

# Zeno Regime of Collective Emission: Non-Markovianity beyond Retardation

Yu-Xiang Zhang<sup>1,2,3,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institute of Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China*

<sup>2</sup>*School of Physical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China*

<sup>3</sup>*Hefei National Laboratory, Hefei 230088, China*

(Dated: October 30, 2023)

To build up a collective emission, the atoms in an ensemble must coordinate their behavior by exchanging virtual photons. We study this non-Markovian process in a subwavelength atom chain coupled to a one-dimensional (1D) waveguide and find that retardation is not the only cause of non-Markovianity. The other factor is the memory of the photonic environment, for which a single excited atom needs a finite time, the Zeno regime, to transition from quadratic decay to exponential decay. In the waveguide setup, this crossover has a time scale longer than the retardation, thus impacting the development of collective behavior. By comparing a full quantum treatment with an approach incorporating only the retardation effect, we find that the field memory effect, characterized by the population of atomic excitation, is much more pronounced in collective emissions than that in the decay of a single atom. Our results maybe useful for the dissipation engineering of quantum information processings based on compact atom arrays.

It is well known since the 1960s [1, 2] that the short-time dynamics of an excited atom differs significantly from the exponential decay based on the Weisskopf-Wigner formalism [3]. The finite memory of the photonic reservoir leads to a growth in the decay rate from zero that is quadratic in time [4, 5]. It has inspired attempts to prevent decay by quickly repeating measurements [6–9], i.e., the Zeno effect. Actually, the duration of the non-exponential decay, characterized by the Zeno time  $\tau_Z$ , is typically many orders of magnitude shorter than the lifetime, rendering the field memory effect undetectable. For example, an optimal estimation of the 2P-1S transition of the hydrogen atom reads  $\tau_Z \sim 10^{-13}$ s [10]. Instead of the decay of a single atom, in this Letter, we study atom ensembles [11], especially the subwavelength atom arrays, where the separation between two adjacent atoms,  $d$ , is shorter than the resonant wavelength  $\lambda$ , and reveal the prominent memory effect in the Zeno regime.

The long-time collective emissions from an atomic ensemble are well described by Lehmborg's formalism based on the Markov approximation [12, 13]. For example, it predicts a power-law scaling  $\gamma \propto N^{-\alpha}$  with  $N$  the number of atoms for the subradiant states of a subwavelength atom array [14–17]. However, Markovian theories are not able to answer how the collective behaviors are built up. This process must be non-Markovian because the atoms are organized by the retarded photon-mediated interactions. Instead, we may upgrade the Markovian description minimally by including delayed feedback: Every atom starts from exponential decay independently but adjusts its decay rate in response to the signal from another atom. This physical picture has been analytically studied for two atoms with the photonic reservoir being 3D free space [18] or 1D waveguide [19–21]. Retardation effects of waveguide quantum electrodynamics (QED) are also studied in Refs. [22–27].

But how does the Zeno regime come into effect? The

Zeno time, exemplified by the the 2P-1S transition of the hydrogen atom satisfies  $\tau_Z \gg 2\pi/\omega_0 \sim 10^{-15}$ s [10]. In a subwavelength atom array, the minimal retardation time  $t_{\text{retard}} = d/c$ , with  $c$  the speed of light, fulfills that  $t_{\text{retard}} < \lambda/c = 2\pi/\omega_0 \ll \tau_Z$ . It means that the virtual photons sent from an atom have already passed many other atoms, building up cooperativeness to a certain extent, while an isolated atom has not yet entered exponential decay. Thus, the development of the full collective emission and the reduction to Markovian behavior are two simultaneous processes highly intertwined. As illustrated in Fig. 1(a), the above-mentioned retardation-only picture studied in Refs. [19–27] does not apply to compact atom ensembles, i.e., there are memory effects




Figure 1. (a) Sketch of the idea: For closely separated atoms, development of collective behaviors by exchanging virtual photons (dotted blue arrows) and the transition from quadratic to exponential decay of a single atom (Zeno regime caused by the memory effect of the field, represented by the red back-flow arrows) are highly intertwined. (b) The instantaneous emission rate  $\Gamma_{\text{inst}}(t)$  of the decay of a single atom (in units of  $\Gamma_0$ ). Legend: const-wQED (solid curves), lin-wQED (dashed curves). Values of  $\Gamma_0/\omega_0$  are distinguished by coloring:  $10^{-2}$  (red),  $10^{-3}$  (pink) and  $10^{-6}$  (blue). (c) Zoom-out view of (b) for  $t \leq 50/\omega_0$ .

beyond retardation.

To show the memory effect beyond retardation, we shall compare the retardation-only picture with a full quantum treatment. Their difference is displayed by the evolution of instantaneous decay rates and excited state populations. Our findings indicate that this memory effect in collective emissions is much more pronounced than that in the decay of a single atom, making sub-wavelength atom array a better platform to detect the non-Markovianity in the Zeno regime. In this Letter, we shall concentrate on the setup of waveguide QED. Experimental feasibilities and memory effect of free space radiation field will also be discussed.

*Zeno Time of the Waveguide QED.* The waveguide QED setup consists of  $N$  two-level atoms with the ground state  $|g\rangle$  and the excited state  $|e\rangle$ , and a 1D continuum of bosonic modes. The annihilation and generation operator of the waveguide mode with wavenumber  $k$  are denoted by  $a_k$  and  $a_k^\dagger$ , respectively. They satisfy the bosonic commutation relation  $[a_k, a_{k'}^\dagger] = 2\pi\delta(k - k')$ . Hamiltonian of the system is conventionally written in analogy with the multipolar gauge Hamiltonian of quantum optics, colloquially the “ $\mathbf{d} \cdot \mathbf{E}$ ” Hamiltonian [28–30], though the bosons field may not be photonic, e.g. it could be surface acoustic waves [31, 32] and matter waves [33, 34], etc.,

$$H_M = \sum_{i=1}^N \omega_0 \sigma_i^\dagger \sigma_i + \int_{-\Lambda}^{\Lambda} \frac{dk}{2\pi} \omega_k a_k^\dagger a_k - i \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{-\Lambda}^{\Lambda} \frac{dk}{2\pi} g_k \sigma_{i,X} (a_k e^{ikx_i} - a_k^\dagger e^{-ikx_i}) \quad (1)$$

where  $\sigma_i = |g\rangle_i \langle e|$ ,  $\sigma_{i,X} = \sigma_i + \sigma_i^\dagger$ ,  $x_i$  denotes the coordinate of atom  $i$ ,  $\Lambda$  is the cutoff of wavenumber. The coupling strength  $g_k$  will be specified below. Here we assume a linear dispersion relation for the waveguide,  $\omega_k = v_g |k|$ , where  $v_g$  is the group velocity of the guided modes. (The Zeno time of a setup with non-linear dispersion relation is found qualitatively the same [35].) The atomic transition frequency  $\omega_0$  defines a resonant wavenumber  $k_0 = \omega_0/v_g$ . We assume  $k_0 \ll \Lambda$  so that the non-Markovianity induced by reservoir band edges [36] is irrelevant.

The counter-rotating terms of Hamiltonian (1) cannot be ignored for short-time dynamics [10]. Moreover, they are found to lead to non-linearity at the single-photon level [37]. Fortunately, theoretical difficulties brought by them can be avoided by turning to the gauge introduced by Drummond [38], which is also called the Jaynes-Cummings (JC) gauge [39, 40]. The transformation from the multipolar gauge to the JC gauge reads  $H_{\text{JC}} = e^{-iS} H_M e^{iS}$ , where

$$S = \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{-\Lambda}^{\Lambda} \frac{dk}{2\pi} \frac{g_k}{\omega_0 + \omega_k} \sigma_{i,X} (a_k e^{ikx_i} + a_k^\dagger e^{-ikx_i}). \quad (2)$$

At the first order of  $g_k$ , we obtain

$$H_{\text{JC}} \approx \sum_{i=1}^N \omega_0 \sigma_i^\dagger \sigma_i + \int_{-\Lambda}^{\Lambda} \frac{dk}{2\pi} \omega_k a_k^\dagger a_k - i \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{-\Lambda}^{\Lambda} \frac{dk}{2\pi} g_k^{\text{JC}} (\sigma_i^\dagger a_k e^{ikx_i} - \sigma_i a_k^\dagger e^{-ikx_i}) \quad (3)$$

where  $g_k^{\text{JC}} = 2g_k\omega_0/(\omega_k + \omega_0)$ . The neglected terms at the order of  $O(g_k^2)$  give corrections to the atom and waveguide self-energies, while corrections to their couplings occur at the order of  $O(g_k^3)$  [10, 41, 42].

The absence of counter-rotating terms grants  $H_{\text{JC}}$  (3) a nice property that its ground state is identical to that of its free part  $|G\rangle = |g_1, g_2 \cdots g_N, \emptyset\rangle$ , an atom-field product state, where  $\emptyset$  denotes the field vacuum. Then, the physical state of exciting an atom from the overall ground state,  $\sigma_i^\dagger |G\rangle$ , is also a product state. This kind of physical states are exactly the initial states interested by us. With respect to the multipolar gauge  $H_M$ , the same physical state is written as  $e^{iS} \sigma_i^\dagger |G\rangle$ , which is, however, an entangled state between the atoms and the field. Recall that initial states in the product form can greatly simplify the theoretical analysis and are essential for theories of open quantum system [43–45]. Thus, we choose to work with  $H_{\text{JC}}$  instead of  $H_M$ .

Next, let us specify the coupling strength  $g_k$ . In the literature of waveguide QED, a localized atom-field interaction is often assumed [46] so that  $g_k$  is a  $k$ -independent constant [28–30, 46]. It can be spelled by the Markovian decay rate  $\Gamma_0$  as  $g_k^2 = \Gamma_0 v_g/2$ . Another option for  $g_k$  is  $g_k \propto |k|^{1/2}$ , the same as the multipolar Hamiltonian of atoms in free space [30] (recall that an atom does not couple to the full displacement field but only its transverse component, which is a nonlocal field [47]). In this case, we have  $g_k^2 = \Gamma_0 v_g |k| / (2k_0)$ . The above two choices for  $g_k$  correspond to a constant and a linear spectral density, hence will be denoted by “const-wQED” and “lin-wQED”, respectively.

We are now in a position to calculate the Zeno time. Given an initial state  $|\Psi_0\rangle$  and a Hamiltonian  $H$ , the Zeno time  $\tau_Z$  is defined from the short-time expansion of the non-decay probability

$$\left| \langle \Psi_0 | e^{-iHt} | \Psi_0 \rangle \right|^2 = 1 - t^2/\tau_Z^2 + \cdots \quad (4)$$

The Zeno time is a characterization to the duration of non-exponential decay, but not an exact measure. Nevertheless, we substitute  $|\Psi_0\rangle = |e, \emptyset\rangle$  and  $H_{\text{JC}}$  with  $N = 1$  into Eq. (4) and obtain

$$\tau_Z^{-2} = \begin{cases} 2\Gamma_0\omega_0/\pi & \text{const.} \\ 2\Gamma_0\omega_0 \ln(\Lambda/k_0)/\pi & \text{lin.} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Remarkably,  $\tau_Z$  of const-wQED is independent of the cutoff  $\Lambda$ , which is introduced in Eq. (1). This is not seen

elsewhere. The above result implies that  $\tau_Z \gg 1/\omega_0$ , hence  $\tau_Z \gg \tau_{\text{retard}}$ , is valid if  $\omega_0/\Gamma_0 \gg 1$  (for const-wQED) or  $\omega_0/\Gamma_0 \gg \ln(\Lambda/k_0)$  (for lin-wQED). Such weak atom-field couplings are satisfied commonly. Zeno time for  $N > 1$  is discussed in Ref. [35].

*Equation of Motion.* Suppose that the system is initialized with only one atomic excitation. Note that  $H_{\text{JC}}$  preserves the number of excitations, thanks to the absence of counter-rotating terms. Thus, the evolution is captured by the singly-excited ansatz

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i(t) \sigma_i^\dagger |G\rangle + \int_{-\Lambda}^{\Lambda} \frac{dk}{2\pi} \beta_k(t) a_k^\dagger |G\rangle, \quad (6)$$

where  $\alpha_i(t)$  and  $\beta_k(t)$  are superposition coefficients to be determined. The Schrödinger equation in the interaction picture implies the integro-differential equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \alpha_i(t) = & - \sum_{j=1}^N \int_{-\Lambda}^{\Lambda} \frac{dk}{2\pi} |g_k^{\text{JC}}|^2 \int_0^t d\tau \alpha_j(\tau) \\ & \times e^{ik(x_i - x_j) + i(\omega_k - \omega_0)(t - \tau)}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

This equation is further transformed into an integral equation and solved numerically [35].

The above equation will be compared with the following one embodying only the non-Markovianity caused by retardation [20, 21]

$$\frac{d\alpha_i(t)}{dt} = -\frac{\Gamma_0}{2} \left[ \alpha_i(t) + \sum_{j \neq i} e^{ik_0 r_{ij}} \alpha_j(t - \frac{r_{ij}}{v_g}) \Theta(t - \frac{r_{ij}}{v_g}) \right] \quad (8)$$

where  $r_{ij} = |x_i - x_j|$  and  $\Theta(t) = 1$  for  $t > 0$  and vanishes otherwise. It can be derived from Eq. (7) via an approximation introduced in Ref. [18], see also Ref. [35]. Note that while the right-hand-side of Eq. (7) incorporates the entire history  $\tau \in [0, t]$ , the right-hand-side of Eq. (8) includes only a distance-dependent delay. Ignoring this delay immediately aligns it with the Markovian effective non-Hermitian Hamiltonian of waveguide QED [30]. Hereafter, data produced by Eq. (8) will be labeled by ‘‘retard.’’

We shall characterize the non-exponential decay by instantaneous decay rate  $\Gamma_{\text{inst}}$  and population in excited state  $P_e(t)$  of the whole chain:

$$\Gamma_{\text{inst}}(t) \equiv -\frac{d}{dt} \ln P_e(t), \quad P_e(t) = \sum_{i=1}^N |\alpha_i(t)|^2. \quad (9)$$

These two quantities can also be defined for every individual atom in an apparent way.

*Individual decay.* Let us start from the decay of a single atom. We plot  $\Gamma_{\text{inst}}(t)$  in units of  $\Gamma_0$  in Figs. 1(b,c) for both const-wQED (solid curves) and lin-wQED (dashed curves). Either one is calculated with three values of  $\Gamma_0/\omega_0$ ,  $10^{-2}$  (red),  $10^{-3}$  (pink) and  $10^{-6}$  (blue). The

cutoff is set at  $\Lambda/k_0 = 10^4$ . For either const-wQED or lin-wQED, curves belonging to the three  $\Gamma_0/\omega_0$  almost overlap; for each value of  $\Gamma_0/\omega_0$ ,  $\Gamma_{\text{inst}}(t)$  of lin-wQED increases faster at first ( $t \lesssim 1/\omega_0$ ) but soon becomes more gradual than that of const-wQED. The latter increases to roughly  $1.4\Gamma_0$  and turns to oscillating around  $\Gamma_0$  with a waning amplitude. The non-Markovianity of const-wQED is more pronounced, as what we learn from its Zeno time (5). It is shown in Fig. 1(c) that the oscillation of the curves of const-wQED is still visible at  $t = 50/\omega_0$ , equivalent to a distance of eight wavelengths for photon propagation.

Although the curves of  $\Gamma_{\text{inst}}(t)$  clearly demonstrate the non-exponential decay, it is defined as the derivative with respect to time so that producing the curves requires a high temporal resolution ( $\ll 1/\omega_0$ ) of measuring  $P_e(t)$ . This is of course experimentally challenging. The requirement of temporal resolution might be relaxed if the non-Markovianity can be manifested by  $P_e(t)$  itself, or equivalently,  $\Delta P_e(t) = P_e(t) - P_e(0)$ . Unfortunately, we will see in Fig. 2(e) that it is not the case for  $N = 1$ :  $\Delta P_e(t)$  is averaged out to the memory-less Markovian result quickly. But fortunately, it would be possible for subwavelength atom arrays ( $N > 1$ ).

*Superradiance.* We consider a chain of atoms initialized in the timed-Dicke state

$$|\Psi_k\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=1}^N e^{ikx_j} \sigma_j^\dagger |G\rangle. \quad (10)$$

This kind of states are experimentally accessible [48, 49]. State (10) with  $k = \pm k_0$  are the single-photon superradiant state [50]. We substitute  $|\Psi_{k_0}\rangle$  with  $N = 20$ ,  $\Gamma_0/\omega_0 = 10^{-4}$ , and atom-atom separation  $d = 0.1\pi/k_0$  (see results of  $d = 0.5\pi/k_0$  in [35]) into Eqs. (7) and (8) and show the results of  $\Gamma_{\text{inst}}(t)$  in Fig. 2(a) for  $t \leq 10/\omega_0$ . Curves of Eq. (7) (red for lin-wQED and blue for const-wQED) show continuous growth while that of Eq. (8) (grey) gives a step-like increase. They agree well after  $t \approx 6/\omega_0$ .

Next, we pick five atoms, No. 1, 2, 5, 10, 20 ( $x_i < x_j$  if  $i < j$ ), and plot the individual instantaneous decay rate,  $\Gamma_{j,\text{inst}}(t) = -d(\ln|\alpha_j|^2)/dt$  in Fig. 2(b). It shows that the atoms decay at different rates. Atom 1 decays slowly while Atom 20 accelerates to  $20\Gamma_0$  (the opposite is obtained if we choose  $|\Psi_k\rangle$  with  $k = -k_0$ ). The three curves (const-wQED, lin-wQED and retard.) agree better for atoms in the middle, i.e., atom 10. In particular, for atom 1, significant derivations between three curves of  $\Gamma_{1,\text{const}}$  are visible: the grey curve (retard.) shows two cycles of emission and absorption, the red curve (const-wQED) shows only emission while absorption is dominant for the blue curve (lin-wQED).

Such discrepancy inspires us to look at the change of individual population  $\Delta P_e = |\alpha_j(t)|^2 - |\alpha_j(0)|^2$ , where  $|\alpha_j(0)|^2 = 1/N$  for state (10). In Fig. 2(c), we plot it for

atom 1 of a shorter chain ( $N = 10$ ) within a longer time window  $t \leq 50/\omega_0$ . To compare with Fig. 1, we apply the same three values of  $\Gamma_0/\omega_0$  and the same coloring as in Fig. 1. Figure 2(c) shows that for  $\Gamma_0/\omega_0 = 10^{-3}$  (pink) and  $10^{-6}$  (blue) there is a gap of  $\lesssim 10\Gamma_0/\omega_0$  between const-wQED (solid curves) and lin-wQED (dashed curves), while the predictions of Eq. (8) (dotted curves) are roughly in the middle. For stronger atom-waveguide coupling  $\Gamma_0/\omega_0 = 10^{-2}$ , the curves of const-wQED (red solid) and that of Eq. (8) (red dotted) have a tendency toward getting closer. We also plot  $\Delta P_e(t)$  for the last atom (No. 10) in Fig. 2(d). It shows gaps between const-wQED (solid) and lin-wQED (dashed) of roughly the same scale as atom 1, except for the case of  $\Gamma_0/\omega_0 = 10^{-2}$ . A zoom-in view for  $\omega_0 t \in [45, 50]$  is shown in the left-most panel of Fig. 2(e).

To compare, we plot  $\Delta P_e(t)$  for the case of  $N = 1$  in




Figure 2. The decay of superradiant state  $|\Psi_{k_0}\rangle$ . (a) The instantaneous decay rate  $\Gamma_{\text{inst}}(t)$  for const-wQED (red) and lin-wQED (blue), both of which are determined by Eq. (7), and the retardation-only solution “retard.” (grey) given by Eq. (8). Other parameters:  $\Gamma_0/\omega_0 = 10^{-4}$ ,  $N = 20$ , and  $d = 0.1\pi/k_0$ . (b) The individual instantaneous decay rate of five selected atoms [the legend is the same as in (a)]. The change of individual excited state population  $\Delta P_e(t)$  (in units of  $\Gamma_0/\omega_0$ ) for (c) atom 1; (d) atom 10. In (c,d), we have  $N = 10$ ,  $d = 0.1\pi/k_0$  and  $\Gamma_0/\omega_0 = 10^{-2}$  (colored by red)  $10^{-3}$  (pink), and  $10^{-6}$  (blue). Predictions of const-wQED, lin-wQED and the retardation-only solution “retard.” are plotted by solid, dashed, and dotted curves, respectively. (e) Left panel: zoom-in view of (d) for  $\omega_0 t \in [45, 50]$ ; The three right panels:  $\Delta P_e(t)$  of a single atom coupled to the waveguide with  $\Gamma_0/\omega_0 = 10^{-2}$ ,  $10^{-3}$  and  $10^{-6}$ , respectively.




Figure 3. The decay of the subradiant state  $|\Psi_{\text{sub}}\rangle$  with  $N = 20$ . (a) The instantaneous decay rate  $\Gamma_{\text{inst}}(t)$  (in units of  $\Gamma_0$ ). The other parameters and the legend are the same as in Fig. 2(a). (b) The change of population on the excited state  $\Delta P_e(t)$  (in units of  $\Gamma_0/\omega_0$ ).

the right three panels of Fig. 2(e), each for one choice of  $\Gamma_0/\omega_0$ . We find that predictions of the three models (solid, dashed and dotted curves) are almost indistinguishable for  $\omega_0 t \in [45, 50]$ . Thus, in terms of  $\Delta P_e(t)$ , the non-Markovian effect in the Zeno regime is much more prominent in collective emissions than in the decay of a single atom. And it is reasonable to conclude that the requirement of temporal resolution is significantly relaxed to the level of  $\lesssim 10/\omega_0$ .

*Subradiance.* The effective Hamiltonian of waveguide QED defines a subradiant eigenstate approximated by  $|\Psi_{\text{sub}}\rangle = (|\Psi_k\rangle - |\Psi_{-k}\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$  with  $kd = \pi N/(N+1)$  [14–16]. We suppose the same parameters as in Fig. 2(a,b) and plot  $\Gamma_{\text{inst}}(t)$  for a chain initialized in  $|\Psi_{\text{sub}}\rangle$  in Fig. 3(a). In all cases, the subradiance is built through quick oscillations between emissions and absorptions. But the amplitudes are different: The piecewise curve predicted by Eq. (8) has the largest amplitudes. In Fig. 3(b), we plot  $\Delta P_e(t)$  of the whole chain. It also shows apparent relative discrepancies between the three predictions.

*Discussions.* It is of fundamental interest to extend the theory to atoms in free space. However, a controversial issue is that on which Hamiltonian all calculations should be based. Most works chose the Coulomb gauge ( $\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{p}$  interaction) disregarding the  $\mathbf{A}^2$  term, see, e.g., Refs. [51–55]. Taking the counter-rotating terms into account, it has been found that  $\tau_Z^{-2} \sim \ln \Lambda$  [10], the same as lin-wQED. Thus, we expect the same non-Markovianity, or perhaps even more pronounced, because the resonant dipole-dipole interaction in free space diverges as  $1/r^3$  for short distances, resulting in strong photon blockade [56]. But recently Hamiltonians of quantum optics is revisited by causal perturbation theory [57]. In this sense, non-Markovianity beyond retardation might be viewed as a probe to determine which theory better captures the true physics.

For experimental tests, our plots show that temporal resolution at the scale of  $\lesssim 10/\omega_0$  is favorable. Among

various platforms of waveguide QED, superconducting circuits have the highest coupling efficiency [30] and fabricating the transmon qubits into a subwavelength chain is straightforward [58]. The transition frequency  $\omega_0$  is in the GHz regime so that temporal resolution at nanosecond is sufficient. Subwavelength atom arrays can also be realized by trapping Sr atoms in optical lattices [59]. The wavelength of  $^3P_0 - ^3D_1$  transition is  $2.6\mu\text{m}$  so the temporal resolution should be  $\lesssim 10\text{fs}$ . Scenarios where the boson fields are surface acoustic waves [31, 32] and matter waves [33, 34] need further studies.

*Conclusions.* We have studied the Zeno regime of the decay of subwavelength atom arrays coupled to a 1D waveguide. Non-markovianity beyond retardation, characterized by instantaneous decay rates and population in the excited states, is addressed by comparing the full quantum treatment Eq. (7) with Eq. (8), which includes only the retardation effect. Specifically, the evolution of excited state population (in the single-photon superradiant state) manifests reservoir memory effect with a significantly relaxed temporal resolution. Our results might be useful for protecting the quantum information stored in compact atom ensembles [14, 60] via dissipation engineering [61], and studying the correlated noise in quantum computing processors [62], etc. For future works, one may explore such possibilities using the theoretical tools of non-Markovian open systems [43–45].

The author thanks Klaus Mølmer for careful reading of the manuscript and for providing valuable comments. The author acknowledges the financial support from CAS Project for Young Scientists in Basic Research (YSBR-100), National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12375024), Innovation Program for Quantum Science and Technology (Grant No. 2-6), and the startup grant of IOP-CAS.

---

\* [iyxz@iphy.ac.cn](mailto:iyxz@iphy.ac.cn)

- [1] R. G. Winter, Evolution of a quasi-stationary state, *Phys. Rev.* **123**, 1503 (1961).
- [2] R. G. Newton, The exponential decay law of unstable systems, *Annals of Physics* **14**, 333 (1961).
- [3] V. Weisskopf and E. Wigner, Berechnung der natürlichen linienbreite auf grund der diracschen lichttheorie, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **63**, 54 (1930).
- [4] S. R. Wilkinson, C. F. Bharucha, M. C. Fischer, K. W. Madison, P. R. Morrow, Q. Niu, B. Sundaram, and M. G. Raizen, Experimental evidence for non-exponential decay in quantum tunnelling, *Nature* **387**, 575 (1997).
- [5] A. Crespi, F. V. Pepe, P. Facchi, F. Sciarrino, P. Mataloni, H. Nakazato, S. Pascazio, and R. Osellame, Experimental investigation of quantum decay at short, intermediate, and long times via integrated photonics, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 130401 (2019).
- [6] C. B. Chiu, E. C. G. Sudarshan, and B. Misra, Time evolution of unstable quantum states and a resolution of zeno’s paradox, *Phys. Rev. D* **16**, 520 (1977).
- [7] B. Misra and E. C. G. Sudarshan, The zeno’s paradox in quantum theory, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **18**, 756 (1977).
- [8] W. M. Itano, D. J. Heinzen, J. J. Bollinger, and D. J. Wineland, Quantum zeno effect, *Phys. Rev. A* **41**, 2295 (1990).
- [9] C. Presilla, R. Onofrio, and U. Tambini, Measurement quantum mechanics and experiments on quantum zeno effect, *Annals of Physics* **248**, 95 (1996).
- [10] H. Zheng, S. Y. Zhu, and M. S. Zubairy, Quantum zeno and anti-zeno effects: Without the rotating-wave approximation, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 200404 (2008).
- [11] R. H. Dicke, Coherence in spontaneous radiation processes, *Phys. Rev.* **93**, 99 (1954).
- [12] R. H. Lehmburg, Radiation from an  $n$ -atom system. i. general formalism, *Phys. Rev. A* **2**, 883 (1970).
- [13] R. H. Lehmburg, Radiation from an  $n$ -atom system. ii. spontaneous emission from a pair of atoms, *Phys. Rev. A* **2**, 889 (1970).
- [14] A. Asenjo-Garcia, M. Moreno-Cardoner, A. Albrecht, H. J. Kimble, and D. E. Chang, Exponential improvement in photon storage fidelities using subradiance and “selective radiance” in atomic arrays, *Phys. Rev. X* **7**, 031024 (2017).
- [15] Y.-X. Zhang and K. Mølmer, Theory of subradiant states of a one-dimensional two-level atom chain, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 203605 (2019).
- [16] Y.-X. Zhang and K. Mølmer, Subradiant emission from regular atomic arrays: Universal scaling of decay rates from the generalized bloch theorem, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 253601 (2020).
- [17] D. F. Kornovan, N. V. Corzo, J. Laurat, and A. S. Sheremet, Extremely subradiant states in a periodic one-dimensional atomic array, *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 063832 (2019).
- [18] P. W. Milonni and P. L. Knight, Retardation in the resonant interaction of two identical atoms, *Phys. Rev. A* **10**, 1096 (1974).
- [19] C. Gonzalez-Ballester, F. J. García-Vidal, and E. Moreno, Non-markovian effects in waveguide-mediated entanglement, *New Journal of Physics* **15**, 073015 (2013).
- [20] K. Sinha, P. Meystre, E. A. Goldschmidt, F. K. Fatemi, S. L. Rolston, and P. Solano, Non-markovian collective emission from macroscopically separated emitters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 043603 (2020).
- [21] K. Sinha, A. González-Tudela, Y. Lu, and P. Solano, Collective radiation from distant emitters, *Phys. Rev. A* **102**, 043718 (2020).
- [22] F. Dinc and A. M. Brańczyk, Non-markovian super-superradiance in a linear chain of up to 100 qubits, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **1**, 032042 (2019).
- [23] H. Z. Shen, S. Xu, H. T. Cui, and X. X. Yi, Non-markovian dynamics of a system of two-level atoms coupled to a structured environment, *Phys. Rev. A* **99**, 032101 (2019).
- [24] A. Carmele, N. Nemet, V. Canela, and S. Parkins, Pronounced non-markovian features in multiply excited, multiple emitter waveguide qed: Retardation induced anomalous population trapping, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **2**, 013238 (2020).
- [25] S. Arranz Regidor, G. Crowder, H. Carmichael, and S. Hughes, Modeling quantum light-matter interactions

- in waveguide qed with retardation, nonlinear interactions, and a time-delayed feedback: Matrix product states versus a space-discretized waveguide model, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **3**, 023030 (2021).
- [26] R. Trivedi, D. Malz, S. Sun, S. Fan, and J. Vučković, Optimal two-photon excitation of bound states in non-markovian waveguide qed, *Phys. Rev. A* **104**, 013705 (2021).
- [27] K. Barkemeyer, A. Knorr, and A. Carmele, Heisenberg treatment of multiphoton pulses in waveguide qed with time-delayed feedback, *Phys. Rev. A* **106**, 023708 (2022).
- [28] D. Roy, C. M. Wilson, and O. Firstenberg, Colloquium: Strongly interacting photons in one-dimensional continuum, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **89**, 021001 (2017).
- [29] D. E. Chang, J. S. Douglas, A. González-Tudela, C.-L. Hung, and H. J. Kimble, Colloquium: Quantum matter built from nanoscopic lattices of atoms and photons, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **90**, 031002 (2018).
- [30] A. S. Sheremet, M. I. Petrov, I. V. Iorsh, A. V. Poshakinskiy, and A. N. Poddubny, Waveguide quantum electrodynamics: Collective radiance and photon-photon correlations, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **95**, 015002 (2023).
- [31] M. V. Gustafsson, T. Aref, A. F. Kockum, M. K. Ekström, G. Johansson, and P. Delsing, Propagating phonons coupled to an artificial atom, *Science* **346**, 207 (2014).
- [32] L. Guo, A. Grimsmo, A. F. Kockum, M. Pletyukhov, and G. Johansson, Giant acoustic atom: A single quantum system with a deterministic time delay, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 053821 (2017).
- [33] I. de Vega, D. Porras, and J. Ignacio Cirac, Matter-wave emission in optical lattices: Single particle and collective effects, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 260404 (2008).
- [34] L. Krinner, M. Stewart, A. Pazmiño, J. Kwon, and D. Schneble, Spontaneous emission of matter waves from a tunable open quantum system, *Nature* **559**, 589 (2018).
- [35] See *Supplemental Material for additional discussions about Zeno time, detailed calculations and extra plots, which includes Refs. [15, 18, 40, 63]*.
- [36] N. Vats and S. John, Non-markovian quantum fluctuations and superradiance near a photonic band edge, *Phys. Rev. A* **58**, 4168 (1998).
- [37] K. Jacobs, S. Krastanov, M. Heuck, and D. R. Englund, Quantum theory of single-photon nonlinearities generated by ensembles of emitters (2023), [arXiv:2307.01375](https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.01375) [quant-ph].
- [38] P. D. Drummond, Unifying the p-a and d-e interactions in photodetector theory, *Phys. Rev. A* **35**, 4253 (1987).
- [39] A. Stokes and A. Nazir, Gauge ambiguities imply jaynes-cummings physics remains valid in ultrastrong coupling QED, *Nature Communications* **10**, 10.1038/s41467-018-08101-0 (2019).
- [40] A. Stokes and A. Nazir, Implications of gauge freedom for nonrelativistic quantum electrodynamics, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **94**, 045003 (2022).
- [41] D.-w. Wang, Z.-h. Li, H. Zheng, and S.-y. Zhu, Time evolution, lamb shift, and emission spectra of spontaneous emission of two identical atoms, *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 043819 (2010).
- [42] Y. Li, J. Evers, H. Zheng, and S.-Y. Zhu, Collective spontaneous emission beyond the rotating-wave approximation, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 053830 (2012).
- [43] Á. Rivas, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio, Quantum non-markovianity: characterization, quantification and detection, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **77**, 094001 (2014).
- [44] H.-P. Breuer, E.-M. Laine, J. Piilo, and B. Vacchini, Colloquium: Non-markovian dynamics in open quantum systems, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **88**, 021002 (2016).
- [45] I. de Vega and D. Alonso, Dynamics of non-markovian open quantum systems, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **89**, 015001 (2017).
- [46] J.-T. Shen and S. Fan, Coherent single photon transport in a one-dimensional waveguide coupled with superconducting quantum bits, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 213001 (2005).
- [47] C. Cohen-Tannoudji, J. Dupont-Roc, and G. Grynberg, *Photons and Atoms: Introduction to Quantum Electrodynamics*, 1st ed. (Wiley-VCH, 1997).
- [48] R. Röhlsberger, K. Schlage, B. Sahoo, S. Couet, and R. Ruffer, Collective lamb shift in single-photon superradiance, *Science* **328**, 1248 (2010).
- [49] N. V. Corzo, J. Raskop, A. Chandra, A. S. Sheremet, B. Gouraud, and J. Laurat, Waveguide-coupled single collective excitation of atomic arrays, *Nature* **566**, 359 (2019).
- [50] M. O. Scully, E. S. Fry, C. H. R. Ooi, and K. Wódkiewicz, Directed spontaneous emission from an extended ensemble of  $n$  atoms: Timing is everything, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 010501 (2006).
- [51] H. E. Moses, Photon wave functions and the exact electromagnetic matrix elements for hydrogenic atoms, *Phys. Rev. A* **8**, 1710 (1973).
- [52] K. Wódkiewicz and J. Eberly, Markovian and non-markovian behavior in two-level atom fluorescence, *Annals of Physics* **101**, 574 (1976).
- [53] J. Seke and W. N. Herfort, Deviations from exponential decay in the case of spontaneous emission from a two-level atom, *Phys. Rev. A* **38**, 833 (1988).
- [54] P. Facchi and S. Pascazio, Temporal behavior and quantum zeno time of an excited state of the hydrogen atom, *Physics Letters A* **241**, 139 (1998).
- [55] P. R. Berman and G. W. Ford, Spectrum in spontaneous emission: Beyond the weisskopf-wigner approximation, *Phys. Rev. A* **82**, 023818 (2010).
- [56] A. Cidrim, T. S. do Espirito Santo, J. Schachenmayer, R. Kaiser, and R. Bachelard, Photon blockade with ground-state neutral atoms, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 073601 (2020).
- [57] K.-P. Marzlin and B. Fitzgerald, Spontaneous emission and atomic line shift in causal perturbation theory, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **59**, 042103 (2018).
- [58] M. Mirhosseini, E. Kim, X. Zhang, A. Sipahigil, P. B. Dieterle, A. J. Keller, A. Asenjo-Garcia, D. E. Chang, and O. Painter, Cavity quantum electrodynamics with atom-like mirrors, *Nature* **569**, 692 (2019).
- [59] B. Olmos, D. Yu, Y. Singh, F. Schreck, K. Bongs, and I. Lesanovsky, Long-range interacting many-body systems with alkaline-earth-metal atoms, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 143602 (2013).
- [60] M. T. Manzoni, M. Moreno-Cardoner, A. Asenjo-Garcia, J. V. Porto, A. V. Gorshkov, and D. E. Chang, Optimization of photon storage fidelity in ordered atomic arrays, *New Journal of Physics* **20**, 083048 (2018).
- [61] P. M. Harrington, E. J. Mueller, and K. W. Murch, Engineered dissipation for quantum information science, *Nature Reviews Physics* **4**, 660 (2022).

- [62] K. Singh, C. E. Bradley, S. Anand, V. Ramesh, R. White, and H. Bernien, Mid-circuit correction of correlated phase errors using an array of spectator qubits, *Science* **380**, 1265 (2023).
- [63] Y.-X. Zhang, C. R. i Carceller, M. Kjaergaard, and A. S. Sørensen, Charge-noise insensitive chiral photonic interface for waveguide circuit qed, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 233601 (2021).

# SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

Yu-Xiang Zhang<sup>1,2,3,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institute of Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China*

<sup>2</sup>*School of Physical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China*

<sup>3</sup>*Hefei National Laboratory, Hefei 230088, China*

(Dated: October 30, 2023)

The supplemental material includes: Sec. A, a discussion of Zeno time for a chain of  $N > 1$  atoms in a timed-Dicke state; Sec. B, Zeno time of a waveguide with non-linear dispersion relation; Sec. C, more details of Eq. (7) of the main text; Sec. D, a derivation of Eq. (8) of the main text; Sec. E, instantaneous decay rates of a chain of ten atoms with the spacing  $d = 0.5\pi/k_0$ .

## A. Zeno time for $N > 1$

In this section, we calculate the Zeno time  $\tau_{Z,N}$  for  $N$  atoms initialized in the timed-Dicke state  $|\Psi_k\rangle$ , i.e., state (10) of the main text. Substituting the state into the definition (4) of the main text, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_{Z,N}^{-2} &= (\langle \Psi_k | H | \Psi_k \rangle)^2 - \langle \Psi_k | H^2 | \Psi_k \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \int_{-\Lambda}^{\Lambda} \frac{dq}{2\pi} (g_q^{\text{JC}})^2 e^{i(q-k)(x_i-x_j)} \\ &= \tau_Z^{-2} + \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i \neq j} e^{-ik(x_i-x_j)} \int_{-\Lambda}^{\Lambda} \frac{dq}{2\pi} (g_q^{\text{JC}})^2 e^{iq(x_i-x_j)}\end{aligned}\quad (\text{S1})$$

where the contribution of the diagonal terms ( $i = j$ ) is exactly  $\tau_Z$ , the Zeno time of a single atom evaluated in Eq. (5) of the main text.

It is conceivable that the contribution from off-diagonal terms ( $i \neq j$ ) is less divergent in terms of the cutoff  $\Lambda$ , because they have a phase oscillating with  $q$  in the integrand of Eq. (S1). For example, the scale of the integrals of lin-wQED reads

$$\sim \int_0^{\Lambda} dq \left( \frac{\sqrt{q}}{1+q} \right)^2 e^{iqr_{ij}}, \quad (\text{S2})$$

where  $r_{ij} = k_0|x_i - x_j|$ . It diverges in the form of  $\ln \Lambda$  if  $i = j$  but convergences otherwise. Thus, the off-diagonal terms are negligible.

However, the above argument does not apply to the case of const-wQED because the diagonal terms do not divergent with  $\Lambda$  at all. Scales of the integrals of const-wQED are estimated as

$$\sim \int_0^{\Lambda} dq \left( \frac{1}{1+q} \right)^2 e^{iqr_{ij}}. \quad (\text{S3})$$

It converges with increasing  $\Lambda$  even for the case of  $i = j$ . By a few lines of calculations we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{\Lambda \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{\Lambda} dq \left( \frac{1}{1+q} \right)^2 e^{iqr_{ij}} \\ = 1 - r_{ij} e^{-ir_{ij}} [\text{si}(-r_{ij}) + \text{ci}(r_{ij})].\end{aligned}\quad (\text{S4})$$

The above integral shows a constant term regardless of  $r_{ij}$  and an oscillating term. It turns that the relation between  $\tau_{Z,N}$  and  $\tau_Z$  is subtle. If the initial state has a wavenumber  $k = O(1)$ , the summation of  $e^{ik(x_i-x_j)}$  in Eq. (S1) will wash out the off-diagonal terms. But if  $k = O(N^{-1})$  in particular  $k = 0$ , a linear scaling of  $\tau_{Z,N}^{-2}$ , hence  $\tau_{Z,N} \sim N^{-1/2}$  might be possible. That is, a long chain may not favor a longer  $\tau_Z$ .

Nevertheless,  $|\Psi_k\rangle$  with  $k = 0$  is an subradiant state of waveguide QED [1]. It is not pertinent to the super-radiant states that are mostly interested by us. And a shorter chain is more accessible in practice.

## B. Zeno time for waveguide with non-linear dispersion relation

In Ref. [2] the author and colleagues studied a waveguide QED setup realized by superconducting circuits, where an artificial atoms of finite size ( $\delta x$ ) couples to a transmission line. The transmission line is modeled as a chain of coupled LC loops, where each loop has inductance  $l\delta_z$  and conductance  $c\delta_z$ . We refer the readers to the supplemental material of Ref. [2] for details of the circuits. In short, the take home message is that we have  $g_k \propto \sqrt{w_k}$  and

$$\omega_k = J \left| \sin \frac{k}{2} \right| \quad (\text{S5})$$

where  $J = \frac{2}{\sqrt{lc\delta_z}}$  plays the role of energy cutoff, and the wavenumber  $k$  is defined in the Brillouin zone  $[-\pi, \pi]$ .

To evaluate the Zeno time, we define the group velocity at the resonant frequency  $\omega_0$ ,  $v_g = \frac{J}{2} \cos(\frac{k_0}{2})$ . Then, the Zeno time of a single atom reads

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_Z^{-2} &= \frac{4\Gamma_0 v_g \sin(k_0/2)}{\pi} \int_0^{\pi/2} dx \frac{\sin(x)}{[\sin(\frac{k_0}{2}) + \sin(x)]} \\ &= \frac{4\Gamma_0 v_g a}{\pi(1-a^2)} \left[ -1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-a^2}} \ln \frac{1 + \sqrt{1-a^2} + a}{1 - \sqrt{1-a^2} + a} \right],\end{aligned}\quad (\text{S6})$$

where  $a = \sin(k_0/2)$ . Now we assume that the resonant frequency is far from the cutoff, i.e.,  $k_0 \ll \pi$ . It leads to

the approximation that  $2v_g a \approx \omega_0$  so that

$$\tau_Z^{-2} \approx \frac{2\Gamma_0\omega_0}{\pi} [\ln(2\Lambda + 1) - 1] \quad (\text{S7})$$

where  $\Lambda = a^{-1} = J/\omega_0$ . That is, the Zeno time of this model is qualitatively the same as the Zeno time of lin-wQED.

### C. Kernel of the Integro-Differential Equation

In our numerical calculations, the integro-differential equation (7) of the main text is transformed to an integral equation

$$\alpha_i(t) - \alpha_i(0) = i \frac{2\Gamma_0}{\pi} \int_0^t d\tau [A_{ij}(t - \tau)] \alpha_j(\tau), \quad (\text{S8})$$

where the kernel is specified in the below. To determine the kernels in the above integral equations, we introduce

$$(I1) \int_0^\Lambda dx \frac{\cos(xr_{ij})}{x-1} (1 - e^{i(1-x)\phi}) = \left[ \cos(r_{ij})\text{ci}(xr_{ij}) - \sin(r_{ij})\text{si}(xr_{ij}) - \frac{e^{ir_{ij}}}{2} \text{csi}(xr_{ij}^-) - \frac{e^{-ir_{ij}}}{2} \text{csi}^*(xr_{ij}^+) \right] \Big|_{-1}^{\Lambda-1} \quad (\text{S11a})$$

$$(I2) \int_0^\Lambda dx \frac{\cos(xr_{ij})}{x+1} (1 - e^{i(1-x)\phi}) = \left[ \cos(r_{ij})\text{ci}(xr_{ij}) + \sin(r_{ij})\text{si}(xr_{ij}) - \frac{e^{i(\phi-r_{ij}^-)}}{2} \text{csi}(xr_{ij}^-) - \frac{e^{i(\phi+r_{ij}^+)}}{2} \text{csi}^*(xr_{ij}^+) \right] \Big|_1^{\Lambda+1} \quad (\text{S11b})$$

$$(I3) \int_0^\Lambda dx \frac{\cos(xr_{ij})}{(1+x)^2} [1 - e^{i(1-x)\phi}] = \frac{\cos(\Lambda r_{ij})}{\Lambda+1} (e^{-i(\Lambda+1)\phi} - 1) + 1 - e^{i\phi} - \left\{ r_{ij} [\cos(r_{ij})\text{si}(xr_{ij}) - \sin(r_{ij})\text{ci}(xr_{ij})] + \frac{i}{2} r_{ij}^- e^{i(2\phi-r_{ij})} \text{csi}(xr_{ij}^-) - \frac{i}{2} r_{ij}^+ e^{i(2\phi+r_{ij})} \text{csi}^*(xr_{ij}^+) \right\} \Big|_1^{\Lambda+1} \quad (\text{S11c})$$

where  $r_{ij}^\pm = r_{ij} \pm \phi$ , and we have introduced

$$\text{csi}(x) \equiv \text{ci}(x) + i\text{si}(x) \equiv - \int_x^\infty dt \frac{e^{it}}{t},$$

and its complex conjugate  $\text{csi}^*(x)$ .

The population of the bosonic field excitation

$$N_b(t) = \int_{-\Lambda}^\Lambda \frac{dk}{2\pi} |\beta_k(t)|^2$$

is obtained from the atomic amplitudes by

$$N_b(t) = \sum_{i,j=1}^N \int_0^t d\tau \int_0^t d\tau' B_{ij}(\tau - \tau') \alpha_i(\tau) \alpha_j(\tau'), \quad (\text{S12})$$

the unit less notations  $\phi = \omega_0(t - \tau)$ ,  $r_{ij} = k_0|x_i - x_j|$  and a short hand replacement  $\Lambda/k_0 \rightarrow \Lambda$ . Then we have that in the constant case,

$$A_{ij}^{\text{const.}}(\phi) = \int_0^\Lambda dx \frac{\cos(xr_{ij})}{(1+x)^2} \frac{1 - e^{i(1-x)\phi}}{x-1} = \frac{1}{4}(I_1 - I_2 - 2I_3), \quad (\text{S9})$$

and in the linear case,

$$A_{ij}^{\text{lin.}}(\phi) = \int_0^\Lambda dx \frac{x \cos(xr_{ij})}{(1+x)^2} \frac{1 - e^{i(1-x)\phi}}{x-1} = \frac{1}{4}(I_1 - I_2 + 2I_3); \quad (\text{S10})$$

where the abbreviated terms are

where the kernel is defined by

$$B_{ij}(t - \tau) = \int_{-\Lambda}^\Lambda \frac{dk}{2\pi} |g_k^{\text{JC}}|^2 e^{-ik(x_i - x_j) - i(\omega_0 - \omega_k)(t - \tau)} \quad (\text{S13})$$

For the constant case, the kernel of photon population is evaluated as

$$B_{ij}^{\text{const.}}(\phi) = \frac{\Gamma_0\omega_0}{\pi} \int_0^\Lambda dx \frac{1}{(1+x)^2} 2 \cos(xr_{ij}) e^{i(x-1)\phi} = \frac{\Gamma_0\omega_0 e^{-i\phi}}{\pi} \left[ - \frac{2 \cos(xr_{ij})}{1+x} e^{ix\phi} \Big|_0^\Lambda + \sum_{s=\pm} i\phi_s e^{-i\phi_s} \text{csi}(x\phi_s) \Big|_1^{\Lambda+1} \right] \quad (\text{S14})$$

where  $\phi_{\pm} = \phi \pm r_{ij}$ ; for the linear case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} B_{ij}^{\text{lin.}}(\phi) &= \frac{\Gamma_0 \omega_0}{\pi} \int_0^{\Lambda} dx \frac{x}{(1+x)^2} 2 \cos(xr_{ij}) e^{i(x-1)\phi} \\ &= \sum_{s=\pm} e^{-i\phi_s} \text{csi}(x\phi_s) \Big|_1^{\Lambda+1} - B_{ij}^{\text{const.}}(\phi). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S15})$$

We solved both the population of atomic excitation and the number of photonic excitations. The sum of them, which should be one in theory, is used to renormalize the numerical solutions.

#### D. Derivation of Eq. (8) of the main text

Equation (8) of the main text goes beyond the Markovian equation of motion (governed by the non-Hermitian effective Hamiltonian, in the absence of the quantum jumps) minimally. It shares a properties with the Markovian formalism that it is gauge invariant [3]. We can derive it from any choice of Hamiltonian. (Hamiltonian is of course gauge-dependent.)

In order to derive Eq. (8), the trick firstly introduced in Ref. [4] is to substitute the following approximation

$$\int \frac{dk}{2\pi} f(k) e^{i(k_0-k)x} \approx f(k_0) \delta(x) \quad (\text{S16})$$

into Eq. (7) of the main text. The above approximation is valid if the function  $f(k)$  changes slowly with  $k$ . In the large  $\Lambda$  limit, it leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \alpha_i(t) &= - \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{1}{v_g} \left| g_{k_0}^{\text{JC}} \right|^2 \int_0^t d\tau \alpha_j(\tau) e^{ik_0|x_i-x_j|} \\ &\quad \delta\left(-\frac{|x_i-x_j|}{v_g} + t - \tau\right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S17})$$

Note that now only the coupling strength at the resonant momentum  $k_0$  shows up. Thus there is no difference to base the derivation on either const-wQED or lin-wQED. The above equation reduces to Eq. (8) of the main text by using  $\Gamma_0 = 2g_{k_0}^2/v_g$ .

#### E. Results of $d = 0.5\pi/d$

Results presented in the main text belong to sub-wavelength arrays with the atom-atom separation  $d = 0.1\pi/k_0$ . The field memory effect will be diminished if  $d$  becomes larger. To see it we consider a chain of 10 atoms with  $d = 0.5\pi/d$  and  $\Gamma_0/\omega_0 = 10^{-4}$ , and suppose the chain is initialized in the single-photon superradiant state  $|\Psi_{k_0}\rangle$ . We show in Fig. 1 the instantaneous decay rate of the whole chain and of five atoms, No. 1, 2, 5, 6, 10. It can be seen that the differences between const-wQED, lin-wQED and Eq. (8) of the main text are less prominent than the case of  $d = 0.1\pi/k_0$ .




Figure 1. The instantaneous decay rate  $\Gamma_{\text{inst}}(t)$  (in the unit of  $\Gamma_0$ ) of a chain of 10 atoms initialized in  $|\Psi_{k_0}\rangle$  separated by  $d = 0.5\pi/k_0$ .

\* iyxz@iphy.ac.cn

- [1] Y.-X. Zhang and K. Mølmer, Theory of subradiant states of a one-dimensional two-level atom chain, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 203605 (2019).
- [2] Y.-X. Zhang, C. R. i Carceller, M. Kjaergaard, and A. S. Sørensen, Charge-noise insensitive chiral photonic interface for waveguide circuit qed, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 233601 (2021).
- [3] A. Stokes and A. Nazir, Implications of gauge freedom for nonrelativistic quantum electrodynamics, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **94**, 045003 (2022).
- [4] P. W. Milonni and P. L. Knight, Retardation in the resonant interaction of two identical atoms, *Phys. Rev. A* **10**, 1096 (1974).