Subwavelength atomic arrays, recently labeled as quantum metamaterials, have emerged as an exciting platform for obtaining novel quantum optical phenomena. The strong interference effects in these systems generate subradiant excitations that propagate through the atomic array with very long lifetimes. Here, we demonstrate that one can harness these excitations to obtain tunable directional emission patterns and collective dissipative couplings when placing judiciously additional atoms nearby the atomic array. For doing that, we first characterize the optimal array geometry to obtain directional emission patterns. Then, we characterize the best atomic positions to couple efficiently to the subradiant metasurface excitations, and provide several improvement strategies based on entangled atomic clusters or bilayers. Afterwards, we also show how the directionality of the emission pattern can be controlled through the relative dipole orientation between the auxiliary atoms and the one of the array. Finally, we benchmark how these directional emission patterns translate into collective, anisotropic dissipative couplings between the auxiliary atoms by studying the lifetime modification of atomic entangled states.

Since the seminal work by Dicke [1], the modification of atomic radiation by the presence of other atoms have been a very active of area in quantum optics. Even if atoms do not interact directly, the exchange of photons via their optical transitions leads to interactions among them [2, 3] and, consequently, to strong collective effects when atoms are close enough. The first paradigmatic example of this was provided by Dicke [1], who showed that an atomic ensemble confined within a volume smaller than their optical wavelength ($\lambda_0$) emit photons with a collective enhancement of its decay rate [4]. With the advent of optical lattices [5, 6], the focus expanded to atomic arrays. Few pioneering works considered first the modification of the photonic energy dispersion for arrays with inter-atomic distances $d \sim \lambda_0$ [7–14]. However, the interest in the field recently exploded by studying the properties of (deeply) subwavelength arrays, that is, when $d < (\ll)\lambda_0$ [15–38]. For such distances, interference leads to collective atomic responses very different from their individual one, like in metamaterials [39], and which can be harnessed to improve photon-storage fidelities [17] and quantum registers [29], to generate multiphoton states [34], or to obtain chiral [30] or magnetic [35] light-matter interfaces. These prospects have placed such quantum metamaterials [34] at the spotlight, triggering several experimental realization [40, 41].

One of the most remarkable features of these systems is that they host subradiant excitations which propagate confined within them [17–28] with very long lifetimes. These subradiant excitations display non-trivial energy dispersions, like the photons propagating in photonic crystals [42], which can be tuned modifying the array configuration. This is why recent works [36–38] have pointed out these quantum metamaterials as a platform for exploring the physics of atoms coupled to photonic-crystals [43]. Compared to nanophotonics, these systems: i) do not require the complicated trapping schemes to place atoms nearby dielectrics [44–49]; ii) the energy dispersions of the guided modes can be modified by optical means and do not rely on nanofabrication; iii) differently from the guided modes in photonic crystals, these subradiant modes interact [36], which can be used to induce gates among them. So far, these initial works [36–38] have mostly considered the emergence of band-gap mediated, coherent interactions, however, the possibilities are much richer [50–62]. Thus, a timely question is whether some of these non-trivial phenomena can be exported to these platforms, and also whether they provide new opportunities to tune them.

One of these exciting possibilities is the generation of anisotropic dissipative couplings between emitters when energetically tuned to Van-Hove singularities [58–62]. Despite of its incoherent nature, such directional couplings lead to the formation of bound-states in the continuum [59, 60, 63, 64], which can be instrumental to design quantum gates [65, 66]. These initial works [58–60] were based on simplified models, which neglected the coupling to free-space and polarization effects. Here, we propose a realistic quantum metasurface where these phenomena can be observed and controlled. For example, we demonstrate how the directionality can be modified through the relative orientation of the impurity-array atomic dipoles. Besides, we show how the emission into the subradiant modes can be increased using entangled clusters or bilayer metasurfaces. We characterize these phenomena first with a single emitter, studying its emission, and then with many, characterizing the lifetime modification of entangled states, i.e., the signature of super/subradiance [1].

The setup we consider along this manuscript is depicted in Fig. 1(a): several auxiliary atoms are placed near a square atomic array with inter-atomic distance $d$. For simplicity, we consider atomic systems with a single optical transition ($\epsilon - g$) of frequency $\omega_{a/0} = k_{a/0}c = 2\pi c/\lambda_{a/0}$ and polarization $\varphi_{a/0}$ for the impu-
functions \( S^0_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum \sigma^j_{\alpha \beta} e^{i k x r_j} \), where \( k = (k_x, k_y) \in [-\pi/d, \pi/d]^2 \), and their (complex) eigen-energies read:

\[
\omega_k - i \frac{\gamma_k}{2} = \omega_0 - \sum \frac{3 \Gamma_0}{k_0} \hat{\Phi}_0^* \cdot \hat{G}_0(k) \cdot \hat{\Phi}_0 \, .
\] (3)

where \( \hat{G}_0(k) = \sum e^{-i k x r_j} \hat{G}_0(r_j) \) is the discrete Fourier transform of the free-space tensor. In Fig. 1(b) we plot the energy dispersion, \( \omega_k \) and their associated imaginary part \( \gamma_k \) (in color scale) along a path of the Brillouin zone and for an array with \( d/\lambda_0 = 0.3 \) \([67]\). As expected for such distances, interference effects lead to the sub(super)-radiant character \( (\gamma_k < \langle \gamma \rangle) \) of the eigenstates outside (within) the light cone. Its energy dispersion \( \omega_k \) features a saddle-point at the X-point, which leads to a Van-Hove singularity in the density of states at its energy, see Fig. 1(c). This singularity also appears in the nearest-neighbour model, and it is where the anisotropic emission and collective interactions for resonant emitters were predicted \([58-60]\). In that case, however, the saddle-point is accompanied by straight iso-frequencies, \( \pm k_x \pm (\mp) k_y = \pm \pi/d \text{, important for the emission directionality.} \) The long-range nature of the photon-mediated interactions in free space \([17]\) modify this behaviour. This is shown explicitly in Fig. 1(d-f), where we plot \( \omega_k \) and the corresponding isofrequency line at the X-point for several \( d/\lambda_0 \). By doing a systematic analysis \([67]\), we find that \( d/\lambda_0 \approx 0.3 \) leads to an optimal performance for in-plane polarized modes because it maximizes the iso-frequency straightness, the density of states at that energy, and, as we see next, its tunability.

Let us now consider the effect of placing an impurity atom near the array at position \( r_0 \). The dynamics of the combined system is described by the Hamiltonian:

\[ H = H_a + H_{am} + H_m, \]

where \( H_a \), \( H_{am} \) and \( H_m \) have the same form as Eq. (1), but replacing \( \omega_0, \Gamma_0 \rightarrow \omega_0, \Gamma_a \), and where the impurity-metasurface couplings \( J_{0j}, J_{ij} \) are given by Eq. (2) changing \( \mathbf{r}_j \rightarrow \mathbf{r}_0 \) and \( \Gamma_0 \rightarrow \sqrt{\Gamma_0 \Gamma_a} \) \([68]\). To characterize how well the impurity atoms couple to the guided modes of the metasurface, we calculate the meta-surface Purcell factor \( (P) \), that is, the ratio between the decay rate into subradiant modes \( (\Gamma_m) \) compared to free-space modes \( (\Gamma') \). We do it using two complementary approaches. First, the semi-analytical approach developed in Ref. \([17]\):

\[ P_a = \frac{g_a^2}{2 \pi} \text{Im} \left( \int \int |k| > k_0 d^2 k \hat{E}_{\mathbf{k}}^* \mathbf{\alpha}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}_0) \otimes \mathbf{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}_0) \mathbf{\alpha}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}_0) \right) \]

where \( \mathbf{\alpha}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}_0), \mathbf{\beta}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}_0) \) are the field eigen-modes evaluated at the impurity atom position \( \mathbf{r}_0 \) \([67]\). This expression is obtained under the Born-Markov approximation which neglects retardation within the array, and assumes \( \Gamma_m \) is much smaller than the band-width of \( \omega_k \). To avoid relying in this assumption, and get a better picture of real experiments, we alternatively calculate \( P \) by solving exactly the dynamics assuming an initially excited impurity

**FIG. 1.** (a) Impurity atoms (red) are placed near a square atomic array (gray) with lattice constant \( d \). Each array/impurity atom has a single optical transition of wavelength \( \lambda_{0/a} \) and a free space decay rate of \( \Gamma_{0/a} \). (b) Band structure for an array with in-plane polarization \( \hat{\Phi} = \hat{e}_y \) and \( d/\lambda_0 = 0.3 \). Color scale represents the collective decay rate, and the gray shadow region denotes the light cone. (c) Density of state in arbitrary units for the band structure shown in (b). (d)-(f) Color maps of the array band-structure with (a) Color scale represents the collective decay rate, and strength of the \( a \)-array atoms placed at positions \( \mathbf{r}_a \). Its dynamics can be described within an stochas-
atom, i.e., $\sigma_{eg}^a|\text{vac}\rangle$. Since $H$ is excitation preserving, the system wavefunction at any time reads:

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = \left( C_a(t)\sigma_{eg}^a + \sum_{j=1}^{N} C_{r_j}(t)\sigma_{eg}^{j} \right) |\text{vac}\rangle .$$

(5)

From this wavefunction one can obtain a numerical estimation of the Purcell factor [67], that we label as $P_n$, which takes into account non-Markovian effects. Besides, plotting $|C_{r_j}(t)\rangle$, one obtains the spatial emission pattern, that will be directly related to how the impurity atoms interact among them.

In Fig. 2(a-b), we plot the dependence of the Purcell factor on the vertical distance $z$ for emitters placed above an atom or at the center of the unit cell, respectively, as well as its emission pattern (in the inset). We compare both the semi-analytical $P_a$ (solid lines) and the numerical approach $P_n$ (dashed lines) and for two different distances, i.e., $d/\lambda_0 = 0.1$ and 0.3 in red and blue, respectively. Closer interatomic distances of the impurity atom to the metasurface lead to larger Purcell factors, although at expense of losing the cross-directional emission, as expected from Figs. 1(d-f). Besides, it is also at these small $z$ regions where we see the larger deviations between the semi-analytical and numerical Purcell factors. These differences can be attributed to strong deviations from the Markovian behaviour [67], where $P_n$ is not expected to work, and can be attenuated by reducing $\Gamma_a$, e.g., with a Raman transition. Apart from this deviation, another important difference of placing the impurity atom exactly above a metasurface atom [(a)] or at the center of the unit cell [(b)] is the tunability of the cross-directional emission shown in the inset of both panels. In particular, we can show that changing the relative orientation of the impurity/array dipoles $\theta = \arccos (\hat{\mathbf{p}}_a \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}}_r)$ cancels the emission along one of the direction in the former case, but not in the later. To characterize qualitatively this tunability, we define a directional parameter $\chi_{1D}$ [67], such that $\chi_{1D} = 1$ when the emission is purely one-dimensional, while $\chi_{1D} \approx 0$ when it becomes isotropic or emits in two orthogonal directions. In Figs. 2(c-d) we plot $\chi_{1D}(\theta)$ for the impurity positions of panels (a-b), respectively, showing that $\chi_{1D}(\theta) \approx 1$ for certain $\theta$, with impurities at the center of the unit cell, whereas $\chi_{1D}(\theta) \approx 0$ at all $\theta$ for the other case.

In Fig. 2, we see how for the most tunable situation ($d/\lambda_0 = 0.3$), the Purcell factor is limited to $P \approx 1$. Now, we explore two possible strategies to boost $P$ while still preserving the possibility of tuning the directional emission patterns. The first strategy consists in placing pairs of emitters separated a distance $d_p$ and prepared in a given entangled state, e.g., $|\Psi_c\rangle = (|\psi_1 \psi_2\rangle + |\psi_2 \psi_1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. This can be done, e.g., using dynamical optical tweezers and local spin exchange [69] or Rydberg interactions [70]. The intuition is that the interference between the atomic emission within the cluster can lead to a cancellation of free-space emission, and ultimately boost $P$. This occurs for the antisymmetric case, obtaining $P \sim 10$, but at the price of losing the tunability of the directional emission [67]. Since for this manuscript, we are interested in keeping the tunability, in Fig. 3(c) we compare the numerically obtained $P_c$ for the symmetric cluster with the individual one $P_b$ for a dipole in the center of a plaquette at $z = 0$ as a function of the cluster distance $d_c$. Like this, one can get a moderate improvement $P_c \approx 1.5$ for $d_c \approx 0.45d$, but keeping the directional emission. Besides, we observe an effective rotation of the emission as $d_c$ increases, which shows that $d_c$ can be used as tuning knob by itself. The other strategy consists changing the metasurface structure by a bilayer one with separation $d_b$, see scheme in Fig. 3(b). This structure also features straight iso-frequencies [67], where one can energetically tune the impurity atom to obtain directional emission patterns. In Fig. 3(d), we numerically obtain $P_b$ for the bilayer system and show how it can reach $P_b/P_b \approx 7$ for either small $d_b$ distances, keeping the 1D tunability, or for $d_b \approx 0.7$ but losing the 1D character of the emission.
After having characterized the single impurity coupling, let us consider how the directional emission patterns translate into collective dissipative interactions when more impurity atoms couple to the metasurface. One typical signature of these dissipative couplings is the lifetime renormalization of entangled atomic states [1]. This means that if an individual system decays with a rate $\Gamma_{\text{ind}}$, an entangled pair features a collective enhancement (decrease) of such decay rate $\Gamma_{\text{coll}} > (\prec)\Gamma_{\text{ind}}$ depending on whether it is a super(sub)-radiant configuration. In Fig. 4 we extract this collective enhancement $\Gamma_{\text{coll}}$ as a function of the distance between impurities, $d_e/d$, through a numerical fitting of the dynamics for the three different configurations explored in Figs. 2-3, namely, i) for a pair of impurity atoms near the single-layer array (blue dots); ii) for a pair of entangled atomic clusters near the single-layer array (green dots); iii) for a pair of impurity atoms within a shifted bilayer array (orange dots). We also plot in black solid line a comparison to the case with no metasurface. In Fig. 4(a), we plot $\Gamma_{\text{coll}}$ normalized to the impurity atom free-space individual decay rate $\Gamma_a$. There we observe how indeed all strategies provide an improvement of collective effects compared to the case with no metasurface. To better compare the intrinsic collective dynamics induced in the different systems, in Fig. 4(b) we plot the same configurations but normalizing $\Gamma_{\text{coll}}$ to the individual decay rate $\Gamma_{\text{ind}}$ in each configuration. There, we observe how the bilayer enhances better collective effects at small distances due to its imperfect directionality, see Fig. 3(d), whereas the entangled cluster performs better at larger distances.

Summing up, we show how to obtain strongly directional emission patterns by placing atoms near quantum metasurfaces. We also study several strategies to achieve more efficient couplings between the impurity atoms and the directional subradiant modes of the metasurfaces based on entangled clusters or bilayer systems. Finally, we also show how these directional emission patterns translate into collective dissipative couplings when more impurity atoms couple to the metasurface. This shows the potential of quantum metasurfaces to induce non-trivial collective dissipative effects resulting from the interplay of interference and unconventional band-structures. Our results can be of interest as well for subwavelength exciton arrays in 2D materials [71]. An interesting outlook is to extend this analysis to the case topological band-structure models [25, 56, 57].
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Supplemental Material: Tunable directional emission and collective dissipation with quantum metasurfaces

This Supplementary Material is divided as follows: in SM1 we explain in detail how to calculate the emergent band-structure of the single-layer metasurface, including the results for the in-plane and out-of-plane polarized modes; in Section SM2 we explain how to characterize impurity atom-metasurface coupling following both the semi-analytical approach of Ref. [17], and the numerical strategy that we design for this manuscript; in Section SM3 we provide more details on how to tune the directional emission; in Section SM4 we explain the improvement strategies developed in the main part of the manuscript based on entangled clusters and bilayer structures; finally, in Section SM5 we explain the different configurations used to explore the collective superradiant dynamics of Fig. 4 of the main text.

SM1. BAND-STRUCTURE OF THE SINGLE LAYER CONFIGURATION

In this section, we are interested in characterizing completely the eigen-modes and eigen-energies of the sub-wavelength atomic array of Fig. 1(a) of the main manuscript. This quantum metasurface has a square geometry with primitive vectors $\mathbf{a}_1/2 = d \mathbf{e}_x/y$, being $d$ the inter-atomic distance. The array has a total $N = N_l^2$ number of atoms, where $N_l$ denotes the linear size of the system. Thus, the position of the $j$-th atom, $\mathbf{r}_j$, can be described by two integer indices $n_j = 0, 1, \ldots, N_l$ such that $\mathbf{r}_j = n_1 \mathbf{a}_1 + n_2 \mathbf{a}_2$. For simplicity, we assume a two-level system description of the atoms. This means that the atoms only have a single optical transition between an excited and ground state $|e\rangle \leftrightarrow |g\rangle$; the frequency dependence of the different configurations used to explore the collective superradiant dynamics of Fig. 4 of the main text.

Irrespective of the polarization chosen, the dynamics of the sub-wavelength atomic array is described within a master equation formalism through the following Born-Markov master equation [2, 3]:

$$\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{d \rho}{dt} = i (\rho H_m - H_m \rho) + \sum_{i \neq j} \Gamma_{ij} \sigma^i_{ge} \rho \sigma^j_{eg},$$

where $H_m$ is an effective non-Hermitian Hamiltonian given by

$$H_m/\hbar = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left( \omega_0 - i \Gamma_0/2 \right) \sigma^j_{ee} + \sum_{i \neq j=1}^{N} \left( J_{ij} - i \frac{\Gamma_{ij}}{2} \right) \sigma^i_{eg} \sigma^j_{ge},$$

where $j$ is a index running over the number of atoms of the metasurface, $\Gamma_0 = |\langle \Phi_0 | \omega_0^3 \rangle|/(3\pi \hbar c^3)$ is the individual free-space decay rate, and $\sigma^j_{\alpha\beta} = |\alpha\rangle_j \langle \beta|$ the spin-dipole operator of the $j$-th atom. The coherent ($J_{ij}$) and incoherent ($\Gamma_{ij}$) photon-mediated interactions among emitters are given by the vacuum’s Green Function [2, 3] $G_0(\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j)$:

$$J_{ij} - i \frac{\Gamma_{ij}}{2} = - \frac{3\pi \Gamma_0}{\omega_0} \hat{\mathbf{J}}_i^+ \cdot G_0(\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{J}}_j$$

where:

$$G_0(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{e^{ik_0r}}{4\pi k_0^3 r^3} \left[ \left( k_0^2 r^2 + ik_0r - 1 \right) \mathbf{1}_{3\times3} + \left( -k_0^2 r^2 - 3ik_0r + 3 \right) \frac{\mathbf{r} \otimes \mathbf{r}}{r^2} \right],$$

with $r = |\mathbf{r}|$. Note these expressions of Eqs. (SM2)-(SM4) have already implicit the Born-Markov approximations [2, 3], which assumes that the frequency dependence of $G(\mathbf{r})$ enters directly through the atomic frequency $\omega_0$.

In the thermodynamic limit ($N \rightarrow \infty$) the momentum $\mathbf{k}$ is a good quantum number. This means that the Hamiltonian $H_m$, in the single-excitation subspace, can be diagonalized using the Bloch functions $S^j_\mathbf{k} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_j \sigma^j_{eg} e^{i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}_j}$ as follows:

$$\frac{H_m}{\hbar} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left( \omega_\mathbf{k} - i \frac{\gamma_\mathbf{k}}{2} \right) S^j_\mathbf{k} S^j_\mathbf{k},$$

where $\mathbf{r}_j$ is an effective non-Hermitian Hamiltonian given by

$$H_m/\hbar = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left( \omega_0 - i \Gamma_0/2 \right) \sigma^j_{ee} + \sum_{i \neq j=1}^{N} \left( J_{ij} - i \frac{\Gamma_{ij}}{2} \right) \sigma^i_{eg} \sigma^j_{ge},$$

where $j$ is a index running over the number of atoms of the metasurface, $\Gamma_0 = |\langle \Phi_0 | \omega_0^3 \rangle|/(3\pi \hbar c^3)$ is the individual free-space decay rate, and $\sigma^j_{\alpha\beta} = |\alpha\rangle_j \langle \beta|$ the spin-dipole operator of the $j$-th atom. The coherent ($J_{ij}$) and incoherent ($\Gamma_{ij}$) photon-mediated interactions among emitters are given by the vacuum’s Green Function [2, 3] $G_0(\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j)$:

$$J_{ij} - i \frac{\Gamma_{ij}}{2} = - \frac{3\pi \Gamma_0}{\omega_0} \hat{\mathbf{J}}_i^+ \cdot G_0(\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{J}}_j$$

where:

$$G_0(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{e^{ik_0r}}{4\pi k_0^3 r^3} \left[ \left( k_0^2 r^2 + ik_0r - 1 \right) \mathbf{1}_{3\times3} + \left( -k_0^2 r^2 - 3ik_0r + 3 \right) \frac{\mathbf{r} \otimes \mathbf{r}}{r^2} \right],$$

with $r = |\mathbf{r}|$. Note these expressions of Eqs. (SM2)-(SM4) have already implicit the Born-Markov approximations [2, 3], which assumes that the frequency dependence of $G(\mathbf{r})$ enters directly through the atomic frequency $\omega_0$.

In the thermodynamic limit ($N \rightarrow \infty$) the momentum $\mathbf{k}$ is a good quantum number. This means that the Hamiltonian $H_m$, in the single-excitation subspace, can be diagonalized using the Bloch functions $S^j_\mathbf{k} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_j \sigma^j_{eg} e^{i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}_j}$ as follows:

$$\frac{H_m}{\hbar} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left( \omega_\mathbf{k} - i \frac{\gamma_\mathbf{k}}{2} \right) S^j_\mathbf{k} S^j_\mathbf{k},$$
where \( \mathbf{k} = (k_x, k_y) \) takes values within the first Brillouin zone of the structure, that is \( k_{x,y} \in [-\pi/d, \pi/d] \). Each \( \mathbf{k} \) mode has then associated both a real \((\omega_{\mathbf{k}})\) and imaginary \((\gamma_{\mathbf{k}})\) contribution to their energy given by

\[
\omega_{\mathbf{k}} - i \frac{\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}}{2} = \omega_0 - \frac{3\pi \Gamma_0}{k_0} \mathbf{R}^* \cdot \mathbf{G}_0(\mathbf{k}) \cdot \mathbf{R}_0 ,
\]

where \( \mathbf{G}_0(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_j e^{-i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}_j} \mathbf{G}_0(\mathbf{r}_j) \) is the discrete Fourier transform of the free-space tensor. Note that due to the long-range nature of the photon-mediated interactions of \( \mathbf{G}_0(\mathbf{r}_j) \) (see Eq. (SM4)), the sum in real space is slowly convergent. A method of avoiding that was proposed in Ref. [26] which consists in performing the summations in momentum space. This can be done using Poisson’s identity to write the sum in \( \mathbf{G}_0(\mathbf{r}) \) as a summation over reciprocal lattice vectors:

\[
\sum_{\mathbf{r}_n \neq 0} e^{i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}_n} \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{r}_n) = \frac{1}{A} \sum_\mathbf{g} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{G} - \mathbf{k}) - \mathbf{G}(0),
\]

(SM7)

where \( A \) is the area of the unit cell, and \( \mathbf{g} \) is the Weyl decomposition of the Green tensor, which is given by

\[
g_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{p}) = \int \frac{d\mathbf{p}_s}{2\pi} \frac{k_0^2}{k_0^2} \frac{1}{k_0^2 - p_\alpha p_\beta}.
\]

(SM8)

Note that in Eq. (SM7) we separated the \( \mathbf{r}_n = 0 \) component because it provides an overall energy shift and it is mathematically divergent. Physically, this divergence is smeared out due to two effects: first, the system is finite and thus, one does not actually deal with infinite summation terms; second, the atoms are not point-dipole emitters, but mathematically divergent. Physically, this divergence is smeared out due to two effects: first, the system is finite and second, the atoms are not point-dipole emitters, but mathematically divergent. Physically, this divergence is smeared out due to two effects: first, the system is finite and second, the atoms are not point-dipole emitters, but mathematically divergent. Physically, this divergence is smeared out due to two effects: first, the system is finite and second, the atoms are not point-dipole emitters, but mathematically divergent. Physically, this divergence is smeared out due to two effects: first, the system is finite and second, the atoms are not point-dipole emitters, but mathematically divergent.

For example, in Ref. [26], they obtained expressions for the renormalized Green tensor taking into account finite atomic size \( a_{\text{ho}} \). This results into a convergent Green tensor at the origin:

\[
\mathbf{G}^0(0) = \frac{k_0}{6\pi} \left[ \text{erfi}(k_0 a_{\text{ho}} \sqrt{2}) - i \text{erf}(k_0 a_{\text{ho}} \sqrt{2}/2) \right] \mathbf{I}_{3 \times 3},
\]

(SM9)

where \( \text{erfi}(z) \) is the imaginary error function. On top of that, they also obtained the renormalization of the rest of the components of the Green tensor:

\[
\begin{align*}
g^*_x(\mathbf{p}_{x,y}) &= \left(k_0^2 - p_x^2\right)\mathcal{I}_0, \quad g^*_y(\mathbf{p}_{x,y}) = \left(k_0^2 - p_y^2\right)\mathcal{I}_0, \quad g^*_z(\mathbf{p}_{x,y}) = \left(k_0^2\mathcal{I}_0 - \mathcal{I}_2\right), \quad (SM10a) \\
g^*_{xy}(\mathbf{p}_{x,y}) &= g^*_{yx}(\mathbf{p}_{x,y}) = -p_x p_y \mathcal{I}_0, \quad (SM10b) \\
g^*_{zz}(\mathbf{p}_{x,y}) &= g^*_{xz}(\mathbf{p}_{x,y}) = g^*_{yz}(\mathbf{p}_{x,y}) = g^*_{zy}(\mathbf{p}_{x,y}) = 0, \quad (SM10c)
\end{align*}
\]

where we have defined the following expressions

\[
\mathcal{I}_0(\mathbf{p}_{x,y}) = \mathcal{C} e^{-a_{\text{ho}}^2 \Lambda^2/2} \left[-i + \text{erfi} \left( \frac{a_{\text{ho}} \Lambda}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \right], \quad (SM11)
\]

\[
\mathcal{I}_2(\mathbf{p}_{x,y}) = \Lambda^2 \mathcal{I}_0 - \mathcal{C} \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{a_{\text{ho}}}, \quad (SM12)
\]

\[
\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{p}_{x,y}) = \frac{1}{2\pi k_0^2} e^{-a_{\text{ho}}^2 p^2/2}, \quad (SM13)
\]

\[
\Lambda(\mathbf{p}_{x,y}) = \sqrt{k_0^2 - p^2} \geq 0. \quad (SM14)
\]

An alternative approach consists in directly diagonalizing the Hamiltonian \( H_m \) of Eq. (SM2) for a finite system. In that case, \( \mathbf{k} \) is not strictly a good quantum number, however, the eigenstates that are formally written as:

\[
|\Psi_\alpha\rangle = \sum_j C_{j,\alpha} |\mathbf{r}_j\rangle ,
\]

(SM15)

can be associated to a given \( \mathbf{k} \)-momentum of the Brillouin zone. To do it, one can perform the discrete Fourier transform of \( C_{j,\alpha} \), i.e., \( C_{\alpha}(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_j C_{j,\alpha} e^{i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}_j} \), and see the \( \mathbf{k} \) that has the larger weight. In this section, and in Fig. 1 of the main text, we use this approach to estimate the \( \mathbf{G}(0) \) that needs to be included for a given finite size, and then renormalize with a small \( a_{\text{ho}} \) to get \( \omega_{\mathbf{k}}, \gamma_{\mathbf{k}} \) is a more efficient way.
FIG. SM1. (a-d) Contour plot of $\omega_k$ for (a) tight-binding model, and square atomic arrays with in-plane polarization (b) $d/\lambda_0 = 0.22$, (c) $d/\lambda_0 = 0.31$ and (d) $d/\lambda_0 = 0.39$. The dashed lines are the iso-frequencies of the X-modes, i.e., $\omega_{k=\pm X}$. (e) Parameter $\Delta$ characterizing the proximity to the tight-binding model (see Eq. (SM16)). The vertical dashed lines denotes the distances for which we plotted the band-structure in panels (b-d). (f) Position of the Van-Hove singularity (solid black line) and density of states at the X-mode energy (red circles) as a function of $d/\lambda_0$. The gray shadow region denotes the superradiant band. (g) Band structure for an in-plane polarized atomic dipole array with interatomic distance of $d/\lambda_0 = 0.3$. The colors represent the collective free space decay rate, $\gamma_k$, and the gray shadow region denotes the light cone.

A. Results for in-plane polarized modes

In the main text we choose $d/\lambda_0 = 0.3$ as the optimal inter-atomic distance to obtain the directional behaviour for the in-plane polarized modes. The justify this choice we include here in Fig. SM1 a systematic study of the metasurface band-structure $\omega_k$ for several distances. There, we first plot in Fig. SM1(a), to have it as a reference, the contour plot of the energy dispersion for the nearest-neighbour tight-binding model, i.e., $\omega_k/J = -2\cos(k_x d) + \cos(k_y d)$, highlighting in dashed white the iso-frequency at the X-mode energy responsible of the directional emission [58–60]. In Figs. SM1(b-d) we plot the emergent band-structure of the metasurface for several distances, where we observe how the straightness of the isofrequencies varies with the parameter $d/\lambda_0$. To characterize the straightness, we define a parameter that quantifies the difference of the isofrequencies with respect to the tight-binding model ones as follows:

$$\Delta = \int_0^{\pi/d} dk_x \left[\left(-k_x + \pi/d\right) - \tilde{k}_y(k_x)\right]^2,$$

(SM16)

where $\tilde{k}_y(k_x)$ is the iso-frequency contour line obtained by solving $\omega(k_x, \tilde{k}_y) = \omega_{k=\pm X}$. In Fig. SM1(e) we can see that there is a lattice constant $d/\lambda_0 \sim 0.31$ that minimize the distance to the tight-binding iso-frequencies, which remarkably, is similar to the one where the highest value of the density of states is, see Fig. SM1(f).

B. Results for other polarizations: out-of-plane and circularly polarized transitions

For completeness, we also include here a similar study to the one performed in Fig. SM1, but for the out-of-plane modes. This is what we show in Fig. SM2(a-d), where we show the emergent band structure, $\omega_k$, of a subwavelength atomic array with $\hat{\phi}_0 = \hat{e}_z$ for several distances $d/\lambda_0$. As in the case in-plane polarized situation, $\omega_k$ displays saddle points at the X-point and a straightening of their corresponding isofrequencies. This is more evident when studying the difference of these isofrequencies with respect to the nearest-neighbour model defined by the parameter $\Delta$ (see Eq. (SM16)), as shown in Fig. SM2(e). There, we observe how the optimal distance is $d/\lambda_0 \approx 0.2$ (see Fig. SM2(g) for a line cut of $\omega_k$), also corresponds to a peak in the density of states, see Fig. SM2(f). At larger $d/\lambda_0$ the model displays even a larger value of the density of states, however, this is also partly because other modes become resonant which will spoil directional emission, see Figs. SM2(b-d). Although this larger density of states leads to larger impurity coupling factors (as we will see in the next section), we decided to keep the discussion in the main text for the in-plane polarized modes since they have a less demanding optimal distance ($d/\lambda_0 \approx 0.3$) and a more tunable directionality.

Finally, in Fig. SM3 we include the same analysis for the case where the optical transition is circularly polarized: $\hat{\phi}_0 = (\hat{e}_z + i\hat{e}_y)/\sqrt{2}$. From the analysis of the band-structures and the $\Delta$-parameter, see Figs. SM3(a-f), the isofrequencies become straighter, the smaller $d/\lambda_0$, i.e., there seems not to be an optimal one. However, for large $d/\lambda_0$, the superradiant modes become resonant with the subradiant X-modes which can be detrimental for applications.
FIG. SM2. (a-d) Contour plot of $\omega_k$ for (a) tight-binding model, and square atomic arrays with out-of-plane polarization $\mathbf{p} = \hat{e}_z$ for (b) $d/\lambda_0 = 0.1$, (c) $d/\lambda_0 = 0.19$ and (d) $d/\lambda_0 = 0.36$. The dashed lines are the iso-frequencies of the $X$-modes, i.e., $\omega_{k=X}$. (e) Parameter $\Delta$ characterizing the proximity to the tight-binding model (see Eq. (SM16)). The vertical dashed lines denote the distances for which we plotted the band-structure in panels (b-d). (f) Position of the Van-Hove singularity (solid black line) and density of states at the $X$-mode energy (red circles) as a function of $d/\lambda_0$. The gray shadow region denotes the superradiant band. (g) Band structure for an out-of-plane polarized atomic dipole array with interatomic distance of $d/\lambda_0 = 0.19$. The colors represent the collective free space decay rate, $\gamma_k$, and the gray shadow region denotes the light cone.

FIG. SM3. (a-d) Contour plot of $\omega_k$ for (a) tight-binding model, and square atomic arrays with circularly polarized light polarization $\mathbf{p} = (\hat{e}_x + i\hat{e}_y)/\sqrt{2}$ for (b) $d/\lambda_0 = 0.2$, (c) $d/\lambda_0 = 0.32$ and (d) $d/\lambda_0 = 0.38$. The dashed lines are the iso-frequencies of the $X$-modes, i.e., $\omega_{k=X}$. (e) Parameter $\Delta$ characterizing the proximity to the tight-binding model (see Eq. (SM16)). The vertical dashed lines denote the distances for which we plotted the band-structure in panels (b-d). (f) Position of the Van-Hove singularity (solid black line) and density of states at the $X$-mode energy (red circles) as a function of $d/\lambda_0$. The gray shadow region denotes the superradiant band. (g) Band structure for an out-of-plane polarized atomic dipole array with interatomic distance of $d/\lambda_0 = 0.2$. The colors represent the collective free space decay rate, $\gamma_k$, and the gray shadow region denotes the light cone.
In Fig. SM3(g), we finally provide an example of band-structure for $d/\lambda_0 = 0.2$ showing how indeed it has a similar qualitative shape than the linearly-polarized modes.

**SM2. CHARACTERIZING SINGLE IMPURITY COUPLING TO THE METASURFACE**

In this section, we will introduce an additional impurity atom together with the metasurface, as depicted in Fig. 1(a) of the main text. We denote as $\omega_a$ and $\varphi_a$ to the frequency and polarization vector of its optical transition, such that its individual free-space decay rate reads $\Gamma_a = |\varphi_a|^2 \omega_a^3/(3\pi\hbar c^3)$. Thus, its intrinsic effective Hamiltonian can be written as $H_a/h = (\omega_a - i\Gamma_a/2)\sigma_{eg}^a$. On top of that, this atom will exchange excitations with the metasurface through the same photon-mediated interactions appearing within the metasurface. The Hamiltonian describing such interaction is given by:

$$H_{am} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left( J_{aj} - i \frac{\Gamma_{aj}}{2} \right) \left( \sigma_{eg}^a \sigma_{ge}^j + \sigma_{eg}^j \sigma_{ge}^a \right),$$  \hspace{1cm} (SM17)

where $J_{aj}, \Gamma_{aj}$:

$$J_{aj} - i \frac{\Gamma_{aj}}{2} = - \frac{3\pi \sqrt{\Gamma_{0a}}}{\omega_0} \varphi_a \cdot G_0(r_a - r_j) \cdot \dot{\varphi}_j.$$  \hspace{1cm} (SM18)

Note that here there is already an implicit assumptions that $|\omega_a - \omega_0| \ll \omega_a$ to replace all the occurrences of $\omega_a$ by $\omega_0$.

In what follows we are interested in characterizing the ratio of emission into the subradiant modes of the array ($\Gamma_m$) compared to the rest of the channels, e.g., free-space emission ($\Gamma'$). We denote this ratio as $P = \Gamma_m/\Gamma'$, which we label as the Purcell factor of the metasurface. In what follows we discuss two different methods to calculate it: a semi-analytical one in section SM2A and a full numerical approach in section SM2B. These are the methods used to calculate the results of Figs. 2-3 of the main text. Here, for completeness, we will also use it to characterize the coupling of an impurity with an out-of-plane polarized array in section SM2C.

**A. Semi-analytical calculation of the impurity-metasurface coupling**

Here, we extend the semi-analytical approach derived in Ref. [36] for 1D subwavelength arrays to the metasurface situation. There, it was found that assuming a Born-Markov approximation for the impurity atom dynamics, the emission into the metasurface and free space modes can be calculated as follows:

$$\frac{\Gamma_m}{\Gamma_a} = \frac{9d^2}{2k_a^2} \text{Im} \left( \int \int_{|k| > k_0} \frac{d^2k \varphi_a^* \alpha_k(r_a) \otimes \beta_k(r_a) \dot{\varphi}_a}{(\omega_a - \omega_k)/\Gamma_0} \right),$$  \hspace{1cm} (SM19)

$$\frac{\Gamma'}{\Gamma_a} = 1 + \frac{9d^2}{2k_a^2} \text{Im} \left( \int \int_{|k| \leq k_0} \frac{d^2k \varphi_a^* \alpha_k(r_a) \otimes \beta_k(r_a) \dot{\varphi}_a}{(\omega_a - \omega_k)/\Gamma_0} \right),$$  \hspace{1cm} (SM20)

where $r_a$ is the position of the impurity atom, which is where we evaluate the eigen-modes $\alpha_k(r), \beta_k(r)$ defined as:

$$\alpha_k(r) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} G_0(r_j, r, \omega_0) \cdot \dot{\varphi}_e^{ir_j \cdot k}, \hspace{1cm} (SM21a)$$

$$\beta_k(r) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \dot{\varphi}_e^* G_0(r_j, r, \omega_0) \cdot e^{-ir_j \cdot k}. \hspace{1cm} (SM21b)$$

In Ref. [36] an analytical expression was found for both $\Gamma_m$ and $\Gamma_a$ thanks to the 1D character of the modes. In our case, we can not find that expression, and we have to numerically calculate these integrals to obtain these values. We label as:

$$P_a = \frac{\Gamma_m}{\Gamma_a},$$  \hspace{1cm} (SM22)

to the single impurity-metasurface Purcell factor calculated using this semi-analytical approach.
B. Numerical calculation of impurity-metasurface coupling

The other approach consists in initializing the impurity atom in the excited state, \( |\Psi(0)\rangle = \sigma_{eg}^a |\text{vac}\rangle \), and then compute the exact evolution of the system using the complete non-hermitian Hamiltonian of the combined impurity-metasurface system:

\[
|\Psi(t)\rangle = e^{-iHt/\hbar} |\Psi(0)\rangle ,
\]

where \( H = H_a + H_m + H_{\text{mm}} \). In this method we face two difficulties: i) how to avoid that the quantum emitter dynamics is affected by back-reflection of the subradiant excitations in finite systems; ii) how to extract the ratio \( P \) from \( |\Psi(t)\rangle \).

To tackle the first issue we impose non reflecting boundary conditions by including additional local losses in the dipoles close to the borders of the array. These additional losses must increase smoothly toward the ends of the lattices. For our calculations we find that a quadratic function is sufficient to avoid back scattering in most cases. The individual losses are given by:

\[
\Gamma_0(r_j) = \begin{cases} \Gamma_0, & |r_j| < r_{\text{min}} \\ \Gamma_0 + \frac{\Gamma_{\text{max}}(|r_j| - r_{\text{min}})^2}{(r_{\text{max}} - r_{\text{min}})^2}, & |r_j| \geq r_{\text{min}} \end{cases}
\]

with \( r_{\text{min}} \) the distance from the center of the lattice at which the individual losses starts to increase, and \( r_{\text{max}} \) the maximum distance from the outermost dipole in the array. We empirically find that the best results in our system are obtained with \( \Gamma_{\text{max}} = 10\Gamma_0 \) and \( r_{\text{max}} - r_{\text{min}} = 10d \).

In order to address the second issue, we use the fact that since \( H \) conserves the number excitations, the wavefunction \( |\Psi(t)\rangle \) at any time can be written as:

\[
|\Psi(t)\rangle = (C_a(t)\sigma_{eg}^a + C_{\ell_j}(t)\sigma_{eg}^j) |\text{vac}\rangle ,
\]

from which we can monitor the total population in the impurity atom/lattice, i.e., \( \mathcal{P}_a(t) = |C_a(t)|^2 \) and \( \mathcal{P}_\ell(t) = \sum_j |C_{\ell_j}(t)|^2 \). The effective Hamiltonian induces a non-unitary dynamics, since the excitations can be eventually lost in free space. Thus, although \( \mathcal{P}_a(t=0) = 1 \), the sum \( \mathcal{P}_a(t) + \mathcal{P}_\ell(t) < 1 \) for \( t > 0 \), where the difference with the initial population \( L_T(t) = 1 - \mathcal{P}_a(t) - \mathcal{P}_\ell(t) \) is the total loss into free-space of the system. This total loss can be also obtained by diagonalizing the quantum jump part of the master equation derived in Eq. SM1, i.e., \( \Gamma_{ij} |\phi_\alpha\rangle = \gamma_{ij} |\phi_\alpha\rangle \), which leads to the following instantaneous quantum jump loss:

\[
L_T(t) = \sum_\alpha L_\alpha(t) = \sum_\alpha \int_0^t dt' \gamma_{\alpha a} |\langle \phi_\alpha |\Psi(t')\rangle|^2.
\]

If the metasurface modes were perfectly subradiant, then the Purcell factor could be obtained just by dividing \( P(t) = \mathcal{P}_\ell(t)/L_T(t) \), since \( L_T(t) \) will give the decay of the impurity atom to free-space. In the simulation, however, we introduce absorbing boundaries, that we include in \( \Gamma_0(r_j) \). These boundaries induce an additional decay of the metasurface modes to free-space that is artificially introduced by the simulation. Thus, it should be taken into account into the Purcell factor calculation to obtain a more accurate comparison with the semi-analytical procedure of Eqs. (SM19)-(SM20), which assumes an infinite size system. To estimate how much of the total losses, \( L_T(t) \), are lost via the adiabatic absorbing boundaries, we assume that the hybridization of the absorber atoms with the rest of the metasurface is weak, such that, the losses in the borders are given by

\[
L_b(t) \approx \sum_{|r_j| \geq r_{\text{max}}} \int_0^t dt' (\Gamma_0(r_j - \Gamma_0)|C_{\ell_j}(t')|^2. \]

With that, we can add/subtract these "artificial" losses to each of the parts of the Purcell factor as follows:

\[
P(t) \approx \frac{\mathcal{P}_\ell(t) + L_b(t)}{L_T(t) - L_b(t)}.
\]

When \( t \to \infty \) this value converges to a finite value, which is what we define as the numerical Purcell factor:

\[
P_n = P(t \to \infty).
\]

This procedure is the one we use in the main text to compare with the semi-analytical approach of Eq. (SM22). This method has several important advantages:
FIG. SM4. (a-b) Purcell factor $P$ computed semi-analytically (colored lines), and numerically (markers) for an impurity atom with $\hat{\rho}_a = \hat{e}_y$ placed nearby an array with $d/\lambda_0 = 0.19$ (solid red lines, red points), and $d/\lambda_0 = 0.28$ (dashed blue lines, blue triangles) with out-of-plane polarization $\hat{\rho}_0 = \hat{e}_z$. In (a) the emitter is located on top of a dipole, while in (b) is in the center of a plaquette. (d-e) Non-Markovian witness $N$ defined in Eq. (SM30) for the situations shown in the upper figures (a-b). (c) and (f) represent the excitation dynamics of the array (solid black line) and the impurity atom (dashed red line) corresponding to a typical Markovian/non-Markovian evolution, respectively.

- It does not rely on Born-Markov approximation, and thus will be able to characterize impurity-metasurface couplings at all regimes.
- It can be easily generalized to calculate the Purcell factor of more general situations, such as the entangled cluster or bilayer configuration.

As we already observe for the in-plane polarized modes studied in the main text, both $P_a$ and $P_n$ display the same qualitative dependence with the system parameters, such as impurity-metasurface separation. The main quantitative difference appears in the regions where the Born-Markov approximation breaks, and the dynamics deviates significantly from a pure exponential decay. We explain this more in detail in the next section, where we characterize the impurity metasurface coupling for the out-of-plane transitions.

C. Results for out-of-plane emitters: non-Markovian dynamics

In Fig. SM4(a-b) we study the Purcell factor of an impurity atom with $\hat{\rho}_a = \hat{e}_y$ as a function of its vertical position for an array with out-of-plane polarized modes $\hat{\rho}_0 = \hat{e}_z$. In the two panels we plot the results for two different places of the unit cell depicted in the inset, as we did for the in-plane polarized in the main text. Compared to the case of the in-plane polarized modes, a noteworthy difference is that one can find regions with $P \approx 10$. This is expected since we already pointed that the narrower character of the band should lead to an increase of the density of states at the saddle-point divergence. Another important difference is that $P_a$ (dashed lines) and $P_n$ (markers) differ more than for the in-plane polarized metasurface. This points to the emergence of a more non-Markovian dynamics than in the in-plane polarized case. This is clear in Fig. SM4(c) (Fig. SM4(f)), we plot an example of the impurity atom dynamics in one of the points where the dynamics is (non-)Markovian, respectively. To make this more evident, in Figs. SM4(d-e) we plot a non-Markovianity witness $N$ of the dynamics introduced in Ref. [72] for the same parameters of Fig. SM4(a-b). This witness is defined as

$$N = \frac{\int_{\partial t} |C_a(t)| > 0 dt \partial_t |C_a(t)|^4}{\int_{\partial t} |C_a(t)| < 0 dt \partial_t |C_a(t)|^4},$$

(SM30)
in such a way that Markovian dynamics corresponds to $\mathcal{N} = 0$, and $\mathcal{N} = 1$ for a perfect coherent oscillations, the hall-mark of non-Markovian dynamics. Comparing panels (a-b) with (d-e) we observe how indeed the regions of larger deviations feature a larger value of the non-Markovian witness. Although not shown, this out-of-plane polarization also leads to cross-like directional patterns, though less tunable than the in-plane polarized modes.

**SM3. DIRECTIONALITY CHARACTERIZATION**

In order to characterize in more quantitative and qualitative terms the quasi-1D character of the emission patterns, we introduce a directional emission parameter, $\chi_{1D}$. To define it, we will calculate the amount of emission passed by the dipoles located at a given distance from the center of the lattice $|r_i| \sim R$ where we place our impurity atom. Since our array is discretized, we pick those dipoles based on a midpoint circle algorithm \[73\]. Then, we define the cumulative population of each of these selected dipoles as the integral over time

$$\mathcal{P}_j = \int_0^\infty dt |C_j(t)|^2.$$  

To compare the population of the dipoles in a concentric circle we redefine the cumulative population such that the sum over all dipoles in the circle is equal to one

$$\bar{\mathcal{P}}_j = \frac{\mathcal{P}_j}{\sum_{|r_j| \sim R} \mathcal{P}_j}.$$  

Then we define the directionality as the sum of the populations for the dipoles located at a distance close to $R$, weighted by a function $W(\theta_j)$ which depends on the angle relative to the $x$-axis

$$\chi_{1D} = \sum_{|r_j| \sim R} \mathcal{P}_j W(\theta_j).$$  

By working with the weight function $W(\theta_j) = \cos(2(\theta_j - \theta_{\text{max}}))$, where $\theta_{\text{max}}$ is the angle of maximum population, we obtain that $\chi_{1D} = 1$ if the emission is a straight line. In Fig. 2(c-d) we fixed $\theta_{\text{max}}$ always to $\pi/4$ for clarity of the figure, which is why we obtain negative values when the emission is orthogonal to it. Otherwise, if the emission is isotropic or cross-pattern like the nearest-neighbour hopping model, then $\chi_{1D} = 0$. In order to mitigate the finite size effects, we compute $\chi_{1D}$ for five concentric circles spaced at a distance of $d$, and obtain the mean value of the directionality.

**SM4. IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES: ENTANGLED-CLUSTERS AND BILAYERS**

In this section, we provide more details on the strategies we sketch in the main text to achieve larger Purcell factors in 2D subwavelength arrays.

**A. Entangled clusters**

The first strategy is to consider two impurity atoms separated at a subwavelength scale instead of a single one. We denote the distance from each impurity atom to the center of the cluster with $d_c$, that will be subwavelength $2d_c < \lambda$. The intuitive idea is that if we prepare this atomic cluster in an entangled state:

$$|\Psi_{c,\pm}(0)\rangle = \frac{|e_{a_1}g_{a_2}\rangle \pm |g_{a_1}e_{a_2}\rangle}{\sqrt{2}},$$

then the free-space emission between these two atoms can destructively interfere and boost the Purcell factor of the cluster, that we label as $P_c$. In Fig. SM5(b-c) we calculate both $P_c$ and the associated directionality for the entangled cluster situation considered in the main text, and including both the symmetric (solid blue) and anti-symmetric configuration (dashed green) of the cluster. There, we observe how indeed the antisymmetric configuration can effectively achieved much larger $P_c$’s, but at expense of losing completely the tunability of the emission (though keeping the cross-directional emission pattern). We complement these figures with Fig SM5(a) that shows the individual Purcell factor $P$ for each of the impurity atoms within the cluster as they move from the center of the plaquette. There, we observe how the impurity atoms couple more efficiently to the metasurface around $r \approx 0.4d$, which is where we observe an increase of $P$ for both the symmetric/antisymmetric configuration.
FIG. SM5. (a) Analytical (solid back line) and numerical (red dots) Purcell factor as a function of a single impurity as a function of the diagonal distance \( r \) measured from the center of a plaquette. The inter-atomic distance of the array is \( d/\lambda_0 = 0.3 \), and the polarization \( \hat{\phi} = \hat{e}_y \) for lattice dipoles, and \( \hat{\phi}_a = (\hat{e}_x + \hat{e}_y)/\sqrt{2} \) for the impurity atom. (b) Numerical Purcell factor and (c) directionality for the entangled cluster configuration depicted in the inset. Blue solid (dashed green) lines represent the cluster in the (anti-)symmetric state. All other parameters are the same than in Fig. 3 (a).

### B. Bilayer configuration

The other strategy considered is to change the single layer metasurface by a bilayer one. We assume that the two layers are displaced from the \( z = 0 \) plane at distances \( \pm d_b/2 \), while we will keep the auxiliary atoms at the \( z = 0 \) plane. Here, we characterize numerically the band-structure of the bilayer in Fig. SM6(a-b) considering two situations: one where the bilayers are displaced between them (a), and another one where the layers are top of each other (b). In both cases, one can find subradiant mode regions that around the \( X \) points, one obtains straight iso-frequencies Fig. SM6(c-d) leading to directional emission patterns, as shown in Fig. 3(c) of the main text.

### SM5. COLLECTIVE DYNAMICS

In the main text, we explore the collective dynamics in three different initial configurations:

- The case of two separated single emitters at distance \( d_e \) and initialized in a state:
  \[
  |\Psi_{\text{pair}}(0)\rangle = \frac{|e_{a_1} g_{a_2}\rangle + |g_{a_1} e_{a_2}\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \tag{SM35}\]

- The situation of two separated entangled clusters with intercluster separation \( d_c \), but separated between them at the same position \( d_i \):
  \[
  |\Psi_{\text{pair},c}(0)\rangle = \frac{|\Psi_{c_1, +}(0)\rangle + |\Psi_{c_2, +}(0)\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \tag{SM36}\]

- The case of two separated atoms at distance \( d_e \) among themselves and placed in-between a bilayer system with interlayer distance \( d_b \):
  \[
  |\Psi_{\text{pair},b}(0)\rangle = \frac{|e_{a_1} g_{a_2}\rangle + |g_{a_1} e_{a_2}\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \tag{SM37}\]

Using these initial states, we compute the dynamics using:
  \[
  |\Psi_\alpha(t)\rangle = e^{-iHt/\hbar} |\Psi_\alpha(0)\rangle, \tag{SM38}\]

where the index \( \alpha \) denotes the different configurations. To estimate the strength of the collective effects we make a fit to an exponential decay law, i.e., \( |\Psi_\alpha(t)\rangle \approx e^{-\Gamma_{\alpha} t} \), and plot \( \Gamma_\alpha/\Gamma_{\text{ind}} \), where \( \Gamma_{\text{ind}} \) is the value obtained by the individual decay at each configuration. In Fig. SM7, we plot a representative example of such dynamics and their corresponding emission patterns.

FIG. SM6. (a) Band structure for a bilayer with shift between layers of $d = (0.5, 0.5)$, and a distance between them of $d_b = 0.1d$.
All the dipoles have a polarization parallel to the lattice $\mathbf{\hat{p}} = (\mathbf{\hat{e}}_x + \mathbf{\hat{e}}_y)/\sqrt{2}$ and an interatomic distance of $d/\lambda_0 = 0.3$. (b) Band structure for a bilayer without shift between layers, and a distance between them of $d_b = d$. All the dipoles have a polarization parallel to the lattice $\mathbf{\hat{p}} = (\mathbf{\hat{e}}_x + \mathbf{\hat{e}}_y)/\sqrt{2}$ and an interatomic distance of $d/\lambda_0 = 0.3$. In both cases, the colors represent the collective free space decay rate, and the gray shadow region denotes the light cone. (c-d) Contour plot of $\omega_k$ for (a-b) respectively. The solid white line denotes the iso-frequencies of the $X$-mode.
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[67] “In this Supplementary Material, we provide more details on: i) how to calculate the band-structure and impurity-metasurface coupling; iii) Definition of the directionality parameter; iii) Improvement strategies; iv) Collective dynamics of impurity atoms.”.

[68] Note, here we use the assumption commonly used in the literature that the free-space Green function does not vary significantly for the energy ranges around $\omega_a, \omega_0$.


