

# A complete scheme for atom-mediated deterministic photonic graph state generation

Ziv Aqua<sup>1,\*</sup> and Barak Dayan<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*AMOS and Chemical and Biological Physics Department,  
Weizmann Institute of Science, 76100 Rehovot, Israel*

<sup>2</sup>*Quantum Source Labs, Israel*

(Dated: June 25, 2024)

Highly-entangled multi-photon graph states are a crucial resource in photonic quantum computation and communication. Yet, the lack of photon-photon interactions makes the construction of such graph states especially challenging. Typically, these states are produced through probabilistic single-photon sources and linear-optics entangling operations that require indistinguishable photons. The resulting inefficiency of these methods necessitates a large overhead in the number of sources and operations, creating a major bottleneck in the photonic approach. Here, we show how harnessing single-atom-based photonic operations can enable deterministic generation of photonic graph states, while also lifting the requirement for photon indistinguishability. To this end, we introduce a multi-gate quantum node comprised of a single atom in a W-type level scheme coupled to an optical resonator. This configuration provides a versatile toolbox for generating graph states, allowing the operation of two fundamental photon-atom gates, as well as the deterministic generation of single photons. We investigate the implementation of this setup with a <sup>87</sup>Rb atom and evaluate its performance through numerical simulations.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Large-scale entanglement is at the core of quantum technologies, which hold the potential to surpass the capabilities of classical devices [1]. At the forefront, fault-tolerant quantum computation relies on error-correcting codes in which logical quantum information is encoded in highly entangled states of many physical qubits [2]. As one of the most promising routes towards large-scale quantum computers, discrete-variable photonic quantum computing utilizes physical qubits encoded in single photons. Optical photonic qubits exhibit exceptionally low decoherence rates due to the absence of interaction between single photons and their weak interaction with the environment. Additionally, photons can be easily manipulated by linear optics to achieve high-fidelity single-qubit gates [3–5], and long optical fibers can essentially perform as nearly noise-free quantum memories [6]. However, the lack of photon-photon interaction poses a significant challenge in generating the necessary entanglement. In one-way [7–11] and fusion-based [12] quantum computing, which are particularly suited for the photonic platform [13], this challenge primarily lies in preparing fixed entangled resource states, referred to as cluster or graph states [14, 15]. Additionally, photonic graph states serve as an entanglement resource for many more applications in photonic quantum information processing, including all-optical quantum repeaters for long-distance quantum communication [16, 17] and quantum simulations [18, 19].

The challenge of generating photonic graph states centers around two key tasks: producing single photons and performing photonic entangling operations. Traditionally, these tasks are carried out probabilistically, em-

ploying single-photon sources based on parametric photon pair generation [20–25], and entangling operations that rely on multi-photon quantum interference in linear-optics circuits [26–31]. Since quantum interference depends on the contribution of indistinguishable paths to the final state, ensuring high-fidelity entangling operations requires the sources to meet stringent conditions in terms of photon indistinguishability, presenting a major hurdle in the field. Notable demonstrations in this probabilistic approach include the observation of up to 12-photon graph states [32–38] in bulk optics, and 4-photon graph states on a programmable photonic chip [39, 40]. A potential method to address the inefficiency associated with the generation process is to encode a number of qubits in multiple modes a single photon, thereby reducing the number of photons required per graph state [41–49]. Thus far, demonstrations in both these approaches have been restricted to schemes that produce graph states in an unheralded, postselected manner, where the generation of the state is ensured only upon measuring it. To achieve the on-demand operation necessary for quantum applications, it is essential to use heralded schemes that enable active multiplexing of these probabilistic processes. However, implementing such a procedure poses a considerable challenge, as it requires a substantial overhead in the number of heralded single-photon sources and entangling operations to guarantee the generation of graph states.

An alternative approach harnesses cavity-enhanced matter-based quantum emitters to deterministically generate single photons and mediate effective photon-photon interactions. The construction of photonic graph states in this approach has been explored in many theoretical works [50–58]. Experimentally, small-scale states have been demonstrated with different types of quantum emitters, which serve either as single-photon sources at the input of linear-optics circuits [59–62], or as memory qubits

---

\* zivaqua@gmail.com




FIG. 1. Conceptual depiction of a quantum network comprising of interconnected W-type nodes, each with a single atom capable of performing photon-atom SWAP and CZ gates, as well as producing single photons. This network provides a versatile platform for the deterministic generation of photonic graph states.

that distribute entanglement over a sequence of emitted photons [63–68]. However, to achieve the large-scale photonic entanglement necessary for practical quantum applications, many quantum emitters need to be integrated as nodes within a large quantum network. This entails scalable devices in which the generated photonic states must be compatible with the operations of that network. For instance, in fusion networks [12], it is imperative to ensure high indistinguishability between photons generated by different emitters. Moreover, to retain the advantages of photonic quantum computing, the photon generation and entanglement processes must be both highly efficient and extremely rapid, such that the generated states can be stored in reasonable lengths of optical fibers without significant loss. Developing an efficient light-matter interface suitable for large photonic networks, which enables the rapid generation of high-fidelity photonic graph states, remains an outstanding challenge.

In this work, we propose a complete scheme for the deterministic and rapid generation of such photonic graph states based on cavity-mediated photon-atom quantum gates. We introduce a novel quantum node comprised of a single atom with a W-type level structure in an optical cavity. This node is capable of both generating single photons and executing two native photon-atom gates, namely SWAP and controlled-Z (CZ). The ability to perform these operations within the same apparatus enables a modular design, promoting the integration of such quantum nodes in photonic networks, as depicted in Figure 1. Importantly, due to the inherently identical nature of atoms, photons emitted by one atomic module are compatible with photon-atom gates in another module. Therefore, by combining entanglement generation via the CZ gate with the ability to exchange atomic and photonic qubits through the SWAP gate, this approach provides a versatile toolkit for deterministic photonic graph state generation. Moreover, the typical duration of these gates and the ability to integrate several atomic modules can enable significantly higher repetition rates compared to previous demonstrations with single atoms, offering an improvement of roughly 2-3 orders of magnitude.

Additionally, photon-atom gates are insensitive to the exact pulse shape of the photonic qubit, and accordingly can operate with sources that emit temporally impure photons, thereby lifting the strict requirement for indistinguishable photons. This insensitivity stems from the large separation of timescales between the long coherence lifetime of the atomic qubit, encoded in two ground states, and the fast light-matter interaction with the photonic qubit, dictated by the cavity-enhanced coupling rate with the excited state [69]. We show that high gate fidelities are achieved as long as the bandwidth of the photons is significantly smaller than the interaction bandwidth of the atom-cavity system, even when performed with photons in mixed spectro-temporal states. In other words, after the gate operation has ended, no knowledge of the transient dynamics of the interaction is imprinted on the atom or the outgoing photon.

This paper is structured as follows. First, in Sec. II, we present a quantum node consisting of an atom with a W-type level structure coupled to an optical resonator, and specify its two operation modes for the photon-atom SWAP and CZ gates. In Sec. III, we describe a deterministic single-photon source based on the underlying mechanism of the SWAP gate. In Sec. IV we establish the compatibility of this single-photon source with photon-atom gates. Following that, in Sec. V, we demonstrate how these operations can be utilized to generate photonic graph states deterministically, providing an example for the generation of a 6-ring graph state. Subsequently, in Sec. VI, we discuss the feasibility of this scheme, propose the implementation of the W-system in a  $^{87}\text{Rb}$  atom and assess its performance. Finally, in Sec. VII, we summarize and offer concluding remarks. Throughout the paper, we present analytical calculations and numerical simulations detailed in Appendices A and B.

## II. MULTI-GATE NODE USING A CAVITY-COUPLED ATOMIC W-SYSTEM

The photon-atom SWAP [70, 71] and CZ [72, 73] gates involve a cavity-mediated interaction of a single photon with a three-level atom. In both gates, the atom consists of a single excited level and two ground states, which encode the atomic qubit. However, each gate requires a different configuration of atom-cavity coupling. In the CZ gate, only one atomic transition is resonantly coupled to the cavity mode. Upon an incident single photon in that mode, the joint photon-atom state acquires a  $\pi$ -phase depending on the initial state of the atom. This conditional  $\pi$ -phase shift mechanism [74, 75] enables the operation of the CZ gate. On the other hand, the SWAP gate requires that both atomic transitions are exclusively coupled to two orthogonal modes of the cavity. This configuration leads to single-photon Raman interaction (SPRINT) [76–78], where an incoming single photon effectively ‘pushes’ the atom to the dark state of the incoming mode. This serves as the underlying mechanism in the SWAP gate.




FIG. 2. Multi-gate quantum node. (a) Schematic description of a single atom in a W-type level scheme coupled to two optical modes of a waveguide via a resonator; mode  $\hat{a}_l$  couples to transitions  $|s_l\rangle \leftrightarrow |e_l\rangle$  and  $|s_r\rangle \leftrightarrow |e_0\rangle$ , while  $\hat{a}_r$  is coupled to  $|s_r\rangle \leftrightarrow |e_r\rangle$  and  $|s_l\rangle \leftrightarrow |e_0\rangle$ . An additional guided mode,  $\hat{a}_t$ , does not interact with the resonator and the atom. At the bottom, we introduce a simplified representation of this W-system, with the convention that light propagates from left to right. In the following we refer to this diagram (without the mode labels) when discussing devices with multiple atom-cavity sites. (b)-(d) Configurations for different photon-atom gates. In all configurations, the two degenerate ground states of the atom encode the  $|0_a\rangle$  and  $|1_a\rangle$  states of the atomic qubit. (b) and (c) depict the operation of the SWAP gate in the  $\Lambda$ - and W-type level schemes, respectively. Note that the interaction with the additional excited states in the W-system counteracts and eliminates the  $\pi$ -phase of the empty cavity, which occurs in the  $\Lambda$ -system for the  $|0_a, 0_p\rangle$  and  $|1_a, 1_p\rangle$  input states. The photonic qubit is encoded in left- and right-propagating optical modes, coupled to distinct transitions in the atom, marked by blue and orange. These settings also support the SPRINT-based extraction of a single photon from a coherent pulse, as detailed in Sec. III. (d) The CZ gate operates when only one atomic transition is coupled to an optical mode, defining the state  $|1_p\rangle$  of the photonic qubit, with the  $|0_p\rangle$  state encoded in a non-interacting mode.

To integrate both the conditional phase and the SPRINT mechanism within a single atom, additional atomic levels must be utilized.

We consider an atom in a W-type level scheme with two degenerate ground states,  $s_l$  and  $s_r$ , and three degenerate excited states,  $e_l$ ,  $e_0$ , and  $e_r$ . The atomic transitions are coupled to two orthogonal modes of a waveguide,  $\hat{a}_l$  and  $\hat{a}_r$ , via an optical resonator, as illustrated in Figure 2(a). An additional mode,  $\hat{a}_t$ , does not couple to the resonator and therefore has no impact on the atomic state dynamics. An external control field is employed to inhibit transitions to  $e_0$  by interacting with atomic levels outside the W-system to either induce a light shift or optically dress this state. Disabling the coupling between the ground states through their common excited state,  $e_0$ , effectively divides the photon-atom interaction into two independent parts - left and right; specifically, mode  $\hat{a}_\nu$  interacts solely with the  $s_\nu \leftrightarrow e_\nu$  transition of the atom, where  $\nu \in \{r, l\}$ .

The cavity-mediated interaction can be described by

the following Hamiltonian [79, 80],

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} = & -i\hbar \int d\omega \frac{\sqrt{\kappa/\pi}}{\kappa - i\omega} e^{-i(\omega + \delta_a)t} \\ & \times \left( g_{r0} \hat{\sigma}_{r0}^\dagger \hat{a}_l(\omega) + g_{l0} \hat{\sigma}_{l0}^\dagger \hat{a}_r(\omega) \right. \\ & \left. + g_{ul} \hat{\sigma}_{ul}^\dagger \hat{a}_l(\omega) + g_{rr} \hat{\sigma}_{rr}^\dagger \hat{a}_r(\omega) \right) + \text{h.c} \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Here,  $\hat{\sigma}_{\nu\mu} = |s_\nu\rangle \langle e_\mu|$  represents the atomic lowering operator, where  $\nu$  and  $\mu$  label the ground and excited states of the atom, respectively. We denote the atom-cavity coupling strength of each transition by  $g_\alpha$  for  $\alpha \in \{r0, l0, rr, ll\}$ , where  $2g_\alpha$  is the single-photon Rabi frequency. Additionally, we consider only symmetric transition strengths, i.e.,  $|g_{r0}| = |g_{l0}|$  and  $|g_{rr}| = |g_{ll}|$ .  $\kappa$  represents the cavity amplitude decay rate, while  $\delta_a$  and  $\omega$  denote the detuning of the atomic transitions and the incident field, respectively, both relative to the cavity resonance frequency. Throughout this paper, the center frequency of the incoming optical field is resonant with the atomic transition, and unless stated otherwise, both are resonant with the cavity, i.e.  $\delta_a = 0$ . In the interest of clarity, we simplify our discussion of the control

field by assuming that, when activated, it effectively sets  $g_{r0} = g_{l0} = 0$ . In section VI, where we explore the physical implementation of this scheme, we address this aspect in more detail.

For simplicity, in what follows we assume ideal conditions for the operation of cavity-mediated photon-atom gates. First, we require a high cooperativity parameter,  $C = \Gamma_\alpha / \gamma_\alpha \gg 1$ , where  $\Gamma_\alpha = g_\alpha^2 / \kappa$  denotes the cavity-enhanced emission rate and  $\gamma_\alpha$  represents the free-space spontaneous decay rate in each transition. Additionally, we assume that the intrinsic loss rate of the resonator,  $\kappa_i$ , is significantly smaller compared to the coupling rate between the resonator and the waveguide,  $\kappa_e$ . Under these circumstances, the effects of free-space spontaneous emission and intrinsic cavity losses are negligible, thus allowing the evolution of the system to be governed by the Hamiltonian specified in Eq. 1. Consequently, in the ideal limit, we can conveniently set  $\gamma = \kappa_i = 0$ . Finally, the bandwidth of the single photons used in the gates, denoted by  $\sigma_\omega$ , should satisfy the adiabaticity condition  $\sigma_\omega \ll g_\alpha, \kappa, \Gamma_\alpha$ . For brevity, whenever we do not include the spectro-temporal description of the incoming photon, it is assumed to satisfy this condition.

We investigate the evolution of the quantum state upon an incoming single photon and an atom initialized in one of its ground states. When the incident photon is in mode  $\hat{a}_\nu$  and the atom is initialized in state  $|s_\nu\rangle$ , the photon effectively interacts with a two-level system in a cavity. The induced atomic dipole radiation in transition  $|s_\nu\rangle \leftrightarrow |e_\nu\rangle$  destructively interferes with the intracavity field, rendering the atom-cavity system transparent [72, 79]. As a result, the evolution of the photon-atom state is simply given by,

$$a_\nu^\dagger |0, s_\nu\rangle \rightarrow a_\nu^\dagger |0, s_\nu\rangle \quad (2)$$

If the atom is instead initialized in the other ground state,  $|s_{\bar{\nu}}\rangle$ , the resulting output state depends on whether the control field is activated. When the control field is off, the atomic configuration results in SPRINT [70, 78, 80]; the induced dipole in the  $|s_{\bar{\nu}}\rangle \leftrightarrow |e_0\rangle$  transition leads to destructive interference of the output in mode  $\hat{a}_\nu$ , which 'forces' the atom to emit a photon in the orthogonal mode,  $\hat{a}_{\bar{\nu}}$ , and toggle to  $|s_\nu\rangle$ , as described by Eq. 3a. However, when the control field is activated and the transition to  $|e_0\rangle$  is suppressed, the incoming photon experiences a bare cavity and, accordingly, the state acquires a  $\pi$ -phase shift, as indicated in Eq. 3b.

$$a_\nu^\dagger |0, s_{\bar{\nu}}\rangle \rightarrow \begin{cases} a_{\bar{\nu}}^\dagger |0, s_\nu\rangle & : \text{control off} \\ -a_\nu^\dagger |0, s_{\bar{\nu}}\rangle & : \text{control on} \end{cases} \quad (3a)$$

$$(3b)$$

Lastly, when the incident photon is in the non-interacting mode,  $\hat{a}_t$ , the evolution of the photon-atom state is naturally trivial,

$$a_t^\dagger |0, s_\nu\rangle \rightarrow a_t^\dagger |0, s_\nu\rangle \quad (4)$$

The operations described in Eq. 2-4 form the basis for the SWAP and CZ photon-atom gates. As described in Figure 2(c), when the control field is off, a SPRINT-based SWAP gate is realized with the following encoding,

$$\begin{aligned} |0\rangle_a &\triangleq |s_l\rangle ; |1\rangle_a \triangleq |s_r\rangle \\ |0\rangle_p &\triangleq \hat{a}_l^\dagger |0\rangle ; |1\rangle_p \triangleq \hat{a}_r^\dagger |0\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where mode  $\hat{a}_t$  remains idle. Note that in the  $\Lambda$ -type configuration [78], where excited levels  $|e_l\rangle$  and  $|e_r\rangle$  are absent, the evolution of the state in Eq. 2 acquires a  $\pi$ -phase shift as the photon interacts with an empty cavity. This results in a modified SWAP operation with local Pauli-Z unitaries, as depicted in Figure 2(b).

On the other hand, when the control field is activated, the atomic configuration enables the implementation of a CZ gate based on the conditional  $\pi$ -phase shift, utilizing the interaction with either the left or the right transition, as illustrated in Figure 2(d). Here, the qubits are defined as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} |0\rangle_a &\triangleq |s_\nu\rangle ; |1\rangle_a \triangleq |s_{\bar{\nu}}\rangle \\ |0\rangle_p &\triangleq \hat{a}_t^\dagger |0\rangle ; |1\rangle_p \triangleq \hat{a}_\nu^\dagger |0\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

and mode  $\hat{a}_{\bar{\nu}}$  remains unused. Note that the distinct coupling with the left and right transitions can be harnessed to construct a robust CZ gate by incorporating modes  $\hat{a}_l$  and  $\hat{a}_r$  in a Sagnac interferometer [81].

Overall, the ability to execute both gates within the same atomic level scheme establishes this configuration as a versatile node for universal photonic quantum information processing; effective photon-photon CZ gates are facilitated by combining the photon-atom SWAP and CZ gates, while photonic single-qubit gates can be implemented by linear-optics elements. When integrated with a suitable on-demand single-photon source, this system allows to efficiently generate arbitrary photonic graph states.

### III. DETERMINISTIC EXTRACTION OF SINGLE PHOTONS

The W-system can function as a single-photon source as SPRINT enables to deterministically extract a single photon from a classical coherent pulse [77, 80]. When a multiple-photon pulse in mode  $\hat{a}_r$  is incident upon a W-system initialized in  $|s_l\rangle$ , the first photon is extracted to mode  $\hat{a}_l$  and the atom is toggled to  $|s_r\rangle$ , as outlined in Eq. 3a. Consequently, the remaining photons in the pulse are transmitted in mode  $\hat{a}_r$ . Ideally, failure can only occur due to the absence of a photon in the incoming pulse. Therefore, as the average number of photons in the pulse,  $\bar{n}$ , increases, the extraction success probability exponentially approaches unity (see Figure 3(a)). Following a successful extraction, a subsequent single photon can be extracted to mode  $\hat{a}_r$  by sending a coherent pulse in mode  $\hat{a}_l$ , which also resets the atom to  $|s_l\rangle$ . This






FIG. 3. Single photon source based on extraction of single photons from coherent pulses by an atomic W-system. (a) Extraction success probability (orange), single-photon modal purity (blue), and infidelity of photon-atom gate performed with extracted photons (green) as a function of the average number photons in the incident coherent pulse, denoted by  $\bar{n}$ . Note that for  $\bar{n} = 5$ , single photons are extracted practically deterministically, and even though the modal impurity approaches 1/2, these photons can still be used to perform high-fidelity photon-atom gates (see Sec. IV for a detailed analysis). Solid lines represent analytical calculations, while circles denote numerical simulations (error bars are smaller than markers). (b) The spectral density of extracted photons for  $n = 1, 5$ , shown in orange and blue, respectively. Solid lines represent analytical calculations and error bars denote simulation results. The dashed line indicates the spectral density of the incoming pulse. Results in (a) and (b) are based on a Gaussian coherent pulse with  $\sigma_t = 50\text{ns}$  and an ideal source with  $\kappa\sigma_t/2\pi = \Gamma\sigma_t/2\pi = 10^2$ .

process can be repeated to generate a stream of single photons alternating between modes  $\hat{a}_l$  and  $\hat{a}_r$ .

Under ideal conditions, the final state of the system following a successful extraction process that started with

the atom in  $|s_\nu\rangle$  is given by [80],

$$|\psi\rangle = -e^{-\bar{n}/2}\sqrt{\bar{n}}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt f(t)a_\nu^\dagger(t) \quad (7)$$

$$\times \exp(\sqrt{\bar{n}}\int_t^{\infty} dt' f(t')a_\nu^\dagger(t'))|0\rangle \otimes |s_\nu\rangle$$

where  $f(t)$  represents the temporal wavepacket of the incoming pulse. Note that the single-photon nonlinearity introduced by the atom-cavity system ensures that the extracted field in mode  $\hat{a}_\nu$  does not contain higher Fock components, resulting in ideal number purity for this source. On the other hand, as indicated by the lower limit of the second integral in Eq. 7, the extracted photon and the transmitted field are time-entangled; only after the atom emits a photon in mode  $\hat{a}_\nu$  and becomes transparent to the incoming field can a detection event in mode  $\hat{a}_\nu$  occur. Consequently, disregarding the temporal information in the transmitted field results in a single photon in a mixed state of temporal modes, with a modal purity approaching 1/2 as  $\bar{n} \rightarrow \infty$  [82] (see Figure 3(a)).

This fact seems to suggest that extracted photons may be unsuitable for linear-optics gates, which rely on interference of indistinguishable photons. However, a recent study shows that perfect two-photon interference can be recovered from a pair of extraction sources by employing a temporal quantum eraser (TQE) [83]. This technique allows extracted photons to be used in two-photon linear-optics gates, making them compatible with fusion networks. In the TQE scheme, the incoming modes of two extraction sources are integrated within a balanced Mach-Zehnder interferometer. During the extraction process, the parity of detected photons in the dark port projects the extracted photons onto a two-photon state with a well-defined exchange symmetry, ensuring perfect two-photon interference. In Sec. VI, we investigate the feasibility of the TQE in a non-ideal configuration.

The more straight-forward approach we explore here is the use of photon-atom gates, which are insensitive to the temporal impurity of the photons. Still, the bandwidth of the extracted photons does have an effect on the performance of photon-atom gates in non-ideal atom-cavity systems. For a given incoming pulse, the probability of the first photon to arrive earlier within the pulse increases with  $\bar{n}$ . Therefore, the extracted photon pulse duration scales as  $\sim 1/\sqrt{\log(\bar{n})}$  [82], leading to a broadening of its power spectrum (see Figure 3(b)). This effect can be countered by using longer coherent pulses at the input, at the price of a lower extraction repetition rate, which can then be mitigated by multiplexing several sources. In the following section, we examine the compatibility of this source with photon-atom gates in the W-system.

#### IV. PHOTON-ATOM GATES WITH EXTRACTED PHOTONS

Photon-atom gates, particularly SWAP and CZ, can achieve near-ideal operation even when employing a single photon in a mixed state of temporal, and hence spectral modes, defined as follows,

$$\rho = \iint d\omega_1 d\omega_2 D(\omega_1, \omega_2) a_\nu^\dagger(\omega_1) |0\rangle \langle 0| a_\nu(\omega_2) \quad (8)$$

As we show below, this stems from the fact that the fidelity of these processes depends only on the power spectrum of the incoming photon,  $D(\omega, \omega)$ , rather than its entire spectral description,  $D(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ . Intuitively, in an ideal closed quantum system, the outgoing photon must 'carry' the information of the coherences,  $D(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ , making the final state of the atom insensitive to these off-diagonal terms. In other words, a measurement of the final atomic state cannot provide us with information on the spectral coherences of the photon. Therefore, extracted photons in mixed temporal states can be utilized reliably in photon-atom gates.

In order to demonstrate this, we outline the derivation of the fidelity of SPRINT, which serves as the underlying mechanism of the SWAP gate, with an incident photon as defined in Eq. 8. A detailed derivation of both SPRINT and the conditional  $\pi$ -phase shift, which forms the basis of the CZ gate, are included in Appendix A. We first examine a single photon in a pure state of mode  $\hat{a}_r$  incident upon an atom initialized in  $|s_l\rangle$ . The final state of the system, following its evolution under the Hamiltonian in Eq. 1, assuming  $g_{r0} = g_{l0} = g$ , is expressed by,

$$|\psi_f\rangle = \int d\omega f(\omega) \left[ J(\omega) a_l^\dagger(\omega) |0, s_r\rangle + \left( J(\omega) - \frac{\kappa + i\omega}{\kappa - i\omega} \right) a_r^\dagger(\omega) |0, s_l\rangle \right] \quad (9)$$

Here,  $f(\omega)$  is the spectral amplitude profile of the incoming photon, and  $J(\omega)$  is the spectral response of the atom-cavity system, which depends on its parameters -  $\kappa, g, \delta_a$  (see Appendix A 1).

When considering an incident photon in a mixed state, we can diagonalize the density matrix in Eq. 8, representing it as a statistical ensemble of pure single-photon states. Each of these states is evolved separately according to Eq. 9, and their mixture yields the final state of the system. The fidelity of the process is defined as the overlap the final state with the ideal state, where the atom is in  $|s_r\rangle$  and the output photon in mode  $\hat{a}_l$  (Eq. 3a). This fidelity is given by,

$$\mathcal{F}_{sprint} = \int d\omega D(\omega, \omega) |J(\omega)|^2 \quad (10)$$

which solely depends on the spectral bandwidth of the incoming photon. To ensure the high-fidelity operation of the gate, this bandwidth needs to be significantly nar-




FIG. 4. Infidelities in photon-atom gates with extracted photons. (a) and (b) shows the infidelity of SPRINT and the conditional  $\pi$ -phase shift, respectively. These operations are performed in a limited-bandwidth W-system with  $g_\alpha = \kappa = 2\pi \times 100$  MHz using single photons extracted from coherent pulses with durations  $\sigma_t = 20, 50, 200$  ns (shown in orange, blue, and green, respectively). Solid lines represent analytical calculations, while error bars denote results from numerical simulations. Note that while the infidelity increases with the average photon number  $\bar{n}$ , this effect can be mitigated by employing a longer input coherent pulse. Specifically, with  $\bar{n} = 5$ , corresponding to deterministic extraction, infidelities lower than 1% can be achieved for the system parameters chosen.

rower than the interaction bandwidth of the atom-cavity system, as defined by its physical parameters. A similar result arises when analyzing the fidelity of the condition phase mechanism (see Appendix A 3).

With this understanding, we can examine the fidelity of photon-atom gates with extracted photons. As previously discussed, the power spectrum of these photons broadens as the average number of photons in the initial coherent pulse increases, leading to gate infidelity in a limited-bandwidth atom-cavity system. To investigate this effect, we use an ideal W-system as a source unit

that extracts a single photon from a coherent pulse with a Gaussian temporal envelope characterized by a standard deviation  $\sigma_t$ . This photon is directed into mode  $\hat{a}_r$  of a different W-system, referred to as the gate unit, with a limited bandwidth set by  $g_\alpha = \kappa = 2\pi \times 100\text{MHz}$ .

We consider two configurations for the gate unit; firstly, with the control field off, we examine the operation of SPRINT by preparing the atom in state  $|s_l\rangle$ . Secondly, we analyze the conditional phase mechanism by initializing the atom in  $|+\rangle = (|s_l\rangle + |s_r\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$  and activating the control field, which sets  $g_{r0} = g_{l0} = 0$ . In the desired operation, the atomic state undergoes a phase flip, resulting in the orthogonal superposition state  $|-\rangle = (|s_l\rangle - |s_r\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ . Figure 4 presents the infidelity in both processes resulting from the broadening of the extracted photon spectrum. As mentioned in the previous section, for given the bandwidth of the atom-cavity system, we can reduce the resulting infidelity by extracting single photons from longer coherent pulses.

Note that the conditional phase shift and SPRINT are the active parts of the CZ and SWAP gates, respectively; therefore, they correspond to the most demanding aspects of the photon-atom gates. Specifically, in the CZ gate, whenever the input photonic qubit is in  $|0\rangle_p$  (Eq. 6), the evolution of the state is trivial, and hence the desired gate operation is expected to occur with a unit fidelity. Similarly, in the SWAP gate, the operation for inputs  $|0_p0_a\rangle$  and  $|1_p1_a\rangle$  (Eq. 5) does not involve SPRINT, leading to ideal gate performance. Therefore, the state infidelity values in Figure 4 represent upper bounds to the gate infidelity of SWAP and CZ.

## V. DETERMINISTIC GENERATION OF PHOTONIC GRAPH STATES

Graph states are a class of entangled states that can be associated with a graph consisting of vertices, representing qubits, and edges, indicating pairwise entanglement. These states can be constructed by initializing each of the qubits in  $|+\rangle = (|0\rangle + |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$  and performing a CZ gate between qubits that share an edge. A few interconnected W-type atom-cavity sites can be used to deterministically generate small-scale photonic graph states. The capabilities of W-systems, as introduced in the previous sections, provide a versatile toolkit for devising protocols aimed at producing such states; employing the CZ gate to generate photon-atom entanglement, mapping between atomic and photonic qubits by applying the SWAP gate, and generating single photons compatible with these processes through SPRINT-based extraction. For consistency, we henceforth define the atomic qubit as described in Eq. 5,

$$|0\rangle_a \triangleq |s_l\rangle ; |1\rangle_a \triangleq |s_r\rangle \quad (11)$$

Naturally, achieving the desired output state involves a tradeoff between the duration of a protocol and the




FIG. 5. Schematic description and the equivalent quantum circuit for two schemes of a dual-CZ gate (DCZ) between three qubits: (a) a single photonic qubit and two atomic qubits in separate W-systems, or (b) a single atomic qubit and two photonic qubits.

number of atom-cavity sites needed to execute it, considering that certain photon-atom operations can take place simultaneously. However, two key observations regarding the implementation of the CZ gate in the W-system allow us to utilize resources more efficiently. First, in the CZ gate, the state  $|0_p\rangle$  corresponds to a photon in a non-interacting mode  $\hat{a}_l$  (Eq. 6). Instead, this mode can be directed to a different W-system, as depicted in Figure 5(a), enabling us to simultaneously execute two CZ gates between a single photonic qubit and two atomic qubits in separate W-systems, denoted  $W_1$  and  $W_2$ . We refer to this operation as a dual-CZ gate (DCZ), where the CZ gate with  $W_1$  proceeds as usual, while the gate operation with  $W_2$  includes Pauli-X unitaries on the photonic qubit as mode  $|0_p\rangle$ , rather than  $|1_p\rangle$ , interacts with this atom.

Second, as previously stated, when the control field is activated, the W-system configuration consists of two separate photon-atom cavity-enhanced interactions, where mode  $\hat{a}_l$  ( $\hat{a}_r$ ) couples exclusively to transition  $|s_l\rangle \leftrightarrow |e_l\rangle$  ( $|s_r\rangle \leftrightarrow |e_r\rangle$ ). This configuration enables to perform a DCZ gate with a single atomic qubit and two photonic qubits, as described in Figure 5(b). In this setup, the  $|1\rangle$  state of the first (second) photonic qubit is encoded in mode  $\hat{a}_l$  ( $\hat{a}_r$ ) of the W-system, whereas the  $|0\rangle$  state remains uncoupled to the atom-cavity system. Once again, due to the definitions of the qubits, the CZ gate with the second photonic qubit involves two Pauli-X gates on the atomic qubit.

To demonstrate the concepts discussed so far, we present an efficient scheme for generating 6-ring graph states utilizing six W-type atom-cavity sites. We consider the configuration shown in Figure 6, comprising of three source units, labeled  $W_{0n}$ , and three gate units, denoted  $W_{1n}$ , where  $n \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ . These units are interconnected via a routing unit with input and output modes denoted by  $\hat{a}_{0-5}$  and  $\hat{b}_{0-5}$ , respectively. Initially, each source atom  $W_{0n}$  is prepared in its left ground state, ready to extract a single photon in mode  $\hat{a}_{2n}$ , and each gate atom is prepared in its  $|+\rangle_a$  state, functioning as an intermediate atomic node in the graph state. The gener-




FIG. 6. Schematic description of a device for the generation of 6-ring graph states. The setup is comprised of six W-type atom-cavity sites interconnected through a routing unit that can be set in two configurations corresponding to steps 1 and 5 of Algorithm 1.

ation sequence is then initiated, and can be repeated as required.

At the first stage, we produce an intermediate photon-atom 6-ring graph state, comprised of the atomic qubits in  $W_{1n}$  and the photons generated from  $W_{0n}$  (see Figure 7). By sending coherent pulses in modes  $\hat{a}_{2n+1}$ , single photons are extracted in modes  $\hat{a}_{2n}$  and source atoms are toggled to their right ground state. The routing unit is configured to direct modes  $\hat{a}_{2n}$  into a superposition  $(\hat{b}_{2n} + \hat{b}_{2n+3})/\sqrt{2}$ , where mode index addition is modulo 6. This results in three photonic qubits at the inputs of the gate units, each initialized in the state  $|+\rangle_n$  defined by modes  $\hat{b}_{2n}$  and  $\hat{b}_{2n+3}$ ). The external control field is activated at the gate units  $W_{1n}$  to set them in the CZ operation mode and three simultaneous DCZ gates are implemented; each photonic qubit  $|+\rangle_n$  undergoes two CZ gates with the atomic qubits in sites  $W_{1(2n)}$  and  $W_{1(2n+1)}$ , where atom index addition modulo 3 is understood.

After the coherent pulses pass through the source units, we initiate the second stage, aiming to map the atomic qubits of the intermediate graph state into pho-




FIG. 7. The three-stage evolution of the generation process in Algorithm 1; initialization of the atomic qubits, generation of photon-atom entanglement with DCZ gates, and mapping of atomic qubits to output photonic qubits using SWAP. In the diagram, black vertices represent the atomic qubits in the gate units, with labels  $1n$  indicating each W-system. Blue and orange vertices labeled by  $ij$  represent output photonic qubits, each defined by modes  $\hat{b}_i$  and  $\hat{b}_j$ . The SWAP operation in the last stage allows for the re-initialization of atomic qubits, enabling the repetition of the last two stages as necessary.

tonic qubits. Since the atoms in  $W_{0n}$  transitioned to the right ground states at the first extraction event, coherent pulses in modes  $\hat{a}_{2n}$  enable us to extract single photons in modes  $\hat{a}_{2n+1}$  and reset the source atoms to their left ground states. We configure the routing unit to direct  $\hat{a}_{2n+1}$  into a superposition  $(\hat{b}_{2n} + \hat{b}_{2n+1})/\sqrt{2}$  and deactivate the control fields in  $W_{1n}$ , setting them in a SWAP operation mode. In this configuration, each photonic qubit, now defined in modes  $\hat{b}_{2n}$  and  $\hat{b}_{2n+1}$ , is incident upon gate unit  $W_{1n}$ . Accordingly, three SWAP gates are applied, serving two purposes; mapping the atomic qubits into photonic qubits, thus completing a 6-ring photonic graph state, and resetting the atomic qubits in  $W_{1n}$  to  $|+\rangle$  for the next repetition of the generation scheme. Overall, the protocol is summarized in Algorithm 1 below.

Note that due to Pauli-X gates involved in the operation of the DCZ gates (see Figure 5(a)-(b)), the output photonic state requires the application of a  $Z^{\otimes 6}$  unitary in order to conform with the standard definition of a graph state. Implementing this Pauli-Z correction for each qubit can be easily achieved in photonic circuits using phase elements. However, this correction may not be necessary, as it simply introduces a Pauli transformation to the stabilizers of the graph state, which can be accounted for when employing this state as an entanglement resource.

## VI. FEASIBILITY

The proposed setup for generating photonic graph states relies on trapping single atoms within low-loss, high-cooperativity optical resonators. Single-atom trap-



---

**Algorithm 1:** generation of 6-ring graphs
 

---

0. Initialization:
    - $W_{0n}$  source atoms in left ground state
    - $W_{1n}$  gate atoms in qubit state  $|+\rangle$
  1. Set routing unit:
    - $\hat{a}_{2n} \rightarrow (\hat{b}_{2n} + \hat{b}_{2n+3})/\sqrt{2}$
  2. Turn control field ON in gate units  $W_{1n}$
  3. Send extraction pulses in modes  $\hat{a}_{2n+1}$
  4. Wait pulse duration T
  5. Set routing unit:
    - $\hat{a}_{2n+1} \rightarrow (\hat{b}_{2n} + \hat{b}_{2n+1})/\sqrt{2}$
  6. Turn control field OFF in gate units  $W_{1n}$
  7. Send extraction pulses in modes  $\hat{a}_{2n}$
  8. Repeat steps 1-7
- 

ping has been achieved in a wide range optical cavities, with different cooling schemes developed to ensure a reliable photon-atom interface [84]. Achieving such an interface in scalable devices is essential to enable practical applications in quantum computing and communication. Recent demonstrations of potentially scalable systems include fiber Fabry-Pérot [85–88], tapered nanofiber [89, 90], photonic crystal [91–93], and whispering-gallery-mode [94] resonators. In this context, trapping single atoms near photonic integrated circuits, compatible with state-of-the-art fabrication techniques, is highly desirable. However, this task is particularly challenging due to limited optical access caused by the typical dimensions of the photonic chip. Nevertheless, recent advancements in chip design and trapping methods have shown significant promise [95–98].

We investigate the implementation of the atomic W-type level scheme in the  $D_1$  line of  $^{87}\text{Rb}$  ( $5S_{1/2} \rightarrow 5P_{1/2}$ ), as illustrated in Figure 8. The states of the W-system are defined as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} |s_{l,r}\rangle &= |F=1, m_F=-1, 1\rangle \\ |e_{l,0,r}\rangle &= |F'=2, m_F=-2, 0, 2\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Here, the optical modes  $\hat{a}_r$  and  $\hat{a}_l$  couple to the  $\sigma^+$  and  $\sigma^-$  transitions, respectively. Note that this property arises naturally in the transverse-magnetic modes of whispering-gallery-mode microresonators [99]. We consider a  $\pi$ -polarized external control field, resonant with the  $5P_{1/2} \rightarrow 6S_{1/2}$  transition. This field couples each excited states in the W-system to a higher excited state




FIG. 8. A possible physical realization of the multi-gate W-system in  $^{87}\text{Rb}$ . The W-system is comprised of two ground states within the  $5S_{1/2}$  manifold and three excited states in  $5P_{1/2}$ , with the relevant  $\sigma^\pm$ -polarized transitions at 795nm. We utilize a  $\pi$ -polarized external control field at 1324nm to selectively inhibit transitions in the W-system by coupling each of the excited states to a higher excited state in  $6S_{1/2}$ .

in the  $6S_{1/2}$  manifold, denoted as,

$$\begin{aligned} |c_0\rangle &= |F''=1, m_F=0\rangle \\ |c_{l,r}\rangle &= |F''=2, m_F=-2, 2\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

The interaction Hamiltonian is given by,

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{control}} = \sum_{\mu \in \{l, 0, r\}} \Omega_\mu \hat{\sigma}'_\mu e^{-i\Delta_\mu t} + \text{h.c.} \quad (14)$$

where  $\hat{\sigma}'_\mu = |e_\mu\rangle \langle c_\mu|$  denotes the transition lowering operator and  $\Omega_\mu$  represents the Rabi frequency of the external field in that transition. The detuning of the external field relative to the transitions is denoted by  $\Delta_\mu$ , where  $\Delta_l = \Delta_r$  are related to  $\Delta_0$  by the frequency difference between  $F''=1$  and  $F''=2$ . When  $\Delta_0 = 0$ , the control field dresses the states  $|e_0\rangle$  and  $|c_0\rangle$ , leading to electromagnetically induced transparency that inhibits atomic absorption from  $|s_{l,r}\rangle$  to  $|e_0\rangle$ . Additionally, a light shift is introduced to  $|e_l\rangle$  and  $|e_r\rangle$  due to the interaction of the detuned field with transitions  $\hat{\sigma}'_{l,r}$ . Alternatively, when  $\Delta_{l,r} = 0$ , transitions  $|s_l\rangle \leftrightarrow |e_l\rangle$  and  $|s_r\rangle \leftrightarrow |e_r\rangle$  are suppressed, while  $|e_0\rangle$  experiences a light shift. This effectively transform the atomic level scheme from a W- to a  $\Lambda$ -configuration. The extent of these effects is related to the ratio between  $\Omega$  and  $g_\alpha$ , and in the suitable parameter regime, they can serve as a reliable tool for suppressing transitions in the W-system.

We conduct numerical simulations (see Appendix B) to evaluate the performance of the photon-atom oper-

ations in this implementation with the following parameters. We utilize a resonator characterized by  $(\kappa_e, \kappa_i)/2\pi = (100, 1)$  MHz, corresponding to an intrinsic quality factor of  $\sim 10^8$ . The atom-cavity coupling strength in the cycling transition of the  $D_2$  line of  $^{87}\text{Rb}$  is  $g_{cyc}/2\pi = 200\text{MHz}$ . The coupling strengths,  $g_\alpha$ , are derived from  $g_{cyc}$  using the ratio between the dipole matrix elements of the relevant transitions, resulting in  $(g_{ll}, g_{rr}, g_{l0}, g_{r0})/2\pi \approx -(141, 141, 58, 58)\text{MHz}$ . Although values within this range for  $g_{cyc}$  and  $\kappa_i$  have thus far only been demonstrated in separate devices [85, 86, 91–93, 100, 101], we believe that realizing such a photon-atom interface is possible in the near future. The CZ configuration of the W-system is enabled by activating the control field with  $(\Omega, \Delta_0)/2\pi = (100, 0)\text{MHz}$ . Additionally, in order to optimize photon-atom operations in the presence of multiple excited levels [78], the resonance frequency of the cavity is slightly detuned from the  $F=1 \rightarrow F'=2$  transition, with  $\delta_a/2\pi = -6$  MHz.

We characterize the SWAP and CZ gates by employing pure single photons with a Gaussian temporal profile of  $\sigma_t = 25\text{ns}$ , resonant with the  $F=1 \rightarrow F'=2$  transition. As previously discussed, the gate infidelity arising from utilizing photons in mixed states is determined only by the power spectrum of these photons relative to the atom-cavity bandwidth. Therefore, our simulation results also apply for extracted photons, as the duration of the initial coherent pulses in the extraction process can always be adjusted to ensure that the spectrum of these photons is narrower than that of the pure photons used in the simulation. We perform quantum process tomography [102, 103] on the gates, utilizing a maximum-likelihood estimation approach [104] to obtain the Choi state corresponding to the operation of each gate [105–107]. Figure 9 depicts the absolute values of these Choi states in the qubit subspace. The average process fidelities achieved are 99.6(1)% for SWAP and 99.8(1)% for CZ, with corresponding photon loss probabilities of 8.1(2)% and 2.6(2)%, respectively. These metrics promote the potential of such devices in deterministically generating useful graph states for photonic quantum information processing.

Furthermore, we investigate the performance of SPRINT-based extraction as a single-photon source. We utilize an incident Gaussian coherent pulse of  $\sigma_t = 100\text{ns}$  and  $\bar{n} = 5$ , ensuring a negligible vacuum component and maintaining a narrow extracted photon spectrum compared to a pure single photon with  $\sigma_t = 25\text{ns}$ . As the extraction process strongly depends the cooperativity of transitions  $|s_{l,r}\rangle \leftrightarrow |e_0\rangle$ , we simulate the success probability for different values of  $g_{cyc}$  while keeping all other parameters constant, as depicted in Figure 10. In the limit of high cooperativity, the extraction probability is only limited by the intrinsic losses of the resonator.

As mentioned earlier, modally-impure extracted photons can be reliably employed in two-photon linear-optics operations by utilizing a TQE [83]. This ensures that the photonic graph states produced in our scheme are




FIG. 9. Choi matrix (in absolute value) in the qubit subspace, representing the simulated process tomography for (a) SWAP and (b) CZ in the  $^{87}\text{Rb}$  implementation of the W-system (see text). The average fidelity for the SWAP and CZ gates is 99.6(1)% and 99.8(1)%, respectively.

compatible with protocols requiring such operations, e.g. fusion-based quantum computation [12]. However, photon loss in the transmitted field during extraction hinders the performance of the TQE as it relies on a photon number parity measurement. In the W-system, once a photon is extracted, the remaining photons within the incoming pulse interact with a two-level atom, as detailed in Eq. 2. Consequently, the extent of photon loss mainly depends on the cooperativity of this transition. Alternatively, by utilizing the control field with  $\Delta_l = \Delta_r = 0$  to suppress transitions to  $e_l$  and  $e_r$ , photon extraction can be performed in an effective atomic  $\Lambda$ -type level scheme. In this configuration, following extraction, the atom is driven to its dark state, resulting in photon loss of the transmitted field being determined by the quality of the resonator, expressed by the ratio of  $\kappa_e$  to  $\kappa_i$ . Note that the interaction with the first photon of the incoming pulse is the same in both the  $\Lambda$ - and W-type systems, hence the extraction probabilities in Figure 10 apply for the  $\Lambda$ -system as




FIG. 10. Extraction probability (orange) and HOM coincidence rate in a TQE setup (blue) for different values of  $g_{cyc}$  in  $^{87}\text{Rb}$ . Dots and shaded areas indicate the simulated values and uncertainty, respectively. Star markers represent the single-photon source performance for our choice of parameters in W- and  $\Lambda$ -systems (see text).

well. We simulate the Hong-Ou-Mandel (HOM) interference [108] between a pair of extracted photons in a TQE setup. We obtain the HOM coincidence rate heralded upon an even number of detection events in the dark port of the TQE interferometer, which serves as a measure of the infidelity in two-photon linear-optics gates. As depicted in Figure 10, for our choice of parameters, the  $\Lambda$ -system configuration outperforms the W-system, resulting in a coincidence rate of 0.7(1)% and 5.4(1)%, respectively.

Our analysis addresses non-ideal photon-atom operations involving a limited-bandwidth atom-cavity system, a complex atomic level scheme, and undesirable loss channels represented by  $\kappa_i$  and  $\gamma$ . However, practical systems may exhibit additional imperfections that introduce errors to these operations, such as atomic motion, parasitic coupling between the modes of the resonator, and polarization mismatch between these modes and the atomic transitions [78]. Some of these effects can be mitigated through physical techniques, such as the application of a magnetic field and spectral filtering, or by incorporating heralding mechanisms to favor the desired outcome [109]. We defer to future work a more comprehensive analysis, which explores these aspects in the available parameter space and establishes a connection between imperfect photon-atom operations and a complete characterization of generated graph states, taking into account qubit leakage and correlated errors arising during the generation process.

## VII. DISCUSSION

We have presented a scheme for an atom-based deterministic generation of photonic graph states. Our scheme employs cavity-mediated atomic W-systems, capable of both producing single photons through SPRINT-based extraction and executing photon-atom SWAP and CZ gates. Notably, these photon-atom gates can perform with near-unit fidelity even with photons in mixed temporal modes. This feature ensures the compatibility between extracted photons and the operation of the gates. Utilizing these processes within an interconnected network of W-systems provides a fast and versatile approach to entangling photonic qubits, enabling the generation of arbitrary photonic graph states. Interestingly, by applying the TQE, pairs of extracted photons in mixed states can be projected into an indistinguishable two-photon states, allowing the generated graph states in our scheme to be incorporated in linear-optics-based fusion networks.

Moreover, we have explored the implementation of the atomic W-system in  $^{87}\text{Rb}$  and evaluated key performance metrics under realistic conditions for the SWAP and CZ gates, as well as for single-photon extraction and the TQE. These metrics demonstrate the potential of this approach and encourage further research to fully assess the integration of such an interface in practical devices. This involves developing a comprehensive error model that accounts for all potential imperfections and identifying the optimal operating conditions to support useful quantum applications.

It is important to note that, in contrast to previous proposals, our approach separates the source and gate units, and therefore, in principle, requires more quantum emitters. However, when considering the generation of large-scale entanglement in a network of many emitters, this constant factor in the required number of units becomes inconsequential. We believe that, in terms of scalability, our scheme fulfills critical figures of merit, including the high-rate operations that enable to take full advantage of optical fibers as reliable quantum memories, the compatibility between the generated photonic states and the operations in the network, and the modularity of our basic unit, which allows for robust control over the operation modes of the W-system.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge Daniel Sabsovich and Serge Rosenblum for fruitful discussions, and support from the Israeli Science Foundation, the Binational Science Foundation, and the Minerva Foundation. B.D. is the Dan Lebas and Roth Sonnwend Professorial Chair of Physics.

## Appendix A: Photon-atom gates with photons in mixed spectral modes

### 1. SPRINT with a pure single photon

In the configuration that leads to SPRINT, with an incoming pure single photon in mode  $\hat{a}_r$  and the atom initialized in  $|s_l\rangle$ , the state of the system at all times can be expressed as,

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = \int d\omega C_{s_l}(\omega, t) a_r^\dagger(\omega) |0, s_l\rangle + \int d\omega C_{s_r}(\omega, t) a_l^\dagger(\omega) |0, s_r\rangle + C_{e_0}(t) |0, e_0\rangle \quad (\text{A1})$$

with initial conditions  $C_{s_r}(\omega, t_0) = C_{e_0}(t_0) = 0$ , and the normalization condition  $\int d\omega |C_{s_l}(\omega, t_0)|^2 = 1$ . Note that states  $|e_{l,r}\rangle$  are not involved in the interaction since there is a single excitation in the system. The wavefunction evolves under the time-dependent Schrödinger equation arising from the 'modes of the universe' system Hamiltonian (Eq. 1), leading to the following differential equations,

$$\dot{C}_{s_l}(\omega, t) = g \frac{\sqrt{\kappa/\pi}}{\kappa + i\omega} e^{i(\omega + \delta_a)t} C_e(t) \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$\dot{C}_{s_r}(\omega, t) = g \frac{\sqrt{\kappa/\pi}}{\kappa + i\omega} e^{i(\omega + \delta_a)t} C_e(t) \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$\dot{C}_{e_0}(t) = -g \int d\omega \frac{\sqrt{\kappa/\pi}}{\kappa - i\omega} e^{-i(\omega + \delta_a)t} \times [C_{s_l}(\omega, t) + C_{s_r}(\omega, t)] \quad (\text{A4})$$

where we denote  $g = g_{r0} = g_{l0}$ .

We first formally integrate Eqs. A2 and A3,

$$C_{s_l}(\omega, t) = C_{s_l}(\omega, t_0) + g \frac{\sqrt{\kappa/\pi}}{\kappa + i\omega} \int_{t_0}^t dt' C_{e_0}(t') e^{i(\omega + \delta_a)t'} \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$C_{s_r}(\omega, t) = g \frac{\sqrt{\kappa/\pi}}{\kappa + i\omega} \int_{t_0}^t dt' C_{e_0}(t') e^{i(\omega + \delta_a)t'} \quad (\text{A6})$$

Substituting Eqs. A5 and A6 into Eq. A4 and performing the second integral over  $\omega$ ,

$$\dot{C}_{e_0}(t) = -g \int d\omega \frac{\sqrt{\kappa/\pi}}{\kappa - i\omega} C_{s_l}(\omega, t_0) e^{-i(\omega + \delta_a)t} - 2g^2 \int_{t_0}^t dt' C_{e_0}(t') e^{-(\kappa + i\delta_a)(t-t')} \quad (\text{A7})$$

Now introduce the Fourier transform,

$$C_{e_0}(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\eta \tilde{C}_{e_0}(\eta) e^{-i\eta t} \quad (\text{A8})$$

into Eq. A7,

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\eta (-i\eta) \tilde{C}_{e_0}(\eta) e^{-i\eta t} = -g \int d\omega \frac{\sqrt{\kappa/\pi}}{\kappa - i\omega} C_{s_l}(\omega, t_0) e^{-i(\omega + \delta_a)t} - \frac{g^2}{\pi} \int_{t_0}^t dt' \int d\eta \tilde{C}_{e_0}(\eta) e^{-i\eta t' - (\kappa + i\delta_a)(t-t')} \quad (\text{A9})$$

Fourier transforming Eq. A9 (integrating both sides  $\int dt e^{i\eta t}$ ) and formally letting  $t_0 \rightarrow -\infty$  allows us to solve for  $\tilde{C}_{e_0}(\eta)$ ,

$$\tilde{C}_{e_0}(\eta) = -2g\sqrt{\kappa\pi} \frac{C_{s_l}(\eta - \delta_a, -\infty)}{2g^2 - i\eta(\kappa - i(\eta - \delta_a))} \quad (\text{A10})$$

We can substitute Eq. A10 back into Eqs. A5 and A6 by first observing that for the final state of the system, at  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , the ground state amplitudes are simply given by,

$$C_{s_l}(\omega, \infty) = C_{s_l}(\omega, -\infty) + g \frac{\sqrt{\kappa/\pi}}{\kappa + i\omega} \tilde{C}_{e_0}(\omega + \delta_a) \quad (\text{A11})$$

$$C_{s_r}(\omega, \infty) = g \frac{\sqrt{\kappa/\pi}}{\kappa + i\omega} \tilde{C}_{e_0}(\omega + \delta_a) \quad (\text{A12})$$

We can then write,

$$C_{s_l}(\omega, \infty) = C_{s_l}(\omega, -\infty) (1 - S(\omega)) \quad (\text{A13})$$

$$C_{s_r}(\omega, \infty) = -C_{s_l}(\omega, -\infty) S(\omega) \quad (\text{A14})$$

where,

$$S(\omega) = \frac{2g^2\kappa}{(\kappa + i\omega)(2g^2 - i(\omega + \delta_a)(\kappa - i\omega))} \quad (\text{A15})$$

Since the outgoing field in each mode is given by  $C_{s_l}(\omega, \infty)$  and  $C_{s_r}(\omega, \infty)$  multiplied by the cavity transmission factor  $-(\kappa + i\omega)/(\kappa - i\omega)$  [110], the overall state evolution is,

$$\int d\omega f(\omega) a_r^\dagger(\omega) |0, s_l\rangle \longrightarrow \int d\omega f(\omega) [J(\omega) a_l^\dagger(\omega) |0, s_r\rangle + (J(\omega) - \frac{\kappa + i\omega}{\kappa - i\omega}) a_r^\dagger(\omega) |0, s_l\rangle] \quad (\text{A16})$$

where we denote,

$$f(\omega) = C_{s_l}(\omega, -\infty) \quad (\text{A17})$$

$$J(\omega) = \frac{\kappa + i\omega}{\kappa - i\omega} S(\omega) \quad (\text{A18})$$

Note the final state remains normalized, as  $|\tau(\omega)|^2 = 1$



and  $J(\omega)$  maintains,

$$|J(\omega)|^2 + |1 - J(\omega)|^2 = 1 \quad (\text{A19})$$

## 2. SPRINT with a photon in a mixed state of spectral modes

Consider the initial state for SPRINT with an incoming single photon in a mixed state of spectral modes,

$$\rho_{\text{ini}} = \iint d\omega_1 d\omega_2 D(\omega_1, \omega_2) a_r^\dagger(\omega_1) |0, s_l\rangle \langle 0, s_l| a_r(\omega_2) \quad (\text{A20})$$

We can always choose a different basis in which the density matrix is diagonalized, i.e. written as a statistical mixture of pure single photon states,

$$\rho_{\text{ini}} = \sum_i P_i |\psi_i\rangle \langle \psi_i| \quad (\text{A21})$$

where,

$$|\psi_i\rangle = \int d\omega f_i(\omega) a_r^\dagger(\omega) |0, s_l\rangle \quad (\text{A22})$$

and,

$$D(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \sum_i P_i f_i(\omega_1) f_i^*(\omega_2) \quad (\text{A23})$$

Assuming the eigenmodes  $f_i(\omega)$  are well-behaved (absolutely integrable), we can evolve each of the pure states separately according to Eq. A16. We can then use Eq. A23 to write the final state of the system,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_f = \iint d\omega_1 d\omega_2 D(\omega_1, \omega_2) & \left[ \left( J(\omega_1) - \frac{\kappa + i\omega_1}{\kappa - i\omega_1} \right) \left( J^*(\omega_2) - \frac{\kappa - i\omega_2}{\kappa + i\omega_2} \right) a_r^\dagger(\omega_1) |0, s_l\rangle \langle 0, s_l| a_r(\omega_2) \right. \\ & \left( J(\omega_1) - \frac{\kappa + i\omega_1}{\kappa - i\omega_1} \right) J^*(\omega_2) a_r^\dagger(\omega_1) |0, s_l\rangle \langle 0, s_r| a_l(\omega_2) \\ & J(\omega_1) \left( J^*(\omega_2) - \frac{\kappa - i\omega_2}{\kappa + i\omega_2} \right) a_l^\dagger(\omega_1) |0, s_r\rangle \langle 0, s_l| a_r(\omega_2) \\ & \left. J(\omega_1) J^*(\omega_2) a_l^\dagger(\omega_1) |0, s_r\rangle \langle 0, s_r| a_l(\omega_2) \right] \quad (\text{A24}) \end{aligned}$$

We define the fidelity of SPRINT as the probability of finding the atom in  $|s_r\rangle$ , and accordingly, the output photon in mode  $\hat{a}_l$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{\text{sprint}} &= \int d\omega \langle 0, s_r| a_l(\omega) \rho_f a_l^\dagger(\omega) |0, s_r\rangle \quad (\text{A25}) \\ &= \int d\omega D(\omega, \omega) |J(\omega)|^2 \end{aligned}$$

As evident, SPRINT fidelity depends solely on the power spectrum of the incoming photon.

## 3. Conditional $\pi$ -phase shift with a photon in a mixed state of spectral modes

When the control field is activated, effectively setting  $g_{r0} = g_{l0} = 0$ , the W-system is in the CZ operation mode. In this configuration, for an incoming pure single photon in mode  $\hat{a}_r$ , the state of the system at all times can be

expressed as,

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi(t)\rangle &= \int d\omega C_{s_l}(\omega, t) a_r^\dagger(\omega) |0, s_l\rangle + \quad (\text{A26}) \\ & \int d\omega C_{s_r}(\omega, t) a_r^\dagger(\omega) |0, s_r\rangle + C_{e_r}(t) |0, e_r\rangle \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $|e_r\rangle$  is the only excited state coupled to by the system Hamiltonian (Eq. 1) in this setting.

When the atom is prepared in  $|s_l\rangle$ , it does not interact with the photon and we can immediately write,

$$C_{s_l}(\omega, \infty) = C_{s_l}(\omega, -\infty) \quad (\text{A27})$$

However, for an atom initialized in  $|s_r\rangle$  the incoming photon effectively interacts with a two-level atom and the evolution of the state is given by [79],

$$C_{s_r}(\omega, \infty) = C_{s_r}(\omega, -\infty) Q(\omega) \quad (\text{A28})$$

where we define,

$$Q(\omega) = \frac{\omega + i\kappa}{\omega - i\kappa} \frac{(\omega - i\kappa)(\omega + \delta_a) - g_{rr}^2}{(\omega + i\kappa)(\omega + \delta_a) - g_{rr}^2}$$

Similarly to Eq. A16, the output field in mode  $\hat{a}_r$  is given by multiplying the amplitudes in Eq. A27-A28 by the cavity transmission factor  $-(\kappa + i\omega)/(\kappa - i\omega)$ . Hence, we can write the evolution of the following states,

$$\int d\omega f(\omega) a_r^\dagger(\omega) |0, s_l\rangle \rightarrow - \int d\omega f(\omega) \frac{\kappa + i\omega}{\kappa - i\omega} a_r^\dagger(\omega) |0, s_l\rangle \quad (\text{A29})$$

$$\int d\omega f(\omega) a_r^\dagger(\omega) |0, s_r\rangle \rightarrow \int d\omega f(\omega) \chi(\omega) a_r^\dagger(\omega) |0, s_r\rangle \quad (\text{A30})$$

where  $f(\omega)$  denotes the spectral amplitude profile of the incoming photon and we define,

$$\chi(\omega) = \frac{(\omega - i\kappa)(\omega + \delta_a) - g_{rr}^2}{(\omega + i\kappa)(\omega + \delta_a) - g_{rr}^2}$$

which maintains  $|\chi(\omega)|^2 = 1$ .

In order to examine the conditional phase shift with an incoming photon in a mixed state of spectral modes, we consider an atom initialized in an equal superposition state,  $(|s_l\rangle + |s_r\rangle)/2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\text{ini}} = & \frac{1}{2} \iint d\omega_1 d\omega_2 D(\omega_1, \omega_2) a_r^\dagger(\omega_1) |0\rangle \langle 0| a_r(\omega_2) \\ & \otimes \left( |s_l\rangle \langle s_l| + |s_l\rangle \langle s_r| + |s_r\rangle \langle s_l| + |s_r\rangle \langle s_r| \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A31})$$

Using the same decomposition as in Eq. A21-A23 and the evolution in Eq. A27-A28, the final state of the system is given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_f = & \frac{1}{2} \iint d\omega_1 d\omega_2 D(\omega_1, \omega_2) a_r^\dagger(\omega_1) |0\rangle \langle 0| a_r(\omega_2) \\ & \otimes \left[ |s_l\rangle \langle s_l| - \chi^*(\omega_2) \frac{\kappa + i\omega_1}{\kappa - i\omega_1} |s_l\rangle \langle s_r| \right. \\ & \left. - \chi(\omega_1) \frac{\kappa - i\omega_2}{\kappa + i\omega_2} |s_r\rangle \langle s_l| + |s_r\rangle \langle s_r| \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A32})$$

Ideally, the photon induces a relative  $\pi$  phase shift and atom ends up in the orthogonal superposition state,  $(|s_l\rangle - |s_r\rangle)/2$ . Therefore, the fidelity of the process is given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{cp} = & \int d\omega \frac{\langle s_l| - \langle s_r|}{\sqrt{2}} \langle 0| a_r(\omega) \rho_f a_r^\dagger(\omega) |0\rangle \frac{|s_l\rangle - |s_r\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \\ = & \frac{1}{2} \int d\omega D(\omega, \omega) \left( 1 + \text{Re}(\chi(\omega) \frac{\kappa - i\omega}{\kappa + i\omega}) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A33})$$

which only depends on the power spectrum of the incoming photon.




FIG. 11. Schematic description of the atom-cavity system within the framework of cascaded open quantum systems (see text).

## Appendix B: Theoretical model for numerical simulations

In this paper, we derive analytical expressions based on the modes of the universe Hamiltonian in Eq. 1, which describes the cavity-mediated interaction of quantum fields  $\hat{a}_l$  and  $\hat{a}_r$  with a single atom. To complement these results and extend our analysis beyond ideal photon-atom operations, we adopt a description our system using the theory of cascaded open quantum systems [111], as depicted in Figure 11; one-sided virtual cavities  $\hat{a}_s$  and  $\hat{b}_s$  decay with rate  $\kappa_s$  into orthogonal modes of a waveguide, which couple with rate  $\kappa_e$  to modes  $\hat{a}$  and  $\hat{b}$  of the system resonator, respectively. The optical field in the resonator interacts with the atom with coupling rate  $g$  and eventually leaks back into the waveguide, yielding output operators [112],

$$a_{out} = \sqrt{2\kappa_s} a_s + \sqrt{2\kappa_e} a \quad (\text{B1})$$

$$b_{out} = \sqrt{2\kappa_s} b_s + \sqrt{2\kappa_e} b \quad (\text{B2})$$

An additional virtual cavity decays with the same rate  $\kappa_s$  into a different waveguide that does not interact with the resonator, producing the output mode,

$$c_{out} = \sqrt{2\kappa_s} c_s \quad (\text{B3})$$

We employ the quantum trajectories approach [113], also known as the Monte-Carlo wavefunction method [114, 115], to simulate the evolution of stochastic wavefunctions according to the Schrödinger equation with a non-Hermitian Hamiltonian and quantum jump operators. Following [78, 111], the state of our system

evolves with a non-Hermitian Hamiltonian given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathcal{H}}{\hbar} = & -2i\sqrt{\kappa_s\kappa_e}(a_s a^\dagger + b_s b^\dagger) - i\kappa_s(a_s^\dagger a_s + b_s^\dagger b_s + c_s^\dagger c_s) \\ & + \sum_{j,k} \left( g_{jk}^a a^\dagger |s_j\rangle \langle e_k| + g_{jk}^b b^\dagger |s_j\rangle \langle e_k| + \text{h.c.} \right) \\ & + (\kappa + i\delta_C)(a^\dagger a + b^\dagger b) + \sum_k (\gamma + i\delta_k) |e_k\rangle \langle e_k| \\ & + \sum_j \Delta_j |s_j\rangle \langle s_j| \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B4})$$

Here, states  $|s_j\rangle$  ( $|e_k\rangle$ ) represent ground (excited) states, while  $g_{jk}^a$  and  $g_{jk}^b$  indicate the coupling strength of modes  $\hat{a}$  and  $\hat{b}$  to atomic transition  $|s_j\rangle \leftrightarrow \langle e_k|$ , respectively. Each atomic transition experiences a free-space decay rate denoted by  $\gamma_{jk}$ , with the total decay rate of each excited state being  $\gamma = \sum_j \gamma_{jk}$ . In our discussion of the  $^{87}\text{Rb}$  implementation in Sec. VI, these parameters are determined by atomic selection rules, setting  $g^{a/b}jk = \gamma_{jk} = 0$  for forbidden transitions, and by appropriate branching ratios that establish their relative magnitudes. The total decay rate of the resonator is given by  $\kappa = \kappa_e + \kappa_i$ , where  $\kappa_i$  denotes the intrinsic loss rate.  $\delta_C$  and  $\delta_k$  denote the detuning of the resonator and the atomic transitions relative to the frequency of the virtual cavities, respectively.  $\Delta_j$  denotes the frequency shift of each of the ground states relative to a lowest energy level.

The quantum jump operators in our system include the output modes of the waveguides as described in Eq. B1-B3, along with additional operators accounting for the coupling of the atomic transitions and the modes of the resonator to the environment,

$$L_{jk} = \sqrt{2\gamma_{jk}} |s_j\rangle \langle e_k| \quad (\text{B5})$$

$$L_a = \sqrt{2\kappa_i} a \quad (\text{B6})$$

$$L_b = \sqrt{2\kappa_i} b \quad (\text{B7})$$

For each wavefunction, the Monte-Carlo procedure yields photon detection events induced by the jump operators and the corresponding final state of the atom. Measurement outcomes are then calculated by ensemble averages over the wavefunctions.

Our treatment of the control field differs based on whether we are analyzing the ideal scenario, in which we simply set  $g_{jk} = 0$  for the relevant transitions, or the implementation in  $^{87}\text{Rb}$ , where we directly incorporate an interaction Hamiltonian with a higher excited state manifold,

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{control}} = \sum_{k,l} \Omega_{kl} |e_k\rangle \langle e_l| e^{-i\Delta_{kl}t} + \text{h.c.} \quad (\text{B8})$$

where  $|e_l\rangle$  denotes the higher excited states, while  $\Omega_{kl}$  and  $\Delta_{kl}$  represent the Rabi frequency and relative detuning of the external field for each transition, respectively.

When examining the performance of photon-atom gates with pure photons, we initialize the stochastic wavefunctions with the atom in its qubit subspace and the virtual cavities containing a single excitation; for the SWAP (CZ) gate, the photonic qubit is encoded in a single photon emitted from  $\hat{a}_s$  and  $\hat{b}_s$  ( $\hat{a}_s$  and  $\hat{c}_s$ ). The temporal profile of the photon emitted by the virtual cavity can be controlled by incorporating a time-dependent  $\kappa_s$ , as detailed in [116]. The measurement axis of the output photonic qubit is determined by the definition of the output operators in Eq. B1-B3. Therefore, adjusting the measurement axis involves redefining the output operators as orthogonal superpositions of  $\hat{a}_{out}$  and  $\hat{b}_{out}$  for SWAP, or  $\hat{a}_{out}$  and  $\hat{c}_{out}$  for CZ.

For single-photon extraction, the atom is initialized in one of its ground states, and the incident coherent state is enabled by substituting the virtual cavity in the relevant mode with a time-dependent classical field. We employ two copies of this system to evaluate the purity of extracted photons through HOM interference. This involves defining new output modes by coherently mixing the original modes carrying the extracted photons, essentially implementing a beam splitter. Additionally, the effect of the TQE on the HOM coincidence rate is simulated by similarly mixing the output modes carrying the transmitted fields of both extraction sources. Furthermore, to simulate photon-atom gates with extracted photons, we consider two cascaded systems. In this setup, the output of the source system, designed for single-photon extraction, is fed into another system configured to execute photon-atom gates.

- 
- [1] J. Preskill, Quantum Computing in the NISQ era and beyond, *Quantum* **2**, 79 (2018).
- [2] D. Gottesman, in *Quantum Information Science and Its Contributions to Mathematics, Proceedings of Symposia in Applied Mathematics*, Vol. 68 (American Mathematical Society, Washington, DC, 2010) p. 13.
- [3] J. Carolan, C. Harrold, C. Sparrow, E. Martín-López, N. J. Russell, J. W. Silverstone, P. J. Shadbolt, N. Matsuda, M. Oguma, M. Itoh, G. D. Marshall, M. G. Thompson, J. C. F. Matthews, T. Hashimoto, J. L. O'Brien, and A. Laing, Universal linear optics, *Science* **349**, 711 (2015).
- [4] N. C. Harris, D. Bunandar, M. Pant, G. R. Steinbrecher, J. Mower, M. Prabhu, T. Baehr-Jones, M. Hochberg, and D. Englund, Large-scale quantum photonic circuits in silicon, *Nanophotonics* **5**, 456 (2016).
- [5] K. Alexander, A. Bahgat, A. Benyami, D. Black, D. Bonneau, S. Burgos, B. Burrige, G. Campbell, G. Catalano, A. Ceballos, *et al.*, A manufacturable platform for photonic quantum computing, [arXiv preprint](#)

- arXiv:2404.17570 (2024).
- [6] H. Bombin, I. H. Kim, D. Litinski, N. Nickerson, M. Pant, F. Pastawski, S. Roberts, and T. Rudolph, Interleaving: Modular architectures for fault-tolerant photonic quantum computing, [arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.08612](#) (2021).
  - [7] R. Raussendorf and H. J. Briegel, A one-way quantum computer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 5188 (2001).
  - [8] R. Raussendorf, D. E. Browne, and H. J. Briegel, Measurement-based quantum computation on cluster states, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 022312 (2003).
  - [9] R. Raussendorf, J. Harrington, and K. Goyal, A fault-tolerant one-way quantum computer, *Ann. Phys.* **321**, 2242 (2006).
  - [10] R. Raussendorf, J. Harrington, and K. Goyal, Topological fault-tolerance in cluster state quantum computation, *New J. Phys.* **9**, 199 (2007).
  - [11] H. J. Briegel, D. E. Browne, W. Dür, R. Raussendorf, and M. Van den Nest, Measurement-based quantum computation, *Nat. Phys.* **5**, 19 (2009).
  - [12] S. Bartolucci, P. Birchall, H. Bombin, H. Cable, C. Dawson, M. Gimeno-Segovia, E. Johnston, K. Kieling, N. Nickerson, M. Pant, F. Pastawski, T. Rudolph, and C. Sparrow, Fusion-based quantum computation, *Nat. Commun.* **14**, 912 (2023).
  - [13] M. A. Nielsen, Optical quantum computation using cluster states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 040503 (2004).
  - [14] H. J. Briegel and R. Raussendorf, Persistent entanglement in arrays of interacting particles, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 910 (2001).
  - [15] M. Hein, J. Eisert, and H. J. Briegel, Multiparty entanglement in graph states, *Phys. Rev. A* **69**, 062311 (2004).
  - [16] K. Azuma, K. Tamaki, and H.-K. Lo, All-photonic quantum repeaters, *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 6787 (2015).
  - [17] K. Azuma, S. E. Economou, D. Elkouss, P. Hilaire, L. Jiang, H.-K. Lo, and I. Tzitrin, Quantum repeaters: From quantum networks to the quantum internet, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **95**, 045006 (2023).
  - [18] Y.-J. Han, R. Raussendorf, and L.-M. Duan, Scheme for demonstration of fractional statistics of anyons in an exactly solvable model, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 150404 (2007).
  - [19] C.-Y. Lu, W.-B. Gao, O. Gühne, X.-Q. Zhou, Z.-B. Chen, and J.-W. Pan, Demonstrating anyonic fractional statistics with a six-qubit quantum simulator, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 030502 (2009).
  - [20] D. C. Burnham and D. L. Weinberg, Observation of simultaneity in parametric production of optical photon pairs, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **25**, 84 (1970).
  - [21] P. G. Kwiat, E. Waks, A. G. White, I. Appelbaum, and P. H. Eberhard, Ultrabright source of polarization-entangled photons, *Phys. Rev. A* **60**, R773 (1999).
  - [22] T. B. Pittman, B. C. Jacobs, and J. D. Franson, Single photons on pseudodemand from stored parametric down-conversion, *Phys. Rev. A* **66**, 042303 (2002).
  - [23] J. E. Sharping, K. F. Lee, M. A. Foster, A. C. Turner, B. S. Schmidt, M. Lipson, A. L. Gaeta, and P. Kumar, Generation of correlated photons in nanoscale silicon waveguides, *Opt. Express* **14**, 12388 (2006).
  - [24] C. Reimer, L. Caspani, M. Clerici, M. Ferrera, M. Kues, M. Peccianti, A. Pasquazi, L. Razzari, B. E. Little, S. T. Chu, D. J. Moss, and R. Morandotti, Integrated frequency comb source of heralded single photons, *Opt. Express* **22**, 6535 (2014).
  - [25] J. W. Silverstone, D. Bonneau, K. Ohira, N. Suzuki, H. Yoshida, N. Iizuka, M. Ezaki, C. M. Natarajan, M. G. Tanner, R. H. Hadfield, V. Zwiller, G. D. Marshall, J. G. Rarity, J. L. O'Brien, and M. G. Thompson, On-chip quantum interference between silicon photon-pair sources, *Nat. Photon.* **8**, 104 (2014).
  - [26] D. E. Browne and T. Rudolph, Resource-efficient linear optical quantum computation, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 010501 (2005).
  - [27] P. Kok, W. J. Munro, K. Nemoto, T. C. Ralph, J. P. Dowling, and G. J. Milburn, Linear optical quantum computing with photonic qubits, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **79**, 135 (2007).
  - [28] M. Varnava, D. E. Browne, and T. Rudolph, How good must single photon sources and detectors be for efficient linear optical quantum computation?, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 060502 (2008).
  - [29] Y. Li, P. C. Humphreys, G. J. Mendoza, and S. C. Benjamin, Resource costs for fault-tolerant linear optical quantum computing, *Phys. Rev. X* **5**, 041007 (2015).
  - [30] C. Sparrow, *Quantum interference in universal linear optical devices for quantum computation and simulation*, Ph.D. thesis, Imperial College London (2018).
  - [31] S. Bartolucci, P. M. Birchall, M. Gimeno-Segovia, E. Johnston, K. Kieling, M. Pant, T. Rudolph, J. Smith, C. Sparrow, and M. D. Vidrighin, Creation of entangled photonic states using linear optics, [arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.13825](#) (2021).
  - [32] D. Bouwmeester, J.-W. Pan, M. Daniell, H. Weinfurter, and A. Zeilinger, Observation of three-photon Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger entanglement, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 1345 (1999).
  - [33] P. Walther, K. J. Resch, T. Rudolph, E. Schenck, H. Weinfurter, V. Vedral, M. Aspelmeyer, and A. Zeilinger, Experimental one-way quantum computing, *Nature* **434**, 169 (2005).
  - [34] R. Prevedel, P. Walther, F. Tiefenbacher, P. Böhi, R. Kaltenbaek, T. Jennewein, and A. Zeilinger, High-speed linear optics quantum computing using active feed-forward, *Nature* **445**, 65 (2007).
  - [35] C.-Y. Lu, X.-Q. Zhou, O. Gühne, W.-B. Gao, J. Zhang, Z.-S. Yuan, A. Goebel, T. Yang, and J.-W. Pan, Experimental entanglement of six photons in graph states, *Nat. Phys.* **3**, 91 (2007).
  - [36] X.-C. Yao, T.-X. Wang, H.-Z. Chen, W.-B. Gao, A. G. Fowler, R. Raussendorf, Z.-B. Chen, N.-L. Liu, C.-Y. Lu, Y.-J. Deng, Y.-A. Chen, and J.-W. Pan, Experimental demonstration of topological error correction, *Nature* **482**, 489 (2012).
  - [37] X.-L. Wang, L.-K. Chen, W. Li, H.-L. Huang, C. Liu, C. Chen, Y.-H. Luo, Z.-E. Su, D. Wu, Z.-D. Li, H. Lu, Y. Hu, X. Jiang, C.-Z. Peng, L. Li, N.-L. Liu, Y.-A. Chen, C.-Y. Lu, and J.-W. Pan, Experimental ten-photon entanglement, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 210502 (2016).
  - [38] H.-S. Zhong, Y. Li, W. Li, L.-C. Peng, Z.-E. Su, Y. Hu, Y.-M. He, X. Ding, W. Zhang, H. Li, L. Zhang, Z. Wang, L. You, X.-L. Wang, X. Jiang, L. Li, Y.-A. Chen, N.-L. Liu, C.-Y. Lu, and J.-W. Pan, 12-photon entanglement and scalable scattershot boson sampling with optimal entangled-photon pairs from parametric down-conversion, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 250505 (2018).
  - [39] J. C. Adcock, C. Vigliar, R. Santagati, J. W. Sil-



- verstone, and M. G. Thompson, Programmable four-photon graph states on a silicon chip, *Nat. Commun.* **10**, 3528 (2019).
- [40] D. Llewellyn, Y. Ding, I. I. Faruque, S. Paesani, D. Bacco, R. Santagati, Y.-J. Qian, Y. Li, Y.-F. Xiao, M. Huber, M. Malik, G. F. Sinclair, X. Zhou, K. Rot-titt, J. L. O'Brien, J. G. Rarity, Q. Gong, L. K. Ox-enlowe, J. Wang, and M. G. Thompson, Chip-to-chip quantum teleportation and multi-photon entanglement in silicon, *Nat. Phys.* **16**, 148 (2020).
- [41] G. Vallone, E. Pomarico, P. Mataloni, F. De Martini, and V. Berardi, Realization and characterization of a two-photon four-qubit linear cluster state, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 180502 (2007).
- [42] K. Chen, C.-M. Li, Q. Zhang, Y.-A. Chen, A. Goebel, S. Chen, A. Mair, and J.-W. Pan, Experimental realization of one-way quantum computing with two-photon four-qubit cluster states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 120503 (2007).
- [43] G. Vallone, E. Pomarico, F. De Martini, and P. Mataloni, Active one-way quantum computation with two-photon four-qubit cluster states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 160502 (2008).
- [44] R. Ceccarelli, G. Vallone, F. De Martini, P. Mataloni, and A. Cabello, Experimental entanglement and non-locality of a two-photon six-qubit cluster state, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 160401 (2009).
- [45] X.-L. Wang, Y.-H. Luo, H.-L. Huang, M.-C. Chen, Z.-E. Su, C. Liu, C. Chen, W. Li, Y.-Q. Fang, X. Jiang, J. Zhang, L. Li, N.-L. Liu, C.-Y. Lu, and J.-W. Pan, 18-qubit entanglement with six photons' three degrees of freedom, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 260502 (2018).
- [46] C. Reimer, S. Sciara, P. Roztock, M. Islam, L. Romero Cortés, Y. Zhang, B. Fischer, S. Loranger, R. Kashyap, A. Cino, S. T. Chu, B. E. Little, D. J. Moss, L. Caspani, W. J. Munro, J. Azaña, M. Kues, and R. Morandotti, High-dimensional one-way quantum processing implemented on d-level cluster states, *Nat. Phys.* **15**, 148 (2019).
- [47] M. Erhard, M. Krenn, and A. Zeilinger, Advances in high-dimensional quantum entanglement, *Nat. Rev. Phys.* **2**, 365 (2020).
- [48] C. Vigliar, S. Paesani, Y. Ding, J. C. Adcock, J. Wang, S. Morley-Short, D. Bacco, L. K. Oxenløwe, M. G. Thompson, J. G. Rarity, and A. Laing, Error-protected qubits in a silicon photonic chip, *Nat. Phys.* **17**, 1137 (2021).
- [49] O. Lib and Y. Bromberg, Resource-efficient photonic quantum computation with high-dimensional cluster states, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.10464* (2023).
- [50] C. Schön, E. Solano, F. Verstraete, J. I. Cirac, and M. M. Wolf, Sequential generation of entangled multi-qubit states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 110503 (2005).
- [51] N. H. Lindner and T. Rudolph, Proposal for pulsed on-demand sources of photonic cluster state strings, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 113602 (2009).
- [52] S. E. Economou, N. Lindner, and T. Rudolph, Optically generated 2-dimensional photonic cluster state from coupled quantum dots, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 093601 (2010).
- [53] D. Buterakos, E. Barnes, and S. E. Economou, Deterministic generation of all-photonic quantum repeaters from solid-state emitters, *Phys. Rev. X* **7**, 041023 (2017).
- [54] A. Russo, E. Barnes, and S. E. Economou, Generation of arbitrary all-photonic graph states from quantum emitters, *New Journal of Physics* **21**, 055002 (2019).
- [55] K. Tiurev, P. L. Mirambell, M. B. Lauritzen, M. H. Appel, A. Tiranov, P. Lodahl, and A. S. Sørensen, Fidelity of time-bin-entangled multiphoton states from a quantum emitter, *Phys. Rev. A* **104**, 052604 (2021).
- [56] B. Li, S. E. Economou, and E. Barnes, Photonic resource state generation from a minimal number of quantum emitters, *npj Quantum Inf.* **8**, 11 (2022).
- [57] P. Hilaire, L. Vidro, H. S. Eisenberg, and S. E. Economou, Near-deterministic hybrid generation of arbitrary photonic graph states using a single quantum emitter and linear optics, *Quantum* **7**, 992 (2023).
- [58] M. C. Löbl, S. Paesani, and A. S. Sørensen, Loss-tolerant architecture for quantum computing with quantum emitters, *Quantum* **8**, 1302 (2024).
- [59] D. Istrati, Y. Pilnyak, J. C. Lored, C. Antón, N. Somaschi, P. Hilaire, H. Ollivier, M. Esmann, L. Cohen, L. Vidro, C. Millet, A. Lemaître, I. Sagnes, A. Harouri, L. Lanco, P. Senellart, and H. S. Eisenberg, Sequential generation of linear cluster states from a single photon emitter, *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 5501 (2020).
- [60] H. Cao, L. M. Hansen, F. Giorgino, L. Carosini, P. Zahálka, F. Zilk, J. C. Lored, and P. Walther, Photonic source of heralded Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132**, 130604 (2024).
- [61] S. Chen, L.-C. Peng, Y.-P. Guo, X.-M. Gu, X. Ding, R.-Z. Liu, J.-Y. Zhao, X. You, J. Qin, Y.-F. Wang, Y.-M. He, J. J. Renema, Y.-H. Huo, H. Wang, C.-Y. Lu, and J.-W. Pan, Heralded three-photon entanglement from a single-photon source on a photonic chip, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132**, 130603 (2024).
- [62] M. Pont, G. Corrielli, A. Fyrrillas, I. Agresti, G. Carvacho, N. Maring, P.-E. Emeriau, F. Ceccarelli, R. Albiero, P. H. Dias Ferreira, N. Somaschi, J. Senellart, I. Sagnes, M. Morassi, A. Lemaître, P. Senellart, F. Sciarrino, M. Liscidini, N. Belabas, and R. Osellame, High-fidelity four-photon GHZ states on chip, *npj Quantum Inf.* **10**, 50 (2024).
- [63] I. Schwartz, D. Cogan, E. R. Schmidgall, Y. Don, L. Gantz, O. Kenneth, N. H. Lindner, and D. Gershoni, Deterministic generation of a cluster state of entangled photons, *Science* **354**, 434 (2016).
- [64] C.-W. Yang, Y. Yu, J. Li, B. Jing, X.-H. Bao, and J.-W. Pan, Sequential generation of multiphoton entanglement with a rydberg superatom, *Nat. Photonics* **16**, 658 (2022).
- [65] P. Thomas, L. Ruscio, O. Morin, and G. Rempe, Efficient generation of entangled multiphoton graph states from a single atom, *Nature* **608**, 677 (2022).
- [66] D. Cogan, Z.-E. Su, O. Kenneth, and D. Gershoni, Deterministic generation of indistinguishable photons in a cluster state, *Nat. Photonics* **17**, 324 (2023).
- [67] N. Coste, D. A. Fioretto, N. Belabas, S. C. Wein, P. Hilaire, R. Frantzeskakis, M. Gundin, B. Goes, N. Somaschi, M. Morassi, A. Lemaître, I. Sagnes, A. Harouri, S. E. Economou, A. Auffeves, O. Krebs, L. Lanco, and P. Senellart, High-rate entanglement between a semiconductor spin and indistinguishable photons, *Nat. Photonics* **17**, 582 (2023).
- [68] P. Thomas, L. Ruscio, O. Morin, and G. Rempe, Fusion of deterministically generated photonic graph states, *Nature* **629**, 567 (2024).

- [69] S. Rosenblum, S. Parkins, and B. Dayan, Photon routing in cavity qed: Beyond the fundamental limit of photon blockade, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 033854 (2011).
- [70] K. Koshino, S. Ishizaka, and Y. Nakamura, Deterministic photon-photon  $\sqrt{\text{swap}}$  gate using a  $\Lambda$  system, *Phys. Rev. A* **82**, 010301 (2010).
- [71] O. Bechler, A. Borne, S. Rosenblum, G. Guendelman, O. E. Mor, M. Netser, T. Ohana, Z. Aqua, N. Drucker, R. Finkelstein, Y. Lovsky, R. Bruch, D. Gurovich, E. Shafir, and B. Dayan, A passive photon-atom qubit swap operation, *Nat. Phys.* **14**, 996 (2018).
- [72] L.-M. Duan and H. J. Kimble, Scalable photonic quantum computation through cavity-assisted interactions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 127902 (2004).
- [73] A. Reiserer, N. Kalb, G. Rempe, and S. Ritter, A quantum gate between a flying optical photon and a single trapped atom, *Nature* **508**, 237 (2014).
- [74] A. Reiserer, S. Ritter, and G. Rempe, Nondestructive detection of an optical photon, *Science* **342**, 1349 (2013).
- [75] T. G. Tiecke, J. D. Thompson, N. P. de Leon, L. R. Liu, V. Vuletić, and M. D. Lukin, Nanophotonic quantum phase switch with a single atom, *Nature* **508**, 241 (2014).
- [76] I. Shomroni, S. Rosenblum, Y. Lovsky, O. Bechler, G. Guendelman, and B. Dayan, All-optical routing of single photons by a one-atom switch controlled by a single photon, *Science* **345**, 903 (2014).
- [77] S. Rosenblum, O. Bechler, I. Shomroni, Y. Lovsky, G. Guendelman, and B. Dayan, Extraction of a single photon from an optical pulse, *Nat. Photonics* **10**, 19 (2016).
- [78] S. Rosenblum, A. Borne, and B. Dayan, Analysis of deterministic swapping of photonic and atomic states through single-photon raman interaction, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 033814 (2017).
- [79] J. Gea-Banacloche, Space-time descriptions of quantum fields interacting with optical cavities, *Phys. Rev. A* **87**, 023832 (2013).
- [80] J. Gea-Banacloche and W. Wilson, Photon subtraction and addition by a three-level atom in an optical cavity, *Phys. Rev. A* **88**, 033832 (2013).
- [81] O. Nagib, P. Huft, A. Safari, and M. Saffman, Robust atom-photon gate for quantum information processing, *Phys. Rev. A* **109**, 032602 (2024).
- [82] A. V. Gorshkov, R. Nath, and T. Pohl, Dissipative many-body quantum optics in rydberg media, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 153601 (2013).
- [83] Z. Aqua and B. Dayan, Temporal quantum eraser: Fusion gates with distinguishable photons, [arXiv:2404.01516](https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.01516) (2024).
- [84] A. Reiserer and G. Rempe, Cavity-based quantum networks with single atoms and optical photons, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **87**, 1379 (2015).
- [85] R. Gehr, J. Volz, G. Dubois, T. Steinmetz, Y. Colombe, B. L. Lev, R. Long, J. Estève, and J. Reichel, Cavity-based single atom preparation and high-fidelity hyperfine state readout, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 203602 (2010).
- [86] J. Volz, R. Gehr, G. Dubois, J. Estève, and J. Reichel, Measurement of the internal state of a single atom without energy exchange, *Nature* **475**, 210 (2011).
- [87] J. Gallego, W. Alt, T. Macha, M. Martinez-Dorantes, D. Pandey, and D. Meschede, Strong purcell effect on a neutral atom trapped in an open fiber cavity, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 173603 (2018).
- [88] M. Brekenfeld, D. Niemietz, J. D. Christesen, and G. Rempe, A quantum network node with crossed optical fibre cavities, *Nat. Phys.* **16**, 647 (2020).
- [89] S. Kato and T. Aoki, Strong coupling between a trapped single atom and an all-fiber cavity, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 093603 (2015).
- [90] K. P. Nayak, J. Wang, and J. Keloth, Real-time observation of single atoms trapped and interfaced to a nanofiber cavity, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 213602 (2019).
- [91] J. D. Thompson, T. G. Tiecke, N. P. de Leon, J. Feist, A. V. Akimov, M. Gullans, A. S. Zibrov, V. Vuletić, and M. D. Lukin, Coupling a single trapped atom to a nanoscale optical cavity, *Science* **340**, 1202 (2013).
- [92] P. Samutpraphoot, T. Đorđević, P. L. Ocola, H. Bernien, C. Senko, V. Vuletić, and M. D. Lukin, Strong coupling of two individually controlled atoms via a nanophotonic cavity, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 063602 (2020).
- [93] T. Đorđević, P. Samutpraphoot, P. L. Ocola, H. Bernien, B. Grinkemeyer, I. Dimitrova, V. Vuletić, and M. D. Lukin, Entanglement transport and a nanophotonic interface for atoms in optical tweezers, *Science* **373**, 1511 (2021).
- [94] E. Will, L. Masters, A. Rauschenbeutel, M. Scheucher, and J. Volz, Coupling a single trapped atom to a whispering-gallery-mode microresonator, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 233602 (2021).
- [95] M. E. Kim, T.-H. Chang, B. M. Fields, C.-A. Chen, and C.-L. Hung, Trapping single atoms on a nanophotonic circuit with configurable tweezer lattices, *Nat. Commun.* **10**, 1647 (2019).
- [96] T.-H. Chang, B. M. Fields, M. E. Kim, and C.-L. Hung, Microring resonators on a suspended membrane circuit for atom-light interactions, *Optica* **6**, 1203 (2019).
- [97] T.-H. Chang, X. Zhou, M. Zhu, B. M. Fields, and C.-L. Hung, Efficiently coupled microring circuit for on-chip cavity QED with trapped atoms, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **117**, 174001 (2020).
- [98] X. Zhou, H. Tamura, T.-H. Chang, and C.-L. Hung, Coupling single atoms to a nanophotonic whispering-gallery-mode resonator via optical guiding, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, 103601 (2023).
- [99] C. Junge, D. O'Shea, J. Volz, and A. Rauschenbeutel, Strong coupling between single atoms and nontransversal photons, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 213604 (2013).
- [100] W. Jin, Q.-F. Yang, L. Chang, B. Shen, H. Wang, M. A. Leal, L. Wu, M. Gao, A. Feshali, M. Paniccia, K. J. Vahala, and J. E. Bowers, Hertz-linewidth semiconductor lasers using CMOS-ready ultra-high-q microresonators, *Nat. Photonics* **15**, 346 (2021).
- [101] X. Ji, S. Roberts, M. Corato-Zanarella, and M. Lipson, Methods to achieve ultra-high quality factor silicon nitride resonators, *APL Photonics* **6**, 071101 (2021).
- [102] I. L. Chuang and M. A. Nielsen, Prescription for experimental determination of the dynamics of a quantum black box, *J. Mod. Opt.* **44**, 2455 (1997).
- [103] J. F. Poyatos, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, Complete characterization of a quantum process: The two-bit quantum gate, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 390 (1997).
- [104] Z. Hradil, J. Řeháček, J. Fiurášek, and M. Ježek, 3 Maximum-Likelihood methods in quantum mechanics, in *Quantum State Estimation*, edited by M. Paris and J. Řeháček (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg).

- berg, 2004) pp. 59–112.
- [105] A. Jamiołkowski, Linear transformations which preserve trace and positive semidefiniteness of operators, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **3**, 275 (1972).
- [106] M.-D. Choi, Completely positive linear maps on complex matrices, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **10**, 285 (1975).
- [107] M. Jiang, S. Luo, and S. Fu, Channel-state duality, *Phys. Rev. A* **87**, 022310 (2013).
- [108] C. K. Hong, Z. Y. Ou, and L. Mandel, Measurement of subpicosecond time intervals between two photons by interference, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59**, 2044 (1987).
- [109] M. L. Chan, Z. Aqua, A. Tiranov, B. Dayan, P. Lodahl, and A. S. Sørensen, Quantum state transfer between a frequency-encoded photonic qubit and a quantum-dot spin in a nanophotonic waveguide, *Phys. Rev. A* **105**, 062445 (2022).
- [110] J. Gea-Banacloche and L. M. Pedrotti, Comparative model study of two-photon deterministic passive quantum logical gates, *Phys. Rev. A* **83**, 042333 (2011).
- [111] H. J. Carmichael, Quantum trajectory theory for cascaded open systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 2273 (1993).
- [112] C. W. Gardiner and M. J. Collett, Input and output in damped quantum systems: Quantum stochastic differential equations and the master equation, *Phys. Rev. A* **31**, 3761 (1985).
- [113] H. Carmichael, *An Open Systems Approach to Quantum Optics* (Springer Berlin, 1993).
- [114] J. Dalibard, Y. Castin, and K. Mølmer, Wave-function approach to dissipative processes in quantum optics, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**, 580 (1992).
- [115] K. Mølmer, Y. Castin, and J. Dalibard, Monte carlo wave-function method in quantum optics, *J. Opt. Soc. Am. B* **10**, 524 (1993).
- [116] A. H. Kjøllerich and K. Mølmer, Input-output theory with quantum pulses, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 123604 (2019).