

A New Realization Method for Linear Quantum Stochastic Systems *

Symeon Grivopoulos Ian Petersen

July 11, 2022

*School of Engineering and Information Technology,
University of New South Wales at the Australian Defence Force Academy,
Canberra, ACT 2600, Australia*
symeon.grivopoulos@gmail.com, i.r.petersen@gmail.com

Abstract

The issue of realization of the transfer functions of Linear Quantum Stochastic Systems (LQSSs) is of fundamental importance for the practical applications of such systems, especially as coherent controllers of other quantum systems. So far, most works that addressed this problem have used cascade realizations. In this work, a new method is proposed, where the transfer function of a LQSS is realized by a series of a pre-processing linear static network, a reduced LQSS, and a post-processing linear static network. The introduction of the pre- and post-processing static networks leaves an intermediate reduced LQSS with a simple input/output structure, that is realized by a concatenation of simple cavities. A feedback connection of the cavities through a linear static network is used to produce the correct dynamics for the reduced system. The resulting realization has a nice modular design, and provides a structural picture of the system, as well. The mathematical tool that allows for the construction of this realization, is an SVD-like decomposition for doubled-up matrices in Krein spaces. Illustrative examples are provided for the theory developed.

1 Introduction

Linear Quantum Stochastic Systems (LQSSs) are a class of models of wide use in linear quantum optics and elsewhere [1, 2, 3]. In quantum optics, they describe a variety of devices, such as optical cavities, parametric amplifiers, etc., as well as networks of such devices. The mathematical framework for these models is provided by the theory of quantum Wiener processes and the associated Quantum Stochastic Differential Equations [4, 5, 6]. Potential applications of linear quantum optics include quantum information and photonic signal processing, see e.g. [7, 8, 9, 10, 11]. Another particularly important application of LQSSs is as coherent quantum feedback controllers of other quantum systems, i.e. controllers that do not perform any measurement on the controlled quantum system and thus, have the potential for increased performance compared to classical controllers, see e.g. [12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19].

A problem of fundamental importance for applications of LQSSs, is the problem of realization/synthesis: Given a LQSS with specified parameters, how does one engineer that system using basic quantum optical devices, such as optical cavities, parametric amplifiers, phase shifters, beam splitters, squeezers etc.? The synthesis problem comes in two varieties. First, there is the *strict realization* problem which we just described. This type of realization is necessary in the case where the states of the quantum system are meaningful to the application at hand, e.g in a quantum information processing algorithm. In the case that only the input-output relation of the LQSS is important, we have the problem of *transfer function realization*. This is the case, for example, in controller synthesis.

*This work was funded by the Australian Research Council under grant FL110100020

In recent years, solutions have been proposed to both the strict and the transfer function realization problems. For the strict problem, [20, 21] propose a cascade of cavities realization. This allows for arbitrary couplings of the LQSS to its environment. However, not all possible Hamiltonian interactions between cavities are possible, because the mode of a cavity can influence only modes of subsequent cavities. For this reason, direct Hamiltonian interactions [20] and feedback [21] between cavities have been used to “correct” the dynamics of the cascade to the desired form. For the transfer function realization problem, [22, 23] have shown that a cascade of cavities realization is possible for any *passive* LQSS, in which case all cavities needed to realize it are also passive. More recently [24], it has been shown that a cascade of cavities realization is possible for generic LQSSs.

In this work, we propose an alternative solution to the problem of transfer function realization. We show that by appropriate input and output transformations (which can be realized experimentally by static linear optical networks, see Subsection 2.3), one needs to realize a much simpler transfer function. This “reduced” transfer function can be realized by a concatenation of cavities in a feedback interconnection through a static linear optical network. This realization works for all passive LQSSs (in which case all necessary devices needed to realize it, both static and dynamic, are also passive), and it also works generically in the class of LQSSs.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we establish some notation and terminology used in the paper, and provide a short overview of LQSSs and static linear optical devices and networks. In Section 3, we demonstrate our method of transfer function realization for LQSSs in the context of passive systems, which is the simplest case. Section 4 contains the general realization result, that applies generically to LQSSs. Finally, the Appendix contains the proof of a canonical form for a certain class of matrices (doubled-up matrices, see e.g. [25, 26]) which is the main technical tool necessary to extend the realization from the class of passive LQSSs to the general class. It also contains some remarks on extensions of the realization method to certain non-generic cases.

2 Background Material

2.1 Notation and terminology

We begin by establishing the notation and terminology that will be used throughout this paper:

1. x^* denotes the complex conjugate of a complex number x or the adjoint of an operator x , respectively. As usual, $\text{Re } x$ and $\text{Im } x$ denote the real and imaginary part of a complex number. The commutator of two operators X and Y is defined as $[X, Y] = XY - YX$.
2. For a matrix $X = [x_{ij}]$ with number or operator entries, $X^\# = [x_{ij}^*]$, $X^\top = [x_{ji}]$ is the usual transpose, and $X^\dagger = (X^\#)^\top$. Also, for a vector $x = [x_i]$ with number or operator entries, we shall use the notation $\tilde{x} = \begin{pmatrix} x \\ x^\# \end{pmatrix}$. A vector/matrix with operator entries will be called a vector/matrix of operators, in order to distinguish it from the usual numerical vectors/matrices.
3. The identity matrix in n dimensions will be denoted by I_n , and a $r \times s$ matrix of zeros will be denoted by $0_{r \times s}$. δ_{ij} denotes the Kronecker delta symbol in n dimensions, i.e. $I_n = [\delta_{ij}]$. $\text{diag}(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k)$ is the block-diagonal matrix formed by the square matrices X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k . $\ker X$, $\text{range } X$, and $\text{rank } X$ denote, respectively, the kernel, the range space, and the rank of a matrix X .
4. We define $J_{2k} = \text{diag}(I_k, -I_k)$, and $\Sigma_{2k} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{k \times k} & I_k \\ I_k & 0_{k \times k} \end{pmatrix}$. We have that $J_{2k}^2 = \Sigma_{2k}^2 = I_{2k}$ and, $\Sigma_{2k} J_{2k} \Sigma_{2k} = -J_{2k}$. When the dimensions of I_n , $0_{r \times s}$, J_{2k} or Σ_{2k} can be inferred from context, they will be denoted simply by I , $\mathbf{0}$, J and Σ .
5. We define the *Krein space* $(\mathbb{C}^{2k}, J_{2k})$ as the vector space \mathbb{C}^{2k} equipped with the *indefinite inner product* defined by $\langle v, w \rangle_J = v^\dagger J_{2k} w$, for any $v, w \in \mathbb{C}^{2k}$. The J -norm of a vector $v \in \mathbb{C}^{2k}$

is defined by $|v|_J = \sqrt{|\langle v, v \rangle_J|}$, and if it is nonzero, a normalized multiple of v is $v/|v|_J$. For a $2r \times 2s$ matrix X considered as a map from $(\mathbb{C}^{2s}, J_{2s})$ to $(\mathbb{C}^{2r}, J_{2r})$, its adjoint operator will be called *b-adjoint* and denoted by X^b , to distinguish it from its usual adjoint X^\dagger . One can show that $X^b = J_{2s} X^\dagger J_{2r}$. The b-adjoint satisfies properties similar to the usual adjoint, namely $(x_1 A + x_2 B)^b = x_1^* A^b + x_2^* B^b$, and $(AB)^b = B^b A^b$.

6. Given two $r \times s$ matrices X_1 , and X_2 , respectively, we can form the $2r \times 2s$ matrix $X = \begin{pmatrix} X_1 & X_2 \\ X_2^\# & X_1^\# \end{pmatrix}$. Such a matrix is said to be *doubled-up* [25]. It is immediate to see that the set of doubled-up matrices is closed under addition, multiplication and taking (b-) adjoints. Also, $\Sigma_{2r} X \Sigma_{2s} = X^\#$, if and only if $X^{2r \times 2s}$ is doubled-up.
7. $U(m)$ denotes the group of $m \times m$ unitary matrices, i.e. matrices that satisfy $SS^\dagger = S^\dagger S = I_m$. A $2m \times 2m$ matrix R is called *Bogoliubov* if it is doubled-up and b-unitary, i.e. $RR^b = R^b R = I_{2m}$. The set of these matrices forms a non-compact group known as the Bogoliubov group.

2.2 Linear Quantum Stochastic Systems

The material in this subsection is fairly standard, and our presentation aims mostly at establishing notation and terminology. To this end, we follow the papers [26, 27]. For the mathematical background necessary for a precise discussion of LQSSs, some standard references are [4, 5, 6], while for a Physics perspective, see [1, 28]. The references [20, 29, 30, 31, 25] contain a lot of relevant material, as well.

The systems we consider in this work are collections of quantum harmonic oscillators interacting among themselves, as well as with their environment. The i -th harmonic oscillator ($i = 1, \dots, n$) is described by its position and momentum variables, x_i and p_i , respectively. These are self-adjoint operators satisfying the *Canonical Commutation Relations* (CCRs) $[x_i, x_j] = 0$, $[p_i, p_j] = 0$, and $[x_i, p_j] = i\delta_{ij}$, for $i, j = 1, \dots, n$. We find it more convenient to work with the so-called annihilation and creation operators $a_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(x_i + ip_i)$, and $a_i^* = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(x_i - ip_i)$. They satisfy the CCRs $[a_i, a_j] = 0$, $[a_i^*, a_j^*] = 0$, and $[a_i, a_j^*] = \delta_{ij}$, $i, j = 1, \dots, n$. If we define the n -dimensional vector of operators $a = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)^\top$, the CCRs can be expressed, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} [\check{a}, \check{a}^\dagger] &= \left[\begin{pmatrix} a \\ a^\# \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a^\# \end{pmatrix}^\dagger \right] \doteq \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a^\# \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a^\# \end{pmatrix}^\dagger - \left(\begin{pmatrix} a \\ a^\# \end{pmatrix}^\# \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a^\# \end{pmatrix}^\top \right)^\top \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} I_n & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & -I_n \end{pmatrix} = J_{2n}. \end{aligned}$$

The environment is modelled as a collection of bosonic heat reservoirs. The i -th heat reservoir ($i = 1, \dots, m$) is described by the bosonic field annihilation and creation operators $\mathcal{A}_i(t)$ and $\mathcal{A}_i^*(t)$, respectively. The field operators are *adapted quantum stochastic processes* with forward differentials $d\mathcal{A}_i(t) = \mathcal{A}_i(t+dt) - \mathcal{A}_i(t)$, and $d\mathcal{A}_i^*(t) = \mathcal{A}_i^*(t+dt) - \mathcal{A}_i^*(t)$. They satisfy the quantum Itô products $d\mathcal{A}_i(t)d\mathcal{A}_j(t) = 0$, $d\mathcal{A}_i^*(t)d\mathcal{A}_j^*(t) = 0$, $d\mathcal{A}_i^*(t)d\mathcal{A}_j(t) = 0$, and $d\mathcal{A}_i(t)d\mathcal{A}_j^*(t) = \delta_{ij}dt$. If we define the m -dimensional vector of operators $\mathcal{A}(t) = (\mathcal{A}_1(t), \mathcal{A}_2(t), \dots, \mathcal{A}_m(t))^\top$, the quantum Itô products above can be expressed as

$$d\check{\mathcal{A}}d\check{\mathcal{A}}^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} d\mathcal{A} \\ d\mathcal{A}^\# \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} d\mathcal{A} \\ d\mathcal{A}^\# \end{pmatrix}^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} I_m & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} dt.$$

To describe the dynamics of the harmonic oscillators and the quantum fields, we need to introduce certain operators. We begin with the Hamiltonian operator

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \check{a}^\dagger M \check{a} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a^\# \end{pmatrix}^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} M_1 & M_2 \\ M_2^\# & M_1^\# \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a^\# \end{pmatrix},$$

which specifies the dynamics of the harmonic oscillators in the absence of any environmental influence. M is a $2n \times 2n$ Hermitian doubled-up matrix referred to as the Hamiltonian matrix. Next,

we have the coupling operator L (vector of operators) that specifies the interaction of the harmonic oscillators with the quantum fields. L depends linearly on the creation and annihilation operators, and can be expressed as $L = N_1 a + N_2 a^\#$. We construct the doubled-up coupling matrix $N^{2m \times 2n}$ from $N_1^{m \times n}$ and $N_2^{m \times n}$, as $N = \begin{pmatrix} N_1 & N_2 \\ N_2^\# & N_1^\# \end{pmatrix}$. Finally, we have the unitary scattering matrix $S^{m \times m}$, that describes the interactions between the quantum fields themselves. In practice, it represents the unitary transformation effected on the heat reservoir modes by a static passive linear optical network that precedes the LQSS, see Subsection 2.3.

In the *Heisenberg picture* of Quantum Mechanics, the joint evolution of the harmonic oscillators and the quantum fields is described by the following system of *Quantum Stochastic Differential Equations* (QSDEs):

$$\begin{aligned} d\check{a} &= [-\imath JM - \frac{1}{2} N^\flat N] \check{a} dt - N^\flat \begin{pmatrix} S & 0 \\ 0 & S^\# \end{pmatrix} d\check{\mathcal{A}}, \\ d\check{\mathcal{A}}_{out} &= N \check{a} dt + \begin{pmatrix} S & 0 \\ 0 & S^\# \end{pmatrix} d\check{\mathcal{A}}. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

The field operators $\mathcal{A}_{i\ out}(t)$ describe the outputs of the system. We are going to use a version of (1) generalized in two ways: First, allowing for an active static linear optical network to precede the LQSS (see Subsection 2.3), [25] has generalized (1) by replacing the unitary Bogoliubov transformation $\begin{pmatrix} S & 0 \\ 0 & S^\# \end{pmatrix}$ with a general Bogoliubov transformation, $S^{2m \times 2m} = \begin{pmatrix} S_1 & S_2 \\ S_2^\# & S_1^\# \end{pmatrix}$, with $S S^\flat = S^\flat S = I_{2m}$. We shall refer to this S as a generalized scattering matrix. Second, in the context of coherent quantum systems in particular, the output of a quantum system may be fed into another quantum system, so we substitute the more general input and output notations \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{Y} , for \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{A}_{out} , respectively. The resulting QSDEs are the following:

$$\begin{aligned} d\check{a} &= [-\imath JM - \frac{1}{2} N^\flat N] \check{a} dt - N^\flat S d\check{\mathcal{U}}, \\ d\check{\mathcal{Y}} &= N \check{a} dt + S d\check{\mathcal{U}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The forward differentials $d\mathcal{U}$ and $d\mathcal{Y}$ of m -dimensional inputs and outputs, respectively, contain quantum noises, as well as a signal part (linear combinations of variables of other systems). One can show that the structure of (2) is preserved under linear transformations of the state $\check{a}_{new} = V\check{a}$, if and only if V is Bogoliubov. In that case the system parameters (S, N, M) transform according to $(\tilde{S}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{M}) = (S, NV^{-1}, (V^{-1})^\dagger M V^{-1})$. From the point of view of Quantum Mechanics, V must be Bogoliubov so that the new annihilation and creation operators satisfy the correct CCRs. If one substitutes the vector of state operators \check{a} with a classical state vector, and the stochastic differentials $d\mathcal{U}$ and $d\mathcal{Y}$, with regular differentials $\mathcal{U} dt$ and $\mathcal{Y} dt$, then (2) would be just a complex form of a general *dual* (J, J) *unitary* system. Indeed, the transfer function from $d\check{\mathcal{U}}$ to $d\check{\mathcal{Y}}$ is given by

$$G(s) = \left[I - N[sI + \imath JM + \frac{1}{2} N^\flat N]^{-1} N^\flat \right] S, \quad (3)$$

and can be proven to be dual (J, J) unitary, i.e. it satisfies $G(s) J_{2m} G(-s^*)^\dagger = J_{2m}$, for $\text{Re } s \geq 0$ [26].

When the sub-matrices M_2 , N_2 and S_2 are zero, all the matrices in (2) become block-diagonal. In this case, the evolution of the system and field annihilation operators does not depend on creation operators of either type. We may then retain only the evolution equations for the annihilation operators. With the substitutions M , N , and S , for M_1 , N_1 , and S_1 , respectively, (2) simplifies as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} da &= [-\imath M - \frac{1}{2} N^\dagger N] a dt - N^\dagger S d\mathcal{U}, \\ d\mathcal{Y} &= N a dt + S d\mathcal{U}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

We refer to such a system as an annihilation operator LQSS, or a passive LQSS, because systems in this class describe passive optical devices. Similarly to the case of general LQSSs, one can show that the structure of (4) is preserved under linear transformations of the state $a_{new} = Va$, if and only if V is unitary. In that case the system parameters (S, N, M) transform according to $(\tilde{S}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{M}) = (S, NV^{-1}, VMV^{-1})$. From the point of view of Quantum Mechanics, V must be unitary so that the new annihilation and creation operators satisfy the correct CCRs. The corresponding classical versions of these systems (see discussion in last paragraph) are complex *unitary* systems. In case (4) is a minimal realization, then the system is a complex *lossless bounded real* system. Indeed, the transfer function from $d\mathcal{U}$ to $d\mathcal{Y}$ is given by

$$G(s) = \left[I - N [sI + \imath M + \frac{1}{2} N^\dagger N]^{-1} N^\dagger \right] S, \quad (5)$$

and can be proven to be lossless bounded real, i.e. it is analytic for $\text{Re } s \geq 0$, and satisfies $G(s)^\dagger G(s) \leq I_m$, for $\text{Re } s > 0$, and $G(\imath\omega)^\dagger G(\imath\omega) = I_m$, for $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ [32, 33].

We end this subsection with the model of the basic building block of the proposed synthesis methods for LQSSs, the generalized optical cavity. It is described by its optical mode a , with Hamiltonian matrix $M = \text{diag}(\Delta, \Delta)$, where $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}$ is the so-called cavity detuning. For a generalized cavity with m inputs/outputs, we let $N_1^\top = (e^{\imath\phi_1} \sqrt{\kappa_1}, \dots, e^{\imath\phi_m} \sqrt{\kappa_m})$, and $N_2^\top = (e^{\imath\theta_1} \sqrt{g_1}, \dots, e^{\imath\theta_m} \sqrt{g_m})$. κ_i and g_i will be called the *passive* and the *active coupling coefficient* of the i -th quantum noise to the cavity, respectively. When $g_i = 0$, the interaction of the cavity mode with the i -th quantum noise will be referred to as (*purely*) *passive*, and when $\kappa_i = 0$, it will be referred to as (*purely*) *active*. The model of a cavity with m inputs/outputs, is the following:

$$\begin{aligned} da &= \left(-\imath\Delta - \frac{\gamma}{2} \right) a dt - \sum_{i=1}^m \left[e^{-\imath\phi_i} \sqrt{\kappa_i} d\mathcal{U}_i + e^{-\imath\theta_i} \sqrt{g_i} d\mathcal{U}_i^\# \right], \\ d\mathcal{Y}_i &= e^{\imath\phi_i} \sqrt{\kappa_i} a dt + e^{\imath\theta_i} \sqrt{g_i} a^\# dt + d\mathcal{U}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^m (\kappa_i - g_i)$. If a quantum noise couples passively to the cavity, the corresponding interaction may be realized with a partially transmitting mirror. For an interaction that has an active component, a more complicated implementation is needed, which makes use of an auxiliary cavity, see e.g. [20] for the details. From this point on, we shall use the system-theoretic term *port* for any part of the experimental set-up that realizes an interaction of the cavity mode with a quantum noise (where an input enters and and output exits the cavity). Figure 1 is a graphical representation of a generalized multi-port cavity modelled by equations (6).




Figure 1: Graphical representation of a multi-port cavity. The gray block represents the cavity, and the small squares represent ports. Red is used for passive ports, blue for active ports, and white for all other cases.

2.3 Static Linear Optical Devices and Networks

Besides the generalized cavities discussed above, our proposed realization method for LQSSs makes use of static linear quantum optical devices and networks, as well. Useful references for this material are [34, 20, 35, 36]. The most basic such devices are the following:

1. **The phase shifter:** This device produces a phase shift in its input optical field. That is, if \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{Y} are its input and output fields, respectively, then $\mathcal{Y} = e^{i\theta}\mathcal{U}$, with $0 \leq \theta < 2\pi$. Notice that $\mathcal{Y}^*\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{U}^*\mathcal{U}$. This means that the energy of the output field is equal to that of the input field, and hence energy is conserved. Such a device is called passive.

2. **The beam splitter:** This device produces linear combinations of its two input fields. If we denote its inputs by \mathcal{U}_1 and \mathcal{U}_2 , and its outputs by \mathcal{Y}_1 and \mathcal{Y}_2 , then

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{Y}_1 \\ \mathcal{Y}_2 \end{pmatrix} = R \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{U}_1 \\ \mathcal{U}_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} & \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \\ -\sin \frac{\theta}{2} & \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

$0 \leq \theta < 2\pi$ is called the mixing angle of the beam splitter. There is a more general version of this operation, with

$$R = e^{i\zeta} \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\frac{\phi+\psi}{2}} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} & e^{i\frac{\psi-\phi}{2}} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \\ -e^{i\frac{\phi-\psi}{2}} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} & e^{-i\frac{\phi+\psi}{2}} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

ϕ and ψ are phase differences in the two input and the two output fields, respectively, produced by phase shifters. ζ is a common phase shift in both output fields. This form of R corresponds to a general 2×2 unitary matrix. Because $R \in U(2)$, we can see that

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{Y}_1^* & \mathcal{Y}_2^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{Y}_1 \\ \mathcal{Y}_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{U}_1^* & \mathcal{U}_2^* \end{pmatrix} R^\dagger R \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{U}_1 \\ \mathcal{U}_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{U}_1^* & \mathcal{U}_2^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{U}_1 \\ \mathcal{U}_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

and hence the total energy of the output fields is equal to that of the input fields. So, the beam splitter is also a passive device.

3. **The squeezer:** This device reduces the variance in the real quadrature $(\mathcal{U} + \mathcal{U}^*)/2$, or the imaginary quadrature $(\mathcal{U} - \mathcal{U}^*)/2i$ of an input field \mathcal{U} , while increasing the variance in the other. Its operation is described by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{Y} \\ \mathcal{Y}^* \end{pmatrix} = R \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{U} \\ \mathcal{U}^* \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} \cosh x & \sinh x \\ \sinh x & \cosh x \end{pmatrix}.$$

$x \in \mathbb{R}$ is the squeezing parameter. There is a more general version of this operation, with

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i(\phi+\psi)} \cosh x & e^{i(\psi-\phi)} \sinh x \\ e^{i(\phi-\psi)} \sinh x & e^{-i(\phi+\psi)} \cosh x \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here ϕ, ψ are phase shifts in the input and the output field, respectively, produced by phase shifters. This form of R corresponds to a general 2×2 Bogoliubov matrix. We compute

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Y}^*\mathcal{Y} &= \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{Y}^* & \mathcal{Y} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{Y} \\ \mathcal{Y}^* \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\phi}\mathcal{U}^* & e^{i\phi}\mathcal{U} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \cosh 2x & \sinh 2x \\ \sinh 2x & \cosh 2x \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\phi}\mathcal{U} \\ e^{-i\phi}\mathcal{U}^* \end{pmatrix} \\ &\neq \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\phi}\mathcal{U}^* & e^{i\phi}\mathcal{U} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\phi}\mathcal{U} \\ e^{-i\phi}\mathcal{U}^* \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{U}^*\mathcal{U}, \end{aligned}$$

for $x \neq 0$, and hence energy is not conserved. So, the squeezer is an active device.

By connecting various static linear optical devices, we may form static linear optical networks (multi-port devices). When a network is composed solely of passive devices, it is called passive,

while if it contains any active devices it is called active. The input-output relation of a passive static network with m inputs and outputs, $\mathcal{U} = (\mathcal{U}_1, \dots, \mathcal{U}_m)^\top$ and $\mathcal{Y} = (\mathcal{Y}_1, \dots, \mathcal{Y}_m)^\top$, respectively, is $\mathcal{Y} = R\mathcal{U}$, with $R \in U(m)$. Such a network is a multi-dimensional generalization of the beam splitter and is sometimes called a multi-beam splitter. It turns out that any passive static network can be constructed exclusively from beam splitters and phase shifters [37]. This is due to the fact that an $m \times m$ unitary matrix can be factorized in terms of matrices representing either phase shifting of an optical field in the network or beam splitting between two optical fields in the network, see Figure 2. In the case of active static networks, the input-output relation takes the form




Figure 2: Graphical representation of a passive network and its decomposition in terms of beam splitters and phase shifters. In subsequent figures, red blocks will always represent passive static devices and networks.

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{U} \\ \mathcal{U}^\# \end{pmatrix} = R \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{Y} \\ \mathcal{Y}^\# \end{pmatrix},$$

where R is a $2m \times 2m$ Bogoliubov matrix. For every Bogoliubov matrix, the following factorization holds:

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} U_2 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & U_2^\# \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \cosh X & \sinh X \\ \sinh X & \cosh X \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} U_1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & U_1^\# \end{pmatrix},$$

where $U_1, U_2 \in U(m)$ and $X = \text{diag}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$, with real $x_i, i = 1, \dots, m$. This factorization is known as Shale's Theorem or Bloch-Messiah reduction [20, 35, 36, 38]. The physical interpretation of this equation is that any active static network may be implemented as a sequence of three static networks: First comes a passive static network (multi-beam splitter) implementing the unitary transformation U_1 . Then follows an active static network made of m squeezers, each acting on an output of the first (passive) network, and finally, the outputs of the squeezers are fed into a second multi-beam splitter implementing the unitary transformation U_2 . This is depicted in Figure 3. Because of this structure, an active static network is sometimes called a multi-squeezer. We should stress that both factorizations depicted in Figures 2 and 3 are constructive, hence arbitrary static linear networks can be synthesized.




Figure 3: Graphical representation of an active network and its decomposition in terms of passive networks and squeezers. In subsequent figures, blue blocks will always represent active static devices and networks.

3 Realization of Passive Linear Quantum Stochastic Systems

We first present our method of realization for transfer functions of LQSSs in the case of passive systems first, because it is the simplest case. As discussed in Subsection 2.2, a passive linear quantum stochastic system is described by the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} da &= [-\imath M - \frac{1}{2} N^\dagger N] a dt - N^\dagger S d\mathcal{U}, \\ d\mathcal{Y} &= N a dt + S d\mathcal{U}, \end{aligned}$$

and its transfer function is given by

$$G(s) = \left[I - N [sI + \imath M + \frac{1}{2} N^\dagger N]^{-1} N^\dagger \right] S.$$

The first step is to simplify the coupling between the system and its inputs. In order to do this, we perform the singular value decomposition (SVD) of the coupling matrix N , namely $N = V \hat{N} W^\dagger$. The matrices V and W are unitary, and \hat{N} has the following structure:

$$\hat{N} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \bar{N}^{r \times r} & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{array} \right) = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \sqrt{\kappa_1} & \\ & \ddots \\ & & \sqrt{\kappa_r} & \\ \hline & \mathbf{0} & & \mathbf{0} \end{array} \right), \quad (7)$$

where $r \leq \min\{n, m\}$ is the rank of N , and $\kappa_i > 0, i = 1, \dots, r$. Using the SVD of N in the expression for $G(s)$, and recalling that $V^\dagger = V^{-1}$ and $W^\dagger = W^{-1}$ (unitary matrices), we can factorize $G(s)$ as follows:

$$G(s) = V \left[I - \hat{N} [sI + \imath(W^\dagger M W) + \frac{1}{2} \hat{N}^\dagger \hat{N}]^{-1} \hat{N}^\dagger \right] (V^\dagger S) = V \hat{G}(s) (V^\dagger S). \quad (8)$$

The first and last factors in this factorization of $G(s)$, are unitary transformations of the output and the input, respectively, of the transfer function $\hat{G}(s)$ in the middle factor. As discussed in Subsection 2.3, they can be realized by multi-beam splitters. The transfer function $\hat{G}(s)$ is that of a passive linear quantum stochastic system with scattering matrix I , coupling matrix \hat{N} , and Hamiltonian matrix $\hat{M} = W^\dagger M W$. We shall refer to this system as the reduced system associated to (4). The structure of \hat{N} is such that each of the inputs of $\hat{G}(s)$ enters at most one port of that system. More precisely, r of the inputs of $\hat{G}(s)$ each enter to a (different) port of that system and influence a corresponding (separate) mode. The remaining $m - r$ inputs “pass through” that system without influencing any mode. This means that $\hat{G}(s)$ is block-diagonal, with the second block being just an identity matrix:

$$\hat{G}(s) = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \hat{G}_r(s) & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \mathbf{0} & I_{(m-r)} \end{array} \right). \quad (9)$$

\hat{G}_r is a $r \times r$ lossless bounded real transfer function. Also, $n - r$ of the system modes are not influenced directly by any input. This decomposition has also been proposed in [33]. The situation is depicted in Figure 4.

Now we seek a simple representation for the reduced system

$$\begin{aligned} da &= [-\imath \hat{M} - \frac{1}{2} \hat{N}^\dagger \hat{N}] a dt - \hat{N}^\dagger d\mathcal{U}, \\ d\mathcal{Y} &= \hat{N} a dt + d\mathcal{U}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where the same notation a , \mathcal{U} , and \mathcal{Y} is used for the modes, inputs, and outputs of the reduced system, so that we do not proliferate the notation. Since, in the reduced system, each input influences at most one dynamical mode, its simplest possible realization would use a collection of n separate optical cavities, r of which would be connected to the inputs (a 1-port cavity for each of the r




Figure 4: Graphical representation of the factorization (8) for a passive system. The white block represents \hat{G} , while the upper/lower gray blocks represent the system modes that are influenced directly/indirectly, respectively, by the inputs.

“interacting” inputs), and $n-r$ of which would not be connected to any inputs. If \hat{M} were diagonal, this realization would be correct. It is apparent, however, that such a configuration would not produce the correct Hamiltonian \hat{M} , for general W and M . Nevertheless, there is an easy solution to this: Each cavity should have a second port used for interconnections of the cavities through a multi-beam splitter. We show that with this feedback, we can produce any desired Hamiltonian \hat{M} . The model for the interconnected cavities is the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
da &= [-\imath D - \frac{1}{2}\tilde{N}^\dagger\tilde{N} - \frac{1}{2}\hat{N}^\dagger\hat{N}]a dt - \tilde{N}^\dagger d\mathcal{U}_{int} - \hat{N}^\dagger d\mathcal{U}, \\
d\mathcal{Y} &= \hat{N}a dt + d\mathcal{U}, \\
d\mathcal{Y}_{int} &= \tilde{N}a dt + d\mathcal{U}_{int}, \\
d\mathcal{U}_{int} &= R d\mathcal{Y}_{int}.
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Here, $D \doteq \text{diag}(\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_n)$, and $\tilde{N} \doteq \text{diag}(\sqrt{\tilde{\kappa}_1}, \dots, \sqrt{\tilde{\kappa}_n})$, where $\Delta_i \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\tilde{\kappa}_i > 0$, are the cavity detuning and the coupling coefficient of the interconnection port of the i -th cavity. The $\kappa_i > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, r$ in \hat{N} are the coupling coefficients of the ports of the first r cavities that connect to system inputs and outputs (system ports). The m -dimensional vectors \mathcal{U} , and \mathcal{Y} , contain the inputs/outputs of the system ports, and the n -dimensional vectors \mathcal{U}_{int} , and \mathcal{Y}_{int} , the inputs/outputs of the interconnection ports. $R \in U(n)$ is the unitary transformation that is implemented by a multi-beam splitter that introduces interconnections between the outputs and the inputs of the interconnection ports of the cavities, see Figure 5. Combining the last two equations in (11), we obtain the relation $d\mathcal{U}_{int} = (I - R)^{-1}R\tilde{N}a dt$. At this point, we introduce a variant of the Cayley transform for unitary matrices without unit eigenvalues [39], namely

$$X = (I - R)^{-1}(I + R). \tag{12}$$

The unitarity of R implies that X is skew-Hermitian. We can also solve uniquely for R in terms of X with the following result:

$$R = (X - I)(X + I)^{-1}, \tag{13}$$

where R is defined for all skew-Hermitian matrices X , and can be seen to be unitary due to the skew-Hermitian nature of X . So, this map from the n -dimensional unitary matrices without unit eigenvalues, to the n -dimensional skew-Hermitian matrices, is 1-1 and onto. Now, it is easy to see that $(I - R)^{-1}R = -\frac{1}{2}I + \frac{1}{2}X$. Using the relation between $d\mathcal{U}_{int}$ and a , and the definition of X , the equations for the network take the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}
da &= [-\imath D - \frac{1}{2}\tilde{N}^\dagger X \tilde{N} - \frac{1}{2}\hat{N}^\dagger\hat{N}]a dt - \hat{N}^\dagger d\mathcal{U}, \\
d\mathcal{Y} &= \hat{N}a dt + d\mathcal{U}.
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$




Figure 5: Graphical representation of the transfer function $\hat{G}_r(s)$. The small hollow orthogonal represent passive interconnection ports.

These equations describe a passive linear quantum stochastic system with Hamiltonian matrix \hat{M} given by the expression

$$\hat{M} = D - \frac{\imath}{2} \tilde{N}^\dagger X \tilde{N}. \quad (15)$$

Given any values for the cavity parameters Δ_i and $\tilde{\kappa}_i > 0$, and any desired Hamiltonian matrix $\hat{M} = W^\dagger M W$, we may determine the unique X (and hence the unique R) that achieves this \hat{M} by the expression

$$X = 2\imath \tilde{N}^{-\dagger} (\hat{M} - D) \tilde{N}^{-1}. \quad (16)$$

We summarize the proposed methodology in the following theorem:

Theorem 1 *Given a passive linear quantum stochastic system with Hamiltonian matrix $M^{n \times n}$, coupling operator $N^{m \times n}$, and scattering matrix $S^{m \times m}$, let*

$$G(s) = S - N [sI + \imath M + \frac{1}{2} N^\dagger N]^{-1} N^\dagger S$$

be its transfer function. Let $N = V \hat{N} W^\dagger$ be the singular value decomposition of the coupling matrix N . Then, $G(s)$ can be factorized as $G(s) = V \hat{G}(s) (V^\dagger S)$, where $\hat{G}(s)$ has the form

$$\hat{G}(s) = I - \hat{N} [sI + \imath (W^\dagger M W) + \frac{1}{2} \hat{N}^\dagger \hat{N}]^{-1} \hat{N}^\dagger.$$

Moreover, $\hat{G}(s)$ may be represented as the transfer function of the following feedback network of n 2-port passive cavities:

$$\begin{aligned} da &= [-\imath D - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{N}^\dagger \tilde{N} - \frac{1}{2} \hat{N}^\dagger \hat{N}] a dt - \tilde{N}^\dagger d\mathcal{U}_{int} - \hat{N}^\dagger d\mathcal{U}, \\ d\mathcal{Y} &= \hat{N} a dt + d\mathcal{U}, \\ d\mathcal{Y}_{int} &= \tilde{N} a dt + d\mathcal{U}_{int}, \\ d\mathcal{U}_{int} &= R d\mathcal{Y}_{int}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $D = \text{diag}(\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_n)$, and $\tilde{N} = \text{diag}(\sqrt{\tilde{\kappa}_1}, \dots, \sqrt{\tilde{\kappa}_n})$, where $\Delta_i \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\tilde{\kappa}_i > 0$, are the cavity detuning and the coupling coefficient of the interconnection port, respectively, of the i -th cavity. The m -dimensional vectors \mathcal{U} , and \mathcal{Y} , contain the inputs/outputs of the system ports, and the n -dimensional vectors \mathcal{U}_{int} , and \mathcal{Y}_{int} , the inputs/outputs of the interconnection ports. Finally, the

unitary interconnection matrix (feedback gain) R is determined through the relations

$$\begin{aligned} X &= 2\iota\tilde{N}^{-\dagger}(W^\dagger MW - D)\tilde{N}^{-1}, \\ R &= (X - I)(X + I)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

We end this section with an illustrative example.

Example 1 Consider the 3-mode, 3-input passive linear quantum stochastic system with the following parameters:

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 5 & 1 & -2 \\ 1 & 3 & 0 \\ -2 & 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix}, \quad N = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 3 \\ 2 & 3 & 5 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and, } S = I_3.$$

The SVD of N is given by $N = V\hat{N}W^\dagger$, with

$$\begin{aligned} V &= \begin{pmatrix} -0.2987 & 0.4941 & -0.8165 \\ -0.3065 & -0.8599 & -0.4082 \\ -0.9038 & 0.1283 & 0.4082 \end{pmatrix}, \\ W &= \begin{pmatrix} -0.3093 & 0.2717 & -0.9113 \\ -0.4409 & 0.8081 & 0.3906 \\ -0.8426 & -0.5226 & 0.1302 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and,} \\ \hat{N} &= \text{diag}(6.8092, 2.7632, 0). \end{aligned}$$

The Hamiltonian of the reduced system is given by

$$\hat{M} = W^\dagger MW = \begin{pmatrix} 3.1315 & 0.0370 & -0.7200 \\ 0.0370 & 4.4278 & -2.2169 \\ -0.7200 & -2.2169 & 4.4407 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Letting $D = 0_{3 \times 3}$ and $\tilde{N} = I_3$, equation (16) produces the following X :

$$X = \iota \begin{pmatrix} 6.2631 & 0.0740 & -1.4400 \\ 0.0740 & 8.8556 & -4.4337 \\ -1.4400 & -4.4337 & 8.8814 \end{pmatrix},$$

from which we calculate the feedback gain matrix R using equation (13),

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} 0.9429 + 0.3245\iota & -0.0145 + 0.0276\iota & -0.0237 + 0.0637\iota \\ -0.0145 + 0.0276\iota & 0.9438 + 0.2918\iota & -0.0467 + 0.1449\iota \\ -0.0237 + 0.0637\iota & -0.0467 + 0.1449\iota & 0.9389 + 0.3010\iota \end{pmatrix}.$$

Figure 6 provides a graphical representation of the proposed implementation of the transfer function for this example.

4 Realization of General Linear Quantum Stochastic Systems

In this section, we present our synthesis method for the case of a general linear quantum stochastic system. As described in Section 2, the model for such a system is the following:

$$\begin{aligned} d\check{a} &= [-\iota JM - \frac{1}{2}N^\flat N] \check{a}dt - N^\flat S d\check{U}, \\ d\check{Y} &= N \check{a}dt + S d\check{U}. \end{aligned}$$




Figure 6: Graphical representation of the proposed implementation of the passive transfer function in Example 1.

The corresponding classical transfer function from $d\tilde{\mathcal{U}}$ to $d\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}$ is given by

$$G(s) = \left[I - N[sI + \imath JM + \frac{1}{2}N^b N]^{-1} N^b \right] S.$$

To proceed as in Section 3, we derive two results. First, we derive a canonical form for doubled-up matrices which generalizes the usual SVD that we employed in the last section. This result is along the following lines: Given a complex doubled-up matrix $N^{2m \times 2n}$, there exist Bogoliubov matrices $V^{2m \times 2m}$ and $W^{2n \times 2n}$, and a doubled-up matrix $\hat{N}^{2m \times 2n}$ in a standard reduced form (to be specified in the following), such that $N = V \hat{N} W^b$. Using this factorization of N in the expression for $G(s)$, along with the fact that $V^b = V^{-1}$, and $W^b = W^{-1}$, $G(s)$ can be factorized as follows:

$$G(s) = V \left[I - \hat{N} [sI + \imath J(W^\dagger M W) + \frac{1}{2}\hat{N}^b \hat{N}]^{-1} \hat{N}^b \right] (V^b S) = V \hat{G}(s) (V^b S). \quad (17)$$

The first and last factors in this factorization of $G(s)$, are Bogoliubov transformations of the output and the input, respectively, of the transfer function $\hat{G}(s)$ in the middle factor. As discussed in Subsection 2.3, they can be realized by multi-squeezers. The transfer function $\hat{G}(s)$, is that of a linear quantum stochastic system with generalized scattering matrix I , coupling matrix \hat{N} , and Hamiltonian matrix $\hat{M} = W^\dagger M W$. We shall refer to it as the reduced system associated to (2). We saw in Section 3 that, the structure of the \hat{N} matrix suggested the use of passive cavities as the simplest dynamical elements to realize the associated reduced system. At this point, we have not yet specified the structure of the coupling matrix \hat{N} in the case of general systems and hence, we cannot propose yet the types of devices needed to implement it. Nevertheless, it is obvious that we shall need to prove a result along the following lines: Given any desired Hamiltonian matrix \hat{M} for the reduced system, we can obtain it from the Hamiltonian M_{conc} of the collection (concatenation) of devices used to realize it, with appropriate feedback.

We now state the aforementioned results precisely, and prove them. We begin with a singular value decomposition type of result (canonical form) for doubled-up matrices.

Theorem 2 Let $N^{2m \times 2n} = \begin{pmatrix} N_1 & N_2 \\ N_2^\# & N_1^\# \end{pmatrix}$ be a complex doubled-up matrix, and let $\mathcal{N} \doteq N^b N$.

We assume that all the eigenvalues of \mathcal{N} are semisimple. Also, we assume that $\ker \mathcal{N} = \ker N$, i.e all the eigenvectors of \mathcal{N} with zero eigenvalue belong to the kernel of N . Let $\lambda_i^+ > 0, i = 1, \dots, r_+$, $\lambda_i^- < 0, i = 1, \dots, r_-$, and $\lambda_i^c = \mu_i + \imath \nu_i$, with $\nu_i > 0, i = 1 \dots, r_c$, be the eigenvalues of \mathcal{N} that are, respectively, positive, negative, and non-real with positive imaginary part. Then, there exist Bogoliubov matrices $V^{2m \times 2m}$, $W^{2n \times 2n}$, and a complex matrix $\hat{N}^{2m \times 2n} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{N}_1 & \hat{N}_2 \\ \hat{N}_2^\# & \hat{N}_1^\# \end{pmatrix}$, such that

$N = V \hat{N} W^\dagger$, where $\hat{N}_1 = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \bar{N}_1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{array} \right)$, $\hat{N}_2 = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \bar{N}_2 & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{array} \right)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{N}_1 &= \text{diag}(\sqrt{\lambda_1^+}, \dots, \sqrt{\lambda_{r_+}^+}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{r_-}, \alpha_1 I_2, \dots, \alpha_{r_c} I_2), \\ \bar{N}_2 &= \text{diag}(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{r_+}, \sqrt{|\lambda_1^-|}, \dots, \sqrt{|\lambda_{r_-}^-|}, -\beta_1 \sigma_2, \dots, -\beta_{r_c} \sigma_2). \end{aligned}$$

The matrix $\sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ is one of the Pauli matrices. The parameters α_i and β_i are determined in terms of μ_i and ν_i , as follows:

For $\mu_i > 0$, $\alpha_i = \sqrt{\mu_i} \cosh x_i$, $\beta_i = \sqrt{\mu_i} \sinh x_i$, and $x_i = \frac{1}{2} \sinh^{-1} \frac{\nu_i}{\mu_i}$.

For $\mu_i < 0$, $\alpha_i = \sqrt{|\mu_i|} \sinh x_i$, $\beta_i = \sqrt{|\mu_i|} \cosh x_i$, and $x_i = \frac{1}{2} \sinh^{-1} \frac{\nu_i}{|\mu_i|}$.

For $\mu_i = 0$, $\alpha_i = \beta_i = \sqrt{\frac{\nu_i}{2}}$.

The proof of the theorem is presented in the appendix, along with some remarks extending its applicability to a larger class of matrices than announced in its statement. According to the theorem, the simplest possible blocks of \hat{N} are the following:

- For a positive eigenvalue λ of \mathcal{N} , $\hat{N} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\lambda} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\lambda} \end{pmatrix}$. The simplest implementation would be with a cavity with a passive port of coefficient λ .
- For a negative eigenvalue λ of \mathcal{N} , $\hat{N} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{|\lambda|} \\ \sqrt{|\lambda|} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. The simplest implementation would be with a cavity with an active port of coefficient $|\lambda|$.
- For a non-real eigenvalue $\lambda = \mu + i\nu$,

$$\hat{N} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha I_2 & -\beta \sigma_2 \\ \beta \sigma_2 & \alpha I_2 \end{pmatrix} = \left(\begin{array}{cc|cc} \alpha & 0 & 0 & i\beta \\ 0 & \alpha & -i\beta & 0 \\ \hline 0 & -i\beta & \alpha & 0 \\ i\beta & 0 & 0 & \alpha \end{array} \right),$$

where α and β are given by the corresponding expressions at the end of Theorem 2. It is straightforward to verify that this \hat{N} can be implemented by the cascade connection of two identical 2-port cavities and a beam-splitter, as in Figure 7. The cavity has two ports, one passive with coupling coefficient α^2 , and one purely active with coupling coefficient β^2 . Its coupling matrix N_c is given by

$$N_c = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i\beta \\ \alpha & 0 \\ -i\beta & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha \end{pmatrix}.$$

The beam splitter implements the unitary transformation $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. If the Hamiltonian matrix of each cavity is given by

$$M_c = \begin{pmatrix} \Delta & 0 \\ 0 & \Delta \end{pmatrix},$$

the total Hamiltonian matrix of the two-cavity system is given by

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} \Delta & 0 & 0 & -\alpha\beta \\ 0 & \Delta & -\alpha\beta & 0 \\ 0 & -\alpha\beta & \Delta & 0 \\ -\alpha\beta & 0 & 0 & \Delta \end{pmatrix}.$$




Figure 7: A simple cascade system realizing \hat{N} in the case of a complex eigenvalue.

We turn our attention to the second result necessary in our synthesis method. We show that given a collection of quantum optical dynamical devices that implement the desired reduced coupling matrix \hat{N} , their collective Hamiltonian matrix can be altered via feedback to produce any desired Hamiltonian matrix. In fact, we prove a more general statement:

Theorem 3 *Given a linear quantum stochastic system described by the model*

$$\begin{aligned} d\check{a} &= [-iJM - \frac{1}{2}N^b N] \check{a}dt - N^b Sd\check{U}, \\ d\check{Y} &= N\check{a}dt + Sd\check{U}, \end{aligned}$$

consider the modified system

$$\begin{aligned} d\check{a} &= [-iJM - \frac{1}{2}\tilde{N}^b \tilde{N} - \frac{1}{2}N^b N] \check{a}dt - \tilde{N}^b d\check{U}_{int} - N^b Sd\check{U}, \\ d\check{Y} &= N\check{a}dt + Sd\check{U}, \\ d\check{Y}_{int} &= \tilde{N}\check{a}dt + d\check{U}_{int}, \\ d\check{U}_{int} &= R d\check{Y}_{int}, \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

with $\tilde{N} = \text{diag}(\sqrt{\tilde{\kappa}_1}, \dots, \sqrt{\tilde{\kappa}_n}, \sqrt{\tilde{\kappa}_1}, \dots, \sqrt{\tilde{\kappa}_n})$, and R a Bogoliubov matrix. The new system is constructed from the original one by adding n passive interconnection ports (one for every mode), and feeding back through a multi-squeezer. The m -dimensional vectors \mathcal{U} , and \mathcal{Y} , contain the inputs/outputs of the original system ports, and the n -dimensional vectors \mathcal{U}_{int} , and \mathcal{Y}_{int} , the inputs/outputs of the interconnection ports. Then, there is always a unique R such that the modified system has any desired Hamiltonian matrix \bar{M} .

Proof: Combining the last two equations of (18), we obtain the expression $d\check{U}_{int} = R(I - R)^{-1}\tilde{N}\check{a}dt$. As in Section 3, we introduce the Cayley transform $X = (I + R)(I - R)^{-1}$, defined for Bogoliubov matrices R with no unit eigenvalues. Its unique inverse is defined by $R = (X - I)(X + I)^{-1}$. It is straightforward to verify that, X is doubled-up and \flat -skew-Hermitian ($X^b = -X$) if and only if R is Bogoliubov. Using the identity $R(I - R)^{-1} = -\frac{1}{2}I + \frac{1}{2}X$, we reduce the model of the modified system as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} d\check{a} &= [-iJM - \frac{1}{2}\tilde{N}^b X \tilde{N} - \frac{1}{2}N^b N] \check{a}dt - N^b Sd\check{U}, \\ d\check{Y} &= N\check{a}dt + Sd\check{U}. \end{aligned}$$

The new Hamiltonian \bar{M} is given by the expression $J\bar{M} = JM - \frac{i}{2}(\tilde{N}^b X \tilde{N})$, which can be solved uniquely for the matrix X that produces the desired Hamiltonian, given the parameters \bar{M} , and \tilde{N} , namely $X = 2i(\tilde{N}^b)^{-1}(J\bar{M} - JM)\tilde{N}^{-1}$. So, the corresponding R is determined uniquely by the inverse Cayley transform. ■

Let M_{conc} be the Hamiltonian matrix of the collection (concatenation) of quantum optical dynamical devices that implement the desired reduced coupling matrix \hat{N} . The application of Theorem 3 with M being M_{conc} , and $\bar{M} = \hat{M} = W^\dagger M W$, completes the synthesis. Figure 8 is a graphical representation of the realization of the transfer function of a general LQSS. Each cavity is representative of all cavities of its type needed to implement the transfer function. Finally, we demonstrate our method with an example.




Figure 8: A graphical representation of the realization of the transfer function of a general LQSS. Each cavity is representative of all cavities of its type needed to implement the transfer function.

Example 2 Consider the 2-mode, 2-input linear quantum stochastic system with the following parameters:

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 2 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 2 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad N = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 \\ -1 & 2 & 1 & -1 \\ 2 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix},$$

and $S = I_4$. The eigenvalue decomposition of $N = N^b N$ is computed to be $N = UDU^{-1}$, where $D = \text{diag}(-2.8284, 2.8284, -2.8284, 2.8284)$ and

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} -0.9074 & 0.3474 & 0.2038 & 0.1756 \\ -0.1329 & 0.2965 & 0.4090 & -0.8908 \\ 0 & 0 & -0.8629 & 0.4064 \\ 0.3987 & -0.8896 & -0.2159 & -0.1027 \end{pmatrix}.$$

To the positive eigenvalue $\lambda^+ = 2.8284$, there correspond the eigenvectors u_2 and u_4 given by the second and fourth columns of U . We have that $\langle u_2, u_2 \rangle_J > 0$, and after normalization u_2 becomes $z^+ = (0.2180, -1.1061, 0.5046, -0.1275)^\top$. To the negative eigenvalue $\lambda^- = -2.8284$, there correspond the eigenvectors u_1 and u_3 given by the first and third columns of U . We have that $\langle u_1, u_1 \rangle_J > 0$, and after normalization u_1 becomes $z^- = (-1.0987, -0.1609, 0, 0.4827)^\top$. According to the proof of Theorem 2,

$$W = [[z^+ z^-] \Sigma [z^+ z^-]^\#] = \begin{pmatrix} 0.2180 & -1.0987 & 0.5046 & 0 \\ -1.1061 & -0.1609 & -0.1275 & 0.4827 \\ 0.5046 & 0 & 0.2180 & -1.0987 \\ -0.1275 & 0.4827 & -1.1061 & -0.1609 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since there are no zero eigenvalues,

$$\hat{N} = \bar{N} = \begin{pmatrix} 1.6818 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1.6818 \\ 0 & 0 & 1.6818 & 0 \\ 0 & 1.6818 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and we can compute V simply by

$$V = N W \hat{N}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} -0.0576 & -1.0196 & 0.1834 & -0.0957 \\ -1.0691 & 0.0164 & 0.3357 & 0.1749 \\ 0.1834 & -0.0957 & -0.0576 & -1.0196 \\ 0.3357 & 0.1749 & -1.0691 & 0.0164 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The Hamiltonian of the reduced system should be equal to

$$\hat{M} = W^\dagger M W = \begin{pmatrix} 3.6444 & 1.0135 & 0.4429 & -3.3952 \\ 1.0135 & 4.3462 & -3.3952 & -1.7249 \\ 0.4429 & -3.3952 & 3.6444 & 1.0135 \\ -3.3952 & -1.7249 & 1.0135 & 4.3462 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The reduced system can be implemented by the use of two cavities, one with a passive port (corresponding to λ^+), and one with an active port (corresponding to λ^-). Choosing the detuning of both cavities to be zero, makes the total Hamiltonian of their concatenation $M_{conc} = 0_{4 \times 4}$. Also, we choose $\tilde{N} = I_4$. Then, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} X &= 2i(\tilde{N}^b)^{-1}J(\hat{M} - M)\tilde{N}^{-1} \\ &= i \begin{pmatrix} 7.2889 & 2.0271 & 0.8858 & -6.7904 \\ 2.0271 & 8.6924 & -6.7904 & -3.4497 \\ -0.8858 & 6.7904 & -7.2889 & -2.0271 \\ 6.7904 & 3.4497 & -2.0271 & -8.6924 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

from which the feedback gain R is computed to be

$$\begin{aligned} R &= (X - I)(X + I)^{-1} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} -0.3731 & 0.9082 & 0 & 0.0450 \\ 0.9082 & 0.3125 & -0.0450 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.0450 & -0.3731 & 0.9082 \\ -0.0450 & 0 & 0.9082 & 0.3125 \end{pmatrix} \\ &+ i \begin{pmatrix} 7.8624 & -5.2659 & 7.4743 & -5.8003 \\ -5.2659 & 4.4401 & -5.8003 & 3.7042 \\ -7.4743 & 5.8003 & -7.8624 & 5.2659 \\ 5.8003 & -3.7042 & 5.2659 & -4.4401 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

Figure 9 provides a graphical representation of the proposed implementation of the transfer function for this example.




Figure 9: Graphical representation of the proposed implementation of the transfer function of Example 2.

We end the paper with some remarks.

1. In the case of a negative eigenvalue λ of \mathcal{N} , the form of \hat{N} given in Theorem 2 is $\hat{N} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{|\lambda|} \\ \sqrt{|\lambda|} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. The simplest implementation of this \hat{N} is by a cavity with a purely active port. However, there is a more general form for \hat{N} , that allows for the presence of damping in the port. It is given by the expression

$$\hat{N} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{|\lambda|} \sinh x & \sqrt{|\lambda|} \cosh x \\ \sqrt{|\lambda|} \cosh x & \sqrt{|\lambda|} \sinh x \end{pmatrix},$$

for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

2. Theorem 2 excludes the case of non-semisimple eigenvalues of $\mathcal{N} = N^\flat N$ (Jordan blocks of dimension greater than one). We point out that there is no fundamental issue in this case. In Remark 1 following the proof of Theorem 2 in the Appendix, we extend the theorem in the case of a real eigenvalue with Jordan block of dimension 2. In principle, we could also extend the theorem in the case of real and non-real eigenvalues whose Jordan blocks are of dimension greater than two. The issue is one of complexity: As the dimension of the Jordan block increases, so does the number of parameters of possible canonical forms for N , and it becomes difficult to find them all, sort through them, and find an “optimal canonical form”. One expects that the appearance of non-semisimple eigenvalues of $\mathcal{N} = N^\flat N$ is non-generic.
3. Theorem 2 also excludes the case where $\ker N$ is a strict subspace of $\ker \mathcal{N}$ (it is always a subspace). In this case, N is called J -degenerate. When $\ker \mathcal{N} = \ker N$, N is called J -nondegenerate, and this is the generic situation for a doubled-up $N^{2m \times 2n}$, with $m \leq n$. The proof is as follows: We have that, $\text{rank } N^\flat = \text{rank } J_{2n} N^\dagger J_{2m} = \text{rank } N^\dagger = \text{rank } N$, because J_{2k} is full rank for any k . From this follows that $\text{rank } \mathcal{N} \leq \min(\text{rank } N, \text{rank } N^\flat) = \text{rank } N$. Now, from Sylvester’s rank inequality, we also have that $\text{rank } \mathcal{N} \geq \text{rank } N + \text{rank } N^\flat - 2m = 2 \text{rank } N - 2m$. Hence, $2 \text{rank } N - 2m \leq \text{rank } \mathcal{N} \leq \text{rank } N$. Let us define the unitary $2k \times 2k$ matrix Φ_{2k} by

$$\Phi_{2k} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} I_k & I_k \\ -iI_k & iI_k \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, $N_R = \Phi_{2m} N \Phi_{2n}^{-1}$ is a real $2m \times 2n$ matrix. Conversely, given any real $2m \times 2n$ matrix X , we may create a $2m \times 2n$ doubled-up (complex) matrix X_D by $X_D = \Phi_{2m}^{-1} X \Phi_{2n}$. Notice that $(X_D)_R = X$, and $(N_R)_D = N$, so there is an isomorphism between $2m \times 2n$ real matrices and $2m \times 2n$ complex doubled-up matrices. Also, $\text{rank } N_R = \text{rank } N \Leftrightarrow \text{rank } X_D = X$. It is a well known fact that a $p \times q$ real matrix, with $p \leq q$, will have rank equal to p , generically. A proof of this fact can be easily constructed by using the SVD and arguments proving the genericity of full rank matrices in the set of all square real matrices of a given dimension, see eg. [40, Section 5.6]. Hence, it follows that the generic $2m \times 2n$ doubled-up matrix with $m \leq n$ has rank equal to m . For the corresponding \mathcal{N} , we have that $2(2m) - 2m \leq \text{rank } \mathcal{N} \leq 2m \Rightarrow \text{rank } \mathcal{N} = 2m$. Then, $\dim \ker \mathcal{N} = 2n - 2m = \dim \ker N$, from which $\ker \mathcal{N} = \ker N$ follows. In the case $m \geq n$, it is N^\flat that is generically non-degenerate. Then, one can prove Theorem 2 using N^\flat in place of N . Hence, we see that Theorem 2 is satisfied for generic N (assuming that, generically, $N^\flat N$ and $N N^\flat$ have semisimple eigenvalues). In Remark 2 after the proof of Theorem 2 in the Appendix, we demonstrate the fundamental issue with the J -degenerate case. Also, we identify a special situation where we can extend the validity of Theorem 2 in spite of N being J -degenerate.

4. The two key ideas used in our proposed realization method are the following: First, by using appropriate static networks to transform the inputs and outputs, we need only realize a much simpler transfer function using a concatenation of cavities, and second, feedback through a static network can be used to “correct” the Hamiltonian to its desired form. These two ideas are independent of each other, and can be used in conjunction with other realization methods. For example, the strict realization method of [20] can be modified to use feedback between the cavities through a static network to “correct” the Hamiltonian, rather than direct interactions.

Appendix

This appendix contains the proof of Theorem 2, along with some remarks. We begin with some definitions:

1. The “sip” matrix in k dimensions is defined by the expression

$$\mathcal{S}_k \doteq \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

2. We define $\mathbf{j}_k(\lambda)$ to be the upper Jordan block of size k with eigenvalue λ , if λ is real, and the direct sum of two Jordan blocks of size $k/2$ each (for even k), the first with eigenvalue λ , and the second with eigenvalue λ^* , if λ is complex. The matrix whose columns are the eigenvector and the generalized eigenvectors corresponding to λ , in sequence [41], will be called the eigenvector block corresponding to λ .

3. We define the matrix $\tilde{\Sigma}_{2k}$, by the expression

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_{2k} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{k \times k} & \imath I_k \\ -\imath I_k & 0_{k \times k} \end{pmatrix}.$$

We have that $\tilde{\Sigma}_{2k}^2 = I_{2k}$, $\tilde{\Sigma}_{2k} \mathcal{S}_{2k} \tilde{\Sigma}_{2k} = -\mathcal{S}_{2k}$, and $\tilde{\Sigma}_{2k} \mathbf{j}_{2k}(\lambda) \tilde{\Sigma}_{2k} = \mathbf{j}_{2k}(\lambda^*)$. When its dimension can be inferred from context, it will be denoted simply by $\tilde{\Sigma}$.

The $2n \times 2n$ matrix $\mathcal{N} \doteq N^\flat N$ is \flat -Hermitian, i.e. $\mathcal{N}^\flat = \mathcal{N}$. The spectral theorem for self-adjoint matrices in spaces with indefinite scalar products [42] applied to the case of \mathcal{N} as a \flat -Hermitian matrix in the Krein space (\mathbb{C}^{2n}, J) takes the following form:

Lemma 1 *Let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_A$ be the real eigenvalues of \mathcal{N} , and $\lambda_{A+1}, \dots, \lambda_B$ its complex eigenvalues. There exists a basis of \mathbb{C}^{2n} in which the matrices \mathcal{N} and J have the following canonical forms:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N} &= \mathbf{j}_{k_1}(\lambda_1) \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbf{j}_{k_A}(\lambda_A) \oplus \mathbf{j}_{k_{A+1}}(\lambda_{A+1}) \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbf{j}_{k_B}(\lambda_B), \\ J &= \varepsilon_1 \mathcal{S}_{k_1} \oplus \dots \oplus \varepsilon_A \mathcal{S}_{k_A} \oplus \mathcal{S}_{k_{A+1}} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{S}_{k_B}, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where $\varepsilon_i = \pm 1$, $i = 1, \dots, A$. This decomposition is unique except for permutations.

Let $\{z_1, \dots, z_{2n}\}$ be the aforementioned basis of \mathbb{C}^{2n} . Let $Z^{2n \times 2n} \doteq [z_1 \dots z_{2n}]$, and $Z_i^{2n \times k_i}$ the submatrix of Z that contains the eigenvectors of the i -th block, for $i = 1, \dots, A, A+1, \dots, B$. Then, (19) can be expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}Z &= Z\hat{\mathcal{N}}, \\ JZ &= Z\hat{J}, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where the block-diagonal matrices $\hat{\mathcal{N}}$ and \hat{J} are defined by the following expressions:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{N}} &\doteq \text{diag}(\mathbf{j}_{k_1}(\lambda_1), \dots, \mathbf{j}_{k_A}(\lambda_A), \mathbf{j}_{k_{A+1}}(\lambda_{A+1}), \dots, \mathbf{j}_{k_B}(\lambda_B)), \\ \hat{J} &\doteq \text{diag}(\varepsilon_1 \mathcal{S}_{k_1}, \dots, \varepsilon_A \mathcal{S}_{k_A}, \mathcal{S}_{k_{A+1}}, \dots, \mathcal{S}_{k_B}). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Furthermore, if we define $\varepsilon_i \doteq 1$ for $i = A+1, \dots, B$, (19) implies that $Z_i^\dagger J Z_j = \delta_{ij} (\varepsilon_i \mathcal{S}_i)$, for $i, j = 1, \dots, A, A+1, \dots, B$. That is, the different blocks appearing in (19) are J -orthogonal.

Besides being \flat -Hermitian, \mathcal{N} is also doubled-up, i.e. $\Sigma \mathcal{N} \Sigma = \mathcal{N}^\#$. From the first equation of (20), we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} (\Sigma \mathcal{N} \Sigma) (\Sigma Z) &= (\Sigma Z) \hat{\mathcal{N}} \\ \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}^\# (\Sigma Z) &= (\Sigma Z) \hat{\mathcal{N}} \\ \Rightarrow \mathcal{N} (\Sigma Z^\#) &= (\Sigma Z^\#) \hat{\mathcal{N}}^\#. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Similarly, from the second equation of (20), we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\Sigma J \Sigma) (\Sigma Z) &= (\Sigma Z) \hat{J} \\
\Rightarrow -J (\Sigma Z) &= (\Sigma Z) \hat{J} \\
\Rightarrow J (\Sigma Z^\#) &= (\Sigma Z^\#) (-\hat{J}).
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

If we restrict (22) and (23) in the real eigenspace of \mathcal{N} , $Z_r \doteq [Z_{k_1} \dots Z_{k_A}]$, we obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{N} (\Sigma Z_r^\#) &= (\Sigma Z_r^\#) \text{diag}(\mathbf{j}_{k_1}(\lambda_1), \dots, \mathbf{j}_{k_A}(\lambda_A)), \\
J (\Sigma Z_r^\#) &= (\Sigma Z_r^\#) \text{diag}(-\varepsilon_1 \mathcal{S}_{k_1}, \dots, -\varepsilon_A \mathcal{S}_{k_A}).
\end{aligned}$$

The uniqueness of the decomposition (20) implies that for every real eigenvalue λ , there are two eigenvector blocks, say Z_i and Z_j , such that $Z_j = \Sigma Z_i^\#$, and $\varepsilon_j = -\varepsilon_i$. The situation for the complex eigenvalues is a bit more complicated. The restriction of equations (22) and (23) in the complex eigenspace of \mathcal{N} , $Z_c \doteq [Z_{k_{A+1}} \dots Z_{k_B}]$, furnishes the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{N} (\Sigma Z_c^\#) &= (\Sigma Z_c^\#) \text{diag}(\mathbf{j}_{k_{A+1}}(\lambda_{A+1}^*), \dots, \mathbf{j}_{k_B}(\lambda_B^*)), \\
J (\Sigma Z_c^\#) &= (\Sigma Z_c^\#) \text{diag}(-\mathcal{S}_{k_{A+1}}, \dots, -\mathcal{S}_{k_B}).
\end{aligned}$$

By defining the matrix $\tilde{\Sigma}_c \doteq \text{diag}(\tilde{\Sigma}_{k_{A+1}}, \dots, \tilde{\Sigma}_{k_B})$, the equations above can be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{N} (\Sigma Z_c^\#) &= (\Sigma Z_c^\#) \tilde{\Sigma}_c \text{diag}(\mathbf{j}_{k_{A+1}}(\lambda_{A+1}), \dots, \mathbf{j}_{k_B}(\lambda_B)) \tilde{\Sigma}_c, \\
J (\Sigma Z_c^\#) &= (\Sigma Z_c^\#) \tilde{\Sigma}_c \text{diag}(\mathcal{S}_{k_{A+1}}, \dots, \mathcal{S}_{k_B}) \tilde{\Sigma}_c.
\end{aligned}$$

Multiplying both equations from the right with $\tilde{\Sigma}_c$, provides the desired form:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{N} (\Sigma Z_c^\# \tilde{\Sigma}_c) &= (\Sigma Z_c^\# \tilde{\Sigma}_c) \text{diag}(\mathbf{j}_{k_{A+1}}(\lambda_{A+1}), \dots, \mathbf{j}_{k_B}(\lambda_B)), \\
J (\Sigma Z_c^\# \tilde{\Sigma}_c) &= (\Sigma Z_c^\# \tilde{\Sigma}_c) \text{diag}(\mathcal{S}_{k_{A+1}}, \dots, \mathcal{S}_{k_B}).
\end{aligned}$$

Invoking the uniqueness of the decomposition (20) again, implies that for every complex eigenvalue λ , there are two eigenvector blocks, say Z_i and Z_j , such that $Z_j = \Sigma Z_i^\# \tilde{\Sigma}_{k_i}$. Now we are ready to prove Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 2: We begin with the real positive eigenvalues, λ_i^+ , $i = 1, \dots, r_+$. To each one there correspond two eigenvectors, z_i^+ with $(z_i^+)^\dagger J z_i^+ = 1$, and $\Sigma z_i^{+\#}$ with $(\Sigma z_i^{+\#})^\dagger J (\Sigma z_i^{+\#}) = -1$ (we adopt the convention of expressing the eigenvector whose inner product with itself is negative in terms of the eigenvector whose inner product with itself is positive). These two eigenvectors are also J -orthogonal to each other, i.e $(z_i^+)^\dagger J (\Sigma z_i^{+\#}) = 0$. Due to the semi-simplicity hypothesis and the uniqueness of the decomposition (20), different eigenspaces are J -orthogonal to each other, as well, so that

$$\begin{aligned}
z_i^{+\dagger} J z_j^+ &= 0, \\
(\Sigma z_i^{+\#})^\dagger J (\Sigma z_j^{+\#}) &= 0, \\
(\Sigma z_i^{+\#})^\dagger J z_j^+ &= 0,
\end{aligned}$$

for $i \neq j = 1, \dots, r_+$. If we define the $2n \times r_+$ matrix $Z^+ \doteq [z_1^+ \dots z_{r_+}^+]$, it is straightforward to see that

$$[Z^+ \Sigma Z^{+\#}]^\dagger J [Z^+ \Sigma Z^{+\#}] = J_{2r_+},$$

and

$$\mathcal{N} [Z^+ \Sigma Z^{+\#}] = [Z^+ \Sigma Z^{+\#}] \text{diag}(\lambda_1^+, \dots, \lambda_{r_+}^+, \lambda_1^+, \dots, \lambda_{r_+}^+).$$

The treatment of the real negative eigenvalues is identical. The resulting $2n \times r_-$ matrix Z^- satisfies the analogous relations

$$[Z^- \Sigma Z^{-\#}]^\dagger J [Z^- \Sigma Z^{-\#}] = J_{2r_-},$$

and

$$\mathcal{N}[Z^- \Sigma Z^{-\#}] = [Z^- \Sigma Z^{-\#}] \text{diag}(\lambda_1^-, \dots, \lambda_{r_-}^-, \lambda_1^-, \dots, \lambda_{r_-}^-).$$

Similarly, for the case of zero eigenvalues the corresponding $2n \times r_0$ matrix Z^0 (r_0 is the number of zero eigenvalues) satisfies the relations

$$[Z^0 \Sigma Z^{0\#}]^\dagger J [Z^0 \Sigma Z^{0\#}] = J_{2r_0},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}[Z^0 \Sigma Z^{0\#}] &= 0_{2n \times 2r_0}, \\ N[Z^0 \Sigma Z^{0\#}] &= 0_{2m \times 2r_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\lambda_i^c = \mu_i + \iota \nu_i$, with $\nu_i > 0$, $i = 1 \dots, r_c$, denote the non-real eigenvalues of \mathcal{N} with positive imaginary part. To each one, there correspond four associated eigenvectors, z_{i1}^c , z_{i2}^c , $\Sigma z_{i2}^{c\#}$, and $\Sigma z_{i1}^{c\#}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N} z_{i1}^c &= \lambda_i^c z_{i1}^c, \\ \mathcal{N} z_{i2}^c &= \lambda_i^{c*} z_{i2}^c, \\ \mathcal{N}(\Sigma z_{i2}^{c\#}) &= \lambda_i^c (\Sigma z_{i2}^{c\#}), \\ \mathcal{N}(\Sigma z_{i1}^{c\#}) &= \lambda_i^{c*} (\Sigma z_{i1}^{c\#}), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} z_{i\alpha}^{c\dagger} J z_{i\beta}^c &= 1 - \delta_{\alpha\beta}, \\ (\Sigma z_{i\alpha}^{c\#})^\dagger J (\Sigma z_{i\beta}^{c\#}) &= -1 + \delta_{\alpha\beta}, \\ (\Sigma z_{i\alpha}^{c\#})^\dagger J z_{i\beta}^c &= 0, \text{ for } \alpha, \beta = 1, 2. \end{aligned}$$

For our purposes, it will be beneficial to work with the following linear combinations:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{z}_{i1}^c &\doteq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (z_{i1}^c + z_{i2}^c), \\ \tilde{z}_{i2}^c &\doteq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (z_{i1}^c - z_{i2}^c), \end{aligned}$$

along with $\Sigma \tilde{z}_{i1}^{c\#}$, and $\Sigma \tilde{z}_{i2}^{c\#}$. It is straightforward to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{z}_{i1}^{c\dagger} J \tilde{z}_{i1}^c &= (\Sigma \tilde{z}_{i2}^{c\#})^\dagger J (\Sigma \tilde{z}_{i2}^{c\#}) = 1, \\ \tilde{z}_{i2}^{c\dagger} J \tilde{z}_{i2}^c &= (\Sigma \tilde{z}_{i1}^{c\#})^\dagger J (\Sigma \tilde{z}_{i1}^{c\#}) = -1, \\ \tilde{z}_{i1}^{c\dagger} J \tilde{z}_{i2}^c &= (\Sigma \tilde{z}_{i1}^{c\#})^\dagger J (\Sigma \tilde{z}_{i2}^{c\#}) = 0, \\ (\Sigma \tilde{z}_{i\alpha}^{c\#})^\dagger J \tilde{z}_{i\beta}^c &= 0, \text{ for } \alpha, \beta = 1, 2. \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{N} [\tilde{z}_{i1}^c \Sigma \tilde{z}_{i2}^{c\#} \Sigma \tilde{z}_{i1}^{c\#} \tilde{z}_{i2}^c] \\ &= [\tilde{z}_{i1}^c \Sigma \tilde{z}_{i2}^{c\#} \Sigma \tilde{z}_{i1}^{c\#} \tilde{z}_{i2}^c] \left(\begin{array}{cc|cc} \mu_i & 0 & 0 & \iota \nu_i \\ 0 & \mu_i & -\iota \nu_i & 0 \\ \hline 0 & -\iota \nu_i & \mu_i & 0 \\ \iota \nu_i & 0 & 0 & \mu_i \end{array} \right) \\ &= [\tilde{z}_{i1}^c \Sigma \tilde{z}_{i2}^{c\#} \Sigma \tilde{z}_{i1}^{c\#} \tilde{z}_{i2}^c] \left(\begin{array}{cc} \mu_i I_2 & -\nu_i \sigma_2 \\ \nu_i \sigma_2 & \mu_i I_2 \end{array} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\iota \\ \iota & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ is one of the Pauli matrices. Hence, if we define

$$Z^c \doteq [\tilde{z}_{11}^c \Sigma \tilde{z}_{12}^{c\#} \dots \tilde{z}_{r_c 1}^c \Sigma \tilde{z}_{r_c 2}^{c\#}],$$

For $\mu_i < 0$, $\alpha_i = \sqrt{|\mu_i|} \sinh x_i$, $\beta_i = \sqrt{|\mu_i|} \cosh x_i$, and $x_i = \frac{1}{2} \sinh^{-1} \frac{\nu_i}{|\mu_i|}$.

For $\mu_i = 0$, $\alpha_i = \beta_i = \sqrt{\frac{\nu_i}{2}}$.

Introducing the definition $\mathcal{N} = N^b N$, and the factorization $\bar{\mathcal{N}} = \bar{N}^b \bar{N}$ into (24), we compute:

$$\begin{aligned}
& N^b N [[Z^+ Z^- Z^c] \Sigma [Z^+ Z^- Z^c]^\#] \\
&= [[Z^+ Z^- Z^c] \Sigma [Z^+ Z^- Z^c]^\#] \bar{N}^b \bar{N} \Rightarrow \\
& [[Z^+ Z^- Z^c] \Sigma [Z^+ Z^- Z^c]^\#]^b N^b N [[Z^+ Z^- Z^c] \Sigma [Z^+ Z^- Z^c]^\#] \\
&= \bar{N}^b \bar{N} \Rightarrow \\
& \left(N [[Z^+ Z^- Z^c] \Sigma [Z^+ Z^- Z^c]^\#] (\bar{N})^{-1} \right)^b \cdot \\
& \left(N [[Z^+ Z^- Z^c] \Sigma [Z^+ Z^- Z^c]^\#] (\bar{N})^{-1} \right) = I.
\end{aligned}$$

The fact that \bar{N} is a full rank square matrix of dimension $2(2r_c + r_+ + r_-)$ was implicitly used in the above calculation to guarantee its invertibility. The $2m \times 2(2r_c + r_+ + r_-)$ matrix

$$N [[Z^+ Z^- Z^c] \Sigma [Z^+ Z^- Z^c]^\#] (\bar{N})^{-1},$$

is doubled-up, since each of its factors has this property. Then, there exists a $2m \times (2r_c + r_+ + r_-)$ matrix V_I , such that

$$\begin{aligned}
N [[Z^+ Z^- Z^c] \Sigma [Z^+ Z^- Z^c]^\#] (\bar{N})^{-1} &= [V_I \Sigma V_I^\#] \Leftrightarrow \\
N [[Z^+ Z^- Z^c] \Sigma [Z^+ Z^- Z^c]^\#] &= [V_I \Sigma V_I^\#] \bar{N}. \tag{25}
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that the columns of $[V_I \Sigma V_I^\#]$ are J -orthonormal, i.e.

$$[V_I \Sigma V_I^\#]^\dagger J [V_I \Sigma V_I^\#] = J_{2(2r_c+r_++r_-)}.$$

The final step is to complete a J -orthonormal basis of $(\mathbb{C}^{2m}, J_{2m})$ with the doubled-up property, that is find a matrix $V_{II}^{2m \times 2(m-2r_c-r_+-r_-)}$, such that

$$V \doteq [[V_I V_{II}] \Sigma [V_I V_{II}]^\#]$$

is Bogoliubov. To do this, consider the range of $([V_I \Sigma V_I^\#])$. It is a *nondegenerate* subspace of \mathbb{C}^{2m} , meaning that it admits a J -orthonormal basis. Such a basis is in fact furnished by the columns of $[V_I \Sigma V_I^\#]$. It follows then [42], that its J -orthogonal complement in \mathbb{C}^{2m} , is also nondegenerate, hence it also admits a J -orthonormal basis. Any such basis must contain $m - 2r_c - r_+ - r_-$ vectors whose inner product with themselves is 1, and as many whose inner product with themselves is -1. Then, V_{II} can be any matrix whose columns are comprised by the vectors whose inner product with themselves is 1. Finally, combining equation (25) along with

$$N [Z^0 \Sigma Z^{0\#}] = 0_{2m \times 2r_0} = [\bar{V}_{II} \Sigma \bar{V}_{II}] 0_{2(m-2r_c-r_+-r_-) \times 2r_0},$$

we obtain the equation $NW = V \hat{N}$, where \hat{N} has exactly the form in the statement of the theorem. Given that W is Bogoliubov, the statement of the theorem follows. ■

We conclude this appendix with two remarks that extend the theorem in some special cases.

Remark 1. Here, we extend Theorem 2 in the case of a real eigenvalue with a Jordan block of size 2. We begin with some simple facts. It is easy to see that

$$\mathcal{S}_{2k} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_k & \mathcal{S}_k \\ \mathcal{S}_k & 0_k \end{pmatrix}, \text{ and } \mathcal{S}_{2k+1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_k & 0_{k \times 1} & \mathcal{S}_k \\ 0_{1 \times k} & 1 & 0_{1 \times k} \\ \mathcal{S}_k & 0_{k \times 1} & 0_k \end{pmatrix}.$$

From this structure, and the fact that $\mathcal{S}_k^2 = I_k$, it can be proven easily that the matrices that diagonalize \mathcal{S}_{2k} and \mathcal{S}_{2k+1} are, respectively,

$$T_{2k} \doteq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} I_k & \mathcal{S}_k \\ \mathcal{S}_k & -I_k \end{pmatrix}, \text{ and } T_{2k+1} \doteq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} I_k & 0_{k \times 1} & \mathcal{S}_k \\ 0_{1 \times k} & \sqrt{2} & 0_{1 \times k} \\ \mathcal{S}_k & 0_{k \times 1} & -I_k \end{pmatrix},$$

with $T_{2k}^{-1} \mathcal{S}_{2k} T_{2k} = J_{2k}$, and $T_{2k+1}^{-1} \mathcal{S}_{2k+1} T_{2k+1} = \text{diag}(I_{k+1}, -I_k)$.

Let us consider now the case of a real eigenvalue with a Jordan block of size 2. Lemma 1, along with the discussion that follows it, implies the existence of two vectors, z_1 and z_2 , such that, for $Z \doteq [z_1 \ z_2 \ \Sigma_4 z_1^\# \ \Sigma_4 z_2^\#]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_4 Z &= Z \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{S}_2 & 0_2 \\ 0_2 & -\mathcal{S}_2 \end{pmatrix}, \text{ and} \\ \mathcal{N} Z &= Z \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{j}_2(\lambda) & 0_2 \\ 0_2 & \mathbf{j}_2(\lambda) \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

The vectors \bar{z}_1 and \bar{z}_2 defined by

$$[\bar{z}_1 \ \bar{z}_2] \doteq \left[\frac{z_1 + z_2}{\sqrt{2}} \ \frac{z_1 - z_2}{\sqrt{2}} \right] = [z_1 \ z_2] T_2,$$

satisfy the relation

$$J_4 [\bar{z}_1 \ \bar{z}_2] = [\bar{z}_1 \ \bar{z}_2] (T_2^{-1} \mathcal{S}_2 T_2) = [\bar{z}_1 \ \bar{z}_2] J_2.$$

This means that \bar{z}_1 and \bar{z}_2 are J_4 -orthonormal (with respective J_4 -norms ± 1). We can construct the Bogoliubov matrix W of Theorem 2 out of them, as follows:

$$W = [\bar{z}_1 \ \Sigma_4 \bar{z}_2^\# \ \Sigma_4 \bar{z}_1^\# \ \bar{z}_2] = Z \mathcal{T}_4,$$

with

$$\mathcal{T}_4 \doteq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The structure of \mathcal{T}_4 is inherited from that of T_2 . We have, also,

$$\mathcal{N} W = W \bar{\mathcal{N}},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{N}} &\doteq \mathcal{T}_4^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{j}_2(\lambda) & 0_2 \\ 0_2 & \mathbf{j}_2(\lambda) \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{T}_4 \\ &= \left(\begin{array}{cc|cc} \lambda + \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & \lambda - \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ \hline 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & \lambda + \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & \lambda - \frac{1}{2} \end{array} \right). \end{aligned}$$

To proceed, we have to factorize $\bar{\mathcal{N}} = \bar{\mathcal{N}}^b \bar{\mathcal{N}}$. One such solution is given by

$$\bar{\mathcal{N}} = \begin{pmatrix} c \cosh x & \sinh x & 0 & -c \sinh x \\ 0 & c \cosh x & c \sinh x & \cosh x \\ 0 & -c \sinh x & c \cosh x & \sinh x \\ c \sinh x & \cosh x & 0 & c \cosh x \end{pmatrix},$$

with $c = \sqrt{\lambda + \frac{1}{2}}$, and $\sinh 2x = \frac{1}{2c^2}$, for $\lambda \geq -\frac{1}{2}$, and

$$\bar{N} = \begin{pmatrix} \cosh x & c \sinh x & c \cosh x & 0 \\ -c \sinh x & 0 & \sinh x & c \cosh x \\ c \cosh x & 0 & \cosh x & c \sinh x \\ \sinh x & c \cosh x & -c \sinh x & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

with $c = \sqrt{|\lambda - \frac{1}{2}|}$, and $\sinh 2x = -\frac{1}{2c^2}$, for $\lambda \leq \frac{1}{2}$. In both cases, the kernel of \bar{N} is trivial for $\lambda \neq 0$. Hence, for $\lambda = 0$, this \bar{N} is appropriate to use in the construction of \hat{N} (see proof of Theorem 2) only when 0 is an eigenvalue of \mathcal{N} whose eigenvector is not in $\ker N$. For the case when 0 is an eigenvalue of \mathcal{N} whose eigenvector is in $\ker N$, the following \bar{N} is appropriate:

$$\bar{N} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In every case, we can construct the Bogoliubov matrix V of Theorem 2 following the steps of its proof.

Remark 2. In Theorem 2, we required that $\ker \mathcal{N} = \ker N$. In this case, N is called J -nondegenerate. This condition can be checked simply by calculating the rank of the matrices N and \mathcal{N} . In general, $\text{rank}(\mathcal{N}) \leq \text{rank}(N)$, but when the two are equal, N is J -nondegenerate. To describe the issue with J -degenerate matrices, we need some simple definitions and facts. Let $2r_{0*}$ be the number of (semisimple) zero eigenvalues of \mathcal{N} whose corresponding eigenvectors are not in $\ker N$ ($r_{0*} \leq n$). Let $z_i^{0*}, i = 1, \dots, r_{0*}$ be the corresponding J -orthonormal eigenvectors whose inner product with themselves is 1. Define $Z^{0*} \doteq [z_1^{0*} \dots z_{r_{0*}}^{0*}]$, and $P \doteq N[Z^{0*}(\Sigma Z^{0*})^\#]$. In order to put N in a canonical form, one should be able to write

$$P = N[Z^{0*}(\Sigma Z^{0*})^\#] = [V_{III} \Sigma V_{III}^\#] \bar{N}_{0*}, \quad (26)$$

where $[V_{III} \Sigma V_{III}^\#]$ would be the J -orthonormal basis of $\text{range}(P)$, and \bar{N}_{0*} the restriction/“reduced form” of N in that subspace. Then, one would use Z^{0*} and V_{III} in the construction of the Bogoliubov matrices W and V , respectively, and \bar{N}_{0*} in the construction of \hat{N} , in the proof of Theorem 2. The problem is that

$$P^b P = [Z^{0*}(\Sigma Z^{0*})^\#]^b N[Z^{0*}(\Sigma Z^{0*})^\#] = \mathbf{0}.$$

Thus, the columns of P are a set of self and mutually J -orthogonal vectors. Hence, $\text{range } P$ is a degenerate $2r_{0*}$ -dimensional subspace of \mathbb{C}^{2m} , and degenerate subspaces do not have J -orthonormal bases. So, in the case N is degenerate, the existence of a J -orthonormal basis for $\text{range } P$ is forbidden.

In the following, we identify a special case in which it is possible to establish a relation analogous to (26), and use it to extend the applicability of Theorem 2 to the degenerate case. This is the case when an additional condition holds, namely $PP^b = \mathbf{0}$. Recall that P is doubled-up because it is the product of two doubled-up matrices, and let $P = \begin{pmatrix} P_1 & P_2 \\ P_2^\# & P_1^\# \end{pmatrix}$. Equations $P^b P = 0$, and $PP^b = 0$, imply that $P_1^\dagger P_1 = P_2^\top P_2^\#$, and $P_1 P_1^\dagger = P_2 P_2^\dagger$. Then, if $P_1 = UHY^\dagger$ is a SVD for P_1 , it is straightforward to show that $P_2 = UEHY^\top$, where $E = \text{diag}(\pm 1, \dots, \pm 1)$. Thus, we can factorize P as follows:

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} U & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & U^\# \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} H & EH \\ EH & H \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Y^\dagger & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & Y^\top \end{pmatrix}.$$

Combined with the definition of P , the above equation leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
N[Z^{0*}(\Sigma Z^{0*})^\#] &= \begin{pmatrix} U & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & U^\# \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} H & EH \\ EH & H \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Y^\dagger & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & Y^\top \end{pmatrix} \\
\Leftrightarrow N[Z^{0*}(\Sigma Z^{0*})^\#] \begin{pmatrix} Y & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & Y^\# \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} U & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & U^\# \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} H & EH \\ EH & H \end{pmatrix} \\
\Leftrightarrow N[Z^{0*}Y(\Sigma Z^{0*})^\#Y^\#] &= \begin{pmatrix} UH & UEH \\ U^\#EH & U^\#H \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

The columns of $[Z^{0*}Y(\Sigma Z^{0*})^\#Y^\#]$ are just a different set of J -orthonormal eigenvectors of \mathcal{N} , for Y unitary. Notice that the matrix $H^{m \times r_{0*}}$ must have the structure $H = \begin{pmatrix} H_1^{r_{0*} \times r_{0*}} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}$, with H_1 being diagonal and full rank. Indeed, $2r_{0*} \leq \dim \ker \mathcal{N} \leq \dim \ker N \leq 2m \Rightarrow r_{0*} \leq m$, and $\text{rank } H = \text{rank } P_1 = \text{rank } P_2 = \frac{1}{2}\text{rank } P$, where $\text{rank } P = \min\{\text{rank } N, 2\text{rank } Z^{0*}\} = \min\{2n, 2m, 2r_{0*}\} = 2r_{0*}$. Also, let E_1 be the r_{0*} -dimensional square diagonal matrix made up from the first r_{0*} elements of the diagonal of E , and U_1 the $m \times r_{0*}$ matrix made up from the first r_{0*} columns of U . We have then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\begin{pmatrix} UH & UEH \\ U^\#EH & U^\#H \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} U_1H_1 & U_1E_1H_1 \\ U_1^\#E_1H_1 & U_1^\#H_1 \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} U_1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & U_1^\# \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} H_1 & E_1H_1 \\ E_1H_1 & H_1 \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned}$$

from which we conclude that

$$N[Z^{0*}Y(\Sigma Z^{0*})^\#Y^\#] = \begin{pmatrix} U_1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & U_1^\# \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} H_1 & E_1H_1 \\ E_1H_1 & H_1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (27)$$

Equation (27) is exactly the sought after decomposition of N . The columns of $\begin{pmatrix} U_1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & U_1^\# \end{pmatrix}$ provide a set of $2r_{0*}$ J -orthonormal vectors (though not a basis of $\text{range}(P)$), and $\bar{N}_{0*} = \begin{pmatrix} H_1 & E_1H_1 \\ E_1H_1 & H_1 \end{pmatrix}$. The form of \bar{N}_{0*} suggests that for a zero eigenvalue of \mathcal{N} whose corresponding eigenvector is not in $\ker N$, the implementation of its coupling matrix is by a cavity with a port whose passive and active coupling coefficients are equal in absolute value.

We demonstrate the result for this special case with an example from [15, Section 8].

Example 3 Consider the 1-mode, 3-input system with

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} \Delta & 0 \\ 0 & \Delta \end{pmatrix}, \quad N_1 = N_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\kappa_1} \\ \sqrt{\kappa_2} \\ \sqrt{\kappa_3} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and } S = I_3.$$

We have that $\mathcal{N} = 0_{2 \times 2}$, and $[Z^{0*}(\Sigma Z^{0*})^\#] = I_2$. Hence, $P = N$. However, we also have that $PP^\flat = NN^\flat = 0_{6 \times 6}$. A SVD of $P_1 = N_1$ is given by

$$N_1 = U \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\kappa} \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \mathbf{1},$$

where $\kappa = \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + \kappa_3$, and $U = [u_1 \ u_2 \ u_3]$, with

$$\begin{aligned}
u_1 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\kappa_1} \\ \sqrt{\kappa_2} \\ \sqrt{\kappa_3} \end{pmatrix}, \quad u_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2}} \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{\kappa_2} \\ \sqrt{\kappa_1} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \\
u_3 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2)}} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\kappa_1 \kappa_3} \\ \sqrt{\kappa_2 \kappa_3} \\ -(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2) \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, (27) becomes

$$N = P = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 & 0_{3 \times 1} \\ 0_{3 \times 1} & u_1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\kappa} & \sqrt{\kappa} \\ \sqrt{\kappa} & \sqrt{\kappa} \end{pmatrix},$$

which is obvious. Since there are no other eigenvectors of N , the Bogoliubov matrices V and W in the statement of Theorem 2 are assembled as follows. First, $W = [Z^{0*} (\Sigma Z^{0*})^\#] = I_2$. To construct V , we must complete the J -orthonormal set $\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ 0_{3 \times 1} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0_{3 \times 1} \\ u_1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$ into a J -orthonormal basis of \mathbb{C}^6 . The easiest way to do this is to use the other two columns of U , and set

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} U & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & U^\# \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, N has the decomposition

$$N = \begin{pmatrix} U & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & U^\# \end{pmatrix} \hat{N}, \text{ with } \hat{N}_1 = \hat{N}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\kappa} \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This decomposition could have been surmised directly from the SVD of P_1 , since $N = P$, in this example. From the form of \hat{N} , we see that it can be implemented by a cavity with a port whose passive and active coupling coefficients are equal. The reduced system has the Hamiltonian matrix $\hat{M} = W^\dagger M W = M$, and no feedback is necessary to create it. Figure 10 provides a graphical representation of the proposed implementation of the transfer function for this example.




Figure 10: Graphical representation of the proposed implementation of the transfer function of Example 3.

References

- [1] C. Gardiner and P. Zoller, *Quantum Noise*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second ed., 2000.
- [2] D. Walls and G. Milburn, *Quantum Optics*. Springer-Verlag, 2nd ed., 2008.
- [3] H. Wiseman and G. Milburn, *Quantum Measurement and Control*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [4] K. Parthasarathy, *An Introduction to Quantum Stochastic Calculus*. Birkhauser, 1999.
- [5] P. Meyer, *Quantum Probability for Probabilists*. Springer, second ed., 1995.
- [6] R. L. Hudson and K. R. Parthasarathy, “Quantum Itô’s Formula and Stochastic Evolutions,” *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, vol. 93, pp. 301–323, 1984.
- [7] M. Nielsen and I. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.

- [8] E. Knill, R. Laflamme, and G. Milburn, “A scheme for efficient quantum computation with linear optics,” *Nature*, vol. 409, pp. 46–52, 2001.
- [9] T. C. Ralph, “Quantum optical systems for the implementation of quantum information processing,” *Reports on Progress in Physics*, vol. 69, no. 4, pp. 853–898, 2006.
- [10] G. Zhang and M. R. James, “On the response of quantum linear systems to single photon input fields,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 58, no. 5, pp. 1221–1235, 2013.
- [11] G. Zhang, “Analysis of quantum linear systems response to multi-photon states,” *Automatica*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 442–451, 2014.
- [12] M. Yanagisawa and H. Kimura, “Transfer function approach to quantum control-part I: dynamics of quantum feedback systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 48, no. 12, pp. 2107–2120, 2003.
- [13] M. Yanagisawa and H. Kimura, “Transfer function approach to quantum control-part II: control concepts and applications,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 48, no. 12, pp. 2121–2132, 2003.
- [14] M. James, H. Nurdin, and I. Petersen, “ H^∞ Control of Linear Quantum Stochastic Systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 53, pp. 1787–1803, Sept 2008.
- [15] H. I. Nurdin, M. R. James, and I. R. Petersen, “Coherent quantum LQG control,” *Automatica*, vol. 45, no. 8, pp. 1837 – 1846, 2009.
- [16] A. I. Maalouf and I. R. Petersen, “Coherent H^∞ control for a class of annihilation operator linear quantum systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 309–319, 2011.
- [17] H. Mabuchi, “Coherent-feedback quantum control with a dynamic compensator,” *Physical Review A*, vol. 78, p. 032323, 2008.
- [18] R. Hamerly and H. Mabuchi, “Advantages of Coherent Feedback for Cooling Quantum Oscillators,” *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 109, p. 173602, 2012.
- [19] O. Crisafulli, N. Tezak, D. B. S. Soh, M. A. Armen, and H. Mabuchi, “Squeezed light in an optical parametric oscillator network with coherent feedback quantum control,” *Optics Express*, vol. 21, no. 15, pp. 3761–3774, 2013.
- [20] H. I. Nurdin, M. R. James, and A. C. Doherty, “Network Synthesis of Linear Dynamical Quantum Stochastic Systems,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 2686–2718, 2009.
- [21] H. Nurdin, “Synthesis of Linear Quantum Stochastic Systems via Quantum Feedback Networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 55, pp. 1008–1013, April 2010.
- [22] I. R. Petersen, “Cascade cavity realization for a class of complex transfer functions arising in coherent quantum feedback control,” *Automatica*, vol. 47, no. 8, pp. 1757 – 1763, 2011.
- [23] H. Nurdin, “On Synthesis of Linear Quantum Stochastic Systems by Pure Cascading,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 55, pp. 2439–2444, Oct 2010.
- [24] H. I. Nurdin, S. Grivopoulos, and I. R. Petersen, “The Transfer Function of Generic Linear Quantum Stochastic Systems Has a Pure Cascade Realization,” 2015. Preprint, submitted to *Automatica*. Available online at <http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/1509.05537>.
- [25] J. E. Gough, M. R. James, and H. I. Nurdin, “Squeezing Components in Linear Quantum Feedback Networks,” *Physical Review A*, vol. 81, p. 023804, Feb 2010.

- [26] I. R. Petersen, “Quantum Linear Systems Theory,” in *Proceedings of the 19th International Symposium on Mathematical Theory of Networks and Systems*, (Budapest, Hungary), July 2010.
- [27] A. J. Shaiju and I. R. Petersen, “A Frequency Domain Condition for the Physical Realizability of Linear Quantum Systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 57, pp. 2033–2044, August 2012.
- [28] C. Gardiner and M. Collett, “Input and output in damped quantum systems: Quantum stochastic differential equations and the master equation,” *Physical Review A*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 3761–3774, 1985.
- [29] S. C. Edwards and V. P. Belavkin, “Optimal Quantum Filtering and Quantum Feedback Control,” *arXiv:quant-ph/0506018*, August 2005. Preprint.
- [30] J. Gough and M. James, “The Series Product and Its Application to Quantum Feedforward and Feedback Networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 54, pp. 2530–2544, Nov 2009.
- [31] J. E. Gough, R. Gohm, and M. Yanagisawa, “Linear quantum feedback networks,” *Physical Review A*, vol. 78, p. 062104, Dec 2008.
- [32] A. I. Maalouf and I. R. Petersen, “Bounded real properties for a class of annihilation-operator linear quantum systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 56, no. 4, pp. 786–801, 2011.
- [33] J. E. Gough and G. Zhang, “On Realization Theory of Quantum Linear Systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 59, pp. 139–151, 2015.
- [34] U. Leonhardt, “Quantum Physics of Simple Optical Instruments,” *Reports on Progress in Physics*, vol. 66, pp. 1207–1249, 2003.
- [35] U. Leonhardt and A. Neumaier, “Explicit effective Hamiltonians for general linear quantum-optical networks,” *Journal of Optics B: Quantum and Semiclassical Optics*, vol. 6, pp. L1–L4, Jan 2004.
- [36] S. L. Braunstein, “Squeezing as an irreducible resource,” *Physical Review A*, vol. 71, p. 055801, May 2005.
- [37] M. Reck, A. Zeilinger, H. J. Bernstein, and P. Bertani, “Experimental Realization of Any Discrete Unitary Operator,” *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 73, no. 1, 1994.
- [38] D. Shale, “Linear Symmetries of Free Boson Fields,” *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 103, pp. 149–167, 1962.
- [39] G. Golub and C. V. Loan, *Matrix Computations*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 3rd ed., 1996.
- [40] M. Hirsch, S. Smale, and R. Devaney, *Differential Equations, Dynamical Systems, and an Introduction to Chaos*. Elsevier, 2nd ed., 2004.
- [41] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- [42] I. Gohberg, P. Lancaster, and L. Rodman, *Matrices and Indefinite Scalar Products*, vol. 8 of *Operator Theory*. Birkhäuser, 1983.