagate along the waveguides, have been reported in Ref. (Blanco-Redondo et al., 2018). However, this states were not protected against backscattering in the waveguides. To the best of our knowledge, there has been no experimental realization of the fully-quantum two-dimensional photonic structures with topologically protected propagating single-photon topological states. Light interaction with the two-dimensional atomic arrays, subjected to perpendicular magnetic field, has been studied theoretically in Refs. (Bettles et al., 2017; Perczel et al., 2017). Similarly to the conventional quantum Hall effect the magnetic field leads to formation of single-photon topological edge states that propagate along the edges of the array and are protected against the disorder. More recently, it has been proposed in Ref. (Perczel et al., 2020) to consider a lattice of nonlinear quantum emitters embedded in a photonic crystal slab. Again, this structure should feature band gaps induced by magnetic field, robust edge states, and also a nearly photonic flat band with a nonzero Chern number. Such a flat band should be very sensitive to interactions and this proposal could be potentially used to probe the many-body fractional quantum Hall states in quantum optical setup. As discussed in the end of Sec. III.C, it should be also possible to realize two-particle topological photon states without using complicated lattices or application of external magnetic field (Poshakinskiy et al., 2021). The idea is that two photons create topologically nontrivial potential for each other solely by virtue of the atom-mediated interactions between photons.

A very interesting emerging field is the quantum optics for emitters embedded in photonic crystals (Song et al., 2019b, 2018) or in topologically nontrivial structures, such as a Su-Schrieffer-Heeger array of coupled cavities A-B=A-B=A-B... (Bello et al., 2019). If the energy of emitters is in the band of propagating states, subradiant and superradiant states can form, similarly to the conventional waveguide. The situation changes dramatically when the emitter energy falls into the photonic band gap of the array. In this case the emitter acts as a defect that can lead to formation of localized photonic state bound to the emitter. In another words, the emitter induces a domain wall in the array. The bound states are very special due to the underlying topological structure. First, they are directional, i.e. they decay to either the left or to the right from the emitter depending on the sublattice the emitter is coupled to, see Fig. 38(a). Second, the localized states have nonzero photon amplitudes only at one of the sublattices. The formation of photonic states bound to the emitters has been recently understood as a general feature of many topological photonic structures (Leonforte et al., 2021). They have been termed vacancy-like states due to the following unifying feature: the photon amplitude is zero at the site, directly coupled to the emitter.

If two emitters are coupled to different sublattices, the corresponding topological localized states can overlap and mediate their interaction, and the coupling will be directional as well. The proposal of Ref. (Bello et al., 2019) has been realized very recently in the array of coupled superconducting qubits (Kim et al., 2021). Figure 38(b) shows the experimentally measured directional coupling depending on the relative position of the two qubits in the array $i-j$. The coupling is zero when $i > j$ and decays exponentially for $i < j$. The range of the interaction depends on the width of the band gap of the lattice, that is controlled by the differences of strong and weak couplings between the two qubits in the array. The smaller is the band gap the longer is the interaction range. Thus, one can expect very interesting physics also for the 2D setup, when the emitter is resonant with the photonic Dirac point.

Indeed, very unusual quantum optical features have been predicted for the emitter embedded in a honeycomb lattice of coupled cavities in the tight-binding model (González-Tudela and Cirac, 2018). Such struc-
structures focus on the single-photon regime. However, it has been confirmed that such a system should feature long-ranged coherent light-mediated interactions between the emitters, similarly to the graphene, see Fig. 38(c). Novel effects appear even for such simple problems as spontaneous emission when the emitter is resonant with the Dirac point. Due to the vanishing density of photonic states at the Dirac point, within the Fermi Golden rule approximation, the emitter does not spontaneously decay at all. As a result, the non-Markovian effects start playing a decisive role in the spontaneous decay, and the decay kinetics remains very slow and in the infinite system the emitter population decays with time as $\propto 1/\ln^2 t$ (González-Tudela and Cirac, 2018). When two emitters are resonant with the Dirac point, their interaction becomes strongly sensitive to the sublattices they are coupled to, see Fig. 38(d). If emitters are coupled to the same sublattice, the interaction is dissipative and collective subradiant states can form. If they are coupled to different sublattices, similarly to the case of Fig. 38(a), the coupling becomes coherent and can be long-ranged. The results for the discrete tight-binding model of Ref. (González-Tudela and Cirac, 2018) have recently been also confirmed for a photonic crystal structures in Ref. (Perczel and Lukin, 2020). It has been confirmed that such a system should feature long-ranged coherent light-mediated interactions between the emitters that are essential in exploring exotic many-body phases (Richerme et al., 2014).

So far most of the studies of the topological photonic structures focus on the single-photon regime. However, Ref. (Bello et al., 2019) already considered the many-body spin quantum phases emerging for array of emitters coupled to the Su-Schrieffer-Heeger array. Very recently, it has been predicted that hybridization of chiral photons in the topological two-dimensional cavity array with quantum emitters results in a whole zoo of interacting magnetic lattice models (Bernardis et al., 2020). We expect that photon-photon correlations, considered for a conventional waveguide with linear dispersion in the main part of the review will be eventually studied also in topologically nontrivial waveguides and many more novel and useful effects will appear in the topological setup.

V. SUMMARY AND OUTLOOK

In this review we tried to provide an introduction in the emerging field of waveguide quantum electrodynamics (WQED). We considered various experimental platforms and described in detail several recent groundbreaking experiments devoted to light-matter interactions in the quantum regime including among others tunable bunching and antibunching of emission due to formation of bound photon states, resonant light reflection from atom-made quantum metasurfaces, topological quantum optics. We also provide a detailed introduction into various theoretical techniques useful in quantum optics such as input-output theory, functional integral techniques, diagrammatic Green’s function methods and the Bethe ansatz.

Given the tremendous advances in the WQED field in the last 5–10 years, it is very hard to predict specific directions of future development but substantial progress can certainly be expected. One of the possibilities is the fusion of the quantum optics with the modern photonics and physics of metamaterials driven by novel technological capabilities. Namely, instead of simple periodic arrays of natural or artificial atoms coupled to one-dimensional waveguides it will soon become possible to realize more sophisticated atomic arrangements and more advanced photonic structures, for example with topologically nontrivial photonic states or high-quality optical modes. This will provide new opportunities to route and store light and to engineer its interactions with matter. Another promising research direction is related to complicated high-excited and high-entangled quantum states of atoms and photons. In addition to potential applications for quantum information processing, the WQED systems can act as quantum simulators useful for problems from other fields of physics, for example, many-body localization and delocalization in condensed matter physics. Single-photon properties of disordered arrays have already been studied (Fedorovich et al., 2020; Haakh et al., 2016; Mahmoodian et al., 2018; Song et al., 2021), but the many-body problem of photons interacting with atoms in the disordered structure seems especially
interesting (Fiorelli et al., 2020). For example, there have been recent claims supported by numerical calculations, that the WQED system exhibits many-body localization instead of conventional thermalization (Fayard et al., 2021). The possibility to tune energies and interactions of atoms and to probe the wavefunctions at individual atoms is unprecedented for conventional solid-state systems and will keep to inspire many beautiful experiments.

One more area of research could be devoted to hybrid quantum systems involving interacting excitations, photons and atomic vibrations in the quantum regime. There have already been a number of relevant experimental demonstrations (Bothner et al., 2021; Lecocq et al., 2016) and theoretical predictions (Chang et al., 2013; Iorsh et al., 2020; Sedov et al., 2020) and the field of WQED might soon be complemented by waveguide quantum optomechanics. We hope that all these intriguing predictions will soon drive new theoretical concepts, experimental demonstrations and eventually practical applications for quantum technologies.
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Appendix A: Input-output formalism

In this Appendix we briefly discuss the basic equations of input-output theory of quantum optics (Carmichael, 1993) for a single two-level atom coupled to electromagnetic field propagating in one dimension.

1. Input-output formalism for a single atom

Here we provide more details of the derivation of the equations in Sec. III.A.2 in the main text. We start with the general Hamiltonian (Eq. (5) in the main text) that can be presented as

$$H = H_{\text{phot}} + H_{\text{atom}} + H_{\text{atom-phot}}$$

$$H_{\text{phot}} = \sum_k \omega_k a_k^\dagger a_k,$$  \hspace{1cm} (A1)

$$H_{\text{atom}} = \omega_0 \sigma^\dagger \sigma,$$  \hspace{1cm} (A2)

$$H_{\text{atom-phot}} = -\hat{d}E(z = 0)$$

Here, $\hbar = 1$, $\omega_k = c|k|$ is the frequency of the photonic mode with the wave vector $k$, $c$ is the light speed in the waveguide, and $\sum_k \equiv L \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk/(2\pi)$, where $L$ is the normalization length. Operators $a_k^\dagger$ and $\sigma^\dagger$ describe creation of photon in the waveguide and excitation of the atom and $\sigma = (0 \ 1 \ 1 \ 0)$ in the basis of ground and excited states. The light-atom coupling is described in the dipole approximation,

$$\hat{d} = d(\sigma + \sigma^\dagger),$$  \hspace{1cm} (A3)

with $d$ being the matrix element of electric dipole momentum between ground and excited states of the atom (for simplicity, we assume $d$ to be real). The quantized electromagnetic field reads

$$E(z) = \sum_k \sqrt{\frac{2\pi \omega_k}{L S}} e^{i k z - i \omega_k t} a_k + \text{H.c.} \equiv E^+(z) + E^-(z),$$

where $S$ is the normalization area (effective cross-section of the waveguide).

We assume that the frequencies of all the photons important for the atom-photon interaction are close to $\omega_0$. This allows us to split forward- and backward-going waves when integrating over $k$ as

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk f(k) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk f(k + \omega_0/c) + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk f(k - \omega_0/c)$$

$$\approx \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk f(k + \omega_0/c) + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk f(k - \omega_0/c) ,$$

see also Fig. 5 in the main text. We also neglect the counter-rotating terms $\propto a_k \sigma, a_k^\dagger \sigma^\dagger$ and count all the energies from the atomic resonance $\omega_0$. As a result, the Hamiltonian reduces to

$$H_{\text{phot}} + H_{\text{atom-phot}} = \sum_{\nu=\rightarrow,\leftarrow} \sum_k [\omega_k, \nu a_k^\dagger a_k, \nu + \frac{g}{\sqrt{L}} (a_k^\dagger \sigma + a_k \sigma^\dagger)].$$

(A4)

Here $\omega_{k,\rightarrow} = ck$, $\omega_{k,\leftarrow} = -ck$ are the frequencies of forward- and backward-propagating photons, and $g = -\sqrt{2\pi \omega_0 / \hat{S} \hat{d}}$. The Heisenberg equations of motion for the atomic and photon operators read

$$\frac{id a_{k,\nu}}{dt} = \omega_k a_{k,\nu} + \frac{g}{\sqrt{L}} a_{k,\nu},$$

$$\frac{id \sigma}{dt} = \frac{g}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_{\nu=\rightarrow,\leftarrow} \sum_k a_{k,\nu},$$

and can be integrated as

$$a_{k,\nu}(t) = a_{k,\nu}(0) e^{-i \omega_k t} - \frac{i g}{\sqrt{L}} \int_{-\infty}^{t} dt' e^{-i \omega_{k,\nu}(t-t')} \sigma(t').$$

(A5)
Here the first term in the right-hand side corresponds to the incident field and the second term describes atom emission into the waveguide. Substituting Eq. (A11) into Eq. (A10) we find

\[ \frac{d\sigma}{dt} = \frac{g}{\sqrt{\nu}} \sum_{k} \sum_{\nu} a_{k,\nu}(0)e^{-i\omega_{k}t} \]

\[ - \frac{ig^{2}}{\nu} \sum_{k} \int_{t}^{t} dt' e^{-i\omega_{k}\nu(t-t')} \sigma(t'). \]  

(A12)

Calculating the integral as

\[ \frac{1}{\nu} \sum_{k} \int_{t}^{t} dt' e^{-i\omega_{k}\nu(t-t')} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dk}{2\pi} e^{-ik(t-t')} \]

\[ = \frac{1}{e} \int_{t}^{t} dt' \delta(t-t') = \frac{1}{2e} \]  

we obtain an equation for atom driven by external electromagnetic field

\[ \frac{d\sigma}{dt} = \frac{g}{\sqrt{\nu}} \sum_{k} \sum_{\nu} a_{k,\nu}(0)e^{-i\omega_{k}t} - \gamma_{1D}\sigma. \]  

(A14)

where \( \gamma_{1D} = g^{2}/c \equiv \Gamma_{1D}/2 \) is the spontaneous decay rate. The same equation could be obtained from the Hamiltonian (12) with the spontaneous decay described by the Lindblad operator Eq. (14). Using the Fourier transform \( \sum_{k} a_{k,\nu}e^{ikz} = a_{\nu}(z) \) in Eq. (A11) we also recover Eqs. (6) from the main text.

2. Input-output formalism for an ensemble of distant atoms

The input-output theory from Sec. III.A.2 can be also generalized for an ensemble of distant atoms. Again, we assume the structure is illuminated from the left by a coherent monochromatic light with the frequency \( \epsilon \). The general input light can be expanded over coherent states given by (12) with the spontaneous decay described by the Lindblad operator Eq. (14). More details can be found in Refs. (Caneva et al., 2015; Das et al., 2013; Lalumière et al., 2013). In particular, Ref. (Das et al., 2018) has addressed a very general situation of multilevel atoms in a arbitrary dielectric environment. Equation (14) assumes the validity of the Markovian approximation to describe the atom-waveguide coupling. More general approach can be found in Ref. (Fang et al., 2018).

Appendix B: Multilevel atom in the vicinity of a nanofiber

Here, we present explicit expressions for the eigenmode profile of guided and radiation modes in a fiber, used in Eq. (21) and Eq. (22) of the main text, respectively. The consideration is based on Ref. (Domokos et al., 2002).

The propagation constant \( \beta \) for the guided modes is determined by the fiber eigenvalue equation

\[ J_{0}(qa) \frac{J_{1}(qa)}{h_{1}^{2}} = - \frac{\gamma_{0}^{2}}{2n_{0}^{2}} \frac{K_{1}'(qa)}{qaK_{1}(qa)} + \frac{1}{h^{2}a^{2}} \]  

(B1)

\[ - \left\{ \frac{\gamma_{0}^{2} - \gamma_{2}^{2}}{2n_{0}^{2}} \frac{K_{1}'(qa)}{qaK_{1}(qa)} \right\}^{2} + \frac{\beta^{2}}{n_{1}^{2}k^{2}} \left( \frac{1}{q^{2}a^{2}} + \frac{1}{h^{2}a^{2}} \right)^{2} \right)^{1/2} \]

Here, the parameters \( h \) = \( (n_{1}^{2}k^{2} - \beta^{2})^{1/2} \) and \( q = (\beta^{2} - n_{2}^{2}k^{2})^{1/2} \) characterize electric field inside and outside the fiber, respectively. The notations \( J_{0} \) and \( K_{1} \) stand for the Bessel functions of the first kind and the modified Bessel functions of the second kind, respectively. The mode functions \( e^{(p)} \) of the electric parts of the fun-
damental guided modes for $r < a$ given by
\[ e_r^{(\mu)} = iA \frac{q}{h} \frac{K_1(qa)}{J_1(ha)} [(1-s)J_0(hr) - (1+s)J_2(hr)], \]
\[ e_\varphi^{(\mu)} = -pA \frac{q}{h} \frac{K_1(qa)}{J_1(ha)} [(1-s)J_0(hr) + (1+s)J_2(hr)], \]
\[ e_z^{(\mu)} = fA \frac{2q}{\beta} \frac{K_1(qa)}{J_1(ha)} J_1(hr), \]
where $s = n_1$ for $r < a$ and $n_1 = n_2$ for $r > a$. The parameter $s$ is defined as
\[ s = \frac{1}{J_1'(ha)/haJ_1(ha)} \frac{1}{n_1^2} \frac{1}{h^2} \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{(1-s)J_0(ha) + \frac{1}{(1-s)^2} \left[ J_0'(ha) + J_2'(ha) \right]} \right) \left[ J_1'(ha) - J_0(ha)J_2(ha) \right], \]
and the coefficient $A$ is determined from the normalization condition:
\[ N_\mu = \int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi \int_0^\infty n_1^2 |e^{(\mu)}|^2 r dr = 1. \]

From this condition, one can find that $N_\mu = 2\pi A^2 a^2 (n_1^2 P_1 + n_2^2 P_2)$, where
\[ P_1 = \frac{q^2 K_1'(qa)}{h^2 J_1'(ha)} \left( 1-s \right) ^2 \left[ J_0'(ha) + \frac{1}{(1-s)^2} \left( J_0'(ha) + J_2'(ha) \right) \right] \]
\[ + (1+s)^2 \left[ J_0'(ha) - J_1(ha)J_2(ha) \right], \]
and
\[ P_2 = (1-s)^2 \left[ K_0'(qa) - K_0'(qa) \right] + (1+s)^2 \times \right] \left[ K_1'(qa)K_0'(qa) - K_0'(qa) \right] \]
\[ + 2 \frac{q^2}{\beta^2} \left[ K_0'(qa)K_2'(qa) - K_2'(qa) \right]. \]

We now proceed to the radiation modes. The mode function $e^{(\nu)}$ for $r < a$ is given by
\[ e_r^{(\nu)} = i \frac{h}{\hbar} \left[ \beta h A J_m'(hr) + im \frac{4\pi\omega}{c^2} BJ_m(hr) \right], \]
\[ e_\varphi^{(\nu)} = i \frac{h}{\hbar} \left[ im \frac{\beta}{r} A J_m(hr) - h \frac{4\pi\omega}{c^2} BJ_m'(hr) \right], \]
\[ e_z^{(\nu)} = AJ_m(hr), \]
and for $r > a$, by
\[ e_r^{(\nu)} = \frac{i}{\hbar} \sum_{j=1,2} \left[ \beta q C_j H_m^{(j)}(q r) + im \frac{4\pi\omega}{c^2} D_j H_m^{(j)}(q r) \right], \]
\[ e_\varphi^{(\nu)} = \frac{i}{\hbar} \sum_{j=1,2} \left[ im \frac{\beta}{r} C_j H_m^{(j)}(q r) - q \frac{4\pi\omega}{c^2} D_j H_m^{(j)}(q r) \right], \]
\[ e_z^{(\nu)} = \sum C_j H_m^{(j)}(q r) \]
and satisfies to the normalization condition
\[ \int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi \int_0^\infty n_1^2 \left[ e^{(\nu)} e^{(\nu)^*} \right]_{\beta=\beta',m=m',p=p'} r dr = \delta(\omega-\omega'). \]

For the radiation modes, one has $-n_2 k < \beta < n_2 k$. The characteristic parameters for the field in the inside and outside of the fiber are $h = \sqrt{n_2^2 k^2 - \beta^2}$ and $q = \sqrt{n_2^2 k^2 - \beta^2}$, respectively. The coefficients $C_j$ and $D_j$ are related to the coefficients $A$ and $B$ as
\[ C_j = (-1)^j \frac{i \pi q^2 a}{4n_2^2} (AL_j + \frac{4}{c} BV_j), \]
\[ D_j = (-1)^j \frac{i \pi q^2 a}{4} \left( \frac{1}{4\pi} AV_j - BM_j \right), \]
where
\[ V_j = m k B \frac{N_{e,2}^2 - N_{e,1}^2}{4\pi^2} J_m(ha)H_m^{(j)*}(qa), \]
\[ M_j = \frac{1}{h} \frac{1}{J_m'(ha)H_m^{(j)*}(qa) - \frac{1}{q} J_m(ha)H_m^{(j)*}(qa), \]
\[ L_j = n_2^2 h J_m'(ha)H_m^{(j)*}(qa) - \frac{n_2^2}{q} J_m(ha)H_m^{(j)*}(qa). \]

We specify two polarizations by choosing $B = i m A$ and $B = -i m A$ for $p = +$ and $p = -$, respectively. The orthogonality of the modes requires
\[ \int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi \int_0^\infty n_1^2 \left[ e^{(\nu)} e^{(\nu)^*} \right]_{\beta=\beta',m=m',p=p'} r dr = N_\nu \delta_{pp'} \delta(\omega-\omega'). \]

This leads to
\[ \eta = \frac{c}{4\pi} \sqrt{\frac{n_2^2 |V_j|^2 + |L_j|^2}{|V_j|^2 + n_2^2 |M_j|^2}}, \]
and the normalization constant $N_\nu = \frac{8\pi \omega}{q} \left( n_2^2 |C_j|^2 + \frac{16\pi^2}{c^2} |D_j|^2 \right)$. 

Appendix C: Light reflection and transmission from $N$ closely spaced atoms

In this Appendix, we derive amplitude reflection and transmission coefficients Eqs. (34) for a low intensity light, interacting with an array of $N$ closely spaced atoms. The derivation follows the standard input-output
approach of the quantum optics. We start with the Hamiltonian describing interaction of the continuum of the propagating photonic modes with atoms,

\[ H = H_{\text{phot}} + H_{\text{atoms}} + H_{\text{atom-phot}} \]

\[ = \sum_{k} \omega_{k} a_{k}^{\dagger} a_{k} + \omega_{0} \sum_{j=1}^{N} b_{j}^{\dagger} b_{j} + \frac{g}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_{k} \sum_{j=1}^{N} (a_{k}^{\dagger} b_{j} + a_{k} b_{j}^{\dagger}). \]  

(C1)

Here, \( \omega_{k} = c|k| \) is the frequency of the photonic mode with the wave vector \( k \), \( c \) is the light speed in the waveguide and the summation over \( k \) means \( \sum_{k} \equiv L \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk/(2\pi) \), where \( L \) is the normalization length. Operators \( a_{k}^{\dagger} \) and \( b_{j}^{\dagger} \) describe creation of a photon in the waveguide and an excitation of the atom. Parameter \( g \) describes light-atom coupling in the dipole approximation. We also use the rotating wave approximation. Our goal is to consider single-excited states of photons coupled to atoms that can be presented as

\[ |\psi\rangle = \sum_{k} E_{k} a_{k}^{\dagger} |0\rangle + P \sum_{j=1}^{N} b_{j}^{\dagger} |0\rangle, \]

(C2)

Here, we take into account that light excites only the symmetric superradiant Dicke state of the atomic ensemble. The Schrödinger equation \( H \psi = \omega \psi \) for the states Eq. (C2) assumes the form

\[ (\omega_{k} - \omega) E_{k} + \frac{g}{\sqrt{L}} P = (\omega_{k} - \omega) E_{0} \delta_{k,k_{0}} \]  

(C3)

\[ \frac{Ng}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_{k} E_{k} + (\omega_{0} - \omega) P = 0. \]  

(C4)

The right-hand side of Eq. (C3) is chosen to satisfy the boundary conditions for incident light in the system. Namely, in case, when light-atom coupling is absent, the photonic states with different wave vectors are independent from each other. We can write them as \( E_{k} = E_{0} \delta_{k,k_{0}} \) and they have the frequency \( \omega = \omega_{k_{0}} \). Interaction with the atom leads to mixing of states with different wave vectors and appearance of reflected wave. Excluding electric field from Eqs. (C3),(C4), we find

\[ (\omega_{0} + \Sigma - \omega) P = -\frac{Ng}{\sqrt{L}} E_{0}, \]

(C6)

where the self-energy

\[ \Sigma = -\frac{Ng^{2}}{L} \sum_{k} \frac{1}{\omega_{k} - \omega}. \]  

(C7)

describes the modification of the eigenfrequency of the atom due to interaction with the waveguide modes. The summation over \( k \) can be performed analytically in the rotating wave approximation

\[ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dk}{2\pi} \frac{1}{\omega_{k} - \omega} \approx 2 \lim_{\delta \to 0} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dk}{2\pi} \frac{1}{ek - i\delta - \omega} = \frac{i}{c}. \]  

(C8)

Here, we have split the integration into two parts, \( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk = \int_{0}^{\infty} dk + \int_{-\infty}^{0} dk \) and then extended each of two resulting integrals back to the full axis, which results in the prefactor of 2. That, we find

\[ \Sigma = -iN\gamma_{1D} \]

where \( \gamma_{1D} = g^{2}/c \) is the radiative decay rate of a single atom into the waveguide modes. The radiative decay rate is proportional to the number of atoms, being a manifestation of Dicke superradiance. We note, that the real part of the radiative correction \( \Sigma \) vanishes only in case of linear waveguide spectrum and only in the rotating wave approximation, it is nonzero in general case.

In order to calculate the reflection coefficient, we transform the amplitudes \( E_{k} \) to the real space as

\[ E(x) = \sum_{k} E_{k} \, e^{ikx} = E_{0} \, e^{ik_{0}x} - \frac{g}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_{k} E_{0} \frac{e^{ikx}}{\omega_{k} - \omega}, \]

(C9)

and substitute the value of \( P \) from Eq. (C6), which results in

\[ E(x) = E_{0} \, e^{ik_{0}x} + \frac{iN\gamma_{1D} \delta_{|z|/c}}{\omega_{0} - \omega - i(\gamma + N\gamma_{1D})} \, E_{0}. \]  

(C10)

Here, we have calculated the one-dimensional photon Green’s function by performing the summation over \( k \) in the following way:

\[ \frac{1}{L} \sum_{k} e^{i\omega x/c} \approx \lim_{\delta \to 0} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dk}{2\pi} \frac{e^{ikx}}{\omega_{k} - \omega - i\delta - \omega} = \frac{i}{c} \, e^{ix|x|/c}. \]  

(C11)

Clearly, the second term in Eq. (C10) describes the waves, scattered forward and backward from the atoms, that have the same amplitude \( r = iN\gamma_{1D}/[\omega_{0} - \omega - i(\gamma + N\gamma_{1D})] \), which proves Eqs. (4).

The same equations for reflection and transmission coefficients could also be obtained directly in the real space by solving the Helmholtz equation for the electric field with the resonant local polarization term

\[ \left[ \frac{d^{2}}{dx^{2}} + \left( \frac{\omega}{c} \right)^{2} \right] E(x) = \frac{2N\gamma_{1D}}{c} \frac{\delta(x)}{\omega_{0} - \omega - i\gamma} E(x) \]

under the incidence of the wave \( E(x) = E_{0} \, e^{i\omega x/c} \).
Appendix D: Photon pair scattering from a single atom

Here, we solve the problem of a photon pair scattering on a single three-level atom. General diagrammatic Green’s function approach to solve a more general problem for \(N\) atoms is discussed in Appendix H. The goal of the current section is to present a more straightforward technique, that will be discussed in Appendix E. We start from the Hamiltonian

\[
H = H_{\text{phot}} + H_{\text{atom}} + H_{\text{atom–phot}} = \sum_k \omega_k a_k^\dagger a_k + \omega_0 b^\dagger b + \frac{U}{2} b^\dagger b (b^\dagger b - 1) + \frac{g}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_k (a_k^\dagger b + a_k b^\dagger),
\]

where \(U\) is the anharmonicity parameter. The wavefunction is sought in the form

\[
|\psi\rangle = \sum_k \sum_{k'} E_{kk'} \frac{a_k^\dagger a_{k'}^\dagger}{\sqrt{2}} |0\rangle + \sum_k P_k a_k b^\dagger |0\rangle + Q \frac{b^\dagger b}{\sqrt{2}} |0\rangle .
\]

Here, \(|0\rangle\) is a state with zero photons and the atom is in its ground state. The state Eq. (D2) contains all possible combinations of the double excited states, namely the states with two photons, the states with one photon absorbed and atom in the double excited state and the state with double excited atom (compare with Eq. (C2) for single-excited states). We assume that the structure is excited from left by two photons with the energy \(\varepsilon\) and the wave vector \(k = \varepsilon/c\). In this case, the two-photon amplitude is given by

\[
E_{kk'} + \frac{g}{\sqrt{L}} \frac{\omega_k + \omega_{k'} - 2\varepsilon - i0}{\omega_k + \omega_{k'} - 2\varepsilon - i0} (P_k + P_{k'}) = \delta_{k,\varepsilon/c} \delta_{k',\varepsilon/c}. \tag{D3}
\]

The Schrödinger equation for the states where one photon has been absorbed reads

\[
(\omega_k + \omega_0 - 2\varepsilon) P_k + \frac{g}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_{k'} (E_{kk'} + E_{k'k}) + \frac{g}{\sqrt{L}} \sqrt{2Q} = 0,
\]

Exchanging electric field from Eq. (D3) and substituting into Eq. (D5), we find

\[
(\omega_k + \omega_0 - 2\varepsilon) P_k = \frac{g^2}{L} \sum_{k'} \frac{1}{\omega_k + \omega_{k'} - 2\varepsilon - i0} P_{k'} - \frac{g^2}{\sqrt{L}} Q
+ \frac{2g}{\sqrt{L}} \delta_{k,\varepsilon/c} . \tag{D5}
\]

Here, \(-i0\) in denominator means infinitely small imaginary part that has been introduced to regularize the summation over \(k'.\) This summation can be carried out exactly, similarly to Eq. (C8), and results in

\[
(\omega_k + \omega_0 - 2\varepsilon - i\gamma_{1D}) P_k = \frac{g^2}{L} \sum_{k'} \frac{1}{\omega_k + \omega_{k'} - i0 - 2\varepsilon} P_{k'}
- \frac{g}{\sqrt{L}} Q + \frac{2g^2}{L} \delta_{k,\varepsilon/c}. \tag{D6}
\]

The term \(-i\gamma_{1D} P_k\) in the left hand side of Eq. (D6) describes the spontaneous decay of the state “propagating photon-excited atom” into the state with two propagating photons. We now divide both parts of Eq. (D6) by \(\omega_k + \omega_0 - 2\varepsilon\) and sum over \(k\) to find

\[
\sum_k P_k = \frac{2g/\sqrt{L}}{\omega_0 - \varepsilon - i\gamma_{1D}} - i\frac{g}{c} \sqrt{2LQ} . \tag{D7}
\]

where we have again used Eq. (C8). Importantly, the sum stemming from the first term in the right-hand-side of Eq. (D3) is zero,

\[
\sum_k (\omega_k + \omega_0 - 2\varepsilon - i0)(\omega_k + \omega_{k'} - 2\varepsilon - i0) = 0 . \tag{D8}
\]

The Schrödinger equation for the double-excited state is

\[
(2\omega_0 + U - 2\varepsilon) Q + g \frac{2}{L} \sum_k P_k = 0 . \tag{D9}
\]

Combining Eq. (D9) and Eq. (D6), we find the amplitude of the double-excited state

\[
Q = -\frac{2\sqrt{2}g^3/L}{(\omega_0 + U/2 - \varepsilon - i\gamma_{1D})(\omega_0 - \varepsilon - i\gamma_{1D})} . \tag{D10}
\]

We now proceed to solve Eq. (D6) for \(P_k\). This can be done iteratively, by treating the first term in the right-hand side as a perturbation:

\[
P_k = P_k^{(0)} + P_k^{(1)} + \tilde{P}_k^{(1)}, \tag{D11}
\]

where

\[
P_k^{(0)} = \frac{2g}{\sqrt{L}} \frac{\delta_{k,\varepsilon/c}}{\omega_0 - \varepsilon - i\gamma_{1D}} , \tag{D12}
\]

\[
\tilde{P}_k^{(1)} = \frac{g^2}{L} \sum_{k'} \frac{1}{\omega_k + \omega_{k'} - 2\varepsilon} P_k^{(0)} = \frac{g^3}{L^{3/2}}
\times \frac{1}{(\omega_k + \omega_0 - 2\varepsilon - i\gamma_{1D})(\omega_k - \varepsilon - i0)(\omega_0 - \varepsilon - i\gamma_{1D})} , \tag{D13}
\]

and

\[
\tilde{P}_k^{(1)} = -g \frac{\omega_k - \varepsilon}{\omega_0 + U/2 - \varepsilon - i\gamma_{1D}} . \tag{D14}
\]
The key observation is that the solution Eq. (D11) is actually exact and all the higher order terms are zero. Mathematically, the reason of the cancellation is the same as for the sum Eq. (D8).

We are now in position to find the amplitude of incoherent two-photon scattering process. To this end, we substitute the solution Eq. (D11) into Eq. (D3). The terms \( P_k^{(0)} \) describe the incoherent scattering. The amplitude of the scattering matrix for the incoherent scattering process is given by

\[
S(\omega_k, \omega_k, \epsilon, \epsilon) = 2\pi i \delta(\omega_k + \omega_k - 2\epsilon) M(\omega_k, \omega_k, \epsilon, \epsilon)
\]  
(D15)

where

\[
M(\omega_k, \omega_k, \epsilon, \epsilon) = \frac{L^2}{c^2} \sqrt{\frac{g}{\gamma_{1D}}} (P_k^{(1)} + \bar{P}_k^{(1)} + \bar{P}_k^{(1)})
\]  
(D16)

with \( \omega_k + \omega_k = 2\epsilon \). Performing the summation of four terms in Eq. (D16), we obtain

\[
M(\omega_k, \omega_k, \epsilon, \epsilon) = -\frac{4U}{\gamma_{1D}} \frac{s(\omega_k)s(\epsilon)s(\omega_k)}{2\omega_0 + 2\epsilon - 2i\gamma_{1D}}
\]  
(D17)

where \( s(\omega) = \gamma_{1D}/(\omega_0 - \omega - i\gamma_{1D}) \). This expression exactly matches general result Eq. (41) for \( N = 1 \) atom.

The derivation above becomes especially simple for a two-level atom, where \( U \to \infty \) so that \( Q = 0 \) and the terms \( P_k^{(1)} \) can be neglected. It also explains how the incoherent scattering vanishes for a harmonic atom, \( U = 0 \). In this case, the terms \( P_k^{(1)} + \bar{P}_k^{(1)} \) and \( \bar{P}_k^{(1)} + \bar{P}_k^{(1)} \), resulting from the single-excited and double-excited states, cancel each other exactly.

**Appendix E: Photon pair scattering: the Bethe ansatz**

In this section, we consider the Dicke problem of photons interacting with an array of \( N \) identical two-level atoms. The derivation mostly follows the Bethe ansatz approach from (Rupasov and Yudson, 1984; Yudson and Reineker, 2008) and (Shen and Fan, 2007b).

We start by rewriting the problem Hamiltonian Eq. (D1) in the real space

\[
H = \sum_{\nu = \rightarrow, \leftarrow} \left[ -ic \int dxa_\nu(x) \partial_x a_\nu(x) + g[a_\nu(0)b + a_\nu(0)b^\dagger] \right].
\]  
(E1)

Here, we assume the two-level atoms with the excitations characterized by the destruction operators \( b_j \), \( b = \sum_{j=1}^N b_j \) and \( b^\dagger b + b b^\dagger = 1 \), and \( a_\nu \), are the creation operators for right- (\( \nu = \rightarrow \)) and left- (\( \nu = \leftarrow \)) going photons; \( a_\nu(0)b + a_\nu(0)b^\dagger \). We assume the rotating wave approximation measuring the energies from the atomic resonance \( \omega_0 \) and also set the normalization length \( L \) to unity in this section.

Due to the mirror reflection symmetry \( x \to -x \) the problem described by the Hamiltonian Eq. (E1) can be solved separately in even- and odd- scattering channels. Namely, if the new operators \( a_\nu \) and \( a_\nu^\dagger \)

\[
a(x) = \frac{a_\rightarrow(x) + a_\leftarrow(-x)}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad a_0(x) = \frac{a_\rightarrow(x) - a_\leftarrow(-x)}{\sqrt{2}}
\]  
(E2)

are introduced, the Hamiltonian Eq. (E1) is separated as \( H = H_{\text{even}} + H_{\text{odd}} \), where

\[
H_{\text{even}} = -ic \int dx a^\dagger(x) \partial_x a(x) + \tilde{g}[a^\dagger(0)b + a(0)b^\dagger]
\]  
(E3)

with \( \tilde{g} = \sqrt{2g} \). In the odd scattering channel, the photons do not interact with atoms at all, \( H_{\text{odd}} = -ic \int dx a_0^\dagger(x) \partial_x a_0(x) \), and the problem is trivial. We will now focus on the scattering problem in the even channel.

Single-excited eigenstates of Eq. (E1) can be written as a superposition of the states with one photon and the states with zero photons and atoms excited to a symmetric Dicke state:

\[
|k\rangle = \int dx E(x)a^\dagger(x)|0\rangle + P b^\dagger|0\rangle.
\]  
(E4)

The Schrödinger equation reads

\[
-ic\partial_x E + \tilde{g}\delta(x) P = \varepsilon E,
\]  
(E5)

\[
N\tilde{g} E(0) = \varepsilon P
\]

and has eigenstates with the energy \( \varepsilon = ck \) and

\[
E_k(x) = \theta(-x)e^{ikx} + \theta(x)t_{k_{\text{even}}}^e e^{ikx},
\]  
(E6)

where \( t_{k_{\text{even}}}^e = (ck - iN\gamma_{1D})/(ck + iN\gamma_{1D}) \) is the transmission coefficient in the even channel and \( \gamma_{1D} = \tilde{g}^2/(2c) = g^2/c \) is the radiative decay rate. This derivation is equivalent to the one made in Sec. C in the real space. Reflection and transmission coefficients in Eq. (4) can be found as \( r = (1 - t_{k_{\text{even}}})/2, t = (1 + t_{k_{\text{even}}})/2 \) taking into account that \( \varepsilon = \omega - \omega_0 \). The eigenstate (E4) can be also written in a compact way as

\[
|k\rangle = \int dx a^\dagger(x)f^\dagger(x)|0\rangle, \quad f^\dagger(x) \equiv E(x)a^\dagger(x) + Ps(x)s^\dagger.
\]  
(E7)
We now proceed to the double-excited states having the energy \(2\varepsilon\) and described by the ansatz

\[
\int \int dzdy E(x,y) a^\dagger(x) a(y)|0\rangle + \int dx P(x) a^\dagger(x) b^\dagger|0\rangle,
\]

equivalent to Eq. (D2). Instead of Eqs. (E5), we obtain

\[
-i(\partial_x + \partial_y) E + \frac{\tilde{g}}{2} d(x) P(y) + \delta(y) P(x) = 2\varepsilon E,
\]

(E9)

\[
-i\partial_x P(x) + N\tilde{g}[E(x,0) + E(0,x)] = 2\varepsilon P.
\]

(E10)

Here, we assume the bosonic symmetry \(E(x,y) = E(y,x)\) and also define the electric field at the singular lines \(x = 0\) or \(y = 0\) as

\[
\frac{E(x,0^+)}{E(x,0^-)} = \lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{E(x,-\delta)}{2} + \frac{E(x,\delta)}{2}.
\]

The essence of the Bethe ansatz approach is the representation of the amplitude \(E(x,y)\) as a sum of free-space plane wave solutions outside the singular lines where \(x = 0\) or \(y = 0\),

\[
E(x,y) = \begin{cases} 
A e^{ikx+ipy} + B e^{iky+ipx}, & \text{region I,} \\
At e^{ikx+ipy} + Bt e^{iky+ipx}, & \text{region II,} \\
At e^{ikx+ipy} + Bt e^{iky+ipx}, & \text{region III.}
\end{cases}
\]

(E11)

where the regions I,II,III are indicated in Fig. 40. The states Eq. (E9) have the energy \(2\varepsilon = c(k+p)\). The amplitude \(P(x)\) can be found as

\[
P(x) = \frac{2}{N\tilde{g}} \begin{cases} 
E(x,0^+) - E(x,0^-), & x < 0, \\
E(0^+,x) - E(0^-,x), & x > 0.
\end{cases}
\]

(E12)

and using the continuity condition \(P(0^+) = P(0^-)\), we obtain the relationship between the amplitudes \(A\) and \(B\):

\[
\frac{A}{B} = \frac{-i\tilde{g}^2 + ck - cp}{i\tilde{g}^2 - ck + cp}.
\]

(E13)

Taking into account that \(E(x,y) = E(y,x)\), we rewrite the amplitude in the region where \(x, y < 0\), as

\[
E(x,y) = \theta(x-y)[A e^{ikx+ipy} + B e^{iky+ipx}] \\
+ \theta(y-x)[A e^{iky+ipy} + B e^{ikx+ipx}]
\]

\[
= \frac{A + 1}{2} e^{ikx+ipy} \left( 1 + \text{sign}(x-y) \frac{A-B}{A+B} \right) + (k \leftrightarrow p).
\]

(E14)

Since \((A-B)/(A+B) = i\tilde{g}^2/(ck - cp)\), the eigenstate (E8) can be presented in the following form:

\[
|k,p\rangle = C \int dzdy \left( 1 + \frac{i\tilde{g}^2/c}{k-p} \text{sign}(x-y) \right) \times r^*_k(x) r^*_p(y)|0\rangle,
\]

(E15)

where \(C(k,p)\) is the normalization factor. Such the factorization of (E15) in products of single-excited eigenstates \(r^*_k(x) r^*_p(y)|0\rangle\) is the central result of this section and means that the problem is solvable by the Bethe ansatz. In the Bethe ansatz formalism, the wavevectors \(k\) and \(p\) are termed as rapidities (Tsvelick and Wiegmann, 1983). For two-photon states with real-valued energies \(2\varepsilon = c(k+p)\), the rapidities can be either both real or can correspond to complex conjugated pairs \(k = p^*\) that are termed as "strings", see Fig. 41. Of special interest are the "strings"

\[
k = \frac{\varepsilon + i\gamma_{1D}}{c}, \quad p = \frac{\varepsilon - i\gamma_{1D}}{c},
\]

(E16)

that correspond to the bound two-photon states. Specifically, if \(k\) and \(p\) are given by Eq. (E16), we find from Eq. (E13) that \(B = 0\) and the two-photon state (E11) is then simplified to

\[
E(x,y) = e^{i\varepsilon(x+y)c} e^{-N|x-y|/\gamma_{1D}/c} \times \begin{cases} 
1, & x, y < 0, \\
t_k t_p, & x, y > 0.
\end{cases}
\]

(E17)

The wavefunction amplitude for the bound state decays exponentially with increase of the distance between the two photons \(|x-y|\).

It has been proved in Ref. (Rupasov and Yudson, 1984) that the Bethe ansatz holds for an arbitrary number of excitations \(M = 1, 2, 3, \ldots\), i.e. the quantum Dicke problem is integrable. The eigenstate characterized by the so-called rapidities \(k_1 \ldots k_M\) has the form

\[
|k\rangle = C \int dM x \prod_{m<n} \left( 1 + \frac{i\tilde{g}^2/\text{sign}(x_m - x_n)}{c(k_m - k_n)} \right) \times \prod_{n=1}^M r_{k_n}(x_n)|0\rangle
\]

(E18)

with the energy \(\varepsilon = \sum_{m=1}^M k_m\).
In order to solve a scattering problem, when M photons are incident at the atoms from the left, $x \to -\infty$, one more step is required. Namely, the incident photons wavefunction has to be expanded over the Bethe eigenstates. This can be done in two ways. One is the "brute-force" approach, when the input eigenstate is presented as a superposition of the states Eq. (E15) with real rapidities $k$ and $p$ and a bound state Eq. (E17). It has been proved in Ref. (Shen and Fan, 2007b) that this set is complete and allows one to find the full scattering matrix of the problem. In order to perform such expansion, the eigenstates Eq. (E15), Eq. (E17) have to be properly normalized.

There exists an alternative approach that avoids the subtle discussion of the normalization of Bethe eigenstates and completeness of the scattering matrix and provides the scattered eigenstate directly (Yudson, 1985). Its particular application to the two-photon scattering problem is discussed in detail in (Yudson and Reiniker, 2008). The two-photon part of the wavefunction is expressed as

$$E(x_1, x_2, t) = \int \frac{dk_1}{c_1} \int \frac{dk_2}{c_2} \left( 1 - \frac{2i(g^2/c)\theta(x_2 - x_1)}{k_1 - k_2 + ig^2} \right) \times e^{ik_1(x_1 - x_1^{(0)} - t)}e^{ik_2(x_2 - x_2^{(0)} - ct)}E_{k_1}(x_1)E_{k_2}(x_2),$$

(E19)

where the integration over the rapidities $k_1$ and $k_2$ is performed along the contours $C_1$ and $C_2$ in the complex plane shown in Fig. 42. Here, $x_2^{(0)} < x_1^{(0)} < 0$ are the coordinates of two incident photons at $t = 0$ when the wavefunction is $a_1^+(x_1^{(0)})a_2^+(x_2^{(0)})|0\rangle$. The advantage of the approach Eq. (E19) is that it can be generalized for an arbitrary number of incident photons. To this end, the integration contours should satisfy the relation (Yudson and Reiniker, 2008)

$$\operatorname{Im} k_{n+1} - \operatorname{Im} k_n > \frac{2\gamma_{1D}}{c}, \quad \operatorname{Im} k_1 > -\frac{N\gamma_{1D}}{c}. \quad (E20)$$

Performing the integration in Eq. (E19), we obtain

$$E(x_1, x_2, t) = \Phi(x_1, x_1^{(0)} + ct)\Phi(x_2, x_2^{(0)} + ct) + \Phi_c(x_1, x_2, x_1^{(0)} + ct, x_2^{(0)} + ct).$$

(E21)

Here,

$$\Phi(x, x^{(0)} + ct) = \delta(x - x^{(0)} - ct)$$

$$- 2\gamma_{1D}M\theta(0 < x < x^{(0)} + ct)e^{\gamma_{1D}x^{(0)} - ct}$$

(E22)

is the solution of the scattering problem for input state $a_1^+(x^{(0)})|0\rangle$ with one photon at $t = 0$. Hence, the first term in Eq. (E21) describes the independent scattering of two photons on the arrays of atoms. The second term describes the interaction between the photons and reads

$$\Phi_c(x_1, x_2, x_1^{(0)} + ct, x_2^{(0)} + ct) =$$

$$\frac{2Ng^4}{c^2}\theta(0 < x_1 < x_2 < x_2^{(0)} + ct < x_1^{(0)} + ct)$$

$$\times e^{N\gamma_{1D}(x_1 + x_2 - x_1^{(0)} - x_2^{(0)} - 2ct)}$$

$$\times [N - (N - 1)e^{2\gamma_{1D}(x_2^{(0)} + ct - x_2)}].$$

(E23)

Here, the notation $\theta(0 < x_1 < x_2 < \ldots)$ means the product of the corresponding Heaviside step-functions that is unity if $0 < x_1 < x_2$ and zero otherwise. The second term in square brackets in Eq. (E21) describes the contribution of photon scattering by an atomic system already excited to the Dicke state $b_1^+(0)$. This term is absent for the single-atom case when $N = 1$.

The scattering of two photons with certain incident energies $ck_1, ck_2$ ($ck_1 + ck_2 = 2c$) can be considered by performing the Fourier transform of Eq. (E23). We write the input state as

$$|\text{in}\rangle = \int\int dx_1^{(0)}dx_2^{(0)}\theta(x_2^{(0)} < x_1^{(0)})a_1^+(x_1^{(0)})a_2^+(x_2^{(0)})|0\rangle$$

$$+ (k_1 \leftrightarrow k_2).$$

The scattered state is obtained by separating the odd and even scattering channels and applying Eq. (E23) in the even channel (see Fig. 39 and Eq. (E2)). The scattered state for $x_2, x_1 > 0$ (transmission channel) can be presented as

$$|\text{out}\rangle = |\text{in}\rangle = \int\int dx_1 dx_2 t(x_1, x_2)a_1^+(x_1^{(0)})a_2^+(x_2^{(0)})|0\rangle,$$

(E24)
where

\[
 t(x_1, x_2) = t(x_2, x_1) = \frac{i}{2} [e^{i k_1 x_1 + i k_2 x_2} + (k_1 \leftrightarrow k_2)] t_N(c k_1) t_N(c k_2) \\
+ \frac{7}{8} \int_{x_2}^{\infty} dx_2 \int_{x_2}^{\infty} dx_2^0 \Phi_c(x_1, x_2, x_1^0, x_2^0) \tag{E25}
\]

is the transmission coefficient through \( N \) atoms (equivalent to Eqs. (4)). The first part of Eq. (E25) describes independent transmission of two photons and the second part results from their interaction with each other. The prefactor \( 1/8 \) comes from the conversion from the symmetric to the chiral problem and back (\( \times 1/2^2 \)) and also from the symmetrization of the transmission amplitude with respect to the permutations of \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \). Performing the integration we obtain (Yudson and Reineke, 2008)

\[
 t(x_1, x_2) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ e^{i k_1 x_1 + i k_2 x_2} + (k_1 \leftrightarrow k_2) \right] t_N(c k_1) t_N(c k_2) \\
+ e^{i r(x_1 + x_2)} \frac{N \gamma_{1D}^2 e^{i \omega t} |x_1 - x_2|}{c + i(N - 1) \gamma_{1D}^2 (c k_1 + i N \gamma_{1D})(c k_2 + i N \gamma_{1D})}.
\]

Finally, the transmitted state the momentum representation is found as

\[
 |\text{out} \rangle = \int dp_1 dp_2 S(p_1, p_2 \leftarrow k_1, k_2) a_{p_1}^\dagger a_{p_2}^{\dagger} |0 \rangle
\]

where

\[
 S(p_1, p_2 \leftarrow k_1, k_2) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \delta(p_1 - k_1) \delta(p_2 - k_2) \\
+ (k_1 \leftrightarrow k_2) \right] t_N(c k_1) t_N(c k_2) \\
+ \frac{ic}{\pi \gamma_{1D}^2} \delta(p_1 + p_2 - k_1 - k_2) \\
\times \frac{N(\varepsilon - \omega_0)(\varepsilon - \omega_0 + i N \gamma_{1D})}{\varepsilon - \omega_0 + i(N - 1) \gamma_{1D}}.
\]

and \( s_k = \gamma_{1D}/[\omega_k - \omega_0 + i N \gamma_{1D}] \). Here, we have restored the atomic resonance frequency \( \omega_0 \) to underline the resonant character of the scattering.

**Appendix F: Functional integral approach**

Here, we show show how the photonic degree of freedom can be integrated out to obtain the effective non-Hermitian Hamiltonian for the atomic system (Shi and Sun, 2009; Xu and Fan, 2015). We start from the full Lagrangian of the system \( L = L_{\text{atoms}} + L_{\text{phot}} + L_{\text{atom–phot}} \), where

\[
 L_{\text{phot}} = \sum_k \left( a_k \frac{d a_k}{dt} - \omega_k a_k^{\dagger} a_k \right), \tag{F1}
\]

\[
 L_{\text{atom–phot}} = -\frac{g}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_{k} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left( a_k b_j e^{i k z_j} + a_k^\dagger b_j e^{-i k z_j} \right) .
\]

and \( L_{\text{atoms}} = \sum_j (b_j^{\dagger} d b_j/dt) - H_{\text{atoms}} \) is the Lagrangian of the atoms that depends on \( b_j \) and \( b_j^{\dagger} \) only. The Green’s functions of the atomic subsystem can be described by the generating functional, that is readily given by the functional integral

\[
 Z[\zeta^*_1(t), ..., \zeta^*_N(t); \zeta_1(t), ..., \zeta_N(t)] \tag{F2}
\]

\[
 = \int e^{i \int [L + \sum_j (\zeta^*_j t_j + \zeta_j b_j^\dagger)]} \prod_j D[b_j] D[b_j^\dagger] \prod_k D[a_k] D[a_k^\dagger].
\]

In particular, the single-excitation Green’s function is given by functional derivative

\[
 G_{ji}(t, t') = -\frac{\delta^2 \ln Z}{\delta \zeta_{ji}(t) \delta \zeta_{ji}(t')}, \tag{F3}
\]

We now perform integration over \( D[a_k] \) and \( D[a_k^\dagger] \) in Eq. (F2). To this end, we separate the part that depends on the photonic operators, and switch from temporal representation to the frequency domain, i.e., from \( a_k(t) \) and \( a_k^\dagger(t) \) to their Fourier transforms \( a_k(\omega) \) and \( a_k^\dagger(\omega) \):

\[
 \int (L_{\text{phot}} + L_{\text{atom–phot}}) dt = \sum_k \int \left\{ (\omega - \omega_k) a_k^\dagger(\omega) a_k(\omega) \\
- g \sum_j \left[ a_k(\omega) b_j^\dagger(\omega) e^{i k z_j} + a_k^\dagger(\omega) b_j(\omega) e^{-i k z_j} \right] \right\} dw.
\]

The above expression is quadratic in \( a_k(\omega) \) and \( a_k^\dagger(\omega) \). Therefore, the corresponding functional integral is Gaussian and can be easily evaluated,

\[
 \int e^{i \int [L_{\text{phot}} + L_{\text{atom–phot}}] dt} \prod_k D[a_k] D[a_k^\dagger] = C e^{i S}, \tag{F4}
\]

where \( C \) is a constant and

\[
 \delta S = -\int dw \sum_k \frac{g^2}{\omega - \omega_k + 10} \sum_{j, l} b_j^\dagger b_l e^{i k (z_j - z_l)} . \tag{F5}
\]

Calculating the sum over \( k \) separately for \( k > 0 \) and \( k < 0 \), we obtain

\[
 \delta S = i \gamma_{1D} \int dw \sum_{j, l} b_j^\dagger(\omega) b_l(\omega) e^{i |z_j - z_l|/c} , \tag{F6}
\]

where \( \gamma_{1D} = g^2/c \equiv \Gamma_{1D}/2 \).
Coming back to the generating functional Eq. (F2), we can now present it in the following form:

$$ Z = \int e^{i\int L_{\text{atoms}}^{\text{eff}} dt + \sum_j \langle \zeta_j b_j + \zeta_j b_j^\dagger \rangle} \prod_j D[b_j] D[b_j^\dagger], $$

where \( \int L_{\text{atoms}}^{\text{eff}} dt = \int L_{\text{atoms}} dt + \delta S \) is the effective action of the atomic system that accounts for photon-mediated interatomic interactions. Equivalently, we can introduce the effective Hamiltonian, \( \int L_{\text{atoms}}^{\text{eff}} = \sum_j b_j^\dagger (db_j/dt) - H_{\text{atoms}}^{\text{eff}}(t) \), where

$$ H_{\text{atoms}}^{\text{eff}}(t) = H_{\text{atoms}}(t) - i\gamma_{1D} \sum_{j,l} b_j^\dagger(t) b_l(t - |z_j - z_l|/c) $$

and \( H_{\text{atoms}}(t) = \omega_0 \sum_j b_j^\dagger(t) b_j(t) \). Note, that the two key features of the effective atomic Hamiltonian: it is non-Hermitian and non-Markovian. In the case of excitation by monochromatic light at frequency \( \omega \), we use \( b_j(t - \tau) = b_j e^{-i\omega \tau} \). Then, the effective Hamiltonian assumes the form

$$ H_{\text{atoms}}^{\text{eff}} = \sum_{j,l} H_{jl}(\omega) b_j^\dagger b_l, $$

where matrix

$$ H_{jl}(\omega) = \omega_0 \delta_{lj} + i\gamma_{1D} e^{i\omega |z_j - z_l|/c} $$

coincides with Eq. (53).

**Appendix G: Photon pair scattering: the Green’s function solution in an electron representation**

Here, we show how the two-photon scattering matrix for a single two-level atom (qubit) can be calculated using the Green function technique. First, we introduce the bare (disregarding the light-qubit interaction) Green function of the qubit in its ground and excited states,

$$ G_g(x) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon - \varepsilon_g(x) + i0}, $$

where \( \varepsilon_g(x) \) is energy of the qubit’s ground (excited) state, \( \varepsilon_g - \varepsilon_g = \omega_0 \). The Green function of the waveguide photon with the wave vector \( k \) reads

$$ D_k(\omega) = \frac{1}{\omega - \omega_k + i0} $$

where \( \omega_k = c|k| \) is the photon dispersion.

The interaction with light does not affect the ground state of the qubit, since it cannot emit a photon, while the excited state gets dressed. The dressing occurs due to the processes when the qubit in the excited state emits a photon and then reabsorbs it, as depicted in Fig. 43(a). There, the solid lines denote the Green’s functions of the qubit in its ground or excited state, and wavy lines stand for the photons Green’s function. The vertex represents the process of photons absorption or emission by the atom and correspond to the amplitude \( g_k/\sqrt{L} \), where \( g_k \) is the interaction constant and \( L \) is the normalization length. The excited state self-energy reads, corresponding to diagram in Fig. 43(a), reads

$$ \Sigma(\varepsilon) = -i \sum_k \int \frac{d\varepsilon'}{2\pi} \frac{(ig_k)^2}{\sqrt{L}} G_g(\varepsilon') D_k(\varepsilon - \varepsilon') = \Sigma' + i\Sigma'', $$

where

$$ \Sigma' = \text{V.p.} \int \frac{dk}{2\pi} \frac{g_k^2}{\varepsilon - \varepsilon_g - \omega_k + i0}, $$

$$ \Sigma'' = -\int \frac{dk}{2\pi} \frac{g_k^2}{\varepsilon - \varepsilon_g - \omega_k} \delta(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_g - \omega_k) = -\frac{g_k^2}{\varepsilon - \omega_k} \approx -\gamma_{1D}. $$

The real part \( \Sigma' \) describes the radiative correction to the energy of the excited state (the Lamb shift), while the imaginary part \( \Sigma'' \) corresponds to the lifetime of the excited state, as calculated previously. Note, that if we ignore dependence of \( g_k \) on \( k \) and linearize the photon dispersion near \( k_0 = \omega_0/c, \omega_k \approx \omega_{k_0} + v(k - k_0) \), the \( \Sigma' \) vanishes while \( \Sigma'' \) is constant.

The dressed Green’s function of the excited state is
readily expressed via the self-energy $\Sigma$,

$$G_2(x) = \frac{1}{G^{-1}_2(x) - \Sigma(x)} = \frac{1}{x - \varepsilon_0 + i\gamma_{1D}}. \quad (G7)$$

The single-photon reflection coefficient is given by the diagram in Fig. 43(b), where bold line denotes dressed Green’s function of the excited state, which yields

$$r(\omega_k) = -i\gamma_{1D}G_2(\varepsilon_g + \omega_k) = -\frac{i\gamma_{1D}}{\omega_k - \omega_0 + i\gamma_{1D}}. \quad (G8)$$

A diagram describing simultaneous reflection of two photons is shown in Fig. 43(c). The scattering occurs in the 4-th order in interaction constant. The higher-order contributions are easily taken into account by using the dressed Green’s function of the atom in the excited state (bold solid line). The scattering matrix element corresponding to the diagram reads

$$S_1 = -\frac{g^4}{L^2}G_2(\varepsilon_g + \omega_{k_1})G_2(\varepsilon_g + \omega_{k_1} - \omega_{k_2})iG_2(\varepsilon_g + \omega_{k_2}) \times 2\pi\delta(\omega_{k_1} + \omega_{k_2} - \omega_{k_1} - \omega_{k_2})
\times -\frac{ig^4}{L^2} \frac{1}{\omega_{k_1} - \omega_0 + i\gamma_{1D} + i\gamma_{1D}} \frac{1}{\omega_{k_2} - \omega_0 + i\gamma_{1D}} \times 2\pi\delta(\omega_{k_1} + \omega_{k_2} - \omega_{k_1} - \omega_{k_2}), \quad (G9)$$

where we suppose that $g_k$ is $k$-independent, $g_k = g$. Using the Soochoki formula we decompose the result in two terms,

$$S_1 = S_1^{(coh)} + S_1^{(incoh)} \quad (G10)$$

$$S_1^{(coh)} = -\frac{g^4}{L^2} \frac{1}{\omega_{k_1} - \omega_0 + i\gamma_{1D} + i\gamma_{1D}} \frac{1}{\omega_{k_2} - \omega_0 + i\gamma_{1D}} \frac{1}{\omega_{k_1} - \omega_0 + i\gamma_{1D} + i\gamma_{1D}} \frac{1}{\omega_{k_2} - \omega_0 + i\gamma_{1D}} \times 2\pi\delta(\omega_{k_1} - \omega_{k_1}) \times 2\pi\delta(\omega_{k_1} + \omega_{k_2})$$

$$= \frac{1}{\pi\delta(\omega_{k_1} - \omega_{k_1})} \delta(\omega_{k_1} + \omega_{k_2}) \delta(|k_1|,|k_1|) \delta(|k_1|,|k_1|) \quad (G11)$$

$$S_1^{(incoh)} = -\frac{ig^4}{L^2} \frac{1}{\omega_{k_1} - \omega_0 + i\gamma_{1D} + i\gamma_{1D}} \frac{1}{\omega_{k_2} - \omega_0 + i\gamma_{1D}} \frac{1}{\omega_{k_1} - \omega_0 + i\gamma_{1D} + i\gamma_{1D}} \frac{1}{\omega_{k_2} - \omega_0 + i\gamma_{1D}} \times 2\pi\delta(\omega_{k_1} + \omega_{k_2} - \omega_{k_1} - \omega_{k_2}). \quad (G12)$$

$S_1^{(coh)}$ describes the process where photons are reflected independently, each of them conserving its frequency. The amplitude of such process is given by the product of the single-photon transmission coefficients $r(\omega)$ for the two photons. In contrast, $S_1^{(incoh)}$ describes the process, where the photons interact and the energy is redistributed between them.

Apart from the contribution $S_1$, the scattering matrix features three more,

$$S = S_1 + S_2 + S_3 + S_4 \quad (G13)$$

that are obtained by permutations: $S_2$ by $k_1 \leftrightarrow k_2$, $S_3$ by $k_1 \leftrightarrow k'_2$, and $S_4$ by both $k_1 \leftrightarrow k_2$ and $k'_1 \leftrightarrow k'_2$. The calculation yields for the coherent term

$$S^{(coh)} = r(\omega_{k_1})r(\omega_{k_2}) \left[ \delta(|k_1|,|k'_1|) \delta(|k_2|,|k'_2|) + \delta(|k_1|,|k_2|) \delta(|k'_1|,|k'_2|) \right]. \quad (G14)$$

For the incoherent term, after somewhat cumbersome algebra we obtain

$$S^{(incoh)} = \frac{2ig^4}{L^2} \frac{\omega_{k_1} + \omega_{k_2} - 2\omega_0 + 2i\gamma_{1D}}{(\omega_{k_1} - \omega_0 + i\gamma_{1D})(\omega_{k_2} - \omega_0 + i\gamma_{1D})} \times \frac{2\pi\delta(w_1 + w_2 - w'_{1} - w'_{2})}{(\omega_{k'_1} - \omega_0 + i\gamma_{1D})(\omega_{k'_2} - \omega_0 + i\gamma_{1D})}. \quad (G15)$$

The above results for two-photon scattering matrix for a single atom coincide with those obtained by other methods. However, the above approach does not allow the direct generalization to the case of many atoms (Kocabas, 2016).

Appendix H: Photon pair scattering: the Green’s function solution in an exciton representation

Here, we describe the Green’s function technique for calculation of scattering matrix of an atomic array that is based on excitonic representation of the atomic Hamiltonian Eq. (36). We start from the bare Green’s functions of the atomic excitations and waveguide photons,

$$G(\omega) = \frac{1}{\omega - \omega_0 + i0}, \quad (H1)$$

$$D_k(\omega) = \frac{1}{\omega - \omega_k + i0}. \quad (H2)$$

Similarly to the approach of Appendix G, we start by dressing the atomic excitations by photons. The dressed exciton Green’s function $G_{ij}(\omega)$ can be calculated from the Dyson-like equation depicted in Fig. 44(a), that yields

$$G_{ij}(\omega) = G_{ij}(\omega)
+ \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l,m} g^2 \sum G_{il}(\omega) e^{i\omega_{l}} D_k(\omega) e^{-ik_{m}} G_{mj}(\omega). \quad (H3)$$

Summation over $k$ can be easily performed assuming linear dispersion $\omega_k = c|k|$ and constant $g_k = g$.

$$\frac{1}{L} \sum_{k} \frac{g^2 e^{i\omega_{l}}}{\omega - \omega_k + i0} = -i \frac{g^2}{c} e^{i\omega_{l}} \delta(\omega_{l}) \quad (H4)$$

Then, Eq. (H3) assumes the form

$$(\omega - \omega_0)G_{ij}(\omega) + i\gamma_{1D} \sum_{m} e^{i\omega_{l}} |z_{i} - z_{m}| G_{mj}(\omega) = \delta_{ij}, \quad (H5)$$

where $\gamma_{1D} = g^2/c$. In other words, the exciton Green’s function can be found by inverting the matrix as

$$[G^{-1}(\omega)]_{ij} = (\omega - \omega_0)\delta_{ij} + i\gamma_{1D} e^{i\omega_{l}} |z_{i} - z_{j}| \quad (H6)$$
A similar calculation gives the transmission coefficient

\[ t = 1 - i\gamma_{1D} \sum_{ij} G_{ij} e^{i(\omega/c)(z_j - z_i)}. \]  

where we replace the \( 2\pi\delta(0) \) with \( T = L/c \). The result can be simplified by the use of relations, which follow from Eq. (H5),

\[ s^+_i(\omega) \equiv \sum_j G_{ij} e^{i(\omega/c)z_j} \]  

\[ s^-_i(\omega) \equiv \sum_j G_{ij} e^{-i(\omega/c)z_j} \]  

where \( i_{\text{max(min)}} \) are the indices of the atoms with the maximal (minimal) \( z \)-coordinate value \( z_{\text{max(min)}} \). We then obtain

\[ r = \frac{e^{2i(\omega/c)a_{\text{min}}}}{i\gamma_{1D}} \left[ (\omega - \omega_0 - i\gamma_{1D}) - (\omega - \omega_0)^2 G_{i_{\text{max}},i_{\text{min}}} \right]. \]  

A similar calculation gives the transmission coefficient

\[ t = 1 - i\gamma_{1D} \sum_{ij} G_{ij} e^{i(\omega/c)(z_j - z_i)} \]  

For exciton-exciton interaction with amplitude \( U \), the scattering matrix element is given by the geometric series [Poshakinskiy and Poddubny, 2016]

\[ S_{\text{coh}}^{\text{coh}}(\omega'_1, \omega'_2; \omega_1, \omega_2) \]

\[ = \frac{2g^4}{L^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^N s_i^- (\omega'_1) s_i^+ (\omega'_2) \left[ -iU\delta_{ij} + U^2 \Sigma_{ij} + \ldots \right] 
   \times s_j^- (\omega_1) s_j^+ (\omega_2) 2\pi\delta(\omega_1 + \omega_2 - \omega'_1 - \omega'_2) 
   = 2\pi M \left( \frac{e}{L} \right)^2 \delta(\omega_1 + \omega_2 - \omega'_1 - \omega'_2), \]

where \( s_i^\pm(\omega) \) is defined by Eqs (H8),(H9),

\[ M = -2i\left( \frac{g^4}{c^2} \right) \sum_{i,j=1}^N s_i^- (\omega'_1) s_i^- (\omega'_2) Q_{ij} s_j^+ (\omega_1) s_j^+ (\omega_2) \]  

is the two-exciton self-energy, and the matrix \( Q \) is given by \( Q = -iU(1 - iU\Sigma)^{-1} \), and the matrix \( \Sigma \) has the elements

\[ \Sigma_{ij}(\varepsilon) = \int G_{ij}(\omega) G_{ij}(2\varepsilon - \omega) d\omega \]  

with \( \varepsilon = (\omega_1 + \omega_2)/2 \). In the case of two-level atom, \( \Sigma = \infty \), we get \( Q = \Sigma^{-1} \).

It is instructive to compare the resonances of the scattering matrix \( \Sigma \) with the eigenstates of the two-photon Schrödinger equation. To this end, we substitute the double excited states in the form \( \sum_{mm',nn'} \psi_{mm'} b_{mm'}^\dagger b_{nn'}^\dagger |0\rangle \) into the Hamiltonian Eq. (84) and obtain (Ke et al., 2019)

\[ \sum_{m',n'} (\mathcal{H} + U)_{mm',nn'} \psi_{mm'} \psi_{nn'} = 2\varepsilon \psi_{mn} \]  

with

\[ \mathcal{H}_{mm',nn'} = \delta_{mm'} \mathcal{H}_{nn'} + \delta_{nn'} \mathcal{H}_{mm'} \]

and

\[ U_{mm',nn'} = \delta_{mm} \delta_{mm'} \delta_{nn'} \mathcal{U}. \]

We now note that the integral in Eq. (H13) can be presented as

\[ \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} G_{ij}(\omega) G_{kl}(2\varepsilon - \omega) \]

\[ = \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \left[ \frac{1}{H - \omega} \right]_{ij} \left[ \frac{1}{H + \omega - 2\varepsilon} \right]_{kl} = \left[ \frac{i}{H \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes H - 2\varepsilon} \right]_{ik,jl}. \]

Hence,

\[ \Sigma_{mn} = \frac{i}{H - 2\varepsilon}_{mm,nm}, \]

\[ Q_{mn} = iU \left[ \frac{2\varepsilon - H}{H + U - 2\varepsilon} \right]_{mm,nm}. \]
So the two-photon scattering matrix indeed has resonances when the sum of the energies of two incident photons $2\varepsilon$ matches the energy of the double-excited state Eq. (H14).

Appendix I: Photon pair scattering from a chiral atomic array

Here we generalize the technique from Appendix H to the case of photon pair scattering from a chiral array of two-level atoms. The problem is still described by the Hamiltonians (35)–(37), but the summation is carried out only over the right-going photon states, where $k > 0$. The effective Hamiltonian describing light-mediated interaction between single-excited atomic states is

$$H_{nm} = \begin{cases} 
\varepsilon_n - i(\gamma^- + \gamma), & n = m \\
-2i\gamma^-, & n > m \\
0, & n < m,
\end{cases} \quad (I1)$$

where $\gamma^- = g^2/(2c)$ is the radiative decay rate of a single atom and $\Gamma$ is the nonradiative decay rate. This Hamiltonian is very similar to the Hamiltonian (53) for a non-chiral waveguide, but now the atoms with $n < m$ are not coupled to each other by light.

The Green’s function for single-excited states is given by

$$G_{nm} = \frac{1}{\omega_n - \omega}, \quad (I2)$$

($\omega_n = \omega_n - i\gamma^- - i\gamma$) and

$$G_{nm} = G_{11} + 2i\gamma^- \sum_{m'=0}^{n-1} G_{nm'}, \quad G_{nm} = 0 \text{ for } m > n. \quad (I3)$$

Using (H13), we now find the two-photon scattering kernel

$$\Sigma_{nm}(\varepsilon) = \int G_{nm}(\omega)G_{nm}(2\varepsilon - \omega)\frac{d\omega}{2\pi} = \frac{i\gamma^- \delta_{nm}}{\omega_0 - \varepsilon}. \quad (I4)$$

The scattering matrix is given by (H12) and reads

$$M(\omega, 2\varepsilon - \omega \leftrightarrow \varepsilon, \varepsilon) = \frac{4g^2}{c} \frac{1}{(\varepsilon - \omega_0)(\omega - \omega_0)} \frac{t_{2\varepsilon}^N t_{\omega}^N t_{2\varepsilon - \omega}}{t_{\omega}^N t_{2\varepsilon - \omega}} - 1, \quad (I5)$$

where

$$t_{\omega} = \frac{\omega_n - \omega + i\gamma^- - i\gamma}{\omega_n - \omega - i\gamma^- - i\gamma}. \quad (I6)$$

is the single-photon transmission coefficient of 1 atom. The photon-photon correlation function is found from Eq. (44) and is determined by the residue of $N$-th order at $\omega = \tilde{\omega}_0$ that can be calculated as

$$g_N^{(2)}(0) = \left(1 + \frac{d^{N-1}}{dx^{N-1}}\mathcal{M}|_{x=0}\right)^2 \quad (I7)$$

with

$$\mathcal{M} = \frac{(1 + 2\gamma^-)\left(\frac{1}{\gamma^+} - \frac{1}{\gamma^- + \Gamma}\right)}{\frac{1}{2} - \left(\frac{1}{\gamma^-} + \frac{\gamma}{\gamma^+}\right)^2 + \frac{\gamma}{\gamma^+} - x^2}. \quad (I8)$$

For relatively small values of $N \lesssim 100$, the residue can be readily calculated by expanding the products in Eq. (I8) in the binomial series (Mahmoodian et al., 2018). For large values of $\gamma/\gamma^-$, it is possible to use a simple asymptotic expression Eq. (98) that is valid for arbitrarily large $N$. In order to derive this expression, we rewrite the residue in Eq. (I7) back as a contour integral

$$\frac{d^{N-1}}{dx^{N-1}}\mathcal{M}|_{x=0} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{x=R} \mathcal{M} dx. \quad (I9)$$

For $\Gamma \gg \gamma^-$, the value of the integral is mostly determined by a simple pole at $x = x^*$, where

$$x^* = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma^-} + 1 - \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\gamma^2}{\gamma^-}} \quad (I10)$$

is a zero of the denominator which results in Eq. (98).

Appendix J: Lattice sum for a planar atomic array

Here, we discuss in more detail evaluation of the interaction constant for an infinite square lattice atomic array with the distance $a$, given by definition by Eq. (109), namely

$$C = 4\pi(\omega/c)^2 \sum_{r \neq 0} G_{xx}(r) \equiv \sum_{r \neq 0} \left(\frac{\omega^2}{c^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}\right) \frac{e^{i\omega r/c}}{r}. \quad (J1)$$

The commonly used approach to evaluate the lattice sum is the Ewald summation that is based on splitting the sum in two parts. The first part, corresponding to smaller values of $r$ in the near field zone, is evaluated in the real space, and the second part, corresponding to the far field zone $r \gtrsim c/\omega$ is Fourier transformed into the reciprocal space using the identity

$$G_0(r) = \frac{e^{i\omega r/c}}{r} = \sum_b \frac{2\pi i}{k_0 a^2 e^{i k_0 |z| + i|b|}}. \quad (J2)$$

where $r = (r, z)$ and the reciprocal lattice vectors $b$ form a square lattice with the spacing $2\pi/a$, $k_0 = \sqrt{(\omega/c)^2 - b^2}$. More details on the Ewald summation can
be found e.g. in Ref. (Kambe, 1967). Another very efficient summation technique, that is in our experience even more efficient is the Floquet summation technique developed in (Belov and Simovski, 2005). Specifically, the sum is given by Eq. (A37) of Ref. (Belov and Simovski, 2005) that has to be complex conjugated and also multiplied by $4\pi$ to take into account the time dependence convention $e^{i\omega t}$ and a different definition of the Green’s function used in Ref. (Belov and Simovski, 2005).

We now briefly discuss how to obtain the approximate expression (113) for the lattice constant. The first term $2\pi \omega / (ca^2)$ is given by the term with $b = 0$ in Eq. (J2) multiplied by $q^2$. It describes the radiative decay due to the emission of the waves propagating normally to the array, where $b = 0$, or, in another words, results from far-field radiative coupling between the atoms. The last term $S/2$ is given by the near field and can be obtained by setting $\omega$ in Eq. (J1) to zero:

$$S = \sum_{r \neq 0} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \frac{1}{r} = \sum_{r \neq 0} \frac{3\pi^2 - r^2}{r^5} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{r \neq 0} \frac{1}{r} \approx 9.03 \frac{2a^2}{2} . \tag{J3}$$

The sum for the square lattice converges rapidly enough and can be calculated directly. The term $S'/\omega / c$ results from the field in Eq. (J1) in the intermediate zone between the far field and the near field reads as

$$S'/\omega / c = \sum_{r \neq 0} \frac{1 - (x/r)^2}{r} e^{i b r + i \omega r / c} . \tag{J4}$$

The term $1 - (x/r)^2$ for the square lattice can be replaced by $1/2$, and we can write it as

$$S' = \lim_{z \to 0} \lim_{\omega \to 0} \left( \text{Re} \sum_{r} \frac{e^{i \omega \sqrt{r^2 + z^2} / c}}{\sqrt{r^2 + z^2} - |z|} \right) . \tag{J5}$$

Taking the Fourier transformation of the first term with the help of Eq. (J2) we find

$$S' = \lim_{z \to 0} \lim_{\omega \to 0} \left( \frac{2\pi i}{a} \sum_{b} \frac{e^{i \sqrt{\omega^2 / c^2 - b^2} |z|}}{\sqrt{\omega^2 / c^2 - b^2} - \frac{e^{i \omega |z| / c}}{|z|}} \right) = \lim_{z \to 0} \left( \frac{2\pi i}{a} \sum_{b} \frac{e^{-b |z| / b}}{b} - \frac{1}{|z|} \right) . \tag{J6}$$

Let us first check the cancellation of the singular diverging terms $\propto 1/z$ in (J6). To do this, we can replace the summation by integration:

$$2\pi \sum_{b} \frac{e^{-b z / b}}{b} \approx \int_{0}^{\infty} b db \frac{e^{-b |z| / b}}{b} = \frac{1}{|z|} . \tag{J7}$$

Thus, the terms $1/z$ cancel each other and Eq. (J6) has a finite limit of the order $1/a$. Numerical calculation for a square lattice yields to

$$S' = \lim_{z \to 0} \left( \frac{2\pi}{a} \sum_{b} \frac{e^{-b |z| / b}}{b} - \frac{1}{|z|} \right) = \frac{3.90}{a} . \tag{J8}$$
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