

High-Dimensional Two-Photon Quantum Controlled Phase-Flip Gate

Mingyuan Chen,¹ Jiang-Shan Tang,¹ Miao Cai,¹ Yanqing Lu,^{1,*} Franco Nori (野理),^{2,3,†} and Keyu Xia (夏可宇)^{1,4,‡}

¹College of Engineering and Applied Sciences, National Laboratory of Solid State Microstructures, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210023, China

²Quantum Computing Center, Cluster for Pioneering Research, RIKEN, Wako-shi, Saitama 351-0198, Japan

³Physics Department, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1040, USA

⁴Hefei National Laboratory, Hefei 230088, China

(Dated: April 24, 2024)

High-dimensional quantum systems have been used to reveal interesting fundamental physics and to improve information capacity and noise resilience in quantum information processing. However, it remains a significant challenge to realize universal two-photon quantum gates in high dimensions with high success probability. Here, by considering an ion-cavity QED system, we theoretically propose, to the best of our knowledge, the first high-dimensional, deterministic and universal two-photon quantum gate. By using an optical cavity embedded with a single trapped $^{40}\text{Ca}^+$ ion, we achieve a high average fidelity larger than 98% for a quantum controlled phase-flip gate in four-dimensional space, spanned by photonic spin angular momenta and orbital angular momenta. Our proposed system can be an essential building block for high-dimensional quantum information processing, and also provides a platform for studying high-dimensional cavity QED.

I. INTRODUCTION

Cavity and waveguide quantum electrodynamics (QED) systems have demonstrated the powerful capability of controlling transport of photons by exploiting the strong interaction between atoms and photons in an optical cavity or a waveguide [1], both theoretically [2–18] and experimentally [19–22], but are limited thus far to low-dimensional cases. Theoretically, high-dimensional photonic quantum systems also exhibit exotic fundamental physics regarding quantum nonlocality and Bell's theorem [23–25]. These are superior to low-dimensional systems, in improving the capacity of information processing and noise resilience [23–30], clock synchronization [31], and quantum metrology [32]. These can also significantly simplify quantum circuit designs and enhance efficiencies in quantum computation [33].

The orbital angular momentum (OAM) [34, 35] is a useful resource for exploring high-dimensional quantum information techniques. By using bulk optics, such as spiral phase plates and parity sorters, a high-dimensional single-photon gate in an OAM-encoded basis was conducted experimentally [36]. By fully utilizing the radial and azimuthal degrees of freedom of the photonic OAM, an *equivalent* two-qubit controlled-NOT quantum gate has been demonstrated with a single photon encoded in four-dimensional (4D) OAM space in a recent experiment [37]. Although two-photon quantum gates between qubits were intensively studied, the counterpart in high-dimensional space is still elusive. We note that a multidimensional photon-photon gate has also been realized by using auxiliary photons and linear devices [38], but it is probabilistic.

A recent experiment has demonstrated that the $^{40}\text{Ca}^+$ ion has electrical quadrupole transitions and displays transition selection rules critically dependent on the spin angular momentum (SAM) and OAM of photons [39].

Inspired by this work [39] and the scattering two-photon gate protocol [2], we theoretically propose a scheme based on the ion-cavity QED system to perform a two-photon quantum controlled phase-flip gate (CPF) with high fidelity by encoding two single photons in a 4D space spanned by photonic SAMs and OAMs.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we introduce the key idea and the basic system of our quantum gate and also present the quantum model for it. We explain a high-dimensional basis encoding in the $^{40}\text{Ca}^+$ ion, the scattering phase, and the six-step construction of the gate. Sec. III shows numerical simulation results of our gate performance, and evaluates in details the noise contributions to the gate infidelities. Sec. IV discusses the practical system parameters for its experimental implementation. In the end, we conclude our findings in Sec. V.

II. SYSTEM AND MODEL

The ion-cavity QED system is depicted in Fig. 1(a). A single $^{40}\text{Ca}^+$ ion is trapped in the center of a single-sided Fabry-Pérot cavity. Because the ion-cavity interaction is dependent on the SAM and OAM of the cavity mode, the system needs to be described by high-dimensional cavity QED (cQED). We focus on the electric quadrupole transition of $^{40}\text{Ca}^+$ [39]

$$|4^2S_{1/2}, m_J = \pm \frac{1}{2}\rangle \leftrightarrow |3^2D_{5/2}, m'_J = \pm \frac{1}{2}, \pm \frac{3}{2}, \pm \frac{5}{2}\rangle. \quad (1)$$

We denote the two ground states

$$|4^2S_{1/2}, m_J = \pm \frac{1}{2}\rangle \equiv \{|\uparrow\rangle, |\downarrow\rangle\}, \quad (2)$$

with frequency $\{\omega_\downarrow, \omega_\uparrow\}$, and the six excited magnetic sublevels as

$$|m'_J\rangle \equiv |i_{\text{ion}}\rangle, \quad (3)$$

with $m'_J \in \{-5/2, -3/2, -1/2, 1/2, 3/2, 5/2\}$ corresponding to $i \in \{1_{\text{ion}}, 2_{\text{ion}}, 3_{\text{ion}}, 4_{\text{ion}}, 5_{\text{ion}}, 6_{\text{ion}}\}$, and ω_i for the frequency of excited state $|i_{\text{ion}}\rangle$, respectively.

* yqlu@nju.edu.cn

† fnori@riken.jp

‡ keyu.xia@nju.edu.cn




Figure 1. Schematics of the high-dimensional two-photon quantum controlled phase-flip gate. (a) Two single-photon pulses p_1 and p_2 carrying SAM and OAM act as 4D qudits. They enter the Fabry-Pérot cavity successively as two separate spatio-temporal modes via an optical circulator. The photons are subsequently reflected from the cavity containing a single $^{40}\text{Ca}^+$ ion and acquire a correlated π phase shift. (b) Involved energy levels of the $^{40}\text{Ca}^+$ ion. Transitions are driven by photons in different combinations of SAM and OAM. Transitions between the state $|\uparrow\rangle$ and the excited magnetic sublevels, $\{|m'_j = -3/2\rangle, |m'_j = -1/2\rangle, |m'_j = 1/2\rangle, |m'_j = 3/2\rangle, |m'_j = 5/2\rangle\}$, are far off resonance and negligible. (c) Quantum circuit showing steps performing the proposed quantum gate.

We assume that the cavity modes with differential SAM ($s = \pm 1, 0$) and topological charges ($\ell = \pm 1, 0$) have a degenerate resonance frequency ω_c . We neglect the intrinsic loss of the cavity. The cavity decay rate due to the input-output mirror is denoted by κ . The two input single-photon pulses with frequency ω_p are encoded in their SAM and OAM, denoted as $|s, \ell\rangle$, and are successively injected to and reflected off the cavity. The input and reflected photons are separated via an optical circulator.

A. Transition Selection Rules

According to the transition selection rules of the $^{40}\text{Ca}^+$ ion, the quadrupole transitions require $\Delta m_j = \pm 2, \pm 1, 0$. Thus, there are $2 \times 5 = 10$ transitions involved. The ground state $|\downarrow\rangle$ couples to $|j'_{\text{ion}}\rangle$, with $j' = 1_{\text{ion}}, 2_{\text{ion}}, 3_{\text{ion}}, 4_{\text{ion}}, 5_{\text{ion}}$ and $|\uparrow\rangle$ couples to $|j''_{\text{ion}}\rangle$ with $j'' = 2_{\text{ion}}, 3_{\text{ion}}, 4_{\text{ion}}, 5_{\text{ion}}, 6_{\text{ion}}$, see Fig. 1(b). The coupling strength for the transition $|\downarrow\rangle \leftrightarrow |j'_{\text{ion}}\rangle$ ($|\uparrow\rangle \leftrightarrow |j''_{\text{ion}}\rangle$) are $g_{j'}$ ($g_{j''}$). These are slightly different from each other with the multiplication of Clebsch-Gordan coefficients. We distinguish them in numerical simulations [40]. Here, we assume they are identical and equal to g .

To select the $|\downarrow\rangle \leftrightarrow |5_{\text{ion}}\rangle$ transition for our quantum gate, we apply a magnetic field B to the ion. The six magnetic sublevels are linearly separated in energy due to the Zeeman effect. The level energy is shifted by

$$\delta E = \mu_B g_D m'_j B, \quad (4)$$

where $g_D = 6/5$ is the Landé g -factor for the D state. The ground states $|\downarrow\rangle$ and $|\uparrow\rangle$ also split by

$$\delta E = \mu_B g_S m_j B, \quad (5)$$

where $g_S = 2$ is the g -factor of the S state, μ_B is the Bohr magneton and $\mu_B = 14 \text{ MHz} \cdot \text{mT}^{-1}$. We denote the detuning between the adjacent excited magnetic sublevels as $\Delta = g_D \mu_B B$, and the detuning of the $|\downarrow\rangle \leftrightarrow |5_{\text{ion}}\rangle$ and $|\uparrow\rangle \leftrightarrow |6_{\text{ion}}\rangle$ transitions as

$$\delta_{\Delta m_j=2} = (g_S - g_D) \mu_B B. \quad (6)$$

According to angular momentum conservation, transitions happen only when the photons carry a total angular momentum of

$$L \equiv s + \ell = \{-2, -1, 0, 1, 2\}. \quad (7)$$

But the $\Delta m_j = 0$ transition involves degenerate two-cavity modes with $L = 0$ because the ion can absorb a photon in either state $|+1, -1\rangle$ or $|-1, +1\rangle$. Thus, we consider the remaining four transitions and photon states encoded in the basis of the 4D SAM-OAM hybrid space

$$\{|\Psi\rangle\} = \{|-2\rangle, |-1\rangle, |+1\rangle, |+2\rangle\}. \quad (8)$$

With this chiral 4D cQED system, we can create quantum phase correlations between two single photons reflected off the Fabry-Pérot cavity and thus perform a two-photon quantum phase-flip gate.

B. High-dimensional two-photon quantum controlled phase-flip gate

The key idea of performing the high-dimensional two-photon quantum CPF gate is depicted with the quantum circuit in Fig. 1(c). To perform the gate, we need to first induce a π phase shift, conditioned on the ion spin state $|\downarrow\rangle$, to a specific high-dimensional state of the first single-photon pulse p_1 .

The following step repeats the first for a second single-photon pulse p_2 . Then, the ion is measured to project the three-body entangling state of the two single photons and the ion to a two-photon state. In doing so, the quantum CPF gate is accomplished for two traveling single photons.

The crucial step for the quantum CPF gate is to create a π phase difference between a selective photonic state with the high-dimensional cQED system and other states. This is achieved with a controlled- $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_d$ gate with dimension $d = 4$. In practice, we have four cavity modes, corresponding to $|s = \pm 1, \ell = \pm 1\rangle_{\text{cav}}$.

In experiments, the splitting of cavity modes with different ℓ is typically very small, and can be further suppressed around tens of kHz with appropriate choices of mirror curvatures [41]. Thus, without loss of generality, we assume that these cavity modes are degenerate. We also consider that only the ionic $|\downarrow\rangle \leftrightarrow |5_{\text{ion}}\rangle$ transition is resonant with the cavity modes and the incident photon, i.e.

$$\omega_p = \omega_c = \omega_5 - \omega_{\downarrow} \equiv \omega_{5\downarrow}. \quad (9)$$

This resonance condition between two successive photons and the cavity mode is critical to the success of the gate operation. Significant detunings between the input photons and the ionic transitions can result in a decline in the gate fidelity. Other transitions related to the $|\downarrow\rangle$ and $|\uparrow\rangle$ states are off resonance with the cavity. This selective driving can be obtained by shifting the ionic states with a magnetic field B .

C. Reflection coefficients for the input photon states

The ion in state $|\uparrow\rangle$ decouples from the cavity. In this case, the reflection coefficients for all input photonic states are equal and can be obtained by solving the Heisenberg equation of motion [42] as

$$r_0(\omega_p) = \frac{i(\omega_p - \omega_c) - \kappa}{i(\omega_p - \omega_c) + \kappa}. \quad (10)$$

The phase shift on the input photon is shown by the red dashed curves in Fig. 2(a). For an input single photon resonant with the cavity, $\omega_p = \omega_c$, we obtain $r_0(\omega_c) = -1$; i.e., all reflected photonic states acquire a global π phase. If the ion is in state $|\downarrow\rangle$, the photonic states $|-2\rangle, |-1\rangle, |1\rangle$ still acquire a phase π , according to Eq. (10).

In contrast, the photonic state $|+2\rangle$ couples to the cavity mode with $s = 1$ and $\ell = 1$. This cavity mode strongly interacts with the ionic transition $|\downarrow\rangle \leftrightarrow |5_{\text{ion}}\rangle$. Thus, the reflection coefficient of the photons is now given by

$$r(\omega_p) = \frac{(\omega_p - \omega_c + i\kappa)(\omega_p - \omega_{5\downarrow} + i\gamma) - g^2}{(\omega_p - \omega_c - i\kappa)(\omega_p - \omega_{5\downarrow} + i\gamma) - g^2}. \quad (11)$$

The reflected photon is subject to a phase shift $\phi_L(\omega_p)$. It is essentially different from the aforementioned detuned case due to the vacuum Rabi splitting of the cQED system. It is defined as

$$\phi_L(\omega_p) = \text{Arg}[r(\omega_p)], \quad (12)$$

when the ion is populated in the state $|\downarrow\rangle$. Otherwise, it is calculated as

$$\phi_L(\omega_p) = \text{Arg}[r_0(\omega_p)]. \quad (13)$$

This analytical phase shift is shown by the red dashed curves in Fig. 2(b). Under on-resonance condition, we have

$$r(\omega_c) = (g^2 + \kappa\gamma)/(g^2 - \kappa\gamma) \approx 1. \quad (14)$$

Here, we utilize the strong coupling condition $g^2 \gg \kappa\gamma$. Neglecting the global phase π , the state $|2\rangle$ equivalently acquires a π phase shift with respect to all other photonic states.

Thus, if we prepare the initial ion state in a coherent superposition $(|\downarrow\rangle - |\uparrow\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ state, after reflected off the cQED system, only the state $|\downarrow\rangle|2\rangle$ is subject to a relative π phase shift. This is exactly the high-dimensional ion-photon CPF gate $U_{\text{ap}} = (\mathbf{1}_4, 0; 0, \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_4)$, with $\mathbf{1}_4$ representing the 4D identity matrix, and

$$\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (15)$$

in the basis $\{|-2\rangle, |-1\rangle, |1\rangle, |2\rangle\}$.

D. Gate operations

Now we define the notation of the initial state for the gate operation. We consider that both input photons are resonant with the cavity so that $\omega_p = \omega_c$. The initial state of the two-photon pulses can be written as the product of superposition states

$$|p_1, p_2\rangle_{\text{in}} = \sum_{M, N} \alpha_M \beta_N |M, N\rangle, \quad (16)$$

where $M, N \in \{-2, -1, 1, 2\}$, $\int \sum_M |\alpha_M(t)|^2 dt = 1$ and $\int \sum_N |\beta_N(t)|^2 dt = 1$. This state is defined by the 16 complex time-dependent functions $\alpha_M(t)\beta_N(t)$. For simplicity, we use the compact notation [21]

$$|m, n\rangle \equiv \alpha_M \beta_N |M, N\rangle \quad (17)$$

with $m, n \in \{-2, -1, 1, 2\}$. The two-photon state can then be rewritten in terms of the resonant $|2\rangle$ state as

$$|p_1 p_2\rangle_{\text{in}} = \sum_{i, j \neq 2} |i, j\rangle + \sum_{k \neq 2} (|k, 2\rangle + |2, k\rangle) + |2, 2\rangle. \quad (18)$$

Considering the initial ionic state $|\downarrow\rangle$, the initial system state is then

$$|\psi\rangle_{\text{in}} = |\downarrow\rangle \left(\sum_{i, j \neq 2} |i, j\rangle + \sum_{k \neq 2} (|k, 2\rangle + |2, k\rangle) + |2, 2\rangle \right). \quad (19)$$

Next, we discuss the detailed construction of the high-dimensional two-photon CPF gate according to the quantum circuit schematically shown in Fig. 1(c).

The ion is first prepared in the state $(|\downarrow\rangle - |\uparrow\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ with a $\pi/2$ microwave pulse [43]. The second step is to reflect the first photon state $|p_1\rangle$ off the cavity. This equivalently performs a 4D controlled- \tilde{Z}_4 operation between the ion and the first photon. By neglecting the global phase π , it flips the sign of all states related to state $|\downarrow, p_1 = 2\rangle$. The resultant collective state then becomes

$$|\psi\rangle_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |\downarrow\rangle \left(\sum_{i,j \neq 2} |i, j\rangle + \sum_{k \neq 2} (|k, 2\rangle - |2, k\rangle) - |2, 2\rangle \right) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |\uparrow\rangle \left(\sum_{i,j \neq 2} |i, j\rangle + \sum_{k \neq 2} (|k, 2\rangle + |2, k\rangle) + |2, 2\rangle \right). \quad (20)$$

The third step rotates the ion on the two ionic ground states with a $-\pi/2$ mw pulse. The fourth step performs the controlled- \tilde{Z}_4 gate operation on the ion and the second photon. It converts the system state to

$$|\psi\rangle_4 = |\uparrow\rangle \left(\sum_{k \neq 2} |k, 2\rangle + |2, 2\rangle \right) + |\downarrow\rangle \left(\sum_{i,j \neq 2} |i, j\rangle - \sum_{k \neq 2} |k, 2\rangle \right). \quad (21)$$

Finally, we again apply a $\pi/2$ rotation to the ionic ground states and measure them. Upon detecting the ion in the $|\downarrow\rangle$ state, an additional π phase is imprinted on the state related to the $|p_1 = 2\rangle$, resulting in a π phase flip on the states $(\sum_{k \neq 2} |2, k\rangle + |2, 2\rangle)$, while the photonic state remains unchanged upon detection of $|\uparrow\rangle$. Experimentally, this operation can be realized with a fast temporal switch, which separates the fluorescence photon from the ion and the working photons and directs the former to the single-photon detector [21]. To operate repeatedly, we can wait for enough long time so that the ion returns to its initial state. Subsequently, the photon pulses are separate in time. After measurement, we obtain the final two-photon state

$$|p_1 p_2\rangle_f = \sum_{i,j \neq 2} |i, j\rangle - \sum_{k \neq 2} |k, 2\rangle + \sum_{k \neq 2} |2, k\rangle + |2, 2\rangle \equiv |\psi_{\text{ideal}}\rangle. \quad (22)$$

Without including the global phase, the final state is independent of the outcome of the ionic state detection. Hence, the total circuit acts as a high-dimensional two-photon CPF gate with a truth table describing a gate operation:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i,j \neq 2} |i, j\rangle &\rightarrow \sum_{i,j \neq 2} |i, j\rangle, & \sum_{k \neq 2} |k, 2\rangle &\rightarrow - \sum_{k \neq 2} |k, 2\rangle, \\ \sum_{k \neq 2} |2, k\rangle &\rightarrow \sum_{k \neq 2} |2, k\rangle, & |2, 2\rangle &\rightarrow |2, 2\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

III. EXACT NUMERICAL RESULTS

A. Simulation method

Above we have presented an analytical description for the ideal gate's operation. To evaluate the gate performance, we numerically simulate the actual operations with a full Hamiltonian for comparison with the aforementioned theoretical




Figure 2. Numerical simulation (blue markers) and theoretical results (red dashed curves) of scattered photon phase shifts for the state $|2\rangle$ versus detuning $\omega_p - \omega_c$. (a), the ion is initially prepared in the state other than $|\downarrow\rangle$ (only show one case for example here). (b), the ion is in the $|\downarrow\rangle$ state. Other parameters are $g/\kappa = 3$ and $\Delta/\kappa = 10$, which are experimentally accessible [21].

analysis. The full Hamiltonian for the system is given by $H = H_{c-i} + H_{\text{ph}} + H_{\text{int}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} H_{c-i} &= H_i + H_g + H_d, \\ H_{\text{ph}} &= \sum_{p=1,2} \sum_L \int d\omega_p \omega_p b_{p,L}^\dagger(\omega_p) b_{p,L}(\omega_p), \\ H_{\text{int}} &= \sum_{p=1,2} \sum_L \int d\omega_p \kappa_p (a_L^\dagger b_{p,L}(\omega_p) + b_{p,L}^\dagger(\omega_p) a_L), \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where H_{c-i} characterizes the cavity-ion interactions, H_{ph} describes the propagating photon pulses in the frequency domain, and H_{int} describes the cavity-photon interactions. The annihilation operator for the cavity mode supporting total angular momentum L is denoted as a_L , and $b_{p,L}(\omega)$ is the annihilation operator for the p th photonic field with total angular momentum L in the frequency domain. Here, we change to a reference frame rotating with the cavity frequency ω_c . We set ω_\downarrow as the reference energy. The ionic Hamiltonian in the rotating frame is

$$H_i = \sum_{j=1}^6 \Delta_j \sigma_{jj} + \Delta_\uparrow \sigma_{\uparrow\uparrow}, \quad (25)$$

with operators $\sigma_{jj} \equiv |j_{\text{ion}}\rangle\langle j_{\text{ion}}|$ and $\sigma_{\uparrow\uparrow} \equiv |\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow|$. The detuning between the j -th excited magnetic sublevels and the cavity frequency is represented as Δ_j . The coupling between each cavity mode a_L , $L \in \{-2, -1, 1, 2\}$, and the ions is described by

$$H_g = ((g_1 a_{-2} \sigma_{1\downarrow} + g_2' a_{-2} \sigma_{2\uparrow} + g_2 a_{-1} \sigma_{2\downarrow} + g_3' a_{-1} \sigma_{3\uparrow} + g_4 a_1 \sigma_{4\downarrow} + g_5' a_1 \sigma_{5\uparrow} + g_5 a_2 \sigma_{5\downarrow} + g_6' a_2 \sigma_{6\uparrow}) + \text{H.c.}) . \quad (26)$$

Here, the operator $\sigma_{j'\downarrow} \equiv |j'_{\text{ion}}\rangle\langle\downarrow|$ denotes the transition $|\downarrow\rangle \leftrightarrow |j'_{\text{ion}}\rangle$ and $\sigma_{j''\uparrow}$ for $|\uparrow\rangle \leftrightarrow |j''_{\text{ion}}\rangle$. The driving Hamiltonian between two ground states is

$$H_d = \Omega(t)(\sigma_{\uparrow\downarrow} + \text{H.c.}) , \quad (27)$$

with microwave pulses $\Omega(t) \equiv \Omega_0 w(t)$, where $w(t)$ is the time-dependent box function (See Appendix. B).

The coupling between the cavity and different frequency modes of the photons κ_p is assumed to be uniform. The nonuniform coupling $\kappa_p(\omega)$ introduces Lamb shifts to the dressed cavity resonance frequency. However, the Lamb shifts are very small, typically $\approx 0.01\kappa$, and thus can be neglected, validating our assumptions [44, 45]. By expanding the Hamiltonian with the basis vectors Eq. (A5) in the low-excitation subspace, we obtain the discrete form of the Hamiltonian Eq. (A6) (For more details, see Appendix.A).

In simulations, we consider single-photon pulses

$$|\xi\rangle = \sum_L \int d\omega_p f(\omega_p) b_{p,L}^\dagger(\omega_p) |\mathbf{0}\rangle , \quad (28)$$

where the normalized pulse-shape function $f(\omega_p)$ is Gaussian,

$$f(\omega_p) = \frac{1}{\sigma_\omega \sqrt{\pi}} \exp\left[-\frac{(\omega_p - \omega_c)^2}{\sigma_\omega^2}\right] , \quad (29)$$

with a central frequency ω_c and a bandwidth σ_ω for the inputs. These photons maximize the frequency bandwidth provided by the cavity $\sigma_\omega = \kappa$.

The analytic results for the phase shift of the reflected photons are confirmed by the full-Hamiltonian numerical simulations, see Fig. 2, validating our idea for the high-dimensional two-photon quantum CPF gate.

Now we clarify the evaluation of the output state and the gate-related fidelities. For an arbitrary input state $|\psi_{\text{ph, in}}\rangle \equiv |p_1, p_2\rangle_{\text{in}}$ composed of two temporally separate identical single-photon pulses, we can solve the Schrödinger equation and obtain the final photonic state after gate operations. Only considering the $|\downarrow\rangle \leftrightarrow |5_{\text{ion}}\rangle$ transition in calculations, we obtain an ideal output $|\psi_{\text{ideal}}\rangle$. By including all 10 possible transitions, the photon-photon gate output is $|\psi_{\text{ph, out}}\rangle$. Then, the fidelity of the output state is evaluated as

$$F(|p_1, p_2\rangle_{\text{in}}) = |\langle\psi_{\text{ideal}}|\psi_{\text{ph, out}}\rangle|^2 . \quad (30)$$

To evaluate the performance of the quantum gate, we input $N = 16 \times 16 = 256$ initial two-photon states $|p_1 p_2\rangle_{\text{in}}$ from the




Figure 3. Truth table of the 4D two-photon CPF gate. (a) Ideal truth table. (b) Truth table with $\Delta/g = 10$ in full-Hamiltonian simulations. The coupling strength and the Rabi frequency are $g/\kappa = 3$, $\Omega_0/\kappa = 5$.

complete basis set \mathcal{G} :

$$\mathcal{G} = \left\{ \frac{|0\rangle + |1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{|0\rangle + i|1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{|0\rangle + |2\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{|0\rangle + i|2\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, |0\rangle, |1\rangle, \frac{|0\rangle + |3\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{|0\rangle + i|3\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{|1\rangle + |2\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{|1\rangle + i|2\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, |2\rangle, |3\rangle, \frac{|1\rangle + |3\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{|1\rangle + i|3\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{|2\rangle + |3\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{|2\rangle + i|3\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \right\}^{\otimes 2} . \quad (31)$$

We then calculate the corresponding output states. The gate fidelity can be evaluated as

$$F_G = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{|k\rangle \in \mathcal{G}} F(|k\rangle) , \quad (32)$$

where $F(|k\rangle)$ is the state fidelity for the input two-photon state $|k\rangle$. Detailed simulation methods are provided in Appendix. B.




Figure 4. (a) Gate infidelity $1 - F_G$ versus the detuning-coupling ratio Δ/g . (b) Gate infidelity $1 - F_G$ versus the incident pulse width σ_ω/κ . We consider the three profiles of incident photons: Sech, Gaussian and Lorentzian. (c) Average gate infidelity $1 - \bar{F}$ versus Gaussian deviations in the control pulse area. The coupling strength and Rabi frequency in simulations are $g/\kappa = 3$ and $\Omega_0/\kappa = 5$, respectively.

B. Truth Table

Below we use the truth table to evaluate the performance of our 4D two-photon quantum gate. We input all 16 pure photonic states $|i, j\rangle_{\text{in}}$, ($i, j \in \{-2, -1, 1, 2\}$), to the system. Figure 3(a) shows the truth table for an ideal case. Then, we numerically calculate the final output state according to the quantum circuit with the full Hamiltonian in Eq. (24) for each input state. When all 10 transitions are included in the simulations, the truth table for a large detuning of $\Delta = 10g$ is displayed in Fig. 3(b). It is very close to the idea case. For each input state $|i, j\rangle_{\text{in}}$, we calculate the output state and the corresponding state fidelity $F(|i, j\rangle_{\text{in}})$. The average fidelity evaluated as $1/16 \sum_{|i, j\rangle_{\text{in}}} F(|i, j\rangle_{\text{in}})$ is high, reaching 99%, indicating a high success probability [5, 21, 46]

C. Noise Analysis

1. Fluctuating coupling strengths

Next, we analyze the effects of different error contributions. The main results are summarized in Table I. First, the trapped ions may not be well fixed within the cavity and experience a fluctuating coupling strength depending on its position $g(r)$. The gate fidelity, however, is robust against perturbations of the coupling strength g . This is because the vacuum Rabi splitting of two dressed modes protects the scattering phase factor from deviations, even if g is reduced to a value compa-

Table I. Error contributions to the overall gate fidelity.

Source of gate errors	Error
Pulse shape distortion	1.4×10^{-2}
Transition to unwanted states	0.2×10^{-2}
Cavity mode splitting	$< 1 \times 10^{-3}$
Fluctuation of coupling strength g	$< 1 \times 10^{-3}$
Fluctuations of control microwave pulse	$< 1 \times 10^{-3}$
Lamb shifts caused by inhomogeneous coupling	$< 1 \times 10^{-5}$

table to the cavity decay κ . The contribution of a fluctuating coupling strength g to the overall gate infidelity is of the order 10^{-4} [2, 47].

2. Detuning-coupling ratio

The influence of the detuning-coupling ratio Δ/g on the gate fidelity is studied in Fig. 4(a). As the ratio Δ/g increases from a vanishing value, the gate fidelity first increases rapidly and then becomes saturated. For a well accessible ratio $\Delta = 2g$, the fidelity is already high, about $F_G \approx 95\%$, approaching saturation. When $\Delta = 10g$, the fidelity slightly improves to 98.4%. By using an experimentally available coupling strength $g \approx 2\pi \times 6$ MHz [48] and a magnetic field $B > 35$ mT, we can obtain $\delta_{\Delta m_L=2} \approx 2\pi \times 62.42$ MHz $> 10g$. Therefore, we can perform a high-dimensional quantum gate with the ion-cavity system.

3. Shapes and bandwidth of the incident photons

Another major source of error arises from the distortion of photon pulses. In the most general case, the input single-photon state can be represented by Eq. (28). After a sufficiently long time $t \gg \kappa^{-1}$, the output photon acquires a phase shift:

$$|\xi(t)\rangle = \sum_L \int d\omega_p f(\omega_p) e^{-i\omega_p t} e^{i\phi_L(\omega_p)} b_{p,L}^\dagger(\omega_p) |\mathbf{0}\rangle. \quad (33)$$

The first phase term $\exp(-i\omega_p t)$ represents the free evolution of the photon, while the second term $\exp[i\phi_L(\omega_p)]$ introduces a frequency- and angular-momentum-dependent scattering phase to the photon. Consequently, photon pulses with width σ_ω experience inhomogeneous scattering phases, deviating from the average scattering phase:

$$\phi_L(\omega_p) \approx \phi_L(\omega_c) + \phi_L'(\omega_c)(\omega_p - \omega_c) + \frac{\phi_L''(\omega_c)}{2}(\omega_p - \omega_c)^2. \quad (34)$$

To investigate this distortion effect, we compare the real scattered photon $|\xi(t)\rangle = \exp(-iHt)|\xi(0)\rangle$ with an ideal photon

that experiences no distortion, only delay, and acquires an average scattering phase $\phi_L(\omega_p) \approx \phi_L(\omega_c)$. The final average fidelity against pulse width is depicted in Fig. 4(b). We observe that the gate infidelity ($1 - F_G$) increases monotonically with the ratio σ_ω/κ . Hence, to achieve low distortion and a good match of the scattering phase, the scattered photons must have a bandwidth σ_ω narrower than the cavity dissipation κ .

Furthermore, narrow-band photons generated from the trapped ions often deviate from Gaussian profiles. Thus, we explore the effect of pulse shapes on the gate fidelity, as shown in Fig. 4(b). We compare Gaussian photons with Sech- and Lorentzian shaped photons, described by the following profiles:

$$f_S(\omega_p) = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2\sigma_\omega}} \operatorname{Sech}\left[\frac{\pi(\omega_p - \omega_c)}{\sigma_\omega}\right], \quad (35)$$

for the Sech profile and

$$f_L(\omega_p) = \frac{\sigma_\omega}{\pi[(\omega_p - \omega_c)^2 + \sigma_\omega^2]}, \quad (36)$$

for the Lorentzian profile. We find that the exact pulse shape minimally affects gate transformations. The performance of the Gaussian pulse is marginally the same as the Lorentzian pulse when $\sigma_\omega = \kappa$, with $1 - F_G = 1.4\%$ for the Gaussian profile, and 1.14% for the Lorentzian profile. However, the fidelities for the Sech and Lorentzian pulses are higher than the Gaussian pulse, with infidelities $1 - F_G < 1\%$ when $\sigma_\omega > 0.75\kappa$. Thus, near-unity fidelity of gate operation can be reached only if the narrow photon condition $\sigma_\omega \ll \kappa$ is satisfied. For a Gaussian wavepacket with bandwidth $\sigma_\omega = 0.2\kappa$ and $\Delta/g = 10$, the gate fidelity reaches $F_G = 99.7\%$. The gate fidelity for the Lorentzian pulses under the same condition is $F_G > 99.9\%$, surpassing the lower threshold of quantum error correction [49].

4. Noise of microwave control pulses

In practical operations, experimental imperfections can cause degradation of the gate operation. Here, the degradation mainly originates from the deviation of the control microwave pulses from the $\pi/2$ pulse area. We investigate this pulse area deviation on the average gate infidelity

$$1 - \bar{F} = 1 - \frac{1}{N_r} \sum_{r=1}^{N_r} F_{G,r}. \quad (37)$$

In each gate, we assume that the microwave pulses with amplitude Ω_0 are subject to Gaussian noise with standard deviation ζ . We investigate the gate fidelity averaged over $N_r = 50$ random gate operations versus the deviation strength ζ , see Fig. 4(c). Even for a deviation up to $\zeta \leq 0.25$, the average gate infidelity still remains relatively small, $1 - \bar{F} < 4\%$. In the state-of-the-art experiment, the microwave control of trapped-ion qubits can be made very precise, with infidelities $1 - \bar{F} \approx 10^{-4} - 10^{-6}$, which correspond to very low $\zeta < 0.05$ [50, 51]. Thus, the noise induced by the microwave

control pulse has a small effect on the average gate infidelities. Clearly, this quantum gate is robust against the control imperfection.

IV. EXPERIMENTAL IMPLEMENTATION

Our system can be implemented by strongly coupling a trapped $^{40}\text{Ca}^+$ ion to a one-side Fabry-Pérot microcavity, as demonstrated in [48, 52–54]. One of the cavity mirrors has a relatively low reflectivity (99.92%) as the output/input port, the other mirror has a relatively high reflectivity of 99.99%. Assuming a 600 μm -long cavity, the total decay rate is estimated to be about $\kappa = 2\pi \times 2$ MHz. Photon pulses with bandwidth $\sigma_\omega = \kappa = 2\pi \times 2$ MHz are sequentially reflected off the cavity [21, 55, 56]. The transition of the E_2 line $4^2S_{1/2} \leftrightarrow 3^2D_{5/2}$ has a very long lifetime ≈ 1.045 s. Thus, the spontaneous decay rate γ can be neglected. Using the experimentally available coupling strength $g = 2\pi \times 6$ MHz [39, 48, 52–54, 57] for the $\Delta m = 2$ transition, the average gate fidelity can reach $\bar{F} > 98\%$ when $B > 35$ mT and pulse noise deviation $\zeta < 0.1$. This performance is sufficiently high for many quantum information processing tasks.

V. CONCLUSION

In summary, we have proposed the first deterministic high-dimensional two-photon quantum CPF gate by using the SAM- and OAM-dependent coupling between a $^{40}\text{Ca}^+$ and an optical cavity. The proposed gate achieves a high fidelity larger than 98% and is robust against control imperfections. This approach can be extended to generate high-dimensional multiphoton entangled states, like cluster states and GHZ states, by adding auxiliary photons [42, 58]. Moreover, it can also make multinode quantum networks when the reflected photons are routed by polarization beam splitters. Therefore, this work opens an avenue for investigating fundamental physics of cQED systems in high-dimensional space and developing novel photonic quantum information techniques.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the National Key R&D Program of China (Grants No. 2019YFA0308700 and No. 2019YFA0308704), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11890704), Innovation Program for Quantum Science and Technology (Grants No. 2021ZD0301400), the Program for Innovative Talents and Teams in Jiangsu (Grant No. JSSCTD202138), China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (Grant No. 2023M731613), Jiangsu Funding Program for Excellent Postdoctoral Talent (Grant No. 2023ZB708). F. N. is supported in part by Nippon Telegraph and Telephone Corporation (NTT) Research, the Japan Science and Technology Agency (JST) [via the Quantum Leap Flagship Program (Q-LEAP), and the Moonshot R&D Grant Number JPMJMS2061], the Asian Office of

Aerospace Research and Development (AOARD) (via Grant No. FA2386-20-1-4069), and the Office of Naval Research (ONR) Global (via Grant No. N62909-23-1-2074). M.-Y. Chen thanks Y.-Z. Xiao for fruitful discussions. We thank the

High Performance Computing Center of Nanjing University for allowing the numerical calculations on its blade cluster system.

Appendix A: Hamiltonian Discretization

To simulate the Hamiltonian Eq. (24) in the main text, we need to discretize $b_{p,L}(\omega)$ by introducing a finite but small frequency interval $\delta\omega = 2\sigma_\omega/N$ between two adjacent modes. To ensure that there is no significant change of results after the discretization, the frequency interval $\delta\omega$ should be chosen much smaller than the inverse of the gate operation time $T \approx 1\mu\text{s}$. The pulse width is chosen to be $\sigma_\omega = \kappa = 2\text{ MHz}$ [21]. We used $N = 200$ for our simulation, which suffices because $\delta\omega \ll T^{-1}$. Then, the single-photon state becomes

$$|\xi_p\rangle = \sum_{L,m} f_m b_{p,L,m}^\dagger |\mathbf{0}\rangle. \quad (\text{A1})$$

Here, the pulse profile function is also discretized to

$$f_m(\omega_m) = \frac{1}{\sigma_\omega \sqrt{\pi}} \exp[-(\omega_m - \omega_c)^2 / \sigma_\omega^2]. \quad (\text{A2})$$

The initial two-photon state is then represented as

$$|\xi_{p_1 p_2}\rangle_{\text{init}} = \sum_{L,m} \alpha_L f_m b_{p_1,L,m}^\dagger |\mathbf{0}\rangle \otimes \sum_{L',m'} \beta_{L'} f_{m'} b_{p_2,L',m'}^\dagger |\mathbf{0}\rangle \equiv \sum_{L,L'} \alpha_L \beta_{L'} |L, L'\rangle \equiv |p_1, p_2\rangle_{\text{init}}, \quad (\text{A3})$$

where $\alpha_L, \beta_{L'}$ are normalized complex numbers. The equation Eq. (A3) corresponds to the compact notation $|p_1 p_2\rangle_{\text{init}}$ of the two-photon state in the main text.

After discretizing the basis states, we discretize the Hamiltonians H_{ph} and H_{int} . Replacing $\int \omega d\omega \rightarrow \sum_m \omega_m$, we have

$$H_{\text{ph}} = \sum_{p=1}^2 \sum_{L \in \{-2, -1, 1, 2\}} \sum_{m=1}^N \omega_m b_{p,L,m}^\dagger b_{p,L,m}, \quad H_{\text{int}} = \sum_{p,L,m} \kappa_p (a_L^\dagger b_{p,L,m} + \text{H.c.}). \quad (\text{A4})$$

The ion-cavity system operates at cryogenic temperatures, thus thermal excitations can be neglected. Also, there is only one photon interacting with the ion-cavity system at each time, so we can study the Hamiltonian Eq. (24) in the subspace spanned by

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi(t)\rangle = & \sum_L a_L^\dagger (c_{1,L}(t) |0_L, \downarrow, 0_{p_1}, 0_{p_2}\rangle + c_{2,L}(t) |0_L, \uparrow, 0_{p_1}, 0_{p_2}\rangle) \\ & + \sum_{j=1, j' \neq 3}^5 p_{j'}(t) \sigma_{j', \downarrow} |0_L, \downarrow, 0_{p_1}, 0_{p_2}\rangle + \sum_{j''=2, j'' \neq 4}^6 q_{j''}(t) \sigma_{j'', \uparrow} |0_L, \uparrow, 0_{p_1}, 0_{p_2}\rangle \\ & + \sum_{m,L} b_{p_1,m,L}^\dagger (\psi_{p_1,m,L,\downarrow}(t) |0_L, \downarrow, 0_{p_1}, 0_{p_2}\rangle + \psi_{p_1,m,L,\uparrow}(t) |0_L, \uparrow, 0_{p_1}, 0_{p_2}\rangle) \\ & + \sum_{m,L} b_{p_2,m,L}^\dagger (\phi_{p_2,m,L,\downarrow}(t) |0_L, \downarrow, 0_{p_1}, 0_{p_2}\rangle + \phi_{p_2,m,L,\uparrow}(t) |0_L, \uparrow, 0_{p_1}, 0_{p_2}\rangle). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

In this subspace, the Hamiltonian Eq. (24) is represented as a matrix form

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} H_{\text{c-i}} & H_{\text{int1}} & H_{\text{int2}} \\ H_{\text{int1}}^T & H_{\text{ph1}} & \mathbf{0} \\ H_{\text{int2}}^T & \mathbf{0} & H_{\text{ph2}} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A6})$$

We now describe each Hamiltonian block in detail. The Hamiltonian in the upper left corner $H_{\text{c-i}}$ is a 16×16 matrix describing the ion-cavity interaction in the single-excitation subspace. Here we label $|n_{\text{cav},L}, j_{\text{ion}}, 0_{p_1}, 0_{p_2}\rangle \equiv |n_L, j\rangle$ for convenience. The ion-cavity Hamiltonian $H_{\text{c-i}}$ can be expressed as a combination of four block matrices

$$H_{\text{c-i}} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{B}^\dagger & \mathbf{D} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A7})$$

where the block matrix \mathbf{A} is

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} |1_{-2}, \downarrow\rangle & |1_{-2}, \uparrow\rangle & |1_{-1}, \downarrow\rangle & |1_{-1}, \uparrow\rangle & |1_1, \downarrow\rangle & |1_1, \uparrow\rangle & |1_2, \downarrow\rangle & |1_2, \uparrow\rangle \\ 0 & \Omega(t) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \Omega(t) & \omega_{5\uparrow} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \Omega(t) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \Omega(t) & \omega_{5\uparrow} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \Omega(t) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \Omega(t) & \omega_{5\uparrow} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \Omega(t) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \Omega(t) & \omega_{5\uparrow} \end{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} \langle 1_{-2}, \downarrow | \\ \langle 1_{-2}, \uparrow | \\ \langle 1_{-1}, \downarrow | \\ \langle 1_{-1}, \uparrow | \\ \langle 1_1, \downarrow | \\ \langle 1_1, \uparrow | \\ \langle 1_2, \downarrow | \\ \langle 1_2, \uparrow | \end{matrix}, \quad (\text{A8})$$

the block \mathbf{D} is

$$\mathbf{D} = \begin{pmatrix} |0_{-2}, 1\rangle & |0_{-2}, 2\rangle & |0_{-1}, 2\rangle & |0_{-1}, 3\rangle & |0_1, 4\rangle & |0_1, 5\rangle & |0_2, 5\rangle & |0_2, 6\rangle \\ \omega_{15} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_{25} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega_{25} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_{35} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_{45} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_{65} \end{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} \langle 0_{-2}, 1 | \\ \langle 0_{-2}, 2 | \\ \langle 0_{-1}, 2 | \\ \langle 0_{-1}, 3 | \\ \langle 0_1, 4 | \\ \langle 0_1, 5 | \\ \langle 0_2, 5 | \\ \langle 0_2, 6 | \end{matrix}, \quad (\text{A9})$$

and the block \mathbf{B} is

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{pmatrix} |0_{-2}, 1\rangle & |0_{-2}, 2\rangle & |0_{-1}, 2\rangle & |0_{-1}, 3\rangle & |0_1, 4\rangle & |0_1, 5\rangle & |0_2, 5\rangle & |0_2, 6\rangle \\ g_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & g'_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & g_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & g'_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & g_4 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & g'_5 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & g_5 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & g_6 \end{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} \langle 1_{-2}, \downarrow | \\ \langle 1_{-2}, \uparrow | \\ \langle 1_{-1}, \downarrow | \\ \langle 1_{-1}, \uparrow | \\ \langle 1_1, \downarrow | \\ \langle 1_1, \uparrow | \\ \langle 1_2, \downarrow | \\ \langle 1_2, \uparrow | \end{matrix}. \quad (\text{A10})$$

The single-photon Hamiltonian H_{ph1} can be written as a $8N \times 8N$ matrix. For simplicity, we encode the basis vectors as

$$\begin{aligned} |1\rangle &= |0_{-2}, \downarrow, -2p_1, 0p_2\rangle, & |2\rangle &= |0_{-2}, \uparrow, -2p_1, 0p_2\rangle, \\ |3\rangle &= |0_{-1}, \downarrow, -1p_1, 0p_2\rangle, & |4\rangle &= |0_{-1}, \uparrow, -1p_1, 0p_2\rangle, \\ |5\rangle &= |0_1, \downarrow, 1p_1, 0p_2\rangle, & |6\rangle &= |0_1, \uparrow, 1p_1, 0p_2\rangle, \\ |7\rangle &= |0_2, \downarrow, 2p_1, 0p_2\rangle, & |8\rangle &= |0_2, \uparrow, 2p_1, 0p_2\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A11})$$

The symbol $\mathbf{0}$ denotes the $N \times N$ zero matrix, $\tilde{\omega}$ describes the $N \times N$ discretized eigenfrequency matrix for one single photon, and $\tilde{\Omega}$ is the driving term. These two matrices $\tilde{\omega}$ and $\tilde{\Omega}$ can be written in the form

$$\tilde{\omega} = \begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 & & & \\ & \ddots & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \omega_N \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\Omega} = \begin{pmatrix} \Omega(t) & & & \\ & \ddots & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \Omega(t) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A12})$$

We can then write the matrix elements explicitly as

$$H_{\text{ph1}} = \begin{pmatrix} |1\rangle & |2\rangle & |3\rangle & |4\rangle & |5\rangle & |6\rangle & |7\rangle & |8\rangle \\ \tilde{\omega} & \tilde{\Omega} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \tilde{\Omega} & \tilde{\omega} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \tilde{\omega} & \tilde{\Omega} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \tilde{\Omega} & \tilde{\omega} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \tilde{\omega} & \tilde{\Omega} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \tilde{\Omega} & \tilde{\omega} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \tilde{\omega} & \tilde{\Omega} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \tilde{\Omega} & \tilde{\omega} \end{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} \langle 1 | \\ \langle 2 | \\ \langle 3 | \\ \langle 4 | \\ \langle 5 | \\ \langle 6 | \\ \langle 7 | \\ \langle 8 | \end{matrix}. \quad (\text{A13})$$

The Hamiltonian of the second photon H_{ph2} is of the same structure. For the interaction Hamiltonian of the first photon and ion-cavity system H_{int1} , the matrix elements are

$$H_{\text{int1}} = \begin{pmatrix} |1\rangle & |2\rangle & |3\rangle & |4\rangle & |5\rangle & |6\rangle & |7\rangle & |8\rangle \\ \tilde{\kappa}_1(t) & \tilde{\kappa}_1(t) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \tilde{\kappa}_1(t) & \tilde{\kappa}_1(t) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \tilde{\kappa}_1(t) & \tilde{\kappa}_1(t) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \tilde{\kappa}_1(t) & \tilde{\kappa}_1(t) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \tilde{\kappa}_1(t) & \tilde{\kappa}_1(t) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \tilde{\kappa}_1(t) & \tilde{\kappa}_1(t) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \tilde{\kappa}_1(t) & \tilde{\kappa}_1(t) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \tilde{\kappa}_1(t) & \tilde{\kappa}_1(t) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} \langle 1_{-2}, \downarrow, 0_{p_1}, 0_{p_2} | \\ \langle 1_{-2}, \uparrow, 0_{p_1}, 0_{p_2} | \\ \langle 1_{-1}, \downarrow, 0_{p_1}, 0_{p_2} | \\ \langle 1_{-1}, \uparrow, 0_{p_1}, 0_{p_2} | \\ \langle 1_1, \downarrow, 0_{p_1}, 0_{p_2} | \\ \langle 1_1, \uparrow, 0_{p_1}, 0_{p_2} | \\ \langle 1_2, \downarrow, 0_{p_1}, 0_{p_2} | \\ \langle 1_2, \uparrow, 0_{p_1}, 0_{p_2} | \\ \langle 0_{-2}, 1, 0_{p_1}, 0_{p_2} | \\ \langle 0_{-2}, 2, 0_{p_1}, 0_{p_2} | \\ \langle 0_{-1}, 2, 0_{p_1}, 0_{p_2} | \\ \langle 0_{-1}, 3, 0_{p_1}, 0_{p_2} | \\ \langle 0_1, 4, 0_{p_1}, 0_{p_2} | \\ \langle 0_1, 5, 0_{p_1}, 0_{p_2} | \\ \langle 0_2, 5, 0_{p_1}, 0_{p_2} | \\ \langle 0_2, 6, 0_{p_1}, 0_{p_2} | \end{matrix}. \quad (\text{A14})$$

Here, $\tilde{\kappa}_1(\mathbf{t}) = [\kappa_1(t), \kappa_1(t) \cdots \kappa_1(t)]$ is a $1 \times N$ row vector. The Hamiltonian of the second photon H_{int2} has the same form as H_{int1} , and only requires the substitution of the corresponding elements $\kappa_1(t) \rightarrow \kappa_2(t)$ and basis vectors $|0_L, j, L_{p_1}, 0_{p_2}\rangle \rightarrow |0_L, j, 0_{p_1}, L_{p_2}\rangle$.

Appendix B: Simulation method

Our goal is to simulate the final output two-photon state after gate operations. To achieve this goal, we use the Trotter-Suzuki formula, which is a more computationally-efficient approach to directly compute the time evolution of the given initial two-photon state $|\xi_{p_1 p_2}(T)\rangle = U(T)|\xi_{p_1 p_2}(0)\rangle$. Here, $U(T) = \exp(iHT)$ is the time-evolution operator satisfying $U(t, t_0) = U(t, t_i)U(t_i, t_0)$. Thus, we can expand the time-evolution operator as $U(T) = U(T, T - \Delta t)U(T - \Delta t, T - 2\Delta t) \cdots U(\Delta t, 0)$. The Trotter-Suzuki formula states that for a general Hamiltonian $H = H_1 + H_2$, with two non-commuting parts $[H_1, H_2] \neq 0$, the time evolution operator can be approximated as

$$U(\Delta t) = \exp(-iH\Delta t) = \exp(-iH_1\Delta t) \exp(-iH_2\Delta t) \exp(-i(\Delta t)^2[H_1, H_2]) \approx \exp(-iH_1\Delta t) \exp(-iH_2\Delta t). \quad (\text{B1})$$

For an infinitesimal time interval Δt , the error is negligible. More generally, for $H = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N_H} H_\alpha$, the time-evolution operator can be expressed as

$$U(T) = \prod_{n=1}^N \prod_{\alpha=1}^{N_H} \exp(-iH_\alpha T/n). \quad (\text{B2})$$

We use this general Trotter-Suzuki formula Eq. (B2) to simulate the high-dimensional two-photon CPF gate operations according to Fig. 1(c) in the main text. The only time-dependent elements in the Hamiltonian Eq. (A6) are $\Omega(t)$, $\kappa_1(t)$ and $\kappa_2(t)$. These are the control parameters for different gate operations in Fig. 1(c) in the main text. To be more precise, we divide the time interval $[0, T]$ into six parts t_i , $i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6$, where $[t_{i-1}, t_i]$ denotes the time interval of the i -th gate operation. The controlled microwave pulse $\Omega(t) = \Omega_0 w(t)$ is a segmented function

$$\Omega(t) = \begin{cases} \Omega_0 & 0 \leq t \leq t_1 \text{ \& } t_4 \leq t \leq t_5 \\ \Omega_0 \exp(i\pi) & t_2 \leq t \leq t_3 \\ 0 & \text{others} \end{cases}. \quad (\text{B3})$$

Here, $t_1 = t_5 - t_4 = \pi/(4\Omega_0)$, which ensures that the pulse area is $\pi/2$. The piecewise function $\Omega(t)$ corresponds to $\pi/2, -\pi/2, \pi/2$ rotations to the ion shown in Fig. 1(c) in the main text. To simulate the two ion-photon controlled- \tilde{Z}_4 gate, we set the two coupling strengths $\kappa_1(t)$ and $\kappa_2(t)$ as

$$\kappa_1(t) = \begin{cases} \kappa_1 & t_1 \leq t \leq t_2 \\ 0 & \text{others} \end{cases}, \quad \kappa_2(t) = \begin{cases} \kappa_2 & t_3 \leq t \leq t_4 \\ 0 & \text{others} \end{cases}. \quad (\text{B4})$$

Here, we set $t_2 - t_1 = t_4 - t_3 = 10\kappa^{-1}$ in order to ensure that the photons are completely scattered off the cavity.

To summarize, the simulation procedure is as follows

1. Prepare the initial state $|\Psi(t=0)\rangle = |0_{\text{cav}}, \downarrow\rangle \otimes |\xi_{p_1 p_2}(0)\rangle$ according to Eq. (A3).
2. Time-evolve the system $|\Psi(T)\rangle = \exp(-iH(\Omega, \kappa_1, \kappa_2)(t)T) |\Psi(0)\rangle$.
3. Measure the ionic state and trace over the cavity degrees of freedom to obtain the final two-photon state $|\xi_{p_1 p_2}(T)\rangle$.
4. Compare the simulated $|\xi_{p_1 p_2}(T)\rangle$ with the ideal two-photon state $|\tilde{\xi}_{p_1 p_2}(T)\rangle$, which experiences no distortion, and acquires an average scattering phase $\phi_L(\omega_p) \approx \phi_L(\omega_c)$ in each scattering process. Then, the output state fidelity is obtained via $F = |\langle \xi_{p_1 p_2}(T) | \tilde{\xi}_{p_1 p_2}(T) \rangle|^2$.
5. Repeat the above four procedures for N input states and compute the gate fidelity $F_G = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N F_n$.

Appendix C: Discussion on the coupling strength g

For ionic states $\{|S, m_S\rangle, |D, m_D\rangle\}$, the cavity couples with ionic states with different coupling strengths. We assume $g_{j=3} = g_{j'=4} \equiv g$ and the vacuum coupling strength is g_0 . The coupling strength for the transition $|S, m_S\rangle \leftrightarrow |D, m_D\rangle$ is $g_j = C(J_S m_S, 2q; J_D m_D) g_0$, where $C(J_S m_S, 2q; J_D m_D)$ is the Clebsch-Gordan coefficient given by a Wigner 3-j symbol [40].

$$C(J_S m_S, 2q; J_D m_D) = (-1)^{J_S - 2 + m_D} \sqrt{2J_D + 1} \begin{pmatrix} J_S & 2 & J_D \\ m_S & q & -m_D \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{C1})$$

We estimate that $g_{j=1} = 1/\sqrt{6}g$, $g_{j=2} = \sqrt{2/3}g$, $g_{j=4} = \sqrt{3}/2g$, $g_{j=5} = \sqrt{3/5}g$, and $g_j = g_{j'}$ in our simulation.

-
- [1] Andreas Reiserer, ‘‘Colloquium: Cavity-enhanced quantum network nodes,’’ *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **94**, 041003 (2022).
 - [2] L.-M. Duan and H. J. Kimble, ‘‘Scalable photonic quantum computation through cavity-assisted interactions,’’ *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 127902 (2004).
 - [3] Keyu Xia, Fedor Jelezko, and Jason Twamley, ‘‘Quantum routing of single optical photons with a superconducting flux qubit,’’ *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 052315 (2018).
 - [4] Jacob Hastrup and Ulrik L. Andersen, ‘‘Protocol for generating optical Gottesman-Kitaev-Preskill states with Cavity QED,’’ *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 170503 (2022).
 - [5] Björn Schirnski, Miren Lamaison, and Anders S. Sørensen, ‘‘Passive quantum phase gate for photons based on three level emitters,’’ *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 130502 (2022).
 - [6] Jiangshan Tang, Lei Tang, Haodong Wu, Yang Wu, Hui Sun, Han Zhang, Tao Li, Yanqing Lu, Min Xiao, and Keyu Xia, ‘‘Towards on-demand heralded single-photon sources via photon blockade,’’ *Phys. Rev. Appl.* **15**, 064020 (2021).
 - [7] Anton Frisk Kockum, Adam Miranowicz, Vincenzo Macrì, Salvatore Savasta, and Franco Nori, ‘‘Deterministic quantum nonlinear optics with single atoms and virtual photons,’’ *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 063849 (2017).
 - [8] Ye-Hong Chen, Roberto Stassi, Wei Qin, Adam Miranowicz, and Franco Nori, ‘‘Fault-tolerant multiqubit geometric entangling gates using photonic cat-state qubits,’’ *Phys. Rev. Appl.* **18**, 024076 (2022).
 - [9] Keyu Xia, Mattias Johnsson, Peter L. Knight, and Jason Twamley, ‘‘Cavity-free scheme for nondestructive detection of a single optical photon,’’ *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 023601 (2016).
 - [10] Chui-Ping Yang, Qi-Ping Su, Yu Zhang, and Franco Nori, ‘‘Implementing a multi-target-qubit controlled-not gate with logical qubits outside a decoherence-free subspace and its application in creating quantum entangled states,’’ *Phys. Rev. A* **101**, 032329 (2020).
 - [11] Xin Su, Jiang-Shan Tang, and Keyu Xia, ‘‘Nonlinear dissipation-induced photon blockade,’’ *Phys. Rev. A* **106**, 063707 (2022).
 - [12] Jiang-Shan Tang, Wei Nie, Lei Tang, Mingyuan Chen, Xin Su, Yanqing Lu, Franco Nori, and Keyu Xia, ‘‘Nonreciprocal single-photon band structure,’’ *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 203602 (2022).
 - [13] Lei Tang, Jiangshan Tang, Weidong Zhang, Guowei Lu, Han Zhang, Yong Zhang, Keyu Xia, and Min Xiao, ‘‘On-chip chiral single-photon interface: Isolation and unidirectional emission,’’ *Phys. Rev. A* **99**, 043833 (2019).
 - [14] Keyu Xia, Guowei Lu, Gongwei Lin, Yuqing Cheng, Yueping Niu, Shangqing Gong, and Jason Twamley, ‘‘Reversible non-magnetic single-photon isolation using unbalanced quantum coupling,’’ *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 043802 (2014).
 - [15] Keyu Xia and Jason Twamley, ‘‘All-optical switching and router via the direct quantum control of coupling between cavity modes,’’ *Phys. Rev. X* **3**, 031013 (2013).
 - [16] Tao Li, Adam Miranowicz, Xuedong Hu, Keyu Xia, and Franco Nori, ‘‘Quantum memory and gates using a Λ -type quantum emitter coupled to a chiral waveguide,’’ *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 062318 (2018).
 - [17] Miao Cai, Yanqing Lu, Min Xiao, and Keyu Xia, ‘‘Optimizing single-photon generation and storage with machine learning,’’ *Phys. Rev. A* **104**, 053707 (2021).
 - [18] Mingyuan Chen, Jiangshan Tang, Lei Tang, Haodong Wu, and

- Keyu Xia, “Photon blockade and single-photon generation with multiple quantum emitters,” *Phys. Rev. Res.* **4**, 033083 (2022).
- [19] Severin Daiss, Stefan Langenfeld, Stephan Welte, Emanuele Distanto, Philip Thomas, Lukas Hartung, Olivier Morin, and Gerhard Rempe, “A quantum-logic gate between distant quantum-network modules,” *Science* **371**, 614–617 (2021).
- [20] Andreas Reiserer, Norbert Kalb, Gerhard Rempe, and Stephan Ritter, “A quantum gate between a flying optical photon and a single trapped atom,” *Nature (London)* **508**, 237–240 (2014).
- [21] Bastian Hacker, Stephan Welte, Gerhard Rempe, and Stephan Ritter, “A photon–photon quantum gate based on a single atom in an optical resonator,” *Nature (London)* **536**, 193–196 (2016).
- [22] Stephan Welte, Bastian Hacker, Severin Daiss, Stephan Ritter, and Gerhard Rempe, “Photon-mediated quantum gate between two neutral atoms in an optical cavity,” *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 011018 (2018).
- [23] Manuel Erhard, Robert Fickler, Mario Krenn, and Anton Zeilinger, “Twisted photons: new quantum perspectives in high dimensions,” *Light: Sci. Appl.* **7**, 17146–17146 (2018).
- [24] Manuel Erhard, Mario Krenn, and Anton Zeilinger, “Advances in high-dimensional quantum entanglement,” *Nat. Rev. Phys.* **2**, 365–381 (2020).
- [25] Daniele Cozzolino, Beatrice Da Lio, Davide Bacco, and Leif Katsuo Oxenløwe, “High-dimensional quantum communication: benefits, progress, and future challenges,” *Adv. Quantum Technol.* **2**, 1900038 (2019).
- [26] Martin Ringbauer, Thomas R. Bromley, Marco Cianciaruso, Ludovico Lami, W. Y. Sarah Lau, Gerardo Adesso, Andrew G. White, Alessandro Fedrizzi, and Marco Piani, “Certification and quantification of multilevel quantum coherence,” *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 041007 (2018).
- [27] Mehul Malik, Manuel Erhard, Marcus Huber, Mario Krenn, Robert Fickler, and Anton Zeilinger, “Multi-photon entanglement in high dimensions,” *Nat. Photonics* **10**, 248–252 (2016).
- [28] Mohammad Mirhosseini, Omar S. Magaña-Loaiza, Malcolm N. O’Sullivan, Brandon Rodenburg, Mehul Malik, Martin P. J. Lavery, Miles J. Padgett, Daniel J. Gauthier, and Robert W. Boyd, “High-dimensional quantum cryptography with twisted light,” *New J. Phys.* **17**, 033033 (2015).
- [29] F. Zhu, M. Tyler, N. H. Valencia, M. Malik, and J. Leach, “Is high-dimensional photonic entanglement robust to noise?” *AVS Quantum Sci.* **3**, 011401 (2021).
- [30] S. Pirandola, U. L. Andersen, L. Banchi, M. Berta, D. Bunandar, R. Colbeck, D. Englund, T. Gehring, C. Lupo, C. Ottaviani, J. L. Pereira, M. Razavi, J. Shamsul Shaari, M. Tomamichel, V. C. Usenko, G. Vallone, P. Villoresi, and P. Wallden, “Advances in quantum cryptography,” *Adv. Opt. Photon.* **12**, 1012–1236 (2020).
- [31] Armin Tavakoli, Adán Cabello, Marek Żukowski, and Mohamed Bourennane, “Quantum clock synchronization with a single qudit,” *Sci. Rep.* **5**, 1–4 (2015).
- [32] Robert Fickler, Radek Lapkiewicz, William N Plick, Mario Krenn, Christoph Schaeff, Sven Ramelow, and Anton Zeilinger, “Quantum entanglement of high angular momenta,” *Science* **338**, 640–643 (2012).
- [33] Benjamin P. Lanyon, Marco Barbieri, Marcelo P. Almeida, Thomas Jennewein, Timothy C. Ralph, Kevin J. Resch, Geoff J. Pryde, Jeremy L. O’Brien, Alexei Gilchrist, and Andrew G. White, “Simplifying quantum logic using higher-dimensional Hilbert spaces,” *Nat. Phys.* **5**, 134–140 (2009).
- [34] K. Y. Bliokh and Franco Nori, “Transverse and longitudinal angular momenta of light,” *Phys. Rep.* **592**, 1–38 (2015).
- [35] K. Y. Bliokh, F. J. Rodríguez-Fortuño, Franco Nori, and A. V. Zayats, “Spin–orbit interactions of light,” *Nat. Photonics* **9**, 796–808 (2015).
- [36] Amin Babazadeh, Manuel Erhard, Feiran Wang, Mehul Malik, Rahman Nouroozi, Mario Krenn, and Anton Zeilinger, “High-dimensional single-photon quantum gates: Concepts and experiments,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 180510 (2017).
- [37] Florian Brandt, Markus Hiekkamäki, Frédéric Bouchard, Marcus Huber, and Robert Fickler, “High-dimensional quantum gates using full-field spatial modes of photons,” *Optica* **7**, 98–107 (2020).
- [38] Yulin Chi, Jieshan Huang, Zhanchuan Zhang, Jun Mao, Zinan Zhou, Xiaojiong Chen, Chonghao Zhai, Jueming Bao, Tianxiang Dai, Huihong Yuan, Ming Zhang, Daoxin Dai, Bo Tang, Yan Yang, Zihua Li, Yunhong Ding, Leif K. Oxenløwe, Mark G. Thompson, Jeremy L. O’Brien, Yan Li, Qihuang Gong, and Jianwei Wang, “A programmable qudit-based quantum processor,” *Nat. Commun.* **13**, 1166 (2022).
- [39] Christian T. Schmiegelow, Jonas Schulz, Henning Kaufmann, Thomas Ruster, Ulrich G. Poschinger, and Ferdinand Schmidt-Kaler, “Transfer of optical orbital angular momentum to a bound electron,” *Nat. Commun.* **7**, 1–6 (2016).
- [40] G. F. Quinteiro, Ferdinand Schmidt-Kaler, and Christian T. Schmiegelow, “Twisted-light–ion interaction: The role of longitudinal fields,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 253203 (2017).
- [41] Shibiao Wei, Stuart K. Earl, Jiao Lin, Shan Shan Kou, and Xiao-Cong Yuan, “Active sorting of orbital angular momentum states of light with a cascaded tunable resonator,” *Light Sci. Appl.* **9**, 10 (2020).
- [42] C. Y. Hu, W. J. Munro, and J. G. Rarity, “Deterministic photon entangler using a charged quantum dot inside a microcavity,” *Phys. Rev. B* **78**, 125318 (2008).
- [43] Keyu Xia and Jason Twamley, “Solid-state optical interconnect between distant superconducting quantum chips,” *Phys. Rev. A* **91**, 042307 (2015).
- [44] Guillermo Díaz-Camacho, Diego Porras, and Juan José García-Ripoll, “Photon-mediated qubit interactions in one-dimensional discrete and continuous models,” *Phys. Rev. A* **91**, 063828 (2015).
- [45] Guillermo F. Peñas, Ricardo Puebla, Tomás Ramos, Peter Rabl, and Juan José García-Ripoll, “Universal deterministic quantum operations in microwave quantum links,” *Phys. Rev. Appl.* **17**, 054038 (2022).
- [46] Julian Léonard, Sooshin Kim, Joyce Kwan, Perrin Segura, Fabian Grusdt, Cécile Repellin, Nathan Goldman, and Markus Greiner, “Realization of a fractional quantum Hall state with ultracold atoms,” *Nature (London)* **619**, 495–499 (2023).
- [47] L.-M. Duan, A. Kuzmich, and H. J. Kimble, “Cavity QED and quantum-information processing with “hot” trapped atoms,” *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 032305 (2003).
- [48] Hiroki Takahashi, Ezra Kassa, Costas Christoforou, and Matthias Keller, “Strong coupling of a single ion to an optical cavity,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 013602 (2020).
- [49] Jan Benhelm, Gerhard Kirchmair, Christian F. Roos, and Rainer Blatt, “Towards fault-tolerant quantum computing with trapped ions,” *Nat. Phys.* **4**, 463–466 (2008).
- [50] T. P. Harty, D. T. C. Allcock, C. J. Ballance, L. Guidoni, H. A. Janacek, N. M. Linke, D. N. Stacey, and D. M. Lucas, “High-fidelity preparation, gates, memory, and readout of a trapped-ion quantum bit,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 220501 (2014).
- [51] Colin D Bruzewicz, John Chiaverini, Robert McConnell, and Jeremy M Sage, “Trapped-ion quantum computing: Progress and challenges,” *Appl. Phys. Rev.* **6**, 021314 (2019).
- [52] Birgit Brandstätter, Andrew McClung, Klemens Schüppert, Bernardo Casabone, Konstantin Friebe, Andreas Stute, Piet O. Schmidt, Christian Deutsch, Jakob Reichel, and Rainer Blatt,

- “Integrated fiber-mirror ion trap for strong ion-cavity coupling,” *Rev. Sci. Instrum.* **84** (2013).
- [53] J. D. Sterk, L. Luo, T. A. Manning, P. Maunz, and C. Monroe, “Photon collection from a trapped ion-cavity system,” *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 062308 (2012).
- [54] Matthias Steiner, Hendrik M. Meyer, Christian Deutsch, Jakob Reichel, and Michael Köhl, “Single ion coupled to an optical fiber cavity,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 043003 (2013).
- [55] Matthias Keller, Birgit Lange, Kazuhiro Hayasaka, Wolfgang Lange, and Herbert Walther, “Continuous generation of single photons with controlled waveform in an ion-trap cavity system,” *Nature* **431**, 1075–1078 (2004).
- [56] Dong-Sheng Ding, Zhi-Yuan Zhou, Bao-Sen Shi, and Guang-Can Guo, “Single-photon-level quantum image memory based on cold atomic ensembles,” *Nat. Commun.* **4**, 2527 (2013).
- [57] Jin-Ming Cui, Kun Zhou, Ming-Shu Zhao, Ming-Zhong Ai, Chang-Kang Hu, Qiang Li, Bi-Heng Liu, Jin-Lan Peng, Yun-Feng Huang, Chuan-Feng Li, and Guang-Can Guo, “Polarization nondegenerate fiber Fabry-Perot cavities with large tunable splittings,” *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **112**, 171105 (2018).
- [58] C. Y. Hu, A. Young, J. L. O’Brien, W. J. Munro, and J. G. Rarity, “Giant optical Faraday rotation induced by a single-electron spin in a quantum dot: Applications to entangling remote spins via a single photon,” *Phys. Rev. B* **78**, 085307 (2008).