

High-purity single-photon generation based on cavity QED

Seigo Kikura,^{1,*} Rui Asaoka,^{2,†} Masato Koashi,^{1,3} and Yuuki Tokunaga²

¹*Department of Applied Physics, Graduate School of Engineering,
The University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-8656, Japan*

²*Computer and Data Science Laboratories, NTT Corporation, Musashino 180-8585, Japan*

³*Photon Science Center, Graduate School of Engineering,
The University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-8656, Japan*

We propose a scheme for generating a high-purity single photon on the basis of cavity quantum electrodynamics (QED). This scheme employs an atom as a four-level system and the structure allows the suppression of the re-excitation process due to the atomic decay, which is known to significantly degrade the single-photon purity in state-of-the-art photon sources using a three-level system. Our analysis shows that the re-excitation probability arbitrarily approaches zero without sacrificing the photon generation probability when increasing the power of a driving laser between two excited states. This advantage is achievable by using current cavity-QED technologies. Our scheme can contribute to developing distributed quantum computation or quantum communication with high accuracy.

Single-photon sources based on cavity quantum electrodynamics (QED) are of paramount importance for quantum information processing that ranges from quantum computation [1, 2] and quantum communication [3, 4]. Notably, photon sources using a Λ -type three-level system, which have the advantage of controlling the temporal mode of an emitted photon, have been well studied for their performance [5–10]. Several groups have in fact successfully demonstrated such photon sources using "atomic" systems, e.g., neutral atoms [11–14], ions [15–20], and defects in solids [21, 22].

In photonic quantum information science, various protocols harness quantum interference of photons, where photon sources should preferably generate high-purity single photons. In the three-level photon generation scheme, however, the atomic spontaneous decay and following re-excitation reduce the purity of photons. In fact, several recent experiments have reported that the re-excitation significantly deteriorates the Hong-Ou-Mandel interference visibility [17, 18, 23]. Although choosing an appropriate initial state or truncating the generation process has been proposed to tackle this problem [16, 18], these strategies have limitations in improving the purity, and especially the latter also sacrifices the total photon generation probability.

Here we propose a scheme for generating a high-purity single photon on the basis of cavity QED. This scheme employs a four-level system including two excited states, two (meta)stable states, and two driving lasers. Using an additional energy level to suppress atomic decay has been examined in some protocols [24–27]. In our protocol, this strategy is developed to generate a high-purity photon on the basis of cavity QED. To evaluate the performance of our scheme, we analyze the four-level system proposed here by using the effective operator formalism [28], which shows that the re-excitation probability is




FIG. 1. Three-level system and a cavity for single-photon generation

greatly inhibited in our scheme compared to in the previous three-level one. The distinct advantage of our scheme is that the photon generation probability is hardly sacrificed. Finally, we propose a realistic implementation of our scheme using current cavity-QED technologies.

We first analyze a Λ -type three-level atom in a one-sided cavity shown in Fig. 1 to compare our method with the conventional one that uses this system. The Λ system is formed by two (meta)stable levels $|u\rangle, |g\rangle$, and one excited level $|e\rangle$. The $|u\rangle - |e\rangle$ transition is driven by an external driving pulse of frequency ω_d with Rabi frequency $2\Omega(t)$. The $|g\rangle - |e\rangle$ transition is coupled to a cavity mode of frequency ω_c with coupling strength g , which is defined as a real number. The Hamiltonian in a proper rotating frame is

$$\hat{H} = (\omega_u + \omega_d - \omega_g - \omega_c)\hat{\sigma}_{u,u} + (\omega_e - \omega_g - \omega_c)\hat{\sigma}_{e,e} + (\Omega(t)\hat{\sigma}_{e,u} + g\hat{c}^\dagger\hat{\sigma}_{g,e} + \text{h.c.}), \quad (1)$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_{j,l} = |j\rangle\langle l|$ ($j, l = u, e, g$), \hat{c} (\hat{c}^\dagger) is the annihilation (creation) operator for the cavity mode, ω_l ($l = u, e, g$) is a frequency for the energy of $|l\rangle$, and we set $\hbar = 1$. This Hamiltonian couples only three states $|u, n-1\rangle, |e, n-1\rangle, |g, n\rangle$, where the number represents the photon number of the cavity mode. When the system

* seigo.kikura@fuji.waseda.jp

† rui.asaoka@ntt.com

is initially prepared in $|u, 0\rangle$, we can thus use a simplified Hamiltonian in the manifold $\{|u, 0\rangle, |e, 0\rangle, |g, 1\rangle\}$

$$\hat{H} = \Delta_e |e, 0\rangle\langle e, 0| + (\Omega(t)|e, 0\rangle\langle u, 0| + g|e, 0\rangle\langle g, 1| + \text{h.c.}) \quad (2)$$

where we define $\Delta_e = \omega_e - \omega_g - \omega_c$ and assume $\omega_u + \omega_d = \omega_g + \omega_c$. We describe the cavity decay and atomic spontaneous decay with Lindblad operators: $\hat{L}_{\text{ex}} = \sqrt{2\kappa_{\text{ex}}}|g, 0\rangle\langle g, 1|$ corresponds to the cavity decay where a photon is emitted into the desired external mode, $\hat{L}_{\text{in}} = \sqrt{2\kappa_{\text{in}}}|g, 0\rangle\langle g, 1|$ corresponds to the cavity decay including scattering into undesired modes and intracavity losses, and $\hat{L}_u = \sqrt{2\gamma_u}|u, 0\rangle\langle e, 0|$ corresponds to the atomic decay from $|e\rangle$ to $|u\rangle$. We use an operator \hat{L}_o to represent atomic decays from $|e, 0\rangle$ to levels outside the manifold $\{|u, 0\rangle, |e, 0\rangle, |g, 1\rangle\}$. Those levels may include $|g\rangle$ and other atomic levels except $|u\rangle$ and $|e\rangle$. Without loss of generality, we treat it as a decay to a single level $|o\rangle$ and assume that $\hat{L}_o = \sqrt{2\gamma_o}|o, 0\rangle\langle e, 0|$. We define $2\kappa = 2(\kappa_{\text{ex}} + \kappa_{\text{in}})$ as the total cavity loss rate and $2\gamma = 2(\gamma_u + \gamma_o)$ as the total rate of spontaneous decay.

The master equation describes the time evolution of this atom-cavity system as

$$\frac{d\hat{\rho}}{dt} = -i[\hat{H}, \hat{\rho}] + \sum_x \left(\hat{L}_x \hat{\rho} \hat{L}_x^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{ \hat{L}_x^\dagger \hat{L}_x, \hat{\rho} \} \right) \quad (3)$$

where $x = \text{ex, in, } u, o$. The quantum jumps \hat{L}_{in} and \hat{L}_o lead to the failure of the photon generation, whereas the quantum jump \hat{L}_{ex} leads to the success. The quantum jump \hat{L}_u initializes the system and then the photon generation process re-starts. We call a process where the decay \hat{L}_u does not occur a single excitation and a process where the decay \hat{L}_u occurs even just once a re-excitation process.

We assume that the intensity and time variation of the driving pulse are small. This assumption, which has been used in many previous works [8, 9, 14, 29], enables us to use the effective operator formalism [28]. This formalism shows that a state in an excited subspace is $\hat{\rho}_{\text{excited}} = |\psi_{\text{excited}}\rangle\langle\psi_{\text{excited}}|$ with $|\psi_{\text{excited}}\rangle \propto i\kappa|e, 0\rangle + g|g, 1\rangle$, and describes the time evolution in a ground subspace as a master equation with effective Hamiltonian and Lindblad operators as follows [30]:

$$\hat{H}^{\text{eff}}(t) = \Delta^{\text{eff}}(t)|u, 0\rangle\langle u, 0|, \quad (4)$$

$$\hat{L}_{\text{ex(in)}}^{\text{eff}}(t) = k_{\text{ex(in)}}(t)|g, 0\rangle\langle u, 0|, \quad (5)$$

$$\hat{L}_{u(o)}^{\text{eff}}(t) = l_{u(o)}(t)|u(o), 0\rangle\langle u, 0|. \quad (6)$$

By using the effective operators, we determine the final state of the desired mode in the following way. We classify the single-photon emission events using a label s , which is a non-negative number: In the event with $s = 0$, no quantum jumps occur during $0 < t < t_1$ and a jump $\hat{L}_{\text{ex}}^{\text{eff}}$ occurs at $t = t_1$, where $t_1 > 0$ is arbitrary. For $s > 0$, the event s refers to the case where a jump

\hat{L}_u^{eff} occurs at $t = s$, no quantum jumps occur during $s < t < t_1$, and a jump $\hat{L}_{\text{ex}}^{\text{eff}}$ occurs at $t = t_1$, where $t_1 > s$ is arbitrary. Those events and the complement (no photon emission) are mutually exclusive and are also distinguishable without looking at the desired mode in principle because the occurrence and its time of a quantum jump ($\hat{L}_{\text{in}}^{\text{eff}}, \hat{L}_u^{\text{eff}}, \hat{L}_o^{\text{eff}}$) can be recorded in the associated environment. Hence the final state of the desired mode is given by a mixture of those events as

$$\hat{\rho} = |\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0| + \int_0^\infty ds r(s) |\psi_s\rangle\langle\psi_s| + (1 - P_{\text{total}})|0\rangle\langle 0| \quad (7)$$

where $|0\rangle$ is a vacuum state of the desired mode. Here $r(s)$ is the rate of quantum jump \hat{L}_u^{eff} at $t = s$, which is to be determined from the effective master equation. The unnormalized state vector $|\psi_s\rangle$ ($s \geq 0$) represents the state of the emitted single photon with no quantum jumps during $s < t$ except the jump $\hat{L}_{\text{ex}}^{\text{eff}}$, on condition that the atom-cavity system is in state $|u, 0\rangle$ at time $t = s$. These are pure states because the events involve only quantum jumps $\hat{L}_{\text{ex}}^{\text{eff}}$ whose environment is the desired mode. In fact, the state $|\psi_s\rangle$ is related to the time evolution of the atom-cavity system as

$$|g, 0\rangle|\psi_s\rangle = \int_s^\infty dt \hat{L}_{\text{ex}}^{\text{eff}}(t) \hat{a}^\dagger(t) |\Phi_s(t)\rangle |0\rangle \quad (8)$$

where $\hat{a}(t)$ is the output field operator. Here $|\Phi_s(t)\rangle$ is the state of the atom-cavity system at time t with no quantum jumps during $s < t$, on condition that it is in state $|u, 0\rangle$ at time $t = s$. More precisely, the normalized solution $\hat{\rho}_s(t)$ of the effective master equation with $\hat{\rho}_s(s) = |u, 0\rangle\langle u, 0|$ is written in the form $\hat{\rho}_s(t) = |\Phi_s(t)\rangle\langle\Phi_s(t)| + \hat{\rho}_{s; \text{jumps}}(t)$ with $\hat{\rho}_{s; \text{jumps}}(t)$ representing an unnormalized state after one or more quantum jumps. The time dependence of state $|\Phi_s(t)\rangle$ is determined by solving

$$i \frac{d|\Phi_s(t)\rangle}{dt} = \left(\hat{H}^{\text{eff}}(t) - \frac{i}{2} \sum_x \hat{L}_x^{\text{eff}\dagger}(t) \hat{L}_x^{\text{eff}}(t) \right) |\Phi_s(t)\rangle \quad (9)$$

with initial condition $|\Phi_s(s)\rangle = |u, 0\rangle$. The first and second terms on the right-hand side of the Eq. (7) respectively correspond to the single-photon states emitted by single and re-excitation processes.

The probability of the photon generation up to time t for the single(re-) excitation process $P_{\text{si(re)}}(t)$ is calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\text{si}}(t) &= \int_0^t dt' |\langle 0|\hat{a}(t')|\psi_0\rangle|^2 \\ &= \frac{\kappa_{\text{ex}}^{\text{eff}}}{\kappa_{\text{ex}}^{\text{eff}} + \gamma^{\text{eff}}} \left[1 - e^{-\int_0^t dt' 2(\kappa_{\text{ex}}^{\text{eff}}(t') + \gamma^{\text{eff}}(t'))} \right] \\ P_{\text{re}}(t) &= \int_0^t dt' \int_0^\infty ds r(s) |\langle 0|\hat{a}(t')|\psi_s\rangle|^2 \\ &= \frac{\kappa_{\text{ex}}^{\text{eff}}}{\kappa_{\text{ex}}^{\text{eff}} + \gamma_o^{\text{eff}}} \left[1 - e^{-\int_0^t dt' 2(\kappa_{\text{ex}}^{\text{eff}}(t') + \gamma_o^{\text{eff}}(t'))} \right] - P_{\text{si}}(t) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

(11)




FIG. 2. Four-level system and a cavity

where

$$\kappa_{\text{ex(in)}}^{\text{eff}}(t) = \frac{|k_{\text{ex(in)}}(t)|^2}{2}, \quad \gamma_{u(o)}^{\text{eff}}(t) = \frac{|l_{u(o)}(t)|^2}{2},$$

$$\kappa^{\text{eff}}(t) = \kappa_{\text{ex}}^{\text{eff}}(t) + \kappa_{\text{in}}^{\text{eff}}(t), \quad \gamma^{\text{eff}}(t) = \gamma_u^{\text{eff}}(t) + \gamma_o^{\text{eff}}(t).$$

We assume that we apply $\Omega(t)$ for a sufficiently long time so that the population of $|u, 0\rangle$ finally becomes zero. In this case, the photon generation probabilities of the single excitation and total processes are given by

$$P_{\text{si}} := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} P_{\text{si}}(t) = \frac{\kappa_{\text{ex}}}{\kappa} \frac{g^2}{g^2 + \kappa\gamma}, \quad (12)$$

$$P_{\text{total}} := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (P_{\text{si}}(t) + P_{\text{re}}(t)) = \frac{\kappa_{\text{ex}}}{\kappa} \frac{g^2}{g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o}. \quad (13)$$

The ratio of the photon produced by the re-excitation process is $R_{\text{re}} = 1 - P_{\text{si}}/P_{\text{total}} = \kappa\gamma_u/(g^2 + \kappa\gamma)$. Equations (12) and (13) agree with the universal upper bound for photon generation in a Λ -type three-level system [5].

The quality of a single-photon source may be evaluated by using several quantities. One is the efficiency P_{total} , which has already appeared in the above derivation. To further evaluate the quality of the temporal modes of the single photon, we assume that the state of the emitted light is written by

$$\hat{\rho} = P_{\text{total}}\hat{\rho}_S + (1 - P_{\text{total}})|0\rangle\langle 0| \quad (14)$$

and define single-photon purity D_S and single-photon fidelity F_S by

$$D_S = \text{Tr}[(\hat{\rho}_S)^2], \quad F_S = \langle \psi_{\text{ideal}} | \hat{\rho}_S | \psi_{\text{ideal}} \rangle, \quad (15)$$

where $|\psi_{\text{ideal}}\rangle$ is an ideal single-photon state, which we choose to be $|\psi_{\text{ideal}}\rangle = |\psi_0\rangle/\sqrt{\langle \psi_0 | \psi_0 \rangle}$ here. This purity D_S relates to the Hong-Ou-Mandel interference visibility [31]. Substituting Eq. (7) gives these two measures as [30]

$$D_S = 1 - R_{\text{re}}, \quad F_S = 1 - \frac{R_{\text{re}}}{2 - R_{\text{re}}}. \quad (16)$$

Therefore, the performance depends only on the total photon generation probability and the ratio of the re-excitation process, rather than the driving pulse. The

above discussion indicates that the total photon generation probability needs to be improved and the re-excitation process suppressed to improve the performance of the single-photon source. Equations (12) and (13) show that both goals can be achieved by increasing g .

This improvement, however, requires an experimental breakthrough, and thus other methods to improve the performance need to be proposed. To suppress the re-excitation, we propose a four-level system where we add an excited level $|e_2\rangle$, shown in Fig. 2. The $|u\rangle - |e_2\rangle$ transition is driven by the driving pulse $\Omega(t)$ and $|e_2\rangle - |e\rangle$ transition is driven by an additional laser of frequency ω_2 with Rabi frequency $2\Omega_2$, which is defined as a real constant. We define $2\gamma_{o2}$ and $2\gamma_e$ as the decay rates from $|e_2\rangle$ to $|o\rangle$ and to $|e\rangle$, where we represent atomic decay to levels other than $|u\rangle, |e\rangle$, and $|e_2\rangle$ by decay to a single level $|o\rangle$. We assume that the decay $|e\rangle \rightarrow |u\rangle$ is prohibited by a selection rule.

In the three-level system, the fact that the state vector of excited states is $|\psi_{\text{excited}}\rangle \propto i\kappa|e, 0\rangle + g|g, 1\rangle$ leads to increasing g reducing the population of $|e\rangle$ during the photon generation process and thus suppresses the re-excitation process. In the four-level system, increasing Ω_2 , which can be easily controlled, will reduce the population of $|e_2\rangle$ and thus lead to suppression.

To confirm this expectation, we now analyze the four-level system in the same way we did the three-level one. The Hamiltonian describing the four-level system in a proper rotating frame is given as

$$\hat{H}^{(2)} = \Delta_e|e, 0\rangle\langle e, 0| + \Delta_{e_2}|e_2, 0\rangle\langle e_2, 0|$$

$$+ (\Omega(t)|e_2, 0\rangle\langle u, 0| + \Omega_2|e, 0\rangle\langle e_2, 0| + \text{h.c.}) \quad (17)$$

$$+ (g|g, 1\rangle\langle e, 0| + \text{h.c.})$$

where we define ω_{e_2} as the frequency for the energy of $|e_2\rangle$, $\Delta_e = \omega_e - \omega_u - \omega_d - \omega_2$, $\Delta_{e_2} = \omega_{e_2} - \omega_u - \omega_d$, and assume $\omega_u + \omega_d + \omega_2 = \omega_g + \omega_c$. Here we assume $\gamma_{o2} = \gamma_e = 0$ to compare the four-level system with the three-level one. We will later discuss the case with $\gamma_{o2}, \gamma_e > 0$ and show that these decays will not be an additional problem. Lindblad operators are given as $\hat{L}_{\text{ex}}^{(2)} = \sqrt{2\kappa_{\text{ex}}}|g, 0\rangle\langle g, 1|$, $\hat{L}_{\text{in}}^{(2)} = \sqrt{2\kappa_{\text{in}}}|g, 0\rangle\langle g, 1|$, $\hat{L}_u^{(2)} = \sqrt{2\gamma_u}|u, 0\rangle\langle e_2, 0|$, and $\hat{L}_o^{(2)} = \sqrt{2\gamma_o}|o, 0\rangle\langle e, 0|$. When assuming the intensity and time variation of the driving pulse $\Omega(t)$ are small, we can use the effective operator formalism and find that a state in an excited subspace is $\hat{\rho}_{\text{excited}}^{(2)} = |\psi_{\text{excited}}^{(2)}\rangle\langle \psi_{\text{excited}}^{(2)}|$ with $|\psi_{\text{excited}}^{(2)}\rangle \propto [g^2 + \kappa(\gamma_o + i\Delta_e)]|e_2, 0\rangle - \Omega_2(i\kappa|e, 0\rangle + g|g, 1\rangle)$. Thus, we can decrease the population of $|e_2\rangle$ by setting $\Delta_e = 0$ and increasing Ω_2 , suppressing the re-excitation process. We demonstrate that the total photon generation probability $P_{\text{total}}^{(2)}$ is consistent with Eq. (13) whereas the ratio of the re-excitation process is

$$R_{\text{re}}^{(2)} = \frac{\gamma_u[(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)^2 + \kappa^2\Delta_e^2]}{\kappa(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)\Omega_2^2 + \gamma_u[(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)^2 + \kappa^2\Delta_e^2]}, \quad (18)$$




FIG. 3. (a) Probability of the photon generation via the re-excitation process, (b) total photon generation probability, and (c) photon emission time as a function of Ω_2/g . All detunings of the three- and four-level systems are zero and $\gamma_u = 0.1g, \gamma_g = \kappa_{in} = 0.01g$ and $\kappa_{ex} = \kappa_{in}\sqrt{1 + g^2/\kappa_{in}\gamma}$, which maximizes P_{si} [5]. Dashed lines show the result of the three-level system that includes the minimum emission time when optimizing Ω_0 and the corresponding photon generation probability. The optimal value is $\Omega_0/g^2 = 0.070$. Solid lines show the analytical result.

and Eqs. (16) hold by replacing $R_{re} \rightarrow R_{re}^{(2)}$ [30]. This ratio is minimized for $\Delta_e = 0$ and is made to further approach zero by increasing Ω_2 such that $\Omega_2/\sqrt{\gamma_u(g^2/\kappa + \gamma_o)} \gg 1$. This result shows that $\Omega_2 \geq g^2/\kappa + \gamma_o$ means $R_{re}^{(2)} \leq R_{re}$. Thus, even without increasing g , increasing Ω_2 suppresses the re-excitation process

while maintaining the total photon generation probability.

We calculate the photon generation probability and an emission time by numerically solving the master equation (3), where we use a QuTiP 2 package [32]. In this calculation, we assume the driving pulse that has a linear shape, i.e., $\Omega(t) = \Omega_0 t$. The symbols in Figs. 3(a) and 3(b) show the photon generation probability for the re-excitation process and the total probability with the analytical values represented by the solid lines. These simulations show that the smaller Ω_0 is, the smaller the deviation between exact solutions and ones by the effective operator formalism is. These numerical results demonstrate that setting Ω_0 small and increasing Ω_2 such that $\Omega_2/g \geq (g^2/\kappa + \gamma_o)/g = 3.2$ suppresses the re-excitation process without diminishing the total photon generation probability compared to the three-level system.

Figure 3(c) shows an emission time by numerical calculation. Here we define a photon emission time of the four-level system $t_{em}^{(2)}$ as a time when the photon generation probability for the single excitation process becomes 0.99 of its maximum value, i.e. $0.99 \times (1 - R_{re}^{(2)})P_{total}^{(2)}$. We can find that the photon emission time increases when Ω_2 increases. This behavior can be explained analytically. We can find that the generation probability up to time t for the single excitation process is given as $P_{si}^{(2)}(t) = (1 - R_{re}^{(2)})P_{total}^{(2)}(1 - e^{-\lambda_{si}^{(2)}h(o,t)})$, where we define $h(\tau_1, \tau_2) = \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} dt |\Omega(t)|^2$ [30]. This equation indicates that for a given shape of $\Omega(t)$, increasing $\lambda_{si}^{(2)}$ makes $t_{em}^{(2)}$ small. We can derive the upper bound of $\lambda_{si}^{(2)}$ as $\lambda_{si}^{(2)} \leq 2R_{re}^{(2)}/\gamma_u$ whose equality holds when

$$\Delta_{e_2} = \frac{\kappa^2 \Omega_2^2 \Delta_e}{(g^2 + \kappa \gamma_o)^2 + \kappa^2 \Delta_e^2}. \quad (19)$$

This inequality thus shows a trade-off between the photon emission time and the ratio of the re-excitation process. Note that the trade-off is also valid for the three-level system. However, the numerical result shows that increasing Ω_0 suppresses the delay of photon generation with a slight sacrifice of $P_{total}^{(2)}$.

So far, we have assumed $\gamma_{o2} = \gamma_e = 0$, but there may be non-negligible decay $|e_2\rangle \rightarrow |o\rangle, |e_2\rangle \rightarrow |e\rangle$ in real atoms. The former decay does not decrease the single-photon purity and fidelity but the total photon generation probability, whereas the latter decay affects all of them. However, we can neglect both decays in the limit $\Omega_2 \gg \sqrt{(\gamma_u + \gamma_{o2} + \gamma_e)(g^2/\kappa + \gamma_o)}$ because our system can decrease the population of $|e_2\rangle$ and suppress all decays from $|e_2\rangle$ by increasing Ω_2 [30].

To realize our scheme, we need to use an atom that satisfies following two requirements: The decay $|e\rangle \rightarrow |u\rangle$ is prohibited by the selection rule. The transition $|e_2\rangle - |e\rangle$ can be driven with a sufficient large Ω_2 . One strategy to realize such a system may be to use one-electron atoms with levels in S or D orbital as $|u\rangle$ and $|g\rangle$ and ones in P orbital as $|e\rangle$ and $|e_2\rangle$. However, in this case, driving

the transition $|e_2\rangle - |e\rangle$ with a large Rabi frequency is not easy because the electric-dipole transition is forbidden. A more feasible choice is to use two-electron atoms, which have been attracting attention from the viewpoint of utilizing its metastable levels in P orbital for quantum information processing [33–36]. For example, ^{171}Yb satisfies both requirements by defining the states of interest as $|u\rangle = {}^3P_0|F = 1/2, m_F = -1/2\rangle$, $|e_2\rangle = {}^3D_1|F = 3/2, m_F = 1/2\rangle$, $|e\rangle = {}^3P_1|F = 3/2, m_F = 3/2\rangle$, and $|g\rangle = {}^1S_0|F = 1/2, m_F = 1/2\rangle$. All optical transitions between these states and the coupling with a cavity field have been realized experimentally [37–39].

In conclusion, we have introduced a scheme for generating a high-purity photon on the basis of cavity QED. This scheme can reduce the probability of the re-excitation process close to zero, without sacrificing the total photon generation probability, by increasing the driving-laser power between the excited states. Many photonic quantum information protocols have the ability to handle photon loss, e.g., post-selection by photon de-

tection. Thus, our scheme can significantly increase the performance of such protocols even if the total photon generation probability is low due to imperfections of the cavity-QED system. Our scheme may increase the difficulty of experiments, but we have proposed a feasible implementation using ^{171}Yb with current cavity-QED technologies. Moreover, this can be straightforwardly combined with the scheme of entanglement generation between a ^{171}Yb qubit and a time-bin encoded photon [40]. This scheme is based on running a photon generation protocol for each time bin and any atomic decay during those protocols breaks the coherence and ruins the entanglement generation. Our proposed photon generation scheme that can suppress atomic decays thus helps to realize high-fidelity entanglement generation, which is a key element for distributed quantum computation and quantum communication.

We thank Hiroki Takahashi, Akihisa Goban, and Shinichi Sunami for their advice. This research was supported by JST (Moonshot R&D)(Grant No. JP-MJMS2061).

-
- [1] E. Knill, R. Laflamme, and G. J. Milburn, A scheme for efficient quantum computation with linear optics, *Nature* **409**, 46 (2001).
- [2] C. Monroe, R. Raussendorf, A. Ruthven, K. R. Brown, P. Maunz, L.-M. Duan, and J. Kim, Large-scale modular quantum-computer architecture with atomic memory and photonic interconnects, *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 022317 (2014).
- [3] H. J. Kimble, The quantum internet, *Nature* **453**, 1023 (2008).
- [4] J. P. Covey, H. Weinfurter, and H. Bernien, Quantum networks with neutral atom processing nodes, *npj Quantum Information* **9** (2023).
- [5] H. Goto, S. Mizukami, Y. Tokunaga, and T. Aoki, Figure of merit for single-photon generation based on cavity quantum electrodynamics, *Phys. Rev. A* **99**, 053843 (2019).
- [6] G. S. Vasilev, D. Ljunggren, and A. Kuhn, Single photons made-to-measure, *New Journal of Physics* **12**, 063024 (2010).
- [7] T. Utsugi, A. Goban, Y. Tokunaga, H. Goto, and T. Aoki, Gaussian-wave-packet model for single-photon generation based on cavity quantum electrodynamics under adiabatic and nonadiabatic conditions, *Phys. Rev. A* **106**, 023712 (2022).
- [8] L. Giannelli, T. Schmit, T. Calarco, C. P. Koch, S. Ritter, and G. Morigi, Optimal storage of a single photon by a single intra-cavity atom, *New Journal of Physics* **20**, 105009 (2018).
- [9] A. V. Gorshkov, A. André, M. D. Lukin, and A. S. Sørensen, Photon storage in Λ -type optically dense atomic media. i. cavity model, *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 033804 (2007).
- [10] B. Tissot and G. Burkard, Efficient high-fidelity flying qubit shaping, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **6**, 013150 (2024).
- [11] A. Kuhn, M. Hennrich, and G. Rempe, Deterministic single-photon source for distributed quantum network-
ing, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 067901 (2002).
- [12] M. Hijlkema, B. Weber, H. P. Specht, S. C. Webster, A. Kuhn, and G. Rempe, A single-photon server with just one atom, *Nature Physics* **3**, 253 (2007).
- [13] P. B. R. Nisbet-Jones, J. Dille, D. Ljunggren, and A. Kuhn, Highly efficient source for indistinguishable single photons of controlled shape, *New Journal of Physics* **13**, 103036 (2011).
- [14] O. Morin, M. Körber, S. Langenfeld, and G. Rempe, Deterministic shaping and reshaping of single-photon temporal wave functions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 133602 (2019).
- [15] M. Keller, B. Lange, K. Hayasaka, W. Lange, and H. Walther, Continuous generation of single photons with controlled waveform in an ion-trap cavity system, *NATURE* **431**, 1075 (2004).
- [16] H. G. Barros, A. Stute, T. E. Northup, C. Russo, P. O. Schmidt, and R. Blatt, Deterministic single-photon source from a single ion, *New Journal of Physics* **11**, 103004 (2009).
- [17] M. Meraner, A. Mazloom, V. Krutyanskiy, V. Krcmarsky, J. Schupp, D. A. Fioretto, P. Sekatski, T. E. Northup, N. Sangouard, and B. P. Lanyon, Indistinguishable photons from a trapped-ion quantum network node, *Phys. Rev. A* **102**, 052614 (2020).
- [18] T. Walker, S. V. Kashanian, T. Ward, and M. Keller, Improving the indistinguishability of single photons from an ion-cavity system, *Phys. Rev. A* **102**, 032616 (2020).
- [19] J. Schupp, V. Krcmarsky, V. Krutyanskiy, M. Meraner, T. E. Northup, and B. P. Lanyon, Interface between trapped-ion qubits and traveling photons with close-to-optimal efficiency, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 020331 (2021).
- [20] T. Ward and M. Keller, Generation of time-bin-encoded photons in an ion-cavity system, *New Journal of Physics* **24**, 123028 (2022).
- [21] T. M. Sweeney, S. G. Carter, A. S. Bracker, M. Kim, C. S. Kim, L. Yang, P. M. Vora, P. G. Brereton, E. R. Cleve-

- land, and D. Gammon, Cavity-stimulated raman emission from a single quantum dot spin, *Nature Photonics* **8**, 442 (2014).
- [22] E. N. Knall, C. M. Knaut, R. Bekenstein, D. R. Assumpcao, P. L. Stroganov, W. Gong, Y. Q. Huan, P.-J. Stas, B. Machielse, M. Chalupnik, D. Levonian, A. Suleymanzade, R. Riedinger, H. Park, M. Lončar, M. K. Bhaskar, and M. D. Lukin, Efficient source of shaped single photons based on an integrated diamond nanophotonic system, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 053603 (2022).
- [23] V. Krutyanskiy, M. Galli, V. Krcmarsky, S. Baier, D. A. Fioretto, Y. Pu, A. Mazloom, P. Sekatski, M. Canteri, M. Teller, J. Schupp, J. Bate, M. Meraner, N. Sangouard, B. P. Lanyon, and T. E. Northup, Entanglement of trapped-ion qubits separated by 230 meters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, 050803 (2023).
- [24] D. Porras and J. I. Cirac, Collective generation of quantum states of light by entangled atoms, *Phys. Rev. A* **78**, 053816 (2008).
- [25] J. Borregaard, P. Kómár, E. M. Kessler, A. S. Sørensen, and M. D. Lukin, Heralded quantum gates with integrated error detection in optical cavities, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 110502 (2015).
- [26] A. González-Tudela, V. Paulisch, H. J. Kimble, and J. I. Cirac, Efficient multiphoton generation in waveguide quantum electrodynamics, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 213601 (2017).
- [27] V. Paulisch, H. J. Kimble, J. I. Cirac, and A. González-Tudela, Generation of single- and two-mode multiphoton states in waveguide qed, *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 053831 (2018).
- [28] F. Reiter and A. S. Sørensen, Effective operator formalism for open quantum systems, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 032111 (2012).
- [29] C. K. Law and H. J. Kimble, Deterministic generation of a bit-stream of single-photon pulses, *Journal of Modern Optics* **44**, 2067 (1997).
- [30] See Supplemental Material.
- [31] A. M. Brańczyk, Hong-ou-mandel interference (2017), arXiv:1711.00080 [quant-ph].
- [32] J. Johansson, P. Nation, and F. Nori, Qutip 2: A python framework for the dynamics of open quantum systems, *Computer Physics Communications* **184**, 1234 (2013).
- [33] A. Jenkins, J. W. Lis, A. Senoo, W. F. McGrew, and A. M. Kaufman, Ytterbium nuclear-spin qubits in an optical tweezer array, *Phys. Rev. X* **12**, 021027 (2022).
- [34] S. Ma, A. P. Burgers, G. Liu, J. Wilson, B. Zhang, and J. D. Thompson, Universal gate operations on nuclear spin qubits in an optical tweezer array of ^{171}Yb atoms, *Phys. Rev. X* **12**, 021028 (2022).
- [35] N. Chen, L. Li, W. Huie, M. Zhao, I. Vetter, C. H. Greene, and J. P. Covey, Analyzing the rydberg-based optical-metastable-ground architecture for ^{171}Yb nuclear spins, *Phys. Rev. A* **105**, 052438 (2022).
- [36] J. W. Lis, A. Senoo, W. F. McGrew, F. Rönchen, A. Jenkins, and A. M. Kaufman, Midcircuit operations using the omg architecture in neutral atom arrays, *Phys. Rev. X* **13**, 041035 (2023).
- [37] K. Beloy, J. A. Sherman, N. D. Lemke, N. Hinkley, C. W. Oates, and A. D. Ludlow, Determination of the $5d6s\ ^3D_1$ state lifetime and blackbody-radiation clock shift in yb, *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 051404(R) (2012).
- [38] S. Saskin, J. T. Wilson, B. Grinkemeyer, and J. D. Thompson, Narrow-line cooling and imaging of ytterbium atoms in an optical tweezer array, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 143002 (2019).
- [39] E. Pedrozo-Peñafiel, S. Colombo, C. Shu, A. F. Adiyatullin, Z. Li, E. Mendez, B. Braverman, A. Kawasaki, D. Akamatsu, Y. Xiao, and V. Vuletić, Entanglement on an optical atomic-clock transition, *Nature* **588**, 414–418 (2020).
- [40] W. Huie, S. G. Menon, H. Bernien, and J. P. Covey, Multiplexed telecommunication-band quantum networking with atom arrays in optical cavities, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **3**, 043154 (2021).

Supplementary Material for “High-purity single-photon generation based on cavity QED”

S1. EFFECTIVE OPERATOR FORMALISM

We will summarize the effective operator formalism proposed by Reiter and Sørensen [28]. We consider an open system that consists of two distinct subspaces: ground subspace and decaying excited subspace. We define \hat{P}_{ground} and \hat{P}_{excited} as projection operators onto ground subspace and decaying excited subspace and decompose the Hamiltonian \hat{H} as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{H} &= \hat{P}_{\text{ground}}\hat{H}\hat{P}_{\text{ground}} + \hat{P}_{\text{excited}}\hat{H}\hat{P}_{\text{excited}} + \hat{P}_{\text{excited}}\hat{H}\hat{P}_{\text{ground}} + \hat{P}_{\text{ground}}\hat{H}\hat{P}_{\text{excited}} \\ &= \hat{H}_{\text{ground}} + \hat{H}_{\text{excited}} + \hat{V}_+ + \hat{V}_-.\end{aligned}\quad (\text{S1})$$

We assume that $\hat{H}_{\text{ground}} = 0$ and the coupling of these two subspaces \hat{V}_{\pm} are perturbative. We then approximate

$$\int_0^t dt' e^{-i\hat{H}_{\text{NH}}(t-t')} \hat{V}_+ \simeq -i\hat{H}_{\text{NH}}^{-1} \hat{V}_+, \quad (\text{S2})$$

and find that a state in the excited subspace is given by

$$\hat{\rho}_{\text{excited}} = \hat{P}_{\text{excited}}\hat{\rho}\hat{P}_{\text{excited}} = \hat{H}_{\text{NH}}^{-1}\hat{V}_+\hat{\rho}_{\text{ground}}\hat{V}_-(\hat{H}_{\text{NH}}^{-1})^\dagger, \quad (\text{S3})$$

where we define a non-Hermitian Hamiltonian as

$$\hat{H}_{\text{NH}} = \hat{H}_{\text{excited}} - \frac{i}{2} \sum_k \hat{L}_k^\dagger \hat{L}_k, \quad (\text{S4})$$

and $\hat{\rho}_{\text{ground}} = \hat{P}_{\text{ground}}\hat{\rho}\hat{P}_{\text{ground}}$. Accordingly, the dynamics of a state in ground subspace is governed by

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d\hat{\rho}_{\text{ground}}}{dt} &= (i\hat{V}_-\hat{H}_{\text{NH}}^{-1}\hat{V}_+\hat{\rho}_{\text{ground}} + \text{h.c.}) + \sum_k \hat{L}_k \hat{\rho}_{\text{excited}} \hat{L}_k^\dagger \\ &= -i[\hat{H}^{\text{eff}}, \hat{\rho}_{\text{ground}}] + \sum_k \left[\hat{L}_k^{\text{eff}} \hat{\rho}_{\text{ground}} (\hat{L}_k^{\text{eff}})^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \left\{ (\hat{L}_k^{\text{eff}})^\dagger \hat{L}_k^{\text{eff}}, \hat{\rho}_{\text{ground}} \right\} \right]\end{aligned}\quad (\text{S5})$$

with effective Hamiltonian and Lindblad operators

$$\hat{H}^{\text{eff}} = -\frac{1}{2}\hat{V}_-[\hat{H}_{\text{NH}}^{-1} + (\hat{H}_{\text{NH}}^{-1})^\dagger]\hat{V}_+, \quad (\text{S6})$$

$$\hat{L}_k^{\text{eff}} = \hat{L}_k \hat{H}_{\text{NH}}^{-1} \hat{V}_+. \quad (\text{S7})$$

We will now extend the original results to consider the case with time-dependent couplings $\hat{V}_{\pm}(t)$. By assuming that the time variation of $\hat{V}_+(t)$ is small in the time scale set by \hat{H}_{NH}^{-1} , we find

$$\int_0^t dt' e^{-i\hat{H}_{\text{NH}}(t-t')} \hat{V}_+(t') \simeq -i\hat{H}_{\text{NH}}^{-1} \hat{V}_+(t). \quad (\text{S8})$$

Accordingly, we straightforwardly extend the derivation in Reiter and Sørensen [28], and the state in the excited subspace is given by

$$\hat{\rho}_{\text{excited}} = \hat{P}_{\text{excited}}\hat{\rho}\hat{P}_{\text{excited}} = \hat{H}_{\text{NH}}^{-1}\hat{V}_+(t)\hat{\rho}_{\text{ground}}\hat{V}_-(t)(\hat{H}_{\text{NH}}^{-1})^\dagger. \quad (\text{S9})$$

We also obtain the effective master equation as

$$\frac{d\hat{\rho}_{\text{ground}}}{dt} = -i[\hat{H}^{\text{eff}}(t), \hat{\rho}_{\text{ground}}] + \sum_k \left[\hat{L}_k^{\text{eff}}(t) \hat{\rho}_{\text{ground}} (\hat{L}_k^{\text{eff}}(t))^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \left\{ (\hat{L}_k^{\text{eff}}(t))^\dagger \hat{L}_k^{\text{eff}}(t), \hat{\rho}_{\text{ground}} \right\} \right] \quad (\text{S10})$$

with effective Hamiltonian and Lindblad operators

$$\hat{H}^{\text{eff}}(t) = -\frac{1}{2}\hat{V}_-(t)[\hat{H}_{\text{NH}}^{-1} + (\hat{H}_{\text{NH}}^{-1})^\dagger]\hat{V}_+(t), \quad (\text{S11})$$

$$\hat{L}_k^{\text{eff}}(t) = \hat{L}_k \hat{H}_{\text{NH}}^{-1} \hat{V}_+(t). \quad (\text{S12})$$

We apply this extended effective master equation to three- and four-level systems in the following.

Three-level system

We analyze the Λ -type three-level system as shown in Fig. 1 in the article. The Hamiltonian is given by Eq. (2) in the article and is reproduced here

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_{\text{excited}} + \hat{V}_+(t) + \hat{V}_-(t) \quad (\text{S13})$$

where

$$\hat{H}_{\text{excited}} = \Delta_e |e, 0\rangle \langle e, 0| + g(|e, 0\rangle \langle g, 1| + |g, 1\rangle \langle e, 0|), \quad (\text{S14})$$

$$\hat{V}_+(t) = \Omega(t) |e, 0\rangle \langle u, 0|, \quad \hat{V}_-(t) = \Omega^*(t) |u, 0\rangle \langle e, 0|. \quad (\text{S15})$$

Substituting into Eqs. (S4) and (S9) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\rho}_{\text{excited}} &= |\psi_{\text{excited}}\rangle \langle \psi_{\text{excited}}|, \\ |\psi_{\text{excited}}\rangle &= \frac{\Omega(t)}{g^2 + \kappa(\gamma + i\Delta_e)} \sqrt{\langle u, 0 | \hat{\rho} | u, 0 \rangle} (\i\kappa |e, 0\rangle + g |g, 1\rangle). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S16})$$

From Eqs. (S11) and (S12), we can find:

$$\hat{H}^{\text{eff}}(t) = -\Delta_e |A(t)|^2 |u, 0\rangle \langle u, 0|, \quad (\text{S17})$$

$$\hat{L}_{\text{ex(in)}}^{\text{eff}}(t) = \sqrt{2\kappa_{\text{ex(in)}}} \frac{g}{\kappa} A(t) |g, 0\rangle \langle u, 0|, \quad (\text{S18})$$

$$\hat{L}_{u(o)}^{\text{eff}}(t) = i\sqrt{2\gamma_{u(o)}} A(t) |u(o), 0\rangle \langle u, 0|, \quad (\text{S19})$$

where we define

$$A(t) = \frac{\kappa}{g^2 + \kappa(\gamma + i\Delta_e)} \Omega(t). \quad (\text{S20})$$

To ease the following notation, we define the effective detuning and decay rates as follows:

$$\Delta^{\text{eff}}(t) = -\Delta_e |A(t)|^2, \quad (\text{S21})$$

$$\kappa_{\text{ex(in)}}^{\text{eff}}(t) = \frac{1}{2} \left| \sqrt{2\kappa_{\text{ex(in)}}} \frac{g}{\kappa} A(t) \right|^2 = \frac{\kappa_{\text{ex(in)}} g^2}{\kappa^2} |A(t)|^2, \quad (\text{S22})$$

$$\gamma_{u(o)}^{\text{eff}}(t) = \frac{1}{2} \left| i\sqrt{2\gamma_{u(o)}} A(t) \right|^2 = \gamma_{u(o)} |A(t)|^2, \quad (\text{S23})$$

$$\kappa^{\text{eff}}(t) = \kappa_{\text{ex}}^{\text{eff}}(t) + \kappa_{\text{in}}^{\text{eff}}(t), \quad \gamma^{\text{eff}}(t) = \gamma_u^{\text{eff}}(t) + \gamma_o^{\text{eff}}(t). \quad (\text{S24})$$

We first derive the state of the atom-cavity system at time t with no quantum jumps during $s < t$, on condition that it is in state $|u, 0\rangle$ at time $t = s$. The time dependence of state $|\Phi_s(t)\rangle$ is determined by solving

$$i \frac{d|\Phi_s(t)\rangle}{dt} = \left(\hat{H}^{\text{eff}}(t) - \frac{i}{2} \sum_x \hat{L}_x^{\text{eff}\dagger}(t) \hat{L}_x^{\text{eff}}(t) \right) |\Phi_s(t)\rangle \quad (\text{S25})$$

with initial condition $|\Phi_s(s)\rangle = |u, 0\rangle$. We can find that

$$\hat{H}^{\text{eff}}(t) - \frac{i}{2} \sum_x \hat{L}_x^{\text{eff}\dagger}(t) \hat{L}_x^{\text{eff}}(t) = [\Delta^{\text{eff}}(t) - i(\kappa^{\text{eff}}(t) + \gamma^{\text{eff}}(t))] |u, 0\rangle \langle u, 0| \quad (\text{S26})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi_s(t)\rangle &= e^{-\int_s^t dt' (\kappa^{\text{eff}}(t') + \gamma^{\text{eff}}(t') + i\Delta^{\text{eff}}(t'))} |u, 0\rangle \\ &= \exp \left[-\frac{\kappa}{g^2 + \kappa(\gamma + i\Delta_e)} h(s, t) \right] |u, 0\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S27})$$

Equations (S18) and (S27) give the emitted single-photon state $|\psi_s\rangle = \int_0^\infty dt \psi_s(t) \hat{a}^\dagger(t) |0\rangle$ as

$$\psi_s(t) = 0 \quad \text{if } t < s, \quad (\text{S28})$$

$$\psi_s(t) = \langle g, 0 | \hat{L}_{\text{ex}}^{\text{eff}}(t) | \Phi_s(t) \rangle = \sqrt{2\kappa_{\text{ex}}} \frac{g}{g^2 + \kappa(\gamma + i\Delta_e)} \Omega(t) \exp \left[-\frac{\kappa}{g^2 + \kappa(\gamma + i\Delta_e)} h(s, t) \right] \quad \text{if } t \geq s. \quad (\text{S29})$$

Second, we derive the rate of quantum jump \hat{L}_u^{eff} at $t = s$. From Eq. (S10), we derive the differential equation for the population of $|u\rangle$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\rho}_{u,0} &= -(2\kappa_{\text{ex}}^{\text{eff}}(t) + 2\kappa_{\text{in}}^{\text{eff}}(t) + 2\gamma_o^{\text{eff}}(t))\rho_{u,0} \\ &= -\frac{2\kappa(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)}{(g^2 + \kappa\gamma)^2 + \kappa^2\Delta_e^2}|\Omega(t)|^2\rho_{u,0},\end{aligned}\quad (\text{S30})$$

where $\rho_{u,0} = \langle u, 0 | \hat{\rho} | u, 0 \rangle$. With the initial condition $\rho_{u,0}(0) = 1$, this equation gives

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{u,0}(t) &= \exp\left[-\int_0^t dt' 2(\kappa_{\text{ex}}^{\text{eff}}(t') + \gamma_o^{\text{eff}}(t'))\right] \\ &= \exp\left[-\frac{2\kappa(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)}{(g^2 + \kappa\gamma)^2 + \kappa^2\Delta_e^2}h(0, t)\right].\end{aligned}\quad (\text{S31})$$

We then derive the rate $r(s)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}r(s) &= \text{Tr}\left[\hat{\rho}(s)(\hat{L}_u^{\text{eff}}(s))^\dagger \hat{L}_u^{\text{eff}}(s)\right] = 2\gamma_u^{\text{eff}}(s)\rho_{u,0}(s) \\ &= 2\gamma_u^{\text{eff}}(s) \exp\left[-\int_0^s dt 2(\kappa_{\text{ex}}^{\text{eff}}(t) + \gamma_o^{\text{eff}}(t))\right] \\ &= \frac{\kappa^2\gamma_u}{(g^2 + \kappa\gamma)^2 + \kappa^2\Delta_e^2}|\Omega(s)|^2 \exp\left[-\frac{2\kappa(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)}{(g^2 + \kappa\gamma)^2 + \kappa^2\Delta_e^2}h(0, s)\right].\end{aligned}\quad (\text{S32})$$

We can find the probability of the photon generation from those values. The probability of the photon generation up to time t for the single(re-) excitation process $P_{\text{si(re)}}(t)$ is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}P_{\text{si}}(t) &= \int_0^t dt' |\psi_0(t')|^2 \\ &= \int_0^t dt' 2\kappa_{\text{ex}}^{\text{eff}}(t') \exp\left[-\int_0^{t'} dt'' 2(\kappa_{\text{ex}}^{\text{eff}}(t'') + \gamma_o^{\text{eff}}(t''))\right] \\ &= \frac{\kappa_{\text{ex}}}{\kappa} \frac{g^2}{g^2 + \kappa\gamma} \left\{ 1 - \exp\left[-\frac{2\kappa(g^2 + \kappa\gamma)}{(g^2 + \kappa\gamma)^2 + \kappa^2\Delta_e^2}h(0, t)\right] \right\} \\ &\quad \left(= \frac{\kappa_{\text{ex}}^{\text{eff}}}{\kappa_{\text{ex}}^{\text{eff}} + \gamma_o^{\text{eff}}} \left\{ 1 - \exp\left[-\int_0^t dt' 2(\kappa_{\text{ex}}^{\text{eff}}(t') + \gamma_o^{\text{eff}}(t'))\right] \right\} \right), \\ P_{\text{re}}(t) &= \int_0^t dt' \int_0^\infty ds r(s) |\psi_s(t')|^2 \\ &= \int_0^t dt' |\psi_0(t')|^2 \left\{ \exp\left(\int_0^{t'} dt 2\gamma_u^{\text{eff}}(t)\right) - 1 \right\} \\ &= \frac{\kappa_{\text{ex}}}{\kappa} \frac{g^2}{g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o} \left\{ 1 - \exp\left[-\frac{2\kappa(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)}{(g^2 + \kappa\gamma)^2 + \kappa^2\Delta_e^2}h(0, t)\right] \right\} - P_{\text{si}}(t) \\ &\quad \left(= \frac{\kappa_{\text{ex}}^{\text{eff}}}{\kappa_{\text{ex}}^{\text{eff}} + \gamma_o^{\text{eff}}} \left\{ 1 - \exp\left[-\int_0^t dt' 2(\kappa_{\text{ex}}^{\text{eff}}(t') + \gamma_o^{\text{eff}}(t'))\right] \right\} - P_{\text{si}}(t) \right).\end{aligned}\quad (\text{S33})$$

When applying $\Omega(t)$ for a sufficiently long time so that the population of $|u, 0\rangle$ finally becomes zero, the photon generation probabilities of the single excitation and total processes are given as follows:

$$P_{\text{si}} := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} P_{\text{si}}(t) = \frac{\kappa_{\text{ex}}}{\kappa} \frac{g^2}{g^2 + \kappa\gamma}, \quad (\text{S35})$$

$$P_{\text{total}} := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (P_{\text{si}}(t) + P_{\text{re}}(t)) = \frac{\kappa_{\text{ex}}}{\kappa} \frac{g^2}{g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o}. \quad (\text{S36})$$

From Eq. (S33), we can also find

$$\lambda_{\text{si}} = \frac{2\kappa(g^2 + \kappa\gamma)}{(g^2 + \kappa\gamma)^2 + \kappa^2\Delta_e^2}. \quad (\text{S37})$$

This is bounded as

$$\lambda_{\text{si}} \leq \frac{2R_{\text{re}}}{\gamma_u} \quad (\text{S38})$$

whose equality holds when $\Delta_e = 0$.

Four-level system

We analyze the four-level system as shown in Fig. 2 in the article. We assume $\gamma_{o2} = \gamma_e = 0$ to compare the four-level system with the three-level one. The Hamiltonian is given by Eq. (17) in the article and is reproduced here

$$\hat{H}^{(2)}(t) = \hat{H}_{\text{excited}}^{(2)} + \hat{V}_+^{(2)}(t) + \hat{V}_-^{(2)}(t), \quad (\text{S39})$$

$$\hat{H}_{\text{excited}}^{(2)} = \Delta_e |e, 0\rangle \langle e, 0| + \Delta_{e_2} |e_2, 0\rangle \langle e_2, 0| + g(|e, 0\rangle \langle g, 1| + |g, 1\rangle \langle e, 0|) + \Omega_2(|e, 0\rangle \langle e_2, 0| + |e_2, 0\rangle \langle e, 0|), \quad (\text{S40})$$

$$\hat{V}_+^{(2)}(t) = \Omega(t) |e_2, 0\rangle \langle u, 0|, \quad \hat{V}_-^{(2)}(t) = \Omega^*(t) |u, 0\rangle \langle e_2, 0|. \quad (\text{S41})$$

By assuming the intensity and time variation of $\Omega(t)$ are small, we can follow the same recipe as before and derive the state in the excited subspace as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\rho}_{\text{excited}}^{(2)} &= |\psi_{\text{excited}}^{(2)}\rangle \langle \psi_{\text{excited}}^{(2)}|, \\ |\psi_{\text{excited}}^{(2)}\rangle &= \frac{i\Omega(t)}{g^2(\gamma_u + i\Delta_{e_2}) + \kappa[(\gamma_o + i\Delta_e)(\gamma_u + i\Delta_{e_2}) + \Omega_2^2]} \sqrt{\langle u, 0 | \hat{\rho}^{(2)} | u, 0 \rangle} \\ &\quad \times \{ [g^2 + \kappa(\gamma_o + i\Delta_e)] |e_2, 0\rangle - \Omega_2(i\kappa |e, 0\rangle + g |g, 1\rangle) \}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S42})$$

and the effective operators as follows:

$$\hat{H}^{(2)\text{eff}}(t) = -\frac{(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)^2 \Delta_{e_2} + \kappa^2(\Delta_e \Delta_{e_2} - \Omega_2^2) \Delta_e}{\kappa^2} |A^{(2)}(t)|^2 |u, 0\rangle \langle u, 0|, \quad (\text{S43})$$

$$\hat{L}_{\text{ex(in)}}^{(2)\text{eff}}(t) = -i\sqrt{2\kappa_{\text{ex}}} \frac{g}{\kappa} \Omega_2 A^{(2)}(t) |g, 0\rangle \langle u, 0|, \quad (\text{S44})$$

$$\hat{L}_u^{(2)\text{eff}}(t) = i\sqrt{2\gamma_u} \frac{g^2 + \kappa(\gamma_o + i\Delta_e)}{\kappa} A^{(2)}(t) |u, 0\rangle \langle u, 0|, \quad (\text{S45})$$

$$\hat{L}_o^{(2)\text{eff}}(t) = \sqrt{2\gamma_o} \Omega_2 A^{(2)}(t) |o, 0\rangle \langle u, 0|, \quad (\text{S46})$$

where we define

$$A^{(2)}(t) = \frac{\kappa}{(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)\gamma_u + \kappa(\Omega_2^2 - \Delta_e \Delta_{e_2}) + i[(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)\Delta_{e_2} + \kappa\gamma_u \Delta_e]} \Omega(t). \quad (\text{S47})$$

We then define the effective detuning and decay rates as follows:

$$\Delta^{(2)\text{eff}}(t) = -\frac{(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)^2 \Delta_{e_2} + \kappa^2(\Delta_e \Delta_{e_2} - \Omega_2^2) \Delta_e}{\kappa^2} |A^{(2)}(t)|^2, \quad (\text{S48})$$

$$\kappa_{\text{ex(in)}}^{(2)\text{eff}}(t) = \frac{1}{2} \left| -i\sqrt{2\kappa_{\text{ex}}} \frac{g}{\kappa} \Omega_2 A^{(2)}(t) \right|^2 = \frac{\kappa_{\text{ex(in)}} g^2 \Omega_2^2}{\kappa^2} |A^{(2)}(t)|^2, \quad (\text{S49})$$

$$\gamma_u^{(2)\text{eff}}(t) = \frac{1}{2} \left| i\sqrt{2\gamma_u} \frac{g^2 + \kappa(\gamma_o + i\Delta_e)}{\kappa} A^{(2)}(t) \right|^2 = \gamma_u \frac{(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)^2 + \kappa^2 \Delta_e^2}{\kappa^2} |A^{(2)}(t)|^2, \quad (\text{S50})$$

$$\gamma_o^{(2)\text{eff}}(t) = \frac{1}{2} \left| \sqrt{2\gamma_o} \Omega_2 A^{(2)}(t) \right|^2 = \gamma_o \Omega_2^2 |A^{(2)}(t)|^2, \quad (\text{S51})$$

$$\kappa^{(2)\text{eff}}(t) = \kappa_{\text{ex}}^{(2)\text{eff}}(t) + \kappa_{\text{in}}^{(2)\text{eff}}(t), \quad \gamma^{(2)\text{eff}}(t) = \gamma_u^{(2)\text{eff}}(t) + \gamma_o^{(2)\text{eff}}(t). \quad (\text{S52})$$

From the effective operators, we find the probability of the photon generation up to time t for the single(re-) excitation process $P_{\text{si(re)}}^{(2)}(t)$ as follows:

$$P_{\text{si}}^{(2)}(t) = \frac{\kappa_{\text{ex}}^{(2)\text{eff}}}{\kappa^{(2)\text{eff}} + \gamma^{(2)\text{eff}}} \left\{ 1 - \exp \left[- \int_0^t dt' 2(\kappa^{(2)\text{eff}}(t') + \gamma^{(2)\text{eff}}(t')) \right] \right\}, \quad (\text{S53})$$

$$P_{\text{re}}^{(2)}(t) = \frac{\kappa_{\text{ex}}^{(2)\text{eff}}}{\kappa^{(2)\text{eff}} + \gamma_o^{(2)\text{eff}}} \left\{ 1 - \exp \left[- \int_0^t dt' 2(\kappa^{(2)\text{eff}}(t') + \gamma_o^{(2)\text{eff}}(t')) \right] \right\} - P_{\text{si}}^{(2)}(t). \quad (\text{S54})$$

When applying $\Omega(t)$ for a sufficiently long time so that the population of $|u, 0\rangle$ finally becomes zero, the photon generation probabilities of the single excitation and total processes are given as follows:

$$P_{\text{si}}^{(2)} = \frac{\kappa_{\text{ex}}^{(2)\text{eff}}}{\kappa^{(2)\text{eff}} + \gamma^{(2)\text{eff}}} = \frac{\kappa_{\text{ex}} g^2 \Omega_2^2}{\kappa(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)\Omega_2^2 + \gamma_u[(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)^2 + \kappa^2\Delta_e^2]}, \quad (\text{S55})$$

$$P_{\text{total}}^{(2)} = \frac{\kappa_{\text{ex}}^{(2)\text{eff}}}{\kappa^{(2)\text{eff}} + \gamma_o^{(2)\text{eff}}} = \frac{\kappa_{\text{ex}}}{\kappa} \frac{g^2}{g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o}, \quad (\text{S56})$$

and the ratio of the re-excitation process is given as

$$R_{\text{re}}^{(2)} = \frac{\gamma_u[(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)^2 + \kappa^2\Delta_e^2]}{\kappa(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)\Omega_2^2 + \gamma_u[(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)^2 + \kappa^2\Delta_e^2]}. \quad (\text{S57})$$

From Eq. (S53), we can also find

$$\lambda_{\text{si}}^{(2)} = \frac{2\{\gamma_u[(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)^2 + \kappa^2\Delta_e^2] + (g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)\kappa\Omega_2^2\}}{[(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)\gamma_u + \kappa(\Omega_2^2 - \Delta_e\Delta_{e_2})]^2 + [(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)\Delta_{e_2} + \kappa\gamma_u\Delta_e]^2}. \quad (\text{S58})$$

This is bounded as

$$\lambda_{\text{si}}^{(2)} \leq \frac{2R_{\text{re}}^{(2)}}{\gamma_u} \quad (\text{S59})$$

whose equality holds when

$$\Delta_{e_2} = \frac{\kappa^2\Omega_2^2\Delta_e}{(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)^2 + \kappa^2\Delta_e^2}. \quad (\text{S60})$$

S2. SINGLE-PHOTON PURITY AND FIDELITY

We use single-photon purity D_S and fidelity F_S as performance measures of a single-photon source. We first consider the three-level system. The purity and fidelity are given by

$$D_S = \frac{1}{P_{\text{total}}^2} \left(P_{\text{si}}^2 + 2 \int_0^\infty ds r(s) |\langle \psi_0 | \psi_s \rangle|^2 + \int_0^\infty ds \int_0^\infty ds' r(s)r(s') |\langle \psi_{s'} | \psi_s \rangle|^2 \right), \quad (\text{S61})$$

$$F_S = \frac{1}{P_{\text{total}}} \left(P_{\text{si}} + \frac{1}{P_{\text{si}}} \int_0^\infty ds r(s) |\langle \psi_0 | \psi_s \rangle|^2 \right). \quad (\text{S62})$$

If $s \geq s'$, we can find

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \psi_{s'} | \psi_s \rangle \\ &= \exp \left[\int_0^{s'} dt' (\kappa^{\text{eff}}(t') + \gamma^{\text{eff}}(t') - i\Delta^{\text{eff}}(t')) \right] \exp \left[\int_0^s dt' (\kappa^{\text{eff}}(t') + \gamma^{\text{eff}}(t') + i\Delta^{\text{eff}}(t')) \right] (P_{\text{si}} - P_{\text{si}}(s)). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S63})$$

We then derive

$$\int_0^\infty ds r(s) |\langle \psi_0 | \psi_s \rangle|^2 = \int_0^\infty ds r(s) (P_{\text{si}} - P_{\text{si}}(s))^2 \exp \left[\int_0^s dt' 2(\kappa^{\text{eff}}(t') + \gamma^{\text{eff}}(t')) \right] \quad (\text{S64})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty ds \int_0^\infty ds' r(s)r(s') |\langle \psi_{s'} | \psi_s \rangle|^2 \\ &= 2 \int_0^\infty ds' r(s') \exp \left[\int_0^{s'} dt' 2(\kappa^{\text{eff}}(t') + \gamma^{\text{eff}}(t')) \right] \int_{s'}^\infty ds r(s) (P_{\text{si}} - P_{\text{si}}(s))^2 \exp \left[\int_0^s dt' 2(\kappa^{\text{eff}}(t') + \gamma^{\text{eff}}(t')) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S65})$$




FIG. S1. Proportion of the ratio of the re-excitation process for the four-level system to one for the three-level system $R_{\text{re}}^{(2)}/R_{\text{re}}$. We set $\Delta_e = 0$, $\gamma_u = \gamma_o$, $\kappa_{\text{ex}}/\gamma = 0.99$, $\kappa_{\text{in}}/\gamma = 0.01$.

From Eq. (S33), we can derive

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{s'}^{\infty} ds r(s) (P_{\text{si}} - P_{\text{si}}(s))^2 \exp \left[\int_0^s dt' 2(\kappa^{\text{eff}}(t') + \gamma^{\text{eff}}(t')) \right] \\ &= P_{\text{si}}^2 \frac{R_{\text{re}}}{2 - R_{\text{re}}} \exp \left[- \int_0^{s'} dt 2(2\kappa^{\text{eff}}(t) + \gamma^{\text{eff}}(t) + \gamma_o^{\text{eff}}(t)) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S66})$$

and using this equation gives

$$\int_0^{\infty} ds r(s) |\langle \psi_0 | \psi_s \rangle|^2 = P_{\text{si}}^2 \frac{R_{\text{re}}}{2 - R_{\text{re}}}, \quad (\text{S67})$$

$$\int_0^{\infty} ds \int_0^{\infty} ds' r(s) r(s') |\langle \psi_{s'} | \psi_s \rangle|^2 = P_{\text{si}}^2 \frac{R_{\text{re}}}{2 - R_{\text{re}}} \frac{R_{\text{re}}}{1 - R_{\text{re}}}. \quad (\text{S68})$$

Accordingly, we find

$$D_S = 1 - R_{\text{re}}, \quad F_S = 1 - \frac{R_{\text{re}}}{2 - R_{\text{re}}}. \quad (\text{S69})$$

When considering the four-level system, we can also derive these measures as before:

$$D_S = 1 - R_{\text{re}}^{(2)}, \quad F_S = 1 - \frac{R_{\text{re}}^{(2)}}{2 - R_{\text{re}}^{(2)}}. \quad (\text{S70})$$

These results show that these measures depend only on the ratio of the re-excitation process, rather than $\Omega(t)$.

S3. VALIDITY OF OUR SCHEME FOR A WIDE RANGE OF CAVITY PARAMETERS

We show the parameter regime where the four-level scheme is superior to the three-level one. Figure S1 plots $R_{\text{re}}^{(2)}/R_{\text{re}}$ as the function of system parameters and the threshold curve $R_{\text{re}}^{(2)}/R_{\text{re}} = 1$. When $R_{\text{re}}^{(2)}/R_{\text{re}} < 1$, the purity of an output photon with the four-level scheme is higher than that with the three-level scheme. The values of g , γ_u , γ_o , κ_{in} , and κ_{ex} are shared in both the three-level and four-level cases. We scan g/γ , which determines the success probability in both cases ($P_{\text{total}} = P_{\text{total}}^{(2)}$), and show these values as the horizontal axes. This result indicates that our scheme is valid for a wide range of g/γ . When g/γ becomes enough large, the advantage of our scheme becomes small (in other words, the requirement of Ω_2 becomes high) because the original performance of the cavity is already quite high.

S4. CONSIDERING THE CASE WITH $\gamma_{o2}, \gamma_e \neq 0$

So far, we have assumed $\gamma_{o2} = \gamma_e = 0$. We now remove this assumption and analyze these effects. Our following analytical analysis shows that we can neglect the effect of γ_{o2} and γ_e in the limit $\Omega_2 \gg \sqrt{(\gamma_u + \gamma_{o2} + \gamma_e)(g^2/\kappa + \gamma_o)}$.

We first consider the case with $\gamma_{o2} > 0$ and $\gamma_e = 0$. We can describe the decay $|e_2\rangle \rightarrow |o\rangle$ by a Lindblad operator $\hat{L}_{o2}^{(2)} = \sqrt{2\gamma_{o2}}|o, 0\rangle\langle e_2, 0|$. By using the effective operator formalism, we can find the corresponding effective Lindblad operator as

$$\hat{L}_{o2}^{(2)\text{eff}} = i\sqrt{2\gamma_{o2}}\frac{g^2 + \kappa(\gamma_o + i\Delta_e)}{\kappa}A^{(2)}(t)|o, 0\rangle\langle u, 0| \quad (\text{S71})$$

and derive the total photon probability and the ratio of the re-excitation process by replacing $\gamma_o \rightarrow \gamma_o + \gamma_{o2}[(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)^2 + \kappa^2\Delta_e^2]/(\kappa^2\Omega_2^2)$

$$P_{\text{total}}^{(2)} = \frac{\kappa_{\text{ex}}}{\kappa} \frac{g^2}{g^2 + \kappa\gamma'_o}, \quad (\text{S72})$$

$$R_{\text{re}}^{(2)} = \frac{\gamma_u[(g^2 + \kappa\gamma'_o)^2 + \kappa^2\Delta_e^2]}{\kappa(g^2 + \kappa\gamma'_o)\Omega_2^2 + \gamma_u[(g^2 + \kappa\gamma'_o)^2 + \kappa^2\Delta_e^2]}, \quad (\text{S73})$$

where we define

$$\gamma'_o = \gamma_o + \frac{(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)^2 + \kappa^2\Delta_e^2}{\kappa^2\Omega_2^2}\gamma_{o2}. \quad (\text{S74})$$

We can find $R_{\text{re}}^{(2)}$ is minimized for $\Delta_e = 0$, and in this case $\gamma'_o \rightarrow \gamma_o$ in the limit $\Omega_2 \gg g^2/\kappa + \gamma_o$.

We further consider the case with $\gamma_{o2}, \gamma_e > 0$. We can describe the decay $|e_2\rangle \rightarrow |e\rangle$ by a Lindblad operator $\hat{L}_e^{(2)} = \sqrt{2\gamma_e}|e, 0\rangle\langle e_2, 0|$. We now decompose the total atom-cavity density operator as $\hat{\rho}(t) = \hat{\rho}_{\text{pure}}(t) + \hat{\rho}_{\text{jumps}}(t)$ where we define a trajectory with no quantum jumps as $\hat{\rho}_{\text{pure}}(t)$. Note that $\hat{\rho}_{\text{pure}}(t)$ does not depend on destinations of quantum jumps. That is to say, $\hat{\rho}_{\text{pure}}(t)$ would be the same if we chose $\hat{L}_{o2}^{(2)} = \sqrt{2\gamma_{o2}}|u, 0\rangle\langle e_2, 0|$ and $\hat{L}_e^{(2)} = \sqrt{2\gamma_e}|u, 0\rangle\langle e_2, 0|$ instead. We thus find $\hat{\rho}_{\text{pure,excited}} = \hat{P}_{\text{excited}}\hat{\rho}_{\text{pure}}\hat{P}_{\text{excited}}$ by replacing $\gamma_u \rightarrow \Gamma = \gamma_u + \gamma_{o2} + \gamma_e$ in Eq. (S42) as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\rho}_{\text{pure,excited}} &= |\phi_{\text{excited}}\rangle\langle\phi_{\text{excited}}|, \\ |\phi_{\text{excited}}\rangle &= \frac{i\Omega(t)}{g^2(\Gamma + i\Delta_{e_2}) + \kappa[(\gamma_o + i\Delta_e)(\Gamma + i\Delta_{e_2}) + \Omega_2^2]} \sqrt{\langle u, 0|\hat{\rho}_{\text{pure}}|u, 0\rangle} \\ &\quad \times \{[g^2 + \kappa(\gamma_o + i\Delta_e)]|e_2, 0\rangle - \Omega_2(i\kappa|e, 0\rangle + g|g, 1\rangle)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S75})$$

Using this result gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_{\text{pure}}(t)] &= -2\Gamma\rho_{\text{pure}; e_2, 0} - 2\gamma_o\rho_{\text{pure}; e, 0} - 2\kappa\rho_{\text{pure}; g, 1} \\ &= -2\frac{\kappa(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)\Omega_2^2 + \Gamma[(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)^2 + \Delta_e^2]}{g^2\Omega_2^2}\rho_{\text{pure}; g, 1}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S76})$$

where we define $\rho_{\text{pure}; x} = \langle x|\hat{\rho}_{\text{pure}}|x\rangle$. We also find

$$\frac{dP_{\text{pure}}^{(2)}(t)}{dt} = 2\kappa_{\text{ex}}\rho_{\text{pure}; g, 1}, \quad (\text{S77})$$

where we define the photon generation probability with no atomic decay up to t as $P_{\text{pure}}^{(2)}(t)$. Using Eqs (S76), (S77), and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_{\text{pure}}(t)] = 0$ gives the photon generation probability with no atomic decay as

$$P_{\text{pure}}^{(2)} = \frac{\kappa_{\text{ex}}g^2\Omega_2^2}{\kappa(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)\Omega_2^2 + \Gamma[(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)^2 + \kappa^2\Delta_e^2]}. \quad (\text{S78})$$

We now describe the density operator of the emitted light as

$$\hat{\varrho} = \hat{\varrho}_0 + \int_0^\infty d\tau 2\gamma_u\rho_{\text{pure}; e_2, 0}(\tau)\hat{\varrho}_1(\tau) + \int_0^\infty d\tau 2\gamma_e\rho_{\text{pure}; e_2, 0}(\tau)\hat{\varrho}_2(\tau) + (1 - \bar{P}_{\text{total}}^{(2)})|0\rangle\langle 0|. \quad (\text{S79})$$

Here the first term represents the state of the emitted single photon with no atomic decay. The second term represents the state of the emitted single photon where no quantum jumps occur until τ and a jump \hat{L}_u occurs at τ , where $\tau > 0$ is arbitrary. The third term represents the state of the emitted single photon where no quantum jumps occur until τ and a jump \hat{L}_e occurs at τ , where $\tau > 0$ is arbitrary. We can find $\text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_i(\tau)] \leq \kappa_{\text{ex}}/\kappa$ ($i = 1, 2$), and thus derive

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Tr} \left[\int_0^\infty d\tau 2\gamma_u \rho_{\text{pure}; e_2, 0}(\tau) \hat{\rho}_1(\tau) + \int_0^\infty d\tau 2\gamma_e \rho_{\text{pure}; e_2, 0}(\tau) \hat{\rho}_2(\tau) \right] \\
& \leq \frac{\kappa_{\text{ex}}}{\kappa} \int_0^\infty d\tau 2(\gamma_u + \gamma_e) \rho_{\text{pure}; e_2, 0}(\tau) \\
& = \frac{\kappa_{\text{ex}}}{\kappa} \frac{\int_0^\infty d\tau 2(\gamma_u + \gamma_e) \rho_{\text{pure}; e_2, 0}(\tau)}{\int_0^\infty d\tau (2\Gamma \rho_{\text{pure}; e_2, 0}(\tau) + 2\gamma_o \rho_{\text{pure}; e, 0}(\tau) + 2\kappa \rho_{\text{pure}; g, 1}(\tau))} \\
& = \frac{\kappa_{\text{ex}}}{\kappa} \frac{(\gamma_u + \gamma_e)[(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)^2 + \kappa^2 \Delta_e^2]}{\kappa(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)\Omega_2^2 + \Gamma[(g^2 + \kappa\gamma_o)^2 + \kappa^2 \Delta_e^2]},
\end{aligned} \tag{S80}$$

where we use $\int_0^\infty d\tau (2\Gamma \rho_{\text{pure}; e_2, 0}(\tau) + 2\gamma_o \rho_{\text{pure}; e, 0}(\tau) + 2\kappa \rho_{\text{pure}; g, 1}(\tau)) = 1$. This upper bound is minimized for $\Delta_e = 0$ and is made to further approach zero by increasing Ω_2 such that $\Omega_2/\sqrt{\Gamma(g^2/\kappa + \gamma_o)} \gg 1$.

Therefore, we can only produce the photon with no atomic decay and neglect the effect of γ_{o2} and γ_e in the limit $\Omega_2 \gg \sqrt{\Gamma(g^2/\kappa + \gamma_o)}$.