

# Linear quantum systems: poles, zeros, invertibility and sensitivity

Zhiyuan Dong, Guofeng Zhang, Heung-wing Joseph Lee, and Ian R. Petersen, *Fellow, IEEE*

**Abstract**—The non-commutative nature of quantum mechanics imposes fundamental constraints on system dynamics, which, in the linear realm, are manifested through the physical realizability conditions on system matrices. These restrictions give system matrices a unique structure. This paper aims to study this structure by investigating the zeros and poles of linear quantum systems. Firstly, it is shown that  $-s_0$  is a transmission zero if and only if  $s_0$  is a pole of the transfer function, and  $-s_0$  is an invariant zero if and only if  $s_0$  is an eigenvalue of the  $A$ -matrix, of a linear quantum system. Moreover,  $s_0$  is an output-decoupling zero if and only if  $-s_0$  is an input-decoupling zero. Secondly, based on these zero-pole correspondences and inspired by a recent work on the stable inversion of classical linear systems [1], we show that a linear quantum system must be Hurwitz unstable if it is strongly asymptotically left invertible. Two types of stable input observers are constructed for unstable linear quantum systems. Finally, the sensitivity of a coherent feedback network is investigated; in particular, the fundamental tradeoff between ideal input squeezing and system robustness is studied on the basis of system sensitivity analysis.

**Index Terms**—Linear quantum systems, poles, zeros, input observer, sensitivity, robustness

## I. INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, significant advancements have been made in both theoretical understanding and experimental demonstrations of quantum control. Quantum control plays a key role in a variety of quantum information technologies, such as quantum communication, quantum computation, quantum cryptography, quantum ultra-precision metrology, and nano-electronics [2]–[6]. Analogous to classical control systems theory, linear quantum systems hold great importance in the field of quantum control. Linear quantum systems are mathematical models that describe the behavior of quantum

harmonic oscillators. In this context, “linear” refers to the linearity of the Heisenberg equations of motion for quadrature operators in the quantum system. This linearity often leads to simplifications that facilitate the analysis and control of these systems [7]–[9]. Consequently, linear quantum systems can be effectively studied using powerful mathematical techniques derived from linear systems theory. A wide range of quantum-mechanical systems can be suitably modeled as linear quantum systems; for instance, quantum optical systems [3], [4], [10]–[18], circuit quantum electro-dynamical (circuit QED) systems [19]–[22], cavity QED systems [23]–[25], quantum optomechanical systems [7], [26]–[37], atomic ensembles [31], [34], [38]–[40], and quantum memories [41]–[45].

Although formally similar to linear classical systems, linear quantum systems possess a unique structure due to the non-commutative nature of quantum mechanics. The system matrices of a linear quantum system have a very special structure, which endows linear quantum systems with distinct properties compared to their classical counterparts. For instances, it is shown in [46] and [3, Ch. 6] that detectability is equivalent to stabilizability. For linear quantum passive systems, controllability is equivalent to observability and they imply Hurwitz stability [47, Lem. 3.1]. In fact, later it is proved in [48, Lem. 2 and Thm. 2] that controllability, observability and Hurwitz stability are all equivalent for linear quantum passive systems. For general linear quantum systems (not necessarily passive), controllability and observability are equivalent [48, Prop. 1]. Moreover, if a linear quantum system is Hurwitz stable, then it is both controllable and observable [49, Thm. 3.1]. Finally, it is shown in [50] that the controllable and unobservable (“ $c\bar{o}$ ”) subsystem and the uncontrollable and observable (“ $\bar{c}o$ ”) subsystem coexist or vanish simultaneously.

In systems and control theory, zeros and poles are important concepts which play a significant role in the dynamics and control design of linear dynamical systems. There is a wide range of definitions of system zeros, including decoupling zero [51], blocking zero [52]–[56], transmission zero and invariant zero [57]–[61]. Roughly speaking, transmission zeros represent the frequencies at which the system’s output is zero, regardless of its input. In other words, transmission zeros are the frequencies at which the system’s transfer function becomes zero. Non-minimum phase (namely zeros in the right-half plane) and unstable poles often pose fundamental performance limitations in control system design [61]–[65]. System zeros also play a key role in the system inversion theory, which aims to estimate/reconstruct the input of a system based on its output. Simply speaking, if a linear system is minimum phase, then under mild conditions the system has a

This work is partially financially supported by Innovation Program for Quantum Science and Technology 2023ZD0300600, Guangdong Provincial Quantum Science Strategic Initiative (No. GDZX2200001), Hong Kong Research Grant Council (RGC) under Grant No. 15213924, National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grants Nos. 62003111, 62173288, 62473117, Natural Science Foundation of Guangdong Province under Grant No. 2022A1515010390, and The Science Center Program of National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 62188101. (Corresponding author: Guofeng Zhang.)

Zhiyuan Dong is with School of Science, Harbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen, China (e-mail: dongzhiyuan@hit.edu.cn).

Guofeng Zhang is with Department of Applied Mathematics, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, China and also with Shenzhen Research Institute, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Shenzhen, China (e-mail: guofeng.zhang@polyu.edu.hk).

Heung-wing Joseph Lee is with Department of Applied Mathematics, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, China (e-mail: joseph.lee@polyu.edu.hk).

Ian R. Petersen is with School of Engineering, The Australian National University, Canberra ACT 2601, Australia (e-mail: i.r.petersen@gmail.com).

stable inverse so that the input can be estimated/reconstructed from its output [1], [66]–[72]. Recently, strong left-invertibility of linear systems is characterized by means of invariant zeros [1], [73], and constructive procedures for input reconstruction are proposed.

It is very plausible to speculate that poles and zeros are important also in linear quantum systems theory [8], [44] and are closely related to fundamental performance limitations of linear quantum systems. In fact it has been shown in [74] that these concepts are fundamental to understanding the behavior of linear quantum systems. The purpose of this paper is to delve into the intricacies of invariant zeros, transmission zeros, invertibility, and sensitivity of linear quantum systems, elucidating their roles, relationships, and implications in quantum control theory. Firstly, we prove that  $-s_0$  is a transmission zero if and only if  $s_0$  is a pole of the transfer function of a linear quantum system, and in analog  $-s_0$  is an invariant zero if and only if  $s_0$  is an eigenvalue of the  $A$ -matrix of a linear quantum system. Moreover,  $-s_0$  is an output-decoupling zero if and only if  $s_0$  is an input-decoupling zero. Secondly, based on these zero-pole correspondences, we show that a linear quantum system must be Hurwitz unstable if it is strongly asymptotically left invertible. Moreover, two different types of stable input observers are constructed for unstable linear quantum systems. The first type of stable input observers is a classical one, but is different from the recently constructed one [1]. The second type is of a quantum-mechanical one, but it functions in the average dynamics sense. Finally, the relation between quantum squeezing and robustness of a coherent feedback network is investigated.

Some of the results of this article were presented in the conference paper [75] recently accepted. The following are the most notable comparisons.

- In Section III, Corollary 3.2, Proposition 3.3 and Theorem 3.3 are Propositions 3.1, 3.2 and Theorem 3.1 in [75], respectively. However, Propositions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.4, Corollaries 3.1 and 3.3, Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, and Examples 3.1 and 3.2 in this paper are new results;
- In Section IV, Lemma 4.1 is Theorem 4.1 in [75]. However, Theorem 4.1, Corollary 4.1, and Subsections IV-B and IV-C in this paper are new results.
- In Section V, the ideal input squeezing through a coherent feedback network carried out in Subsections V-A and V-B is a much more comprehensive extension of those in Section V of [75]. Moreover, Subsection V-C in this paper is new.
- Section VI expands on the conclusion in [75] by giving a more detailed discussion on input reconstruction and sensitivity analysis for linear quantum systems.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Linear quantum systems and their poles and zeros are briefly introduced in Section II. The special structural properties of linear quantum systems in terms of their zeros and poles are investigated in Section III. Section IV discusses left invertibility of linear quantum systems by means of invariant zeros. Tradeoffs between squeezing and system robustness of a coherent feedback network is studied in Section V. Section VI concludes this

paper.

*Notation.*  $i = \sqrt{-1}$  denotes the imaginary unit. For a vector of complex numbers or operators  $X = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^\top$ , the complex conjugate of  $X$  or its adjoint operator is denoted by  $X^\# = [x_1^*, \dots, x_n^*]^\top$ . Denote  $X^\dagger = (X^\#)^\top$  and  $\check{X} = [X^\top \ X^\dagger]^\top$ .  $I_k$  is the identity matrix of dimension  $k$ . Let  $J_k = \text{diag}\{I_k, -I_k\}$ ,  $\mathbb{J}_k = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_k \\ -I_k & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ , define the  $b$ -adjoint of  $X \in \mathbb{C}^{2k \times 2r}$  by  $X^b = J_r X^\dagger J_k$ . For two matrices  $U, V \in \mathbb{C}^{k \times r}$ , define the doubled-up matrix  $\Delta(U, V) = \begin{bmatrix} U & V \\ V^\# & U^\# \end{bmatrix}$ .  $\delta_{jk}$  denotes the Kronecker delta function,  $\delta(t-r)$  is the Dirac delta function,  $\otimes$  represents the tensor product. Finally, in this paper the reduced Planck constant  $\hbar$  is set to 1.

## II. LINEAR QUANTUM SYSTEMS

### A. The mathematical model

In this paper, a linear quantum system model composed of  $n$  quantum harmonic oscillators interacting with  $m$  input boson fields is considered. The  $j$ th quantum harmonic oscillator is described by an annihilation operator  $\mathbf{a}_j$  and its adjoint (creation operator)  $\mathbf{a}_j^*$ ; they satisfy the canonical commutation relations  $[\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{a}_k^*] = \delta_{jk}$ ,  $j, k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . Define  $\mathbf{a} = [\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n]^\top$ . The  $j$ th input field is represented by an annihilation operator  $\mathbf{b}_{\text{in},j}(t)$  and its adjoint  $\mathbf{b}_{\text{in},j}^*(t)$ , which enjoy the following singular commutation relations

$$[\mathbf{b}_{\text{in},j}(t), \mathbf{b}_{\text{in},k}^*(r)] = \delta_{jk}\delta(t-r), \quad \forall j, k = 1, 2, \dots, m, \quad t, r \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Denote the integrated annihilation and creation operators by

$$\mathbf{B}_{\text{in}}(t) = \int_{-\infty}^t \mathbf{b}_{\text{in}}(\tau) d\tau, \quad \mathbf{B}_{\text{in}}^\#(t) = \int_{-\infty}^t \mathbf{b}_{\text{in}}^\#(\tau) d\tau,$$

where  $\mathbf{B}_{\text{in}}(t) = [\mathbf{B}_{\text{in},1}(t), \dots, \mathbf{B}_{\text{in},m}(t)]^\top$ . It is convenient to characterize linear quantum systems by the  $(S, \mathbf{L}, \mathbf{H})$  formalism ([8], [76], [77]). Here,  $S$  is a scattering operator satisfying  $S^\dagger S = S S^\dagger = I_m$ , the coupling operators between the system and the input fields are denoted by  $\mathbf{L} = \begin{bmatrix} C_- & C_+ \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{a}$ , where  $C_-, C_+ \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ , and the intrinsic system Hamiltonian  $\mathbf{H} = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{a}^\dagger \Omega \mathbf{a}$ , where  $\Omega = \Delta(\Omega_-, \Omega_+)$  is Hermitian with  $\Omega_-, \Omega_+ \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ . In this paper we assume that  $S = I$  (the identity operator) for simplicity. The temporal evolution of a linear quantum system is governed by a unitary operator  $\mathbf{U}(t, 0)$ , which satisfies the following Itô quantum stochastic differential equation (QSDE)

$$d\mathbf{U}(t, 0) = \left[ \left( -i\mathbf{H} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{L}^\dagger \mathbf{L} \right) dt + d\mathbf{B}_{\text{in}}^\dagger(t) \mathbf{L} - \mathbf{L}^\dagger d\mathbf{B}_{\text{in}}(t) \right] \mathbf{U}(t, 0), \quad (1)$$

with the initial condition  $\mathbf{U}(0, 0) = I$ . In the Heisenberg picture, the evolution of a system operator  $\mathbf{X}(t) = \mathbf{U}^\dagger(t, 0) (\mathbf{X} \otimes I) \mathbf{U}(t, 0)$  can be expressed by the QSDE

$$d\mathbf{X}(t) = \mathcal{L}_G(\mathbf{X}(t)) dt + d\mathbf{B}_{\text{in}}^\dagger(t) [\mathbf{X}(t), \mathbf{L}(t)] + [\mathbf{L}^\dagger(t), \mathbf{X}(t)] d\mathbf{B}_{\text{in}}(t), \quad (2)$$

where the superoperator

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_G(\mathbf{X}(t)) = & -\imath[\mathbf{X}(t), \mathbf{H}(t)] + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{L}^\dagger(t)[\mathbf{X}(t), \mathbf{L}(t)] \\ & + \frac{1}{2}[\mathbf{L}^\dagger(t), \mathbf{X}(t)]\mathbf{L}(t). \end{aligned}$$

The input-output relation is given by

$$d\mathbf{B}_{\text{out}}(t) = \mathbf{L}(t)dt + d\mathbf{B}_{\text{in}}(t). \quad (3)$$

More discussion of open quantum systems can be found in, e.g. [3], [8], [11], [12], [16], [76] and references therein.

Based on Eqs. (2)-(3), the Heisenberg equation of motion of a linear quantum system in the annihilation-creation operator representation can be described by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\check{\mathbf{a}}}(t) &= \mathcal{A}\check{\mathbf{a}}(t) + \mathcal{B}\check{\mathbf{b}}_{\text{in}}(t), \\ \check{\mathbf{b}}_{\text{out}}(t) &= \mathcal{C}\check{\mathbf{a}}(t) + \mathcal{D}\check{\mathbf{b}}_{\text{in}}(t), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where the complex-domain system matrices are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C} &= \Delta(C_-, C_+), \quad \mathcal{B} = -\mathcal{C}^b\mathcal{D}, \\ \mathcal{A} &= -\imath J_n \Omega - \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{C}^b\mathcal{C}, \quad \mathcal{D} = I_{2m}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The corresponding transfer function matrix

$$G(s) = \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{C}(sI - \mathcal{A})^{-1}\mathcal{B} \quad (6)$$

is assumed to be *irreducible*, i.e., each element of the matrix  $G(s)$  is irreducible with the same polynomial in  $s$ , that is, there are no hidden modes.

Taking the expectation on both sides of Eq. (4) with respect to the joint system-field initial state we get a *classical* linear system of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\langle\check{\mathbf{a}}(t)\rangle}{dt} &= \mathcal{A}\langle\check{\mathbf{a}}(t)\rangle + \mathcal{B}\langle\check{\mathbf{b}}_{\text{in}}(t)\rangle, \\ \langle\check{\mathbf{b}}_{\text{out}}(t)\rangle &= \mathcal{C}\langle\check{\mathbf{a}}(t)\rangle + \mathcal{D}\langle\check{\mathbf{b}}_{\text{in}}(t)\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Thus, we can define controllability, observability, and Hurwitz stability for the *quantum* linear system (4) in terms of those for the *classical* linear system (7).

*Definition 2.1:* ([48, Def. 1], [8, Def. 3.1]) The linear quantum system (4) is said to be Hurwitz stable (resp. controllable, observable) if the corresponding linear classical system (7) is Hurwitz stable (resp. controllable, observable).

### B. The Kalman canonical form

Based on the controllability and observability defined in Definition 2.1, a special real-quadrature operator representation of the linear quantum system (4) has been proposed in [50, Thm. 4.4] via the Kalman canonical decomposition, which is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) &= \bar{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{x}(t) + \bar{\mathbf{B}}\mathbf{u}(t), \\ \mathbf{y}(t) &= \bar{\mathbf{C}}\mathbf{x}(t) + \bar{\mathbf{D}}\mathbf{u}(t), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where the coordinate transformations [50, Lem. 4.8]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x} &= \hat{T}^\dagger \check{\mathbf{a}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{q}_h \\ \mathbf{p}_h \\ \mathbf{x}_{co} \\ \mathbf{x}_{c\bar{o}} \end{bmatrix}, \\ \mathbf{u} &= V_m \check{\mathbf{b}}_{\text{in}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{q}_{\text{in}} \\ \mathbf{p}_{\text{in}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{y} = V_m \check{\mathbf{b}}_{\text{out}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{q}_{\text{out}} \\ \mathbf{p}_{\text{out}} \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$




Fig. 1. The Kalman canonical form of a linear quantum system; see [50, Fig. 2].

with the unitary matrix

$$V_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} I_k & I_k \\ -\imath I_k & \imath I_k \end{bmatrix}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}^+,$$

and the coordinate transformation matrix  $\hat{T}$  being orthogonal and block-wise symplectic. The system matrices are

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbf{A}} &= \hat{T}^\dagger \mathcal{A} \hat{T}, \quad \bar{\mathbf{B}} = \hat{T}^\dagger \mathcal{B} V_m^\dagger, \quad \bar{\mathbf{C}} = V_m \mathcal{C} \hat{T}, \quad \bar{\mathbf{D}} = V_m \mathcal{D} V_m^\dagger = I. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

In the sequel, we denote the transfer function matrix of system (8) by  $\mathbb{G}(s)$ . Clearly,

$$\mathbb{G}(s) = V_m G(s) V_m^\dagger, \quad (11)$$

which satisfies

$$\mathbb{G}(-s^*)^\# \mathbb{G}(s) = \mathbb{G}(s) \mathbb{G}(-s^*)^\# = I, \quad (12)$$

where  $\mathbb{G}(s)^\# \triangleq -\mathbb{J}_m \mathbb{G}(s)^\dagger \mathbb{J}_m$ ; see, e.g., [48], [78], [79].

As given in [50, Eq. (67)], the real system matrices  $\bar{\mathbf{A}}, \bar{\mathbf{B}}, \bar{\mathbf{C}}$  in Eq. (10) are of block-wise structure, corresponding to the partition of system variables in Eq. (9)

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbf{A}} &= \begin{bmatrix} A_h^{11} & A_h^{12} & A_{12} & A_{13} \\ 0 & A_h^{22} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & A_{21} & A_{co} & 0 \\ 0 & A_{31} & 0 & A_{c\bar{o}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{\mathbf{B}} = \begin{bmatrix} B_h \\ 0 \\ B_{co} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \\ \bar{\mathbf{C}} &= [ 0 \quad C_h \mid C_{co} \mid 0 ], \quad \bar{\mathbf{D}} = I. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

The physical realizability conditions for the linear quantum system (8) are ([49], [50])

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbf{A}}\bar{\mathbf{J}}_n + \bar{\mathbf{J}}_n\bar{\mathbf{A}}^\top + \bar{\mathbf{B}}\bar{\mathbf{J}}_m\bar{\mathbf{B}}^\top &= 0, \\ \bar{\mathbf{B}} &= \bar{\mathbf{J}}_n\bar{\mathbf{C}}^\top\bar{\mathbf{J}}_m, \end{aligned}$$

where the block-wise symplectic matrix

$$\bar{\mathbf{J}}_n \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{J}_{n_3} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbb{J}_{n_1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbb{J}_{n_2} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (14)$$

More discussion of the quantum Kalman canonical form of linear quantum systems can be found in [50], [49], [80].

### C. Probability amplitude transitions

The transfer function matrix  $\mathbb{G}(s)$  in Eq. (11) of the linear quantum system (8) can be re-written as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{y}_m \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} G_{11} & \cdots & G_{1m} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ G_{m1} & \cdots & G_{mm} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{u}_m \end{bmatrix}, \quad (15)$$

where  $\mathbf{u}_j = [\mathbf{q}_{\text{in},j} \ \mathbf{p}_{\text{in},j}]^\top$  and  $\mathbf{y}_j = [\mathbf{q}_{\text{out},j} \ \mathbf{p}_{\text{out},j}]^\top$ . Let  $\tilde{\mathbb{G}}$  denote the transfer function matrix in Eq. (15). Then we have  $\tilde{\mathbb{G}} = T\mathbb{G}T^\top$  for the permutation matrix  $T = [e_1 \ e_{m+1} \ e_2 \ e_{m+2} \ \cdots \ e_m \ e_{2m}]$ , where  $e_j$  is a column vector whose  $j$ th entry is 1 and all others are zero,  $j = 1, \dots, 2m$ . Let  $\tilde{\mathbb{J}} = T^\top \mathbb{J}_m T = \text{diag}\{\mathbb{J}_1, \dots, \mathbb{J}_1\}$ . According to Eq. (12), we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_{2m} &= -\tilde{\mathbb{J}}\tilde{\mathbb{G}}(-s^*)^\dagger \tilde{\mathbb{J}}\tilde{\mathbb{G}}(s), \\ I_{2m} &= -\tilde{\mathbb{G}}(s)\tilde{\mathbb{J}}\tilde{\mathbb{G}}(-s^*)^\dagger \tilde{\mathbb{J}}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Define  $\tilde{\mathbb{G}}(s)^\# \triangleq -\tilde{\mathbb{J}}_m \tilde{\mathbb{G}}(s)^\dagger \tilde{\mathbb{J}}_m$ . Then, Eq. (16) can be rewritten as

$$I_{2m} = \tilde{\mathbb{G}}(-s^*)^\# \tilde{\mathbb{G}}(s) = \tilde{\mathbb{G}}(s) \tilde{\mathbb{G}}(-s^*)^\#, \quad (17)$$

which are

$$\begin{aligned} I_{2m} &= \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{G}_{11}(-s^*)^\# & \cdots & \tilde{G}_{m1}(-s^*)^\# \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \tilde{G}_{1m}(-s^*)^\# & \cdots & \tilde{G}_{mm}(-s^*)^\# \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{G}_{11}(s) & \cdots & \tilde{G}_{1m}(s) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \tilde{G}_{m1}(s) & \cdots & \tilde{G}_{mm}(s) \end{bmatrix}, \\ I_{2m} &= \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{G}_{11}(s) & \cdots & \tilde{G}_{1m}(s) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \tilde{G}_{m1}(s) & \cdots & \tilde{G}_{mm}(s) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{G}_{11}(-s^*)^\# & \cdots & \tilde{G}_{m1}(-s^*)^\# \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \tilde{G}_{1m}(-s^*)^\# & \cdots & \tilde{G}_{mm}(-s^*)^\# \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

According to Eq. (18), for each  $j = 1, \dots, m$ ,

$$\sum_{k=1}^m \tilde{G}_{kj}(-s^*)^\# \tilde{G}_{kj}(s) = I_2, \quad (20)$$

which means that each input  $\mathbf{u}_j$  must generate some output(s). Similarly, according to Eq. (19), for each  $k = 1, \dots, m$ ,

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \tilde{G}_{kj}(s) \tilde{G}_{kj}(-s^*)^\# = I_2, \quad (21)$$

which means that each output  $\mathbf{y}_k$  must come from some inputs(s). In this sense, Eq. (17) may be regarded as a quantum version of the doubly stochastic matrix in probability theory [81].

### D. Poles, invariant zeros and transmission zeros

In this subsection, the zeros and poles of linear quantum systems are defined. Like Hurwitz stability, controllability and observability defined in Definition 2.1, they are natural generalizations of their classical counterparts.

**Definition 2.2:** ([60, Definition 3.16]) The *invariant zeros of the linear quantum system realization* (8) are the complex numbers  $s_0$ , which satisfy the inequality

$$\text{rank } P(s_0) < \text{normalrank } P(s), \quad (22)$$

where

$$P(s) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \bar{A} - sI & \bar{B} \\ \bar{C} & \bar{D} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (23)$$

**Remark 2.1:** It is worth pointing out that

$$\text{normalrank } P(s) = 2(n + m)$$

always holds for the open linear quantum system (8) due to  $\bar{D} = I_{2m}$ .

As given in [60, Lemma 3.31], let  $s_0$  be an invariant zero, then there exist vectors  $0 \neq x \in \mathbb{C}^{2n}$  and  $u \in \mathbb{C}^{2m}$  such that

$$P(s_0) \begin{bmatrix} x \\ u \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (\bar{A} - s_0 I)x + \bar{B}u \\ \bar{C}x + \bar{D}u \end{bmatrix} = 0. \quad (24)$$

If further  $u = 0$ , then  $s_0$  is a non-observable mode (also called *output-decoupling zero*). On the other hand, there exist vectors  $0 \neq y \in \mathbb{C}^{2n}$  and  $v \in \mathbb{C}^{2m}$  such that

$$[y^\dagger \ v^\dagger]P(s_0) = [y^\dagger(\bar{A} - s_0 I) + v^\dagger \bar{C} \quad y^\dagger \bar{B} + v^\dagger \bar{D}] = 0. \quad (25)$$

If further  $v = 0$ , then  $s_0$  is a non-controllable mode (also called *input-decoupling zero*).

The matrix function  $P(s)$  defined in Eq. (23) can be rewritten in the observability decomposition form

$$\tilde{P}(s) = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{A}_o - sI_{2n-r} & 0 & \bar{B}_o \\ \bar{A}_c & \bar{A}_o - sI_r & \bar{B}_o \\ \bar{C}_o & 0 & \bar{D} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (26)$$

where by the quantum Kalman form (8) with system matrices (13), we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{A}_o &= \begin{bmatrix} A_{co} & A_{21} \\ 0 & A_h^{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{A}_o = \begin{bmatrix} A_h^{11} & A_{13} \\ 0 & A_{\bar{c}\bar{o}} \end{bmatrix}, \\ \bar{A}_c &= \begin{bmatrix} A_{12} & A_h^{12} \\ 0 & A_{31} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{C}_o = [C_{co} \ C_h], \\ \bar{B}_o &= \begin{bmatrix} B_{co} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{B}_o = \begin{bmatrix} B_h \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Clearly, the observable and unobservable eigenvalues are the eigenvalues of  $\bar{A}_o$  and  $\bar{A}_{\bar{o}}$ , respectively.

Thus, the invariant zeros of the linear quantum system realization (8) consist of the eigenvalues of the matrix  $\bar{A}_{\bar{o}}$  and the invariant zeros of the observable subsystem realization or equivalently

$$P_o(s) = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{A}_o - sI_{2n-r} & \bar{B}_o \\ \bar{C}_o & \bar{D} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (28)$$

In control theory, the eigenvalues of the  $A$ -matrix are called the *poles* of the associated state-space realization.

The following result is recalled to prepare for the definition of transmission zeros of linear quantum systems.

**Lemma 2.1:** ([82, Thm. 2.3]) Let  $G(s)$  be a rational matrix function of normal rank  $\ell$ . Then  $G(s)$  may be transformed by a series of elementary row and column operations into a pseudo-diagonal rational matrix  $M(s)$  of the form

$$M(s) = \text{diag} \left\{ \frac{\alpha_1(s)}{\beta_1(s)}, \frac{\alpha_2(s)}{\beta_2(s)}, \dots, \frac{\alpha_\ell(s)}{\beta_\ell(s)}, 0, \dots, 0 \right\}, \quad (29)$$

in which the monic polynomials  $\{\alpha_i(s), \beta_i(s)\}$  are coprime for each  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$  and satisfy the divisibility properties

$$\alpha_i(s) | \alpha_{i+1}(s), \quad \beta_{i+1}(s) | \beta_i(s), \quad i = 1, \dots, \ell - 1. \quad (30)$$

In the control literature,  $M(s)$  is commonly referred to as the Smith-McMillan form of  $G(s)$ ; [51], [60], [82].

In Lemma 2.1, the Smith-McMillan form  $M(s)$  is derived by a series of elementary row and column operations on the transfer matrix  $G(s)$ , which can also be equivalently written as  $M(s) = U(s)G(s)V(s)$ , where  $U(s)$ ,  $V(s)$  are unimodular polynomial matrices in  $s$ .

There are various definitions of transmission zeros in the literature; see for example [57]–[60]. In this paper, we adopt the definition of transmission zeros used in [60].

*Definition 2.3:* ([60, Definition 3.14]) The *transmission zeros* of the transfer function matrix  $G(s)$  are the roots of any one of the numerator polynomials of the Smith-McMillan form given in Lemma 2.1. Moreover,  $s_0$  is called a *blocking zero* if  $\alpha_1(s_0) = 0$ , [56]. In this case,  $M(s_0) \equiv 0$ .

The poles of a transfer function are defined as follows.

*Definition 2.4:* ([60, Definition 3.13]) A complex number  $s_0 \in \mathbb{C}$  is called a *pole* of the transfer function matrix  $G(s)$  if it is a root of any one of the polynomials  $\beta_j(s)$  in the Smith-McMillan (29) form of  $G(s)$ .

*Remark 2.2:* By definition, transmission zeros are defined in terms of transfer functions, while invariant zeros are defined in terms of state-space realizations. However, by [60, Corollary 3.35] a transmission zero must be an invariant zero. Moreover, by [60, Thm. 3.34] the transmission zeros and invariant zeros are identical for minimal system realizations.

The following lemma, which immediately follows Lemma 2.1, presents a useful criterion for  $s_0 \in \mathbb{C}$  being a transmission zero if it is not a pole.

*Lemma 2.2:* ([60, Corollary 3.30]) Let  $G(s)$  be a proper square transfer function matrix such that  $\det[G(s)] \not\equiv 0$ . Suppose  $s_0 \in \mathbb{C}$  is not a pole of  $G(s)$ . Then  $s_0 \in \mathbb{C}$  is a transmission zero of  $G(s)$  if and only if  $\det[G(s_0)] = 0$ .

*Remark 2.3:* Clearly, for open linear quantum systems,  $\det[G(s)] \not\equiv 0$  always holds as  $\mathcal{D} = I_{2m}$ .

### III. ZEROS AND POLES OF LINEAR QUANTUM SYSTEMS

In this section, we study the relation between zeros and poles of linear quantum systems.

#### A. Output-decoupling zeros and input-decoupling zeros

*Proposition 3.1:*  $s_0$  is an output-decoupling zero of the linear quantum system realization (8) if and only if  $-s_0$  is an input-decoupling zero.

*Proof.* Let  $s_0$  be an output-decoupling zero of the linear quantum system realization (8). Then clearly  $s_0^*$  is also an output-decoupling zero. Let the associated vector be  $x$ . That is,

$$\bar{A}x = s_0^*x, \quad \bar{C}x = 0.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{J}_n \mathbb{H}x = s_0^*x, \quad \bar{C}x = 0.$$

Define  $y = \mathbb{J}_n x$ , we have  $y^\dagger \bar{B} = x^\dagger \bar{C}^\top \mathbb{J}_n = 0$  and

$$-s_0 y^\dagger = -s_0 x^\dagger \mathbb{J}_n^\top = -(x^\dagger \bar{A}^\top) \mathbb{J}_n^\top = x^\dagger \mathbb{H} = y^\dagger \bar{A}.$$

Thus,  $-s_0$  is an input-decoupling zero. The converse can be established in a similar way.  $\square$

Noticing that  $s_0^*$  is an eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{A}^\dagger$  if  $s_0$  is an eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{A}$ , the following is an immediate consequence of Proposition 3.1.

*Corollary 3.1:*  $s_0$  is an output-decoupling zero of the linear quantum system realization (4) if and only if  $-s_0^*$  is an input-decoupling zero.

#### B. Transmission zeros and poles

We begin with the following result.

*Proposition 3.2:*  $s_0$  is a pole of the transfer function  $\mathbb{G}(s)$  if and only if  $-s_0^*$  is a transmission zero of  $\mathbb{G}(s)$ .

*Proof.* By [60, Lemma 3.26],  $\mathbb{G}(s)$  can be transformed to its Smith-McMillan form

$$U(s)\mathbb{G}(s)V(s) = M(s) = \text{diag} \left\{ \frac{\alpha_1(s)}{\beta_1(s)}, \frac{\alpha_2(s)}{\beta_2(s)}, \dots, \frac{\alpha_{2m}(s)}{\beta_{2m}(s)} \right\}. \quad (31)$$

$s_0$  being a pole of  $\mathbb{G}(s)$  implies that there exists at least a polynomial  $\beta_i(s)$  satisfying  $\beta_i(s_0) = 0$ . Thus  $s_0$  is a transmission zero of  $\mathbb{G}(s)^{-1}$ ; see e.g., [60, Lemma 3.38]. From Eq. (31) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & V(-s^*)^\# \mathbb{G}(-s^*)^\# U(-s^*)^\# = M(-s^*)^\# \\ & = \text{diag} \left\{ \frac{\alpha_{m+1}^*(-s^*)}{\beta_{m+1}^*(-s^*)}, \dots, \frac{\alpha_{2m}^*(-s^*)}{\beta_{2m}^*(-s^*)}, \right. \\ & \quad \left. \frac{\alpha_1^*(-s^*)}{\beta_1^*(-s^*)}, \dots, \frac{\alpha_m^*(-s^*)}{\beta_m^*(-s^*)} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

By Eq. (12),  $\mathbb{G}(s)^{-1} = \mathbb{G}(-s^*)^\#$ . Consequently,  $s_0$  is also a transmission zero of  $\mathbb{G}(-s^*)^\#$  and therefore there must be a polynomial  $\alpha_j^*(-s_0^*) = 0$  and thus  $\alpha_j(-s_0^*) = 0$  in Eq. (32). As a result,  $-s_0^*$  is a transmission zero. The converse statement can be established in a similar way.  $\square$

Noticing that  $s_0^*$  is a pole of  $\mathbb{G}(s)$  if and only if  $s_0$  is a pole of  $\mathbb{G}(s)$ , Proposition 3.2 can be re-stated as follows.

*Theorem 3.1:*  $s_0$  is a pole of the transfer function  $\mathbb{G}(s)$  if and only if  $-s_0$  is a transmission zero of  $\mathbb{G}(s)$ .

For the transfer function  $G(s)$  defined in Eq. (6) in the complex domain, we have the following result. As the proof is similar to that of Proposition 3.2, it is omitted.

*Corollary 3.2:*  $s_0$  is a pole of the transfer function  $G(s)$  if and only if  $-s_0^*$  is a transmission zero of  $G(s)$ .

*Remark 3.1:* According to Proposition 3.2, the number of transmission zeros equals that of poles of a transfer function.

*Remark 3.2:* According to Proposition 3.2, a purely imaginary pole is also a purely imaginary transmission zero of a linear quantum transfer function matrix and vice versa.

*Example 3.1:* Consider a linear *classical* system with system matrices  $A = B = C = D = I_2$ . Then the transfer function  $\mathbb{G}(s) = \frac{s}{s-1} I_2$ . Clearly, the pole of  $\mathbb{G}(s)$  is 1, while its transmission zero is 0. Thus, Theorem 3.1 in general does not hold for linear classical systems.

The following example demonstrates that the correspondence between transmission zeros and poles given in Theorem 3.1 cannot be used to determine whether a system is quantum or not.

*Example 3.2:* Consider a linear system with transfer function matrix

$$\mathbb{G}(s) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{s-1}{s+1} & 1 \\ 0 & \frac{s+1}{s-1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (33)$$

which satisfies Theorem 3.1. However, it can be verified that Eq. (12) does not hold for this  $\mathbb{G}(s)$ . Thus, the non-commutativity of a linear quantum system gives rise to the correspondence between system poles and zeros as characterized by Theorem 3.1; but on the other hand, not all systems having such properties are valid quantum-mechanical systems.

### C. Invariant zeros and poles

The relations between invariant zeros and poles for linear quantum systems are studied in this subsection.

*Proposition 3.3:*  $s_0$  is an eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{A}$  if and only if  $-s_0^*$  is an invariant zero of the linear quantum system realization (4).

*Proof.*  $s_0$  is an eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{A}$  if and only if  $s_0^*$  is an eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{A}^\dagger$ . Notice that

$$\det [s_0^* I - \mathcal{A}^b] = \det [s_0^* I - J_n \mathcal{A}^\dagger J_n] = \det [s_0^* I - \mathcal{A}^\dagger] = 0. \quad (34)$$

Thus  $s_0^*$  is also an eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{A}^b$ . Since  $\mathcal{D}$  is unitary, it is easy to verify that the following identity holds

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{A} - sI & \mathcal{B} \\ \mathcal{C} & \mathcal{D} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ -\mathcal{D}^{-1}\mathcal{C} & I \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{A} - sI + \mathcal{C}^b\mathcal{C} & \mathcal{B} \\ 0 & \mathcal{D} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (35)$$

where the physical realizability condition of linear quantum systems  $\mathcal{B} = -\mathcal{C}^b\mathcal{D}$  has been used in the derivation. By (35),

$$\begin{aligned} \det[P(s)] &= \det [\mathcal{A} - sI + \mathcal{C}^b\mathcal{C}] \\ &= \det \left[ -sI - \iota J_n \Omega + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{C}^b\mathcal{C} \right] = \det [sI + \mathcal{A}^b]. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Let  $s = -s_0^*$  in Eq. (36), by Eq. (34) we have  $\det[P(-s_0^*)] = 0$ , which means that  $-s_0^*$  must be an invariant zero of the linear quantum system realization (4). Conversely, if  $s_0$  is an invariant zero of the linear quantum system realization (4), then by Eq. (36)  $\det[P(s_0)] = 0$  implies  $s_0$  is an eigenvalue of  $-\mathcal{A}^b$ . Thus,  $-s_0^*$  is an eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{A}$ .  $\square$

For the linear quantum system realization (8) in the real domain, we have the following result, whose proof is omitted.

*Theorem 3.2:*  $s_0$  is an eigenvalue of the matrix  $\bar{A}$  if and only if  $-s_0$  is an invariant zero of the linear quantum system realization (8).

*Example 3.3:* Consider a classical linear system with system matrices  $A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $B = C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ , and  $D = I_2$ . It can be calculated that the Smith-McMillan form of the transfer matrix  $\mathbb{G}(s) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{s}{s-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$  is  $M(s) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{s-1} & 0 \\ 0 & s \end{bmatrix}$ . Thus, the pole and transmission zero of this system are 1 and 0, respectively. Theorem 3.1 does not hold for this linear classical system. Moreover, the eigenvalues of  $A$  are 1 and 2, while it is found that the invariant zeros of this system realization are 0 and 2. Thus, Theorem 3.2 in general does not hold for linear classical systems.

*Remark 3.3:* Obviously, the set of poles of a transfer function is a subset of the eigenvalues of the  $A$ -matrix of a state-space realization, while the set of transmission zeros of a transfer function is a subset of invariant zeros of a state-space realization. Loosely speaking, Theorem 3.2 is a generalization of Theorem 3.1. Thus, in the linear quantum regime, there exist a one-to-one correspondence between poles and transmission zeros of a transfer function and another one-to-one correspondence between eigenvalues of the  $A$ -matrix and invariant zeros of a system realization.

Before going into the main result of this section, Theorem 3.3, we first present an assumption, which is a necessary condition for Theorem 3.3.

*Assumption 3.1:* For the Kalman canonical form (8), we assume that the poles of the “ $h$ ” subsystem and the eigenvalues of the matrix  $A_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}$  are purely imaginary.

*Remark 3.4:* Clearly, Assumption 3.1 holds for linear *passive* quantum systems, see [49], [50]. It also holds for systems that are both controllable and observable, namely minimal realizations. Moreover, as Hurwitz stability implies both controllability and observability ([49, Thm. 3.1]), Assumption 3.1 holds for stable linear quantum systems. Finally, many physical systems satisfy Assumption 3.1; see for example [7], [29], [36]. Nevertheless, there are indeed linear quantum systems whose “ $h$ ” subsystems do not satisfy Assumption 3.1; see Example 4.1 in the next section.

*Theorem 3.3:* Under Assumption 3.1, the set of invariant zeros of the linear quantum system realization (4) is the union of the set of  $\mathcal{A}_{\bar{o}}$  eigenvalues and the set of  $-\mathcal{A}_o^*$  eigenvalues.

*Proof.* By Proposition 3.3, the invariant zeros of the linear quantum system realization (4) are the eigenvalues of  $-\mathcal{A}^b$ . As the set of eigenvalues of  $\mathcal{A}$  can be expressed as a union of the set of observable eigenvalues  $\lambda(\mathcal{A}_o)$  and the set of unobservable eigenvalues  $\lambda(\mathcal{A}_{\bar{o}})$ , it can be verified that the set of eigenvalues of  $-\mathcal{A}^b$  can be also expressed as the union of  $-\lambda^*(\mathcal{A}_o)$  and  $-\lambda^*(\mathcal{A}_{\bar{o}})$  (or equivalently,  $\lambda(\mathcal{A}_{\bar{o}})$  by Assumption 3.1). Thus, the set of invariant zeros of the linear quantum system realization (4) is  $-\lambda^*(\mathcal{A}_o) \cup \lambda(\mathcal{A}_{\bar{o}})$ .  $\square$

*Corollary 3.3:* Under Assumption 3.1, the set of invariant zeros of the linear quantum system realization (8) is a union of the set of  $A_{\bar{o}}$  eigenvalues and the set of  $-A_o$  eigenvalues.

*Proof.* By Theorem 3.2,  $s_0$  is an invariant zero of the linear quantum system realization (8) if and only if  $-s_0$  is an eigenvalue of  $\bar{A}$  if and only if  $s_0$  is an eigenvalue of  $-\bar{A}$ . As  $\lambda(-\bar{A}) = \lambda(-A_o) \cup \lambda(-A_{\bar{o}})$ , and by Assumption 3.1  $\lambda(-A_{\bar{o}}) = \lambda(A_{\bar{o}})$ , we have  $\lambda(-\bar{A}) = \lambda(-A_o) \cup \lambda(A_{\bar{o}})$ . The result follows.  $\square$

In what follows, we take a close look at Assumption 3.1. According to Eqs. (8), (9), and (13), the evolutions of the system variables “ $\mathbf{x}_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}$ ” and “ $\mathbf{p}_h$ ” are not affected by the inputs either directly or indirectly, thus one may wonder whether they are isolated systems. If so, then they evolve unitarily and consequently, all the eigenvalues of the matrices  $A_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}$  and  $A_h^{22}$  must be purely imaginary. Then all the eigenvalues of the matrix  $A_h^{11}$  are also purely imaginary as  $A_h^{11} = -A_h^{22\top}$  [49, Lem. 3.1]. That is, Assumption 3.1 naturally holds. Unfortunately, the above is not true, and in some instances the uncontrollable and unobservable (“ $\bar{c}\bar{o}$ ”) subsystem and the

“ $\mathbf{p}_h$ ” variable are not isolated systems. We take the “ $\bar{c}\bar{o}$ ” subsystem as an example. For the “ $\bar{c}\bar{o}$ ” subsystem, from [49, Lem. 3.3] the matrix  $A_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}$  indeed contains no contribution from the input fields; instead, it is completely determined by the intrinsic system Hamiltonian  $\mathbf{H}$ . In the annihilation-creation operator representation, as discussed in Subsection II-A,  $\mathbf{H} = \frac{1}{2}\check{\mathbf{a}}^\dagger\check{\Omega}\check{\mathbf{a}}$ , where  $\check{\Omega} = \Delta(\Omega_-, \Omega_+)$  is Hermitian with  $\Omega_-, \Omega_+ \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ . The existence of the  $\Omega_+$  term means there is energy input (often called pump in quantum optics) to the system. In other words, in the mathematical modeling, the contribution of the pump is often modeled as part of the intrinsic system Hamiltonian  $\mathbf{H}$  which is represented by the  $\Omega_+$  term, instead an explicit quantum input channel. This is the so-called semi-classical approximation. Thus in reality, the presence of  $\Omega_+$  in the intrinsic system Hamiltonian  $\mathbf{H}$  indicates that the system is not isolated, and thus it does not evolve unitarily and the eigenvalues of the matrix  $A_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}$  may not be purely imaginary. A simple example is a degenerate parameter amplifier (DPA) commonly used in quantum optics. A model of a DPA in the annihilation-creation operator form is as follows ([11, pp. 220]):

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\check{\mathbf{a}}} &= -\frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \kappa & -\epsilon \\ -\epsilon & \kappa \end{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{a}} - \sqrt{\kappa} \check{\mathbf{b}}_{\text{in}}, \\ \check{\mathbf{b}}_{\text{out}} &= \sqrt{\kappa} \check{\mathbf{a}} + \check{\mathbf{b}}_{\text{in}},\end{aligned}$$

which in the real-quadrature operator representation is

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\mathbf{x}} &= -\frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \kappa - \epsilon & 0 \\ 0 & \kappa + \epsilon \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} - \sqrt{\kappa} \mathbf{u}, \\ \mathbf{y} &= \sqrt{\kappa} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{u}.\end{aligned}\quad (37)$$

For this system,  $\Omega_- = 0$ ,  $\Omega_+ = \frac{i\epsilon}{2}$ ,  $C_- = \sqrt{\kappa}$ , and  $C_+ = 0$ . The parameter  $\epsilon$  in  $\Omega_+$  designates the strength of the pump field on the DPA. As for the system variable “ $\mathbf{p}_h$ ”, Example 4.1 in the next section shows that it can be unstable.

The following result gives a sufficient condition under which the eigenvalues of the matrix  $A_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}$  are purely imaginary.

*Proposition 3.4:* Let  $\lambda$  be an eigenvalue of  $A_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}$  and  $x$  be a corresponding eigenvector. If  $x^\dagger \mathbb{J}x \neq 0$ , then  $\lambda$  is purely imaginary.

*Proof.* According to Eq. (8),

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}_{\bar{c}\bar{o}} = A_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}\mathbf{x}_{\bar{c}\bar{o}} + A_{31}\mathbf{p}_h. \quad (38)$$

Integrating both sides of Eq. (38) yields

$$\mathbf{x}_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}(t) = e^{A_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}t}\mathbf{x}_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}(0) + \int_0^t e^{A_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}(t-\tau)}A_{31}\mathbf{p}_h(\tau)d\tau. \quad (39)$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}i\mathbb{J}_{n_2} &= [\mathbf{x}_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}(t), \mathbf{x}_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}(t)^\top] \\ &= e^{A_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}t}[\mathbf{x}_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}(0), \mathbf{x}_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}(0)^\top]e^{A_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}^\top t} \\ &\quad + e^{A_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}t} \int_0^t [\mathbf{x}_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}(0), \mathbf{p}_h(\tau)^\top]A_{31}^\top e^{A_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}^\top(t-\tau)}d\tau \\ &\quad + \int_0^t e^{A_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}(t-\tau)}A_{31}[\mathbf{p}_h(\tau), \mathbf{x}_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}(0)^\top]e^{A_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}^\top t}d\tau \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_0^t e^{A_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}(t-\tau)}A_{31}[\mathbf{p}_h(\tau), \mathbf{p}_h(r)^\top]A_{31}^\top e^{A_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}^\top(t-r)}d\tau dr \\ &= ie^{A_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}t}\mathbb{J}_{n_2}e^{A_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}^\top t},\end{aligned}\quad (40)$$

where the fact that  $[\mathbf{p}_h(\tau), \mathbf{p}_h(r)^\top] = 0$  for all  $0 \leq \tau, r \leq t$  is used. As a result,

$$I = (e^{A_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}t}\mathbb{J}_{n_2})(\mathbb{J}_{n_2}e^{A_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}^\top t})^\top.$$

Let  $\lambda$  be an eigenvalue of the matrix  $A_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}$ , clearly it is also an eigenvalue of the matrix  $A_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}^\top$ . Denote  $x$  an associated eigenvector, then pre-multiplying and post-multiplying Eq.(40) by  $x^\dagger$  and  $x$  respectively yield  $x^\dagger \mathbb{J}_{n_2}x = e^{2\text{Re}(\lambda)t}x^\dagger \mathbb{J}_{n_2}x$ . Consequently, if  $x^\dagger \mathbb{J}_{n_2}x \neq 0$ , then  $\lambda$  is purely imaginary.  $\square$

We end this section with a remark on the eigenvalues of the “ $h$ ” subsystem.

*Remark 3.5:* By [49, Lem. 3.1], the eigenvalues of the “ $h$ ” subsystem are those of the Hermitian matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_h^{11} & 0 \\ 0 & A_h^{22} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -A_h^{22^\top} & 0 \\ 0 & A_h^{22} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (41)$$

Clearly, if the matrix  $A_h^{22}$  is skew-symmetric, then all the eigenvalues of the “ $h$ ” subsystem are purely imaginary.

#### IV. INVARIANT ZEROS AND STRONG LEFT INVERTIBILITY

As an isolated (closed) quantum system evolves unitarily, its temporal dynamics is revertible. For an open linear quantum system  $G$ , it is shown in [78], [79] that its inverse  $G^{-1}$  always exists. In the classical (non-quantum mechanical) control literature, left invertibility is a critical concept in the study of linear systems as it is quite useful in feedforward control [1], [66]–[71]. Recently, it is proved in [1] that if a linear system is (asymptotically) strongly left invertible, then there exists a *stable inversion* such that the input to the original system can be (asymptotically) reconstructed from the output. In this section, we study left invertibility of linear quantum systems. It is worth noting that feedforward control is quite useful in the implementation of measurement-based optical quantum computation [83], [84].

##### A. Left invertibility of linear quantum systems

We first recall the definitions of left invertibility for linear systems.

*Definition 4.1:* ([1, Def. 1]) A classical finite-dimensional linear time-invariant (FDLTI) system

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}(t) &= Ax(t) + Bu(t), \\ y(t) &= Cx(t) + Du(t)\end{aligned}\quad (42)$$

is said to be left invertible if, for  $x(0) = 0$ ,

$$y(t) = 0 \text{ for } t > 0 \implies u(t) = 0 \text{ for } t > 0.$$

*Definition 4.2:* ([1, Def. 5]) The classical finite-dimensional linear time-invariant (FDLTI) system (42) is said to be:

- strongly-(s-)left invertible if for any initial condition  $x(0)$

$$y(t) = 0 \text{ for } t > 0 \implies u(t) = 0 \text{ for } t > 0;$$

- asymptotically strongly-(a.s-)left invertible if for any initial condition  $x(0)$

$$y(t) = 0 \text{ for } t > 0 \implies u(t) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty;$$

- asymptotically strong\* (a.s.\*-)left invertible if for any initial condition  $x(0)$

$$y(t) \longrightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \longrightarrow \infty \implies u(t) \longrightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \longrightarrow \infty.$$

*Remark 4.1:* Clearly, strong left invertibility implies left invertibility. Asymptotic strong-(a.s.-)left invertibility defined above is equivalent to detectability defined in [69, Def. 2]. And correspondingly, Theorem 14 in [1] used in the proof of Lemma 4.1 below is equivalent to [69, Thm. 2].

Similar to Definition 2.1, we say that the linear quantum system (4) is left invertible (resp. strongly-(s.-)left invertible, asymptotically strongly-(a.s.-)left invertible, asymptotically strong\* (a.s.\*-)left invertible) if the corresponding linear classical system (7) is left invertible (resp. strongly-(s.-)left invertible, asymptotically strongly-(a.s.-)left invertible, asymptotically strong\* (a.s.\*-)left invertible).

Due to the special structure of linear quantum systems, we have the following results concerning the relation between their invariant zeros and left invertibility.

*Lemma 4.1:* The linear quantum system (8) under Assumption 3.1 is a.s.-left invertible if and only if the set of  $\bar{A}_o$  eigenvalues is in the right-half plane.

*Proof.* By [1, Thm. 14] and Remark 2.1, a linear quantum system is a.s.-left invertible if and only if the subset of invariant zeros of  $P(s)$  that do not belong to the set of  $(\bar{C}, \bar{A})$ -unobservable eigenvalues is in the left-half plane. By Corollary 3.3, the latter is equivalent to the  $-\bar{A}_o$  eigenvalues are in the left-half plane, which means all the eigenvalues of  $\bar{A}_o$  are in the right-half plane.  $\square$

*Remark 4.2:* Suppose that the linear quantum system (8) under Assumption 3.1 is a.s.-left invertible. Then by Lemma 4.1, the eigenvalues of  $\bar{A}_o$  are all in the right-half plane. By Eq.(27), the eigenvalues of  $A_{co}$  and those of  $A_h^{12}$  are all in the right-half plane. As  $A_h^{12}$  is part of the  $A$ -matrix of the “ $h$ ” subsystem and by Assumption 3.1 the poles of the “ $h$ ” subsystem are all purely imaginary. We arrived at an contradiction. Thus Lemma 4.1 should be modified as the following result.

*Theorem 4.1:* Assume the linear quantum system (8) satisfies 1) there is no the “ $h$ ” subsystem and 2) the eigenvalues of the matrix  $A_{\bar{c}\bar{o}}$  are purely imaginary. Then it is a.s.-left invertible if and only if the set of  $A_{co}$  eigenvalues is in the right-half plane.

*Remark 4.3:* According to Theorem 4.1, if the controllable and observable (“ $co$ ”) subsystem of a linear quantum system (8) is stable, then it is not a.s.-left invertible.

The following example demonstrates that the existence of the “ $h$ ” subsystem does cause problems.

*Example 4.1:* Consider a linear quantum system with  $A = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $B = C = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ , and  $D = I_2$ . This quantum system is physically realizable since  $A + A^\# + BB^\# = 0$ ,  $B = -C^\#D$  ([8], [50], [85]), and is actually an “ $h$ ” system with system Hamiltonian  $\mathbf{H} = \frac{1}{2}x^\top Hx$  and coupling operator  $\mathbf{L} = \Gamma x$ , where  $H = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$  and  $\Gamma = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{bmatrix}$ . Notice that for this system Assumption 3.1 does not hold. On one hand, it is clear that  $A_o = 1$  and thus its only eigenvalue

is 1, which is in the right-half plane. On the other hand, it is straightforward to show that that  $y_2(t) = u_2(t)$  and  $y_1(t) = x_2(t) + u_1(t)$ . If  $y_2 = 0$  for  $t > 0$ , then  $u_2 = 0$  for  $t > 0$ , which indicates that the second output is a.s.-left invertible (even s.-left invertible). However, if  $y_1 = 0$  for  $t > 0$ , then  $u_1(t) = -x_2(t) = -e^t x_2(0)$ , which is divergent for any nonzero initial state  $x_2(0)$ . Thus, this quantum system is not a.s.-left invertible.

*Remark 4.4:* Compared with [1, Thm. 14], Theorem 4.1 is derived with the aid of the special linear quantum systems structure. That is, the equivalent condition is not applied to linear classical systems. Consider a *classical* system with system matrices  $A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $B = \begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ , and  $D = 1$ . Clearly, this system has a *co* subsystem and a “ $\bar{c}\bar{o}$ ” subsystem. Assumption 3.1 holds. The observable eigenvalue is 1, which satisfies the condition “the set of  $A_{co}$  eigenvalues is in the right-half plane” given in Theorem 4.1. However,  $y = 0$  implies that  $u(t) = -e^{2t}u_0$  ( $u_0$  is a constant), which does not converge to zero asymptotically. Thus, this system is not a.s.-left invertible.

*Corollary 4.1:* Let the linear quantum system (8) be a minimal realization. Then it is a.s.-left invertible if and only if the set of  $\bar{A}$  eigenvalues is in the right-half plane or equivalently, all its invariant zeros (which are transmission zeros in this case) are Hurwitz stable.

*Remark 4.5:* Theorem 4.1 and Corollary 4.1 provide conditions for the left invertibility of a linear quantum system by exploring its inner structure. In Subsection IV-B we study this issue. However, it should be noted that the conclusion in Theorem 4.1 and Corollary 4.1 is very strong, it means the “ $co$ ” system must be unstable in order that the system is left invertible.

We conclude this subsection with a final remark.

*Remark 4.6:* By [1, Thm. 15] and Remark 2.1, it is straightforward to obtain that the a.s.-left invertibility and a.s.\*-left invertibility are equivalent to each other for linear quantum systems.

## B. Stable input observers

In this subsection, on the basis of a.s.-left invertibility of the linear quantum system (8) studied in the preceding subsection, we construct input observers which, as implied by Definition 4.2, asymptotically reconstruct the input from its output. Two types of input observers are constructed.

For the first type, we follow the construction procedure proposed in [1]. We look at the the “ $co$ ” subsystem by ignoring the other modes, which is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathbf{x}}_{co}(t) &= A_{co}\mathbf{x}_{co}(t) + B_{co}\mathbf{u}(t), \\ \mathbf{y}(t) &= C_{co}\mathbf{x}_{co}(t) + \mathbf{u}(t), \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Notice that the  $D$ -matrix is a  $2m \times 2m$  identity matrix. By the procedure given in [1, subsec. IV-C], the observer is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\xi}^o &= A_\ell \xi^o + B_{co}\mathbf{y}, \\ u_\ell &= -C_{co}\xi^o + \mathbf{y}, \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where  $A_\ell \triangleq A_{co} - B_{co}C_{co}$ .



*Remark 4.7:* In the input observer constructed in [1, Eq. (37)], there is a feedback gain matrix  $K_\ell$ , and the resulting observer is of the Luenberger type, where the matrix  $K_\ell$  guarantees the asymptotic stability of the input observer. For our linear quantum system (8), as the number of the outputs is equal to the number of the inputs, the input observer (44) has no such matrix  $K_\ell$ . In Theorem 4.2 below we will show that due to the special nature of the invariant zeros of linear quantum systems, the input observer (44) constructed above is actually asymptotically stable.

Define the state estimation error  $\epsilon = \xi^o - \mathbf{x}_{co}$ . Then we have

$$\dot{\epsilon}(t) = A_\ell \epsilon(t). \quad (45)$$

and

$$\mathbf{u}(t) - u_\ell(t) = C_{co} \epsilon(t). \quad (46)$$

*Theorem 4.2:* Under the assumptions in Theorem 4.1, if the linear quantum system (8) is a.s.-left invertible, then it has a stable input observer (44).

*Proof.* Assume the linear quantum system (8) satisfies 1) there is no the “ $h$ ” subsystem and 2) the poles of the  $A_{\bar{c}o}$  subsystem are purely imaginary. If the linear quantum system (8) is a.s.-left invertible, then by Theorem 4.1, the set of  $\bar{A}_o$  eigenvalues is in the right-half plane. In this case, by Theorem 3.2 all the invariant zeros of the observable linear quantum system are in the left-half plane. However,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{A}_o - sI & \bar{B}_o \\ \bar{C}_o & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ -\bar{C}_o & I \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{A}_o - \bar{B}_o \bar{C}_o - sI & \bar{B}_o \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix}.$$

As there is no the “ $h$ ” subsystem, the invariant zeros of the observable linear quantum system realization are exactly the eigenvalues of  $A_\ell = A_{co} - B_{co} C_{co}$ . Thus, all eigenvalues of the matrix  $A_\ell$  are in the left-half plane, and hence the observer (44) is asymptotically stable.  $\square$

*Remark 4.8:* The stable input observer (44) may not be a valid quantum-mechanical system as it may not satisfy the physical realizability conditions. Nevertheless, it is indeed a stable input observer if we focus on the *average* dynamics such as those given in Eq. (7). In other words, replacing  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}$  by their mean values  $\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle, \langle \mathbf{y} \rangle, \langle \mathbf{u} \rangle$ , then we have  $\langle \mathbf{u}(t) \rangle - u_\ell(t) \rightarrow 0$  exponentially as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . In this case, it is a classical stable input observer for a linear classical system. However, due to the absence of the feedback gain matrix  $K_\ell$ , its form is still different from the one in [1, Eq. (37)] (see also [86]). Actually, it is the relation between the invariant zeros and the system poles of quantum linear systems that guarantees its stability.

In contrast to the stable input observer constructed above following the procedure in [1], next we design another type of input observers for a.s.-left invertible linear quantum systems by means of quantum system inversion techniques [78].

Suppose that the intrinsic system Hamiltonian  $\mathbf{H} = 0$  for the linear quantum system realization (8). Then its “ $co$ ” subsystem (43) has the system matrices, [49, Lemma 3.3],

$$\begin{aligned} C_{co} &= V_m \Gamma_{co} = \sqrt{2} \begin{bmatrix} \text{Re}(\Gamma_{co,q}) & \text{Re}(\Gamma_{co,p}) \\ \text{Im}(\Gamma_{co,q}) & \text{Im}(\Gamma_{co,p}) \end{bmatrix}, \\ B_{co} &= \mathbb{J}_{n_1} \Gamma_{co}^\dagger V_m^\dagger \mathbb{J}_m, \\ A_{co} &= -i \mathbb{J}_{n_1} \Gamma_{co}^\dagger J_m \Gamma_{co} / 2 = \frac{1}{2} B_{co} C_{co}. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

By the Kalman canonical decomposition in [50], we know that

$$\mathbf{x}_{co} = V_{n_1} T_{co}^\dagger \check{\mathbf{a}}, \quad (48)$$

where by [50, Lemma 4.3],

$$T_{co} = \begin{bmatrix} Z_1 & 0 \\ 0 & Z_1^\# \end{bmatrix} = \Delta(Z_1, 0) \quad (49)$$

is a unitary and Bogoliubov matrix, i.e.,  $T_{co}^\dagger T_{co} = I_{2n_1}$  (the dimension of the “ $co$ ” subsystem is  $2n_1$ , as evidenced by Eq. (14)) and  $T_{co}^\dagger J_n T_{co} = J_{n_1}$ . Denote ( [49, Remark 3.2])

$$\Gamma_{co} = \begin{bmatrix} \Gamma_{co,q} & \Gamma_{co,p} \\ \Gamma_{co,q}^\# & \Gamma_{co,p}^\# \end{bmatrix}, \quad (50)$$

and by Eq. (48) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L} \\ \mathbf{L}^\# \end{bmatrix} &= \Gamma_{co} \mathbf{x}_{co} = \Gamma_{co} V_{n_1} T_{co}^\dagger \check{\mathbf{a}}_{co} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} \Gamma_{co,q} & \Gamma_{co,p} \\ \Gamma_{co,q}^\# & \Gamma_{co,p}^\# \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & I \\ -I & I \end{bmatrix} T_{co}^\dagger \check{\mathbf{a}}_{co} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} \Gamma_{co,q} - i\Gamma_{co,p} & \Gamma_{co,q} + i\Gamma_{co,p} \\ \Gamma_{co,q}^\# - i\Gamma_{co,p}^\# & \Gamma_{co,q}^\# + i\Gamma_{co,p}^\# \end{bmatrix} T_{co}^\dagger \check{\mathbf{a}}_{co} \\ &= \Delta(\tilde{C}_-, \tilde{C}_+) \check{\mathbf{a}}_{co} = C_{co} \check{\mathbf{a}}_{co}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{C}_- = \frac{\Gamma_{co,q} - i\Gamma_{co,p}}{\sqrt{2}} Z_1^\dagger, \quad \tilde{C}_+ = \frac{\Gamma_{co,q} + i\Gamma_{co,p}}{\sqrt{2}} Z_1^\top. \quad (51)$$

As a result, the minimal linear quantum system (43) in the annihilation-creation operator form is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\check{\mathbf{a}}}_{co}(t) &= \mathcal{A}_{co} \check{\mathbf{a}}_{co}(t) + \mathcal{B}_{co} \check{\mathbf{b}}_{in}(t), \\ \check{\mathbf{b}}_{out}(t) &= C_{co} \check{\mathbf{a}}_{co}(t) + \check{\mathbf{b}}_{in}(t), \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

where

$$C_{co} = \Delta(\tilde{C}_-, \tilde{C}_+), \quad \mathcal{B}_{co} = -C_{co}^\dagger, \quad \mathcal{A}_{co} = -\frac{1}{2} C_{co}^\dagger C_{co}. \quad (53)$$

Because

$$\Gamma_{co} \mathbf{x}_{co} = \Gamma_{co} V_{n_1} \check{\mathbf{a}}_{co} = C_{co} \check{\mathbf{a}}_{co}, \quad (54)$$

we have

$$C_{co} = \Gamma_{co} V_{n_1}. \quad (55)$$

Define a linear quantum system  $P$  with annihilation operators  $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}$  whose intrinsic Hamiltonian  $\mathbf{H} = 0$  and coupling operators are of the form

$$\tilde{\mathbf{L}} = [\tilde{C}_+, \tilde{C}_-] \tilde{\mathbf{a}}. \quad (56)$$

By Eq. (5), the system matrices of the linear quantum system  $P$  in the annihilation-creation operator representation are

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{C} &= \Delta(\tilde{C}_+, \tilde{C}_-) = C_{co} \tilde{J}_{n_1}, \\ \tilde{B} &= -\tilde{C}^\dagger = -J_{n_1} \tilde{C}^\dagger J_{n_1} = -J_{n_1} \tilde{J}_{n_1} C_{co}^\dagger J_{n_1}, \\ \tilde{A} &= -\frac{1}{2} \tilde{C}^\dagger \tilde{C} = \frac{1}{2} \tilde{B} \tilde{C}, \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

where  $\tilde{J}_{n_1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_{n_1} \\ I_{n_1} & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ . The linear quantum system  $P$  in the annihilation-creation operator form is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{a}}}(t) &= \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \tilde{\mathbf{a}}(t) + \tilde{\mathcal{B}} \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{out}(t), \\ \tilde{\mathbf{b}}(t) &= \tilde{C} \tilde{\mathbf{a}}(t) + \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{out}(t), \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

According to [78], the linear quantum system  $P$  is the inverse of the system (52) in the sense that in the frequency domain,

$$P(s)G(s) = I. \quad (59)$$

Next, we show that the linear quantum system  $P$  is Hurwitz stable. By Eq. (57),

$$\tilde{A} = \frac{1}{2}\tilde{B}\tilde{C} = -\frac{1}{2}J_{n_1}\tilde{J}_{n_1}C_{co}^\dagger J_{n_1}C_{co}\tilde{J}_{n_1}, \quad (60)$$

which yields that in the position-momentum quadrature operator representation,

$$\begin{aligned} V_{n_1}\tilde{A}V_{n_1}^\dagger &= -\frac{1}{2}V_{n_1}J_{n_1}\tilde{J}_{n_1}C_{co}^\dagger J_{n_1}C_{co}\tilde{J}_{n_1}V_{n_1}^\dagger \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}V_{n_1}J_{n_1}\tilde{J}_{n_1}V_{n_1}^\dagger\Gamma_{co}^\dagger J_{n_1}\Gamma_{co}V_{n_1}\tilde{J}_{n_1}V_{n_1}^\dagger \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}V_{n_1}J_{n_1}\tilde{J}_{n_1}V_{n_1}^\dagger\mathbb{J}_{n_1}(\mathbb{J}_{n_1}\Gamma_{co}^\dagger V_{n_1}^\dagger\mathbb{J}_{n_1}) \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{J}_{n_1}V_{n_1}J_{n_1}V_{n_1}^\dagger(V_{n_1}\Gamma_{co})V_{n_1}\tilde{J}_{n_1}V_{n_1}^\dagger \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}J_{n_1}B_{co}C_{co}J_{n_1} \\ &= -J_{n_1}A_{co}J_{n_1}. \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

Therefore, if the poles of the “co” subsystem (43) of a given linear quantum system are all in the right-half plane, then the linear quantum system  $P$  is Hurwitz stable. Moreover,  $P$  is actually the inverse of the system (43), that is, it is a stable input observer. In conclusion, under the conditions given in Theorem 4.2 and that the intrinsic Hamiltonian  $\mathbf{H} = 0$ , a stable input observer exists, which is another linear quantum system with system parameters (57).

*Remark 4.9:* To get  $\check{\mathbf{b}}(t) \equiv \check{\mathbf{b}}_{\text{in}}(t)$  in the time domain, Eq. (59) alone is insufficient. We also have to assume zero initial conditions for  $\check{\mathbf{a}}(0)$  and  $\check{\mathbf{a}}(0)$ . However, they are operators on infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces, and are not zero operators. Therefore, the zero initial condition should be understood in the sense of average value. This takes us back to the mean dynamics case. One possible choice is that the initial system states for both the system and the observer are the vacuum states. Being in an initial vacuum state is the quantum counterpart of the zero initial conditions for linear classical systems. Thus, the input observer (58) is for left invertible systems, as defined in Definition 4.1, instead of for strong left invertible systems, as defined in Definition 4.2.

*Remark 4.10:* The first type of input observer, given in Eq. (44), can deal with the plant with nonzero initial state conditions. However, it may not be a valid quantum-mechanical system. In contrast, the construction of the second type of input observer, given in Eq. (58), is indeed a valid quantum-mechanical system. However, the zero initial state condition is necessary for its functionality.

### C. Strong left invertibility

The following result is about the strong left invertibility defined in Definition 4.2.

*Proposition 4.1:* If a linear quantum system has no the “co” subsystem and Assumption 3.1 holds, then it is s.-left invertible.

*Proof.* By [1, Thm. 12], the linear quantum system realization (8) is s.-left invertible if and only if the set of invariant zeros of  $P(s)$  equals the set of  $(\bar{C}, \bar{A})$ -unobservable modes. On the other hand, by Theorem 3.2 established above, the set of invariant zeros of  $P(s)$  equals the set of eigenvalues of  $-\bar{A}$ . Thus, the linear quantum system realization (8) is s.-left invertible if and only if the set of  $(\bar{C}, \bar{A})$ -unobservable modes equals the set of eigenvalues of  $-\bar{A}$ . By Corollary 3.3,  $\lambda(-\bar{A}) = \lambda(-\bar{A}_o) \cup \lambda(\bar{A}_{\bar{o}})$ . Since the linear quantum system has no the “co” subsystem,  $\lambda(\bar{A}_o) = \lambda(\bar{A}_{\bar{o}o})$ , and thus by [49, Lem. 3.1],  $\lambda(-\bar{A}_o) = \lambda(-\bar{A}_{\bar{o}o}) = \lambda(\bar{A}_{\bar{o}\bar{o}}) \subset \lambda(\bar{A}_{\bar{o}})$ . The result follows.  $\square$

*Remark 4.11:* If a linear quantum system has no the “co” subsystem, its transfer function  $\mathbb{G}(s) \equiv I$ . Thus, it has no transmission zeros and poles.

*Remark 4.12:* In [68, Thm. 1.8], a linear system is strongly observable if and only if it has no invariant zeros. In the linear quantum realm, the non-existence of invariant zeros is equivalent to the non-existence of eigenvalues of the  $A$ -matrix. Thus, it means that there is only the  $D$ -matrix. In this case, the conditions of Proposition 4.1 hold naturally. Consequently, the system is s.-left invertible. Thus, in the quantum regime, it seems strongly observability is stronger than s.-left invertibility. The same is true in the classical regime; see [1, Thm. 13] and [68, Thm. 1.8]. Finally, if the linear quantum system in Theorem 4.1 only contains the “co” subsystem and whose poles are all in the right-half plane, then it is strong\* detectable [68, Def. 1.3] and thus has a strong observer [68, Thms. 1.5, 1.6 and 1.12].

## V. FUNDAMENTAL TRADEOFFS BETWEEN SQUEEZING AND ROBUSTNESS

In this section, we study another consequence of pole-zero correspondence of quantum linear systems: tradeoffs between input squeezing and the robustness of the coherent feedback network, as shown in Fig. 2.




Fig. 2. A quantum coherent feedback network composed of two linear quantum systems  $G$ ,  $K$ , and a beamsplitter.

Let the beamsplitter be of the form  $\begin{bmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \beta & -\alpha \end{bmatrix}$  with real parameters  $\alpha, \beta$  satisfying  $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 = 1$ . Assume both the quantum plant  $G$  and controller  $K$  are SISO systems, then the closed-loop transfer function from  $\mathbf{u} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}_q \\ \mathbf{u}_p \end{bmatrix}$  to  $\mathbf{y} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}_q \\ \mathbf{y}_p \end{bmatrix}$  in Fig. 2 is

$$\mathbb{T}(s) = (I + \alpha\mathbb{G}(s)\mathbb{K}(s))^{-1}(\alpha I + \mathbb{G}(s)\mathbb{K}(s)). \quad (62)$$

The squeezing ratio of a quantum input-output system is given by the ratio between the variance of the output quadrature and that of the corresponding input quadrature [87, Sect. 16.3]. If the initial joint system-field state is the vacuum state, then the squeezing ratio of the amplitude quadrature of the coherent feedback network in Fig. 2 at the frequency  $\omega$  is given by  $\frac{\langle \mathbf{y}_q^2(i\omega) \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}_q^2(i\omega) \rangle}$ , and similarly the squeezing ratio of the phase quadrature at the frequency  $\omega$  is given by  $\frac{\langle \mathbf{y}_p^2(i\omega) \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}_p^2(i\omega) \rangle}$ . A zero squeezing ratio is often referred to as *ideal squeezing*.

### A. The coherent feedback network

Assume that  $\Omega$  is purely imaginary and  $C$  is real or purely imaginary for the SISO linear quantum system  $G$ . Then its transfer function matrix associated with the Kalman canonical form (8) is of a diagonal form

$$\mathbb{G}(s) = \text{diag}\{\mathbb{G}_q(s), \mathbb{G}_p(s)\}. \quad (63)$$

By Eq. (12), the transfer matrix  $\mathbb{G}(s)$  satisfies

$$\mathbb{G}_q(s)\mathbb{G}_p(-s) = 1. \quad (64)$$

(See also [74, Eq. (11)].) In fact, the transfer matrix  $\mathbb{G}(s)$  is of the form

$$\mathbb{G}(s) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{s+i\Omega_+ - \frac{1}{2}C_q C_p}{s+i\Omega_+ + \frac{1}{2}C_q C_p} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{s-i\Omega_+ - \frac{1}{2}C_q C_p}{s-i\Omega_+ + \frac{1}{2}C_q C_p} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (65)$$

where  $C_q = C_- + C_+$  and  $C_p = C_- - C_+$ . Clearly, if  $\Omega_+ = \pm \frac{1}{2}C_q C_p$ , then either  $\mathbb{G}_q(s)$  has a zero and simultaneously  $\mathbb{G}_p(s)$  has a pole at the origin, or  $\mathbb{G}_q(s)$  has a pole and simultaneously  $\mathbb{G}_p(s)$  has a zero at the origin. This means that one output quadrature is not affected by the input noise and thus realizes ideal input squeezing at the zero frequency. However, simultaneously the other quadrature output is unstable and diverges to infinity as the frequency tends to 0.

*Example 5.1:* ([88]) Consider a degenerate parametric amplifier (DPA) in Eq. (37). It can be directly calculated that the transfer matrix function is given by

$$\mathbb{G}(s) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{s - \frac{\epsilon}{2} - \frac{\kappa}{2}}{s - \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\kappa}{2}} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{s + \frac{\epsilon}{2} - \frac{\kappa}{2}}{s + \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\kappa}{2}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (66)$$

In the limit  $\epsilon = \pm\kappa$ , the origin is both a zero and a pole. When  $\epsilon = \kappa$ ,  $\mathbb{G}_p(s) = 0$  and thus the ideal input squeezing of the  $p$  quadrature is realized at the zero frequency. However, in this case,  $\mathbb{G}_q(s) = \infty$  which means that the noise in the  $q$  quadrature is infinitely amplified. Similar analysis can be carried out for the case  $\epsilon = -\kappa$ .

Let  $\Omega'$ ,  $C'$  be the parameters of the quantum controller  $K$ , respectively, where  $\Omega'$  is purely imaginary and  $C'$  is real or purely imaginary. Then  $K$  is of the form as  $G$ . In this case, the closed-loop transfer function (62) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{T}(s) &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{T}_q(s) & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbb{T}_p(s) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\alpha + \mathbb{G}_q(s)\mathbb{K}_q(s)}{1 + \alpha\mathbb{G}_q(s)\mathbb{K}_q(s)} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\alpha + \mathbb{G}_p(s)\mathbb{K}_p(s)}{1 + \alpha\mathbb{G}_p(s)\mathbb{K}_p(s)} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

It can be verified that  $\mathbb{T}_q(s)\mathbb{T}_p(-s) = 1$ , which means that the structure in Eq. (64) is preserved in this coherent feedback network; see also [74].

### B. Ideal input squeezing

In this subsection, we study how to realize the ideal input squeezing using the coherent feedback network in Fig. 2.

To realize ideal input squeezing, we need  $\mathbb{T}_j \rightarrow 0$ ,  $j = q$  or  $p$ , which means that either  $\alpha + \mathbb{G}_j\mathbb{K}_j \rightarrow 0$  or  $1 + \alpha\mathbb{G}_j\mathbb{K}_j \rightarrow \infty$ . However,  $1 + \alpha\mathbb{G}_j\mathbb{K}_j \rightarrow \infty$  is equivalent to  $\mathbb{G}_j\mathbb{K}_j \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\alpha \neq 0$ , which means  $\mathbb{T}_j \rightarrow \frac{1}{\alpha} \neq 0$ . Thus, in the sequel, we focus on  $\alpha + \mathbb{G}_j\mathbb{K}_j \rightarrow 0$ ,  $j = q, p$ , to achieve ideal input squeezing.

Take the  $q$  quadrature, for example, we need  $\mathbb{T}_q = 0$ . Suppose that  $\alpha + \mathbb{G}_q\mathbb{K}_q = 0$  in Eq. (67), then from Eqs. (65) and (67) we have

$$\alpha + \frac{s + i\Omega_+ - \frac{1}{2}C_q C_p}{s + i\Omega_+ + \frac{1}{2}C_q C_p} \frac{s + i\Omega'_+ - \frac{1}{2}C'_q C'_p}{s + i\Omega'_+ + \frac{1}{2}C'_q C'_p} = 0. \quad (68)$$

If  $\mathbb{T}_q(s)$  has a zero at the origin, then by Eq. (68) we get

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + \alpha) \left( \frac{1}{4}C_q C_p C'_q C'_p - \Omega_+ \Omega'_+ \right) \\ - (1 - \alpha) \left( \frac{i}{2}C_q C_p \Omega'_+ + \frac{i}{2}C'_q C'_p \Omega_+ \right) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

Similarly, it can be verified that  $\mathbb{T}_p(s)$  producing ideal input squeezing at the zero frequency requires that

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + \alpha) \left( \frac{1}{4}C_q C_p C'_q C'_p - \Omega_+ \Omega'_+ \right) \\ + (1 - \alpha) \left( \frac{i}{2}C_q C_p \Omega'_+ + \frac{i}{2}C'_q C'_p \Omega_+ \right) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

As a result, the coherent feedback network can realize ideal input squeezing at  $s = 0$  under the condition (69) or (70), even if the original plant  $G$  cannot, i.e.,  $\Omega_+ \neq \pm \frac{1}{2}C_q C_p$ ; cf. Eq. (65).

*Remark 5.1:* Notice that both the linear quantum systems  $\mathbb{G}(s)$  and  $\mathbb{T}(s)$  realize quantum BAE measurements. Thus, such systems can achieve perfect squeezing at the zeros of their transfer functions. But to achieve squeezing at a nonzero frequency, conditions are needed on system parameters. More discussions will be given in subsection V-C.

The following two examples demonstrate that the coherent feedback network can realize the ideal input squeezing at the zero frequency by means of a passive controller or an active controller.

*Example 5.2:* We first look at the setup in [89], [90], where  $K$  is 1. The constraints in Eqs. (69) and (70) reduce to

$$\frac{1 - \alpha}{2}C_q C_p \mp i(1 + \alpha)\Omega_+ = 0, \quad (71)$$

which indicates that if  $\alpha = -\frac{i\Omega_+ - \frac{1}{2}C_q C_p}{i\Omega_+ + \frac{1}{2}C_q C_p}$ , then the coherent feedback network in Fig. 2 realizes ideal input squeezing of the  $q$  quadrature at the zero frequency  $\mathbb{T}_q(0) = 0$ , and the noise in the  $p$  quadrature is infinitely amplified  $\mathbb{T}_p(0) = \infty$ . Similar analysis on the ideal input squeezing of the  $p$  quadrature at the zero frequency can be obtained by setting  $\alpha = -\frac{i\Omega_+ + \frac{1}{2}C_q C_p}{i\Omega_+ - \frac{1}{2}C_q C_p}$ .

*Example 5.3:* If the designed controller  $K$  has the same system parameter  $\mathcal{C}$  as the plant  $G$ , that is,  $\mathbb{C}'_q = \mathbb{C}_q$  and  $\mathbb{C}'_p = \mathbb{C}_p$ , then the constraints in Eqs. (69) and (70) reduce to

$$(1 + \alpha) \left( \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{C}_q^2 \mathbb{C}_p^2 - \Omega_+ \Omega'_+ \right) \mp \frac{\imath(1 - \alpha)}{2} \mathbb{C}_q \mathbb{C}_p (\Omega_+ + \Omega'_+) = 0, \quad (72)$$

which yields the system parameter of  $K$

$$\Omega'_+ = \frac{\mp \imath \mathbb{C}_q \mathbb{C}_p (1 + \alpha) \mathbb{C}_q \mathbb{C}_p \mp 2(1 - \alpha) \imath \Omega_+}{2(1 - \alpha) \mathbb{C}_q \mathbb{C}_p \mp 2(1 + \alpha) \imath \Omega_+}. \quad (73)$$

Thus, the coherent feedback network including controller  $K$  with the same system parameter  $\mathcal{C}$  as the plant  $G$  and the pump  $\Omega'_+$  given by Eq. (73) can realize ideal input squeezing at the zero frequency.

According to the ideal input squeezing condition given in Example 5.2, the beamsplitter parameter  $\alpha$  can be solved based on the original plant parameters. However, if the calculated value of  $\alpha$  is not in the interval  $[-1, 1]$ , then the coherent feedback network cannot realize ideal input squeezing at the zero frequency with the aid of the beamsplitter itself. Thus, an active controller proposed in Example 5.3 is needed to realize ideal input squeezing at the zero frequency, which is independent of  $\alpha$ .

### C. Squeezing and sensitivity

In this subsection, we study the tradeoff between ideal input squeezing and closed-loop robustness with respect to parameter variations in the quantum plant  $\mathbb{G}$ .

For the coherent feedback network in Fig. 2, we define

$$\mathbb{S}_j \triangleq \frac{d \log \mathbb{T}_j}{d \log \mathbb{G}_j}, \quad j = q, p, \quad (74)$$

which in fact  $\mathbb{S}$  is of the form

$$\mathbb{S} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{S}_q & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbb{S}_p \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\beta^2 \mathbb{G}_q \mathbb{K}_q}{(1 + \alpha \mathbb{G}_q \mathbb{K}_q)(\alpha + \mathbb{G}_q \mathbb{K}_q)} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\beta^2 \mathbb{G}_p \mathbb{K}_p}{(1 + \alpha \mathbb{G}_p \mathbb{K}_p)(\alpha + \mathbb{G}_p \mathbb{K}_p)} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (75)$$

By definition,  $\mathbb{S}$  describes the sensitivity of the input-output relation  $\mathbb{T}$  with respect to the parameter variations in the quantum system under control. In this sense, in this paper we still call  $\mathbb{S}$  the *sensitivity function*. In fact, this is the original definition of the sensitivity function in the classical control theory ([62, Ch. 4], [91, Sect. 3.4], [61, Eq. (2.24)], [92, Ch. 12]). However, as  $\mathbb{T}$  in Fig. 2 is not the *complementary sensitivity function* commonly used in classical control theory (namely, the transfer function from the reference input signal to system output, see, e.g., [64, Fig. 1] and [92, Fig. 12.9]), the well-known complementarity constraint  $\mathbb{S}(s) + \mathbb{T}(s) \equiv 1$  no longer applies any more. However, since  $\mathbb{T}$  characterizes the input-output squeezing and  $\mathbb{S}$  characterizes the sensitivity of  $\mathbb{T}$  with respect to uncertainties in the quantum plant  $\mathbb{G}$ , it is still meaningful to investigate  $\mathbb{S}(s) + \mathbb{T}(s)$  as it reveals the tradeoff between squeezing and sensitivity.

Re-write the sensitivity matrix function  $\mathbb{S}$  in Eq. (75) as

$$\mathbb{S} = \frac{\mathbb{G}\mathbb{K}}{1 - (\mathbb{G}\mathbb{K})^2} \frac{1 - \mathbb{T}^2}{\mathbb{T}}, \quad (76)$$

provided that  $\mathbb{G}\mathbb{K} \neq \pm I$ . According to Eqs. (67) and (75),

$$\mathbb{S} + \mathbb{T} = \frac{\alpha^2 I + (1 + 2\alpha - \alpha^2) \mathbb{G}\mathbb{K} + (\mathbb{G}\mathbb{K})^2}{(I + \alpha \mathbb{G}\mathbb{K})(\alpha I + \mathbb{G}\mathbb{K})}. \quad (77)$$

Noticing

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha^2 + (1 + 2\alpha - \alpha^2) \mathbb{G}\mathbb{K} + (\mathbb{G}\mathbb{K})^2 \\ &= (\mathbb{G}\mathbb{K} + \frac{1 + 2\alpha - \alpha^2}{2})^2 - \frac{(1 + 4\alpha - \alpha^2)(1 - \alpha^2)}{4}, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\mathbb{S} + \mathbb{T} = \frac{(\mathbb{G}\mathbb{K} + \frac{1 + 2\alpha - \alpha^2}{2})^2 - \frac{(1 + 4\alpha - \alpha^2)(1 - \alpha^2)}{4}}{(I + \alpha \mathbb{G}\mathbb{K})(\alpha I + \mathbb{G}\mathbb{K})}. \quad (78)$$

(Notice that  $\mathbb{G}$ ,  $\mathbb{K}$ ,  $\mathbb{S}$ , and  $\mathbb{T}$  in Eqs. (76)-(78) are all 2-by-2 diagonal matrices. Thus all these equations should be understood as diagonal matrix equations. For example, Eq. (78) is in fact  $\text{diag}\{(\mathbb{S} + \mathbb{T})_q, (\mathbb{S} + \mathbb{T})_p\}$ , where

$$(\mathbb{S} + \mathbb{T})_j = \frac{(\mathbb{G}_j \mathbb{K}_j + \frac{1 + 2\alpha - \alpha^2}{2})^2 - \frac{(1 + 4\alpha - \alpha^2)(1 - \alpha^2)}{4}}{(1 + \alpha \mathbb{G}_j \mathbb{K}_j)(\alpha + \mathbb{G}_j \mathbb{K}_j)} \quad (79)$$

for  $j = q, p$ . We will use this convention in the following discussions.)

If the coherent feedback network in Fig. 2 is designed to realize ideal input squeezing at the frequency  $s_0$  for the input quadrature  $j = q$  or  $p$ , then we need  $\alpha + \mathbb{G}_j(s_0) \mathbb{K}_j(s_0) = 0$  in Eq. (67), but by Eq. (75) this implies the corresponding sensitivity function  $\mathbb{S}_j(s_0) = \infty$ . Thus, if the coherent feedback network is designed to realize ideal input squeezing, then it will be extremely sensitive to the parameter variations in the quantum plant  $G$ . This reveals a fundamental tradeoff between squeezing and system robustness posed by the zeros of the coherent feedback network in Fig. 2. More discussions are given below.

- (i) In the limit  $\alpha \rightarrow \pm 1$ , we have  $\mathbb{S} \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\mathbb{T} \rightarrow \pm I$ , and  $\mathbb{S} + \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \pm I$ . In this case, the output is the input or the input with an additional phase  $\pi$ . This is the trivial case.
- (ii) In the limit  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ , we have  $\mathbb{S} + \mathbb{T} \rightarrow I + \mathbb{G}\mathbb{K}$ . This is the open-loop case.
- (iii) In the limit  $\alpha + \mathbb{G}_j \mathbb{K}_j \rightarrow 0$ ,  $j = q, p$ , this is the ideal input squeezing at the zero frequency case given in Eq. (69) for  $q$  quadrature or Eq. (70) for  $p$  quadrature, respectively. In this case, we have either  $\mathbb{S}(0) \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \infty & \\ & \infty \end{bmatrix}$  and  $\mathbb{T}(0) \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \\ & \infty \end{bmatrix}$  or  $\mathbb{S}(0) \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \infty & \\ & \infty \end{bmatrix}$  and  $\mathbb{T}(0) \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \infty & \\ & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ . In both cases,  $\mathbb{S}(0) + \mathbb{T}(0) \rightarrow \infty$ .
- (iv) In the limit  $I + \alpha \mathbb{G}_j \mathbb{K}_j \rightarrow 0$ ,  $j = q, p$ , we have either  $\mathbb{S}(0) \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \infty & \\ & \infty \end{bmatrix}$  and  $\mathbb{T}(0) \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \infty & \\ & 0 \end{bmatrix}$  or  $\mathbb{S}(0) \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \infty & \\ & \infty \end{bmatrix}$  and  $\mathbb{T}(0) \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \\ & \infty \end{bmatrix}$ . In both cases,  $\mathbb{S}(0) + \mathbb{T}(0) \rightarrow \infty$ .
- (v) (A broader frequency range of  $\mathbb{S} + \mathbb{T}$ .) If  $\mathbb{G}\mathbb{K} \rightarrow -\frac{1 + 2\alpha - \alpha^2}{2}$ , then by Eq. (78)

$$\mathbb{S} + \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \frac{1 + 4\alpha - \alpha^2}{(2 - \alpha)(1 - \alpha^2)}, \quad (80)$$

which indicates that  $\mathbb{S} + \mathbb{T}$  can be a function in terms of  $\alpha$  by choosing proper system parameters, rather than the fixed identity  $\mathbb{S} + \mathbb{T} = I$  in linear classical systems. In this case, there is no ideal input squeezing at any frequencies for either  $q$  or  $p$  quadrature. Since  $\alpha \in (-1, 1)$ , we have  $\mathbb{S} + \mathbb{T} \in (-\infty, \infty)$ . Finally, when  $\alpha = 2 - \sqrt{5}$ , there is a scalar  $s_0$  such that  $\mathbb{S}(s_0) + \mathbb{T}(s_0) = 0$ .

(vi) If  $\alpha^2 + (1 + 2\alpha - \alpha^2)\mathbb{G}\mathbb{K} + (\mathbb{G}\mathbb{K})^2 \rightarrow 0$ , namely,

$$\mathbb{G}\mathbb{K} \rightarrow \frac{\alpha^2 - 2\alpha - 1 \pm \sqrt{(1 + 4\alpha - \alpha^2)(1 - \alpha^2)}}{2}, \quad (81)$$

then  $\mathbb{S} + \mathbb{T} = 0$ .

The above items hold for  $q$  quadrature and  $p$  quadrature separately. In what follows, we derive the statements given in items (iv)-(vi) above.

According to Eq. (78),  $\mathbb{S} + \mathbb{T}$  is a function of the beamsplitter parameter  $\alpha$ . For example, in the  $q$ -quadrature let

$$\mathbb{G}_q\mathbb{K}_q = f(\alpha), \quad (82)$$

which implies that

$$a_2 s^2 + a_1 s + a_0 = 0, \quad (83)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} a_2 &= f(\alpha) - 1, \\ a_1 &= (f(\alpha) - 1)(i\Omega_+ + i\Omega'_+) \\ &\quad + (f(\alpha) + 1)\left(\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{C}_q\mathbb{C}_p + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{C}'_q\mathbb{C}'_p\right), \\ a_0 &= f(\alpha)(i\Omega_+ + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{C}_q\mathbb{C}_p)(i\Omega'_+ + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{C}'_q\mathbb{C}'_p) \\ &\quad - (i\Omega_+ - \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{C}_q\mathbb{C}_p)(i\Omega'_+ - \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{C}'_q\mathbb{C}'_p). \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

First, we analyze item (iv) above.  $1 + \alpha\mathbb{G}_q\mathbb{K}_q = 0$  implies that  $\mathbb{G}_q\mathbb{K}_q = -\frac{1}{\alpha}$ . Thus, inserting  $f(\alpha) = -\frac{1}{\alpha}$  into Eq. (84), we have

$$\begin{aligned} a_0 &= -\frac{1 + \alpha}{\alpha}(-\Omega_+\Omega'_+ + \frac{1}{4}\mathbb{C}_q\mathbb{C}_p\mathbb{C}'_q\mathbb{C}'_p) \\ &\quad - \frac{1 - \alpha}{\alpha}\left(\frac{i}{2}\Omega_+\mathbb{C}'_q\mathbb{C}'_p + \frac{i}{2}\Omega'_+\mathbb{C}_q\mathbb{C}_p\right). \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

Normally,  $1 + \alpha\mathbb{G}_q\mathbb{K}_q = 0$  has a root  $s = 0$  when  $a_0 = 0$ . In this case,  $\mathbb{S}_q(0) = \infty$ , the transfer function  $\mathbb{T}_q(s)$  has a pole at the origin, while the transfer function  $\mathbb{T}_p(s)$  must have a zero at the origin, i.e.,  $\mathbb{T}_p(0) = 0$  and by Eq. (76),  $\mathbb{S}_p(0) = \infty$ . Consequently, there is ideal input squeezing in the  $p$ -quadrature. The case of  $1 + \alpha\mathbb{G}_p\mathbb{K}_p = 0$  can be analyzed similarly.

Next, we analyze item (v) above. In this case,  $f(\alpha) = -\frac{1+2\alpha-\alpha^2}{2}$ . By Eq. (84), we have

$$\begin{aligned} a_2 &= \frac{\alpha^2 - 2\alpha - 3}{2}, \\ a_1 &= \frac{\alpha^2 - 2\alpha - 3}{2}(i\Omega_+ + i\Omega'_+) \\ &\quad + \frac{(\alpha - 1)^2}{2}\left(\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{C}_q\mathbb{C}_p + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{C}'_q\mathbb{C}'_p\right), \\ a_0 &= \frac{\alpha^2 - 2\alpha - 1}{2}(i\Omega_+ + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{C}_q\mathbb{C}_p)(i\Omega'_+ + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{C}'_q\mathbb{C}'_p) \\ &\quad - (i\Omega_+ - \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{C}_q\mathbb{C}_p)(i\Omega'_+ - \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{C}'_q\mathbb{C}'_p). \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

Since  $\alpha \neq -1$ , to realize ideal input squeezing at a frequency  $s_0$  in the  $q$  quadrature, we need  $\alpha + \mathbb{G}_q(s_0)\mathbb{K}_q(s_0) \rightarrow 0$ . Combined with the given condition  $\mathbb{G}_q(s_0)\mathbb{K}_q(s_0) \rightarrow -\frac{1+2\alpha-\alpha^2}{2}$ , yields  $\alpha = \pm 1$ . In both cases,  $\mathbb{T}_q(s_0) = \pm 1$ , which indicates that there is no ideal input squeezing under the assumption of case (v). Since  $\alpha \in (-1, 1)$ ,  $\frac{1+4\alpha-\alpha^2}{(2-\alpha)(1-\alpha^2)} \in (-\infty, \infty)$ . Moreover, for any given  $\alpha \in (-1, 1)$ , Eq. (82) always has a solution. Consequently, by Eq. (78),  $\mathbb{S}_q + \mathbb{T}_q \in (-\infty, \infty)$ . The  $p$ -quadrature case can be studied similarly.

Finally, we analyze item (vi) above, which indicates that  $\mathbb{S} + \mathbb{T} \rightarrow 0$ . As  $\alpha \neq \pm 1$ , inserting  $f(\alpha)$  given by Eq. (81) into Eq. (84), and  $a_0 = 0$  yields that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{(1 - \alpha)^2 \pm \sqrt{(1 + 4\alpha - \alpha^2)(1 - \alpha^2)}}{\alpha^2 - 2\alpha - 3 \pm \sqrt{(1 + 4\alpha - \alpha^2)(1 - \alpha^2)}} \\ &= \frac{2\Omega_+\Omega'_+ - \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{C}_q\mathbb{C}_p\mathbb{C}'_q\mathbb{C}'_p}{i\Omega_+\mathbb{C}'_q\mathbb{C}'_p + i\Omega'_+\mathbb{C}_q\mathbb{C}_p}. \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

Obviously,  $\mathbb{S} + \mathbb{T} \rightarrow 0$  can be realized at the zero frequency by tuning the system parameters in Eq. (87).

The following remark presents the coherent feedback control design comparison between Examples 5.2 and 5.3.

*Remark 5.2:* In Example 5.2, Eq. (82) reduces to

$$\mathbb{G}_q(s) = f(\alpha). \quad (88)$$

As  $f(\alpha) \neq 1$ , Eq. (88) implies that

$$s = \frac{i\Omega_+(1 - f(\alpha)) - \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{C}_q\mathbb{C}_p(1 + f(\alpha))}{f(\alpha) - 1}, \quad (89)$$

which may fail to achieve ideal input squeezing at the zero frequency.

*Example 5.4:* If  $G$  in Fig. 2 is the DPA studied in Example 5.1, and  $K = 1$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{S}_j &= \frac{\beta^2 \left[ (s \mp \frac{\epsilon}{2})^2 - \frac{\kappa^2}{4} \right]}{(1 + \alpha^2) \left[ (s \mp \frac{\epsilon}{2})^2 - \frac{\kappa^2}{4} \right] + 2\alpha \left[ (s \mp \frac{\epsilon}{2})^2 + \frac{\kappa^2}{4} \right]}, \\ \mathbb{T}_j &= \frac{(1 + \alpha)(s \mp \frac{\epsilon}{2}) - (1 - \alpha)\frac{\kappa}{2}}{(1 + \alpha)(s \mp \frac{\epsilon}{2}) + (1 - \alpha)\frac{\kappa}{2}}, \quad j = q, p. \end{aligned} \quad (90)$$

Set

$$\epsilon = \mp \frac{1 - \alpha}{1 + \alpha} \kappa, \quad (91)$$

the ideal input squeezing of the coherent feedback network can be realized in the  $q$  quadrature or  $p$  quadrature at the

zero frequency, while the coherent feedback network will be extremely sensitive to parameter variations.

*Remark 5.3:* By the ideal input squeezing realization condition (91), in  $p$  quadrature we have  $\epsilon = \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}\kappa$ . The beamsplitter parameter can be solved as  $\alpha = \frac{\kappa-\epsilon}{\kappa+\epsilon}$ , which is exactly the critical value  $\alpha_{\text{crit}}$  of the feedback-enhanced squeezing scenario given in [89, Eq. (39)].

*Example 5.5:* Assume that the plant  $G$  and the controller  $K$  are two DPAs with parameters  $\epsilon_i, \kappa_i, i = 1, 2$ , respectively. Then the closed-loop transfer function matrix of the coherent feedback network can be calculated as

$$T_j = \frac{(1+\alpha)\left[(s \mp \frac{\epsilon_1}{2})(s \mp \frac{\epsilon_2}{2}) + \frac{\kappa_1 \kappa_2}{4}\right] - (1-\alpha)\left[\frac{\kappa_1}{2}(s \mp \frac{\epsilon_2}{2}) + \frac{\kappa_2}{2}(s \mp \frac{\epsilon_1}{2})\right]}{(1+\alpha)\left[(s \mp \frac{\epsilon_1}{2})(s \mp \frac{\epsilon_2}{2}) + \frac{\kappa_1 \kappa_2}{4}\right] + (1-\alpha)\left[\frac{\kappa_1}{2}(s \mp \frac{\epsilon_2}{2}) + \frac{\kappa_2}{2}(s \mp \frac{\epsilon_1}{2})\right]}, \quad (92)$$

and the sensitivity function matrix is given in Eq. (93),  $j = q, p$ . Set

$$\kappa_1 \epsilon_2 + \kappa_2 \epsilon_1 = \mp \frac{1+\alpha}{1-\alpha} (\kappa_1 \kappa_2 + \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2). \quad (94)$$

The ideal input squeezing of the coherent feedback network can also be realized in the  $q$  or  $p$  quadrature at zero frequency, while it can be readily shown that the sensitivity of the coherent feedback network will be extremely high to parameter variations.

## VI. CONCLUDING REMARKS AND DISCUSSIONS

In this paper, we investigated the zeros and poles of linear quantum systems. We proved that a linear quantum system is necessarily non-minimum phase if it is Hurwitz stable. We derived necessary and sufficient conditions for the strong left invertibility of linear quantum systems based on their invariant zeros and also constructed stable input observers. Moreover, we examined fundamental trade-offs between input-output squeezing and sensitivity for linear coherent feedback networks. We acknowledge that the research carried out so far in this paper is still preliminary. The following discussions point toward two possible future research directions.

- The proposed two types of stable input observers were constructed on the basis of the pole-zero correspondence for linear quantum systems, which in general does not hold for linear classical systems. In other words, their construction is based on quantum mechanics. However, they should be understood as input observers for average dynamics. Thus, an open question is how to construct a stable input observer for linear quantum systems instead of their average dynamics. Notice that the system variables, input and output variables are operators on infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces, instead of ordinary functions. Moreover, the initial system variables are operators on an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space, which is different from the one for the initial input field operators. Due to this, the well-known results for linear classical systems may not be applicable. For example, according to [60, Cor. 3.37], given a transfer function matrix  $G(s)$  and a minimal realization  $(A, B, C, D)$  of a classical linear system, let  $z_0$  be a transmission zero, but not a pole. For any nonzero vector  $v_0$  of compatible dimension, construct the initial state  $x(0) = (z_0 I - A)^{-1} B v_0$  and the input  $u(t) = v_0 e^{z_0 t}$ , then the output  $y(t) = G(z_0) v_0 e^{z_0 t} \equiv 0$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . This simply does not apply to linear

quantum systems, as  $x(0) = (z_0 I - A)^{-1} B v_0$  does not make sense in the linear quantum regime due to the fact that the initial system variables and the initial input field operators are on different infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces.

- The squeezing and sensitivity analysis conducted thus far in this paper is preliminary too, as the coherent feedback network studied in this paper consists of a SISO quantum plant and a SISO quantum controller. A comprehensive understanding of squeezing and sensitivity analysis and their applications in the design of quantum coherent feedback networks is one of our major future research goals.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors thank the fruitful discussions with Professors Tongwen Chen, Xiang Chen and Long Wang.

## REFERENCES

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. D. Loreto and D. Eberard, "Strong left inversion of linear systems and input reconstruction," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 6, pp. 3612–3617, 2023.
- [2] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [3] H. M. Wiseman and G. J. Milburn, *Quantum Measurement and Control*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [4] H. I. Nurdin and N. Yamamoto, *Linear Dynamical Quantum Systems - Analysis, Synthesis, and Control*. Springer-Verlag Berlin, 2017.
- [5] D. Dong and I. R. Petersen, "Quantum estimation, control and learning: opportunities and challenges," *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 54, pp. 243–251, 2022.
- [6] L. Bao, B. Qi, F. Nori, and D. Dong, "Exponential sensitivity revival of noisy non-Hermitian quantum sensing with two-photon drives," *Physical Review Research*, vol. 6, p. 023216, May 2024.
- [7] N. Yamamoto, "Coherent versus measurement feedback: Linear systems theory for quantum information," *Physical Review X*, vol. 4, no. 4, p. 041029, 2014.
- [8] G. Zhang and Z. Dong, "Linear quantum systems: a tutorial," *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 54, pp. 274–294, 2022.
- [9] L. Bao, B. Qi, and D. Dong, "Stabilizing preparation of quantum gaussian states via continuous measurement," *Automatica*, vol. 164, p. 111622, 2024.
- [10] H. M. Wiseman and G. J. Milburn, "All-optical versus electro-optical quantum-limited feedback," *Physical Review A*, vol. 49, no. 5, pp. 4110–4125, 1994.
- [11] C. Gardiner and P. Zoller, *Quantum Noise*. Springer, 2004.
- [12] D. F. Walls and G. J. Milburn, *Quantum Optics*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- [13] H. Mabuchi, "Coherent-feedback quantum control with a dynamic compensator," *Physical Review A*, vol. 78, no. 3, p. 032323, 2008.
- [14] G. Zhang and M. R. James, "Quantum feedback networks and control: a brief survey," *Chinese Science Bulletin*, vol. 57, no. 18, pp. 2200–2214, 2012.
- [15] I. R. Petersen, "Quantum linear systems theory," in *Proceedings of the 19th International Symposium on Mathematical Theory of Networks and Systems*. Budapest, Hungary, 2010, pp. 2173–2184.
- [16] J. Combes, J. Kerckhoff, and M. Sarovar, "The SLH framework for modeling quantum input-output networks," *Advances in Physics: X*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 784–888, 2017.
- [17] I. R. Petersen, M. R. James, V. Ugrinovskii, and N. Yamamoto, "A systems theory approach to the synthesis of minimum noise non-reciprocal phase-insensitive quantum amplifiers," in *2020 59th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 3836–3841.
- [18] J. Bentley, H. I. Nurdin, Y. Chen, and H. Miao, "Direct approach to realizing quantum filters for high-precision measurements," *Physical Review A*, vol. 103, no. 1, 2021.

$$S_j = \frac{\beta^2 \left[ \left( s \mp \frac{\epsilon_1}{2} \right)^2 - \frac{\kappa_1^2}{4} \right] \left[ \left( s \mp \frac{\epsilon_2}{2} \right)^2 - \frac{\kappa_2^2}{4} \right]}{(1 + \alpha^2) \left[ \left( s \mp \frac{\epsilon_1}{2} \right)^2 - \frac{\kappa_1^2}{4} \right] \left[ \left( s \mp \frac{\epsilon_2}{2} \right)^2 - \frac{\kappa_2^2}{4} \right] + 2\alpha \left\{ \left[ \left( s \mp \frac{\epsilon_1}{2} \right)^2 + \frac{\kappa_1^2}{4} \right] \left[ \left( s \mp \frac{\epsilon_2}{2} \right)^2 + \frac{\kappa_2^2}{4} \right] + \left( s \mp \frac{\epsilon_1}{2} \right) \left( s \mp \frac{\epsilon_2}{2} \right) \kappa_1 \kappa_2 \right\}}, \quad (93)$$

- [19] A. Mátyás, C. Jirauschek, F. Peretti, P. Lugli, and G. Csaba, “Linear circuit models for on-chip quantum electrodynamics,” *IEEE Transactions on Microwave Theory and Techniques*, vol. 59, no. 1, pp. 65–71, 2010.
- [20] D. Bozyigit, C. Lang, L. Steffen, J. Fink, C. Eichler, M. Baur, R. Bianchetti, P. J. Leek, S. Filipp, M. P. Da Silva *et al.*, “Antibunching of microwave-frequency photons observed in correlation measurements using linear detectors,” *Nature Physics*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 154–158, 2011.
- [21] J. Kerckhoff, R. W. Andrews, H. Ku, W. F. Kindel, K. Cicak, R. W. Simmonds, and K. Lehnert, “Tunable coupling to a mechanical oscillator circuit using a coherent feedback network,” *Physical Review X*, vol. 3, no. 2, p. 021013, 2013.
- [22] A. Blais, A. L. Grimsmo, S. Girvin, and A. Wallraff, “Circuit quantum electrodynamics,” *Reviews of Modern Physics*, vol. 93, no. 2, p. 025005, 2021.
- [23] A. C. Doherty and K. Jacobs, “Feedback control of quantum systems using continuous state estimation,” *Physical Review A*, vol. 60, no. 4, p. 2700, 1999.
- [24] C. Sayrin, I. Dotsenko, X. Zhou, B. Peaudecerf, T. Rybarczyk, S. Gleyzes, P. Rouchon, M. Mirrahimi, H. Amini, M. Brune *et al.*, “Real-time quantum feedback prepares and stabilizes photon number states,” *Nature*, vol. 477, no. 7362, pp. 73–77, 2011.
- [25] H. Amini, R. A. Somaraju, I. Dotsenko, C. Sayrin, M. Mirrahimi, and P. Rouchon, “Feedback stabilization of discrete-time quantum systems subject to non-demolition measurements with imperfections and delays,” *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 9, pp. 2683–2692, 2013.
- [26] M. Tsang and C. M. Caves, “Coherent quantum-noise cancellation for optomechanical sensors,” *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 105, no. 12, p. 123601, 2010.
- [27] F. Massel, T. T. Heikkilä, J.-M. Pirkkalainen, S.-U. Cho, H. Saloniemi, P. J. Hakonen, and M. A. Sillanpää, “Microwave amplification with nanomechanical resonators,” *Nature*, vol. 480, no. 7377, pp. 351–354, 2011.
- [28] R. Hamerly and H. Mabuchi, “Advantages of coherent feedback for cooling quantum oscillators,” *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 109, no. 17, p. 173602, 2012.
- [29] C. Dong, V. Fiore, M. C. Kuzyk, and H. Wang, “Optomechanical dark mode,” *Science*, vol. 338, no. 6114, pp. 1609–1613, 2012.
- [30] F. Massel, S. U. Cho, J.-M. Pirkkalainen, P. J. Hakonen, T. T. Heikkilä, and M. A. Sillanpää, “Multimode circuit optomechanics near the quantum limit,” *Nature Communications*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–6, 2012.
- [31] N. Yamamoto, “Decoherence-free linear quantum subsystems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 59, no. 7, pp. 1845–1857, 2014.
- [32] M. Aspelmeyer, T. J. Kippenberg, and F. Marquardt, “Cavity optomechanics,” *Reviews of Modern Physics*, vol. 86, no. 4, p. 1391, 2014.
- [33] C. Ockeloen-Korppi, E. Damskägg, J.-M. Pirkkalainen, A. Clerk, M. Woolley, and M. Sillanpää, “Quantum backaction evading measurement of collective mechanical modes,” *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 117, no. 14, p. 140401, 2016.
- [34] T. M. Karg, B. Gouraud, C. T. Ngai, G.-L. Schmid, K. Hammerer, and P. Treutlein, “Light-mediated strong coupling between a mechanical oscillator and atomic spins 1 meter apart,” *Science*, vol. 369, no. 6500, pp. 174–179, 2020.
- [35] S. Kotler, G. A. Peterson, E. Shojaei, F. Lecocq, K. Cicak, A. Kwiatkowski, S. Geller, S. Glancy, E. Knill, R. W. Simmonds *et al.*, “Direct observation of deterministic macroscopic entanglement,” *Science*, vol. 372, no. 6542, pp. 622–625, 2021.
- [36] L. M. de Lépinay, C. F. Ockeloen-Korppi, M. J. Woolley, and M. A. Sillanpää, “Quantum mechanics-free subsystem with mechanical oscillators,” *Science*, vol. 372, no. 6542, pp. 625–629, 2021.
- [37] R. Sahu, L. Qiu, W. Hease, G. Arnold, Y. Minoguchi, P. Rabl, and J. M. Fink, “Entangling microwaves with light,” *Science*, vol. 380, no. 6646, pp. 718–721, 2023.
- [38] J. K. Stockton, R. Van Handel, and H. Mabuchi, “Deterministic dicke-state preparation with continuous measurement and control,” *Physical Review A*, vol. 70, no. 2, p. 022106, 2004.
- [39] H. I. Nurdin, M. R. James, and I. R. Petersen, “Coherent quantum LQG control,” *Automatica*, vol. 45, no. 8, pp. 1837–1846, 2009.
- [40] T. Astner, S. Nevlacsil, N. Peterschofsky, A. Angerer, S. Rotter, S. Putz, J. Schmiedmayer, and J. Majer, “Coherent coupling of remote spin ensembles via a cavity bus,” *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 118, no. 14, p. 140502, 2017.
- [41] Q. Xu, P. Dong, and M. Lipson, “Breaking the delay-bandwidth limit in a photonic structure,” *Nature Physics*, vol. 3, no. 6, pp. 406–410, 2007.
- [42] Q. He, M. Reid, E. Giacobino, J. Cviklinski, and P. Drummond, “Dynamical oscillator-cavity model for quantum memories,” *Physical Review A*, vol. 79, no. 2, p. 022310, 2009.
- [43] M. Hush, A. Carvalho, M. Hedges, and M. James, “Analysis of the operation of gradient echo memories using a quantum input-output model,” *New Journal of Physics*, vol. 15, no. 8, p. 085020, 2013.
- [44] N. Yamamoto and M. R. James, “Zero-dynamics principle for perfect quantum memory in linear networks,” *New Journal of Physics*, vol. 16, no. 7, p. 073032, 2014.
- [45] H. Nurdin and J. Gough, “Modular quantum memories using passive linear optics and coherent feedback,” *Quantum Information and Computation*, vol. 15, pp. 1017–1040, 2015.
- [46] H. Wiseman and A. Doherty, “Optimal unravellings for feedback control in linear quantum systems,” *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 94, no. 7, p. 070405, 2005.
- [47] M. Guřa and N. Yamamoto, “System identification for passive linear quantum systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, no. 4, pp. 921–936, 2016.
- [48] J. E. Gough and G. Zhang, “On realization theory of quantum linear systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 59, pp. 139–151, 2015.
- [49] G. Zhang, I. R. Petersen, and J. Li, “Structural characterization of linear quantum systems with application to back-action evading measurement,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 65, no. 7, pp. 3157–3163, 2020.
- [50] G. Zhang, S. Grivopoulos, I. R. Petersen, and J. E. Gough, “The Kalman decomposition for linear quantum systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 2, pp. 331–346, 2018.
- [51] H. Aling and J. M. Schumacher, “A nine-fold canonical decomposition for linear systems,” *International Journal of Control*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 779–805, 1984.
- [52] P. Ferreira and S. Bhattacharyya, “On blocking zeros,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 258–259, 1977.
- [53] J. Freudenberg and D. Looze, “Right half plane poles and zeros and design tradeoffs in feedback systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 30, no. 6, pp. 555–565, 1985.
- [54] S. Boyd and C. Desoer, “Subharmonic functions and performance bounds on linear time-invariant feedback systems,” *IMA Journal of Mathematical Control and Information*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 153–170, 1985.
- [55] R. Patel, “On blocking zeros in linear multivariable systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 239–241, 1986.
- [56] B. M. Chen, A. Saberi, and P. Sannuti, “On blocking zeros and strong stabilizability of linear multivariable systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 1051–1055, 1992.
- [57] T. Kailath, *Linear Systems*. Prentice-Hall Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1980.
- [58] C. A. Desoer, F. M. Callier, and F. Callier, *Multivariable Feedback Systems*. Springer-Verlag, 1982.
- [59] F. M. Callier and C. A. Desoer, *Linear System Theory*. Springer Science & Business Media, 1991.
- [60] K. Zhou, J. C. Doyle, and K. Glover, *Robust and Optimal Control*. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1996.
- [61] S. Skogestad and I. Postlethwaite, *Multivariable Feedback Control: Analysis and Design*. John Wiley & Sons, 2010.
- [62] H. W. Bode, *Network Analysis and Feedback Amplifier Design*. D. Van Nostrand, 1945.
- [63] M. M. Seron, J. H. Braslavsky, and G. C. Goodwin, *Fundamental Limitations in Filtering and Control*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [64] J. Chen, S. Fang, and H. Ishii, “Fundamental limitations and intrinsic limits of feedback: An overview in an information age,” *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 47, pp. 155–177, 2019.

- [65] H. Kong and S. Sukkarieh, "An internal model approach to estimation of systems with arbitrary unknown inputs," *Automatica*, vol. 108, p. 108482, 2019.
- [66] P. Moylan, "Stable inversion of linear systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 74–78, 1977.
- [67] G. Zames, "Feedback and optimal sensitivity: model reference transformations, multiplicative seminorms, and approximate inverses," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 301–320, 1981.
- [68] M. Hautus, "Strong detectability and observers," *Linear Algebra and Its Applications*, vol. 50, pp. 353–368, 1983.
- [69] M. Hou and R. J. Patton, "Input observability and input reconstruction," *Automatica*, vol. 34, no. 6, pp. 789–794, 1998.
- [70] T. Sogo, "On the equivalence between stable inversion for nonminimum phase systems and reciprocal transfer functions defined by the two-sided laplace transform," *Automatica*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 122–126, 2010.
- [71] A. Costalunga and A. Piazzì, "A behavioral approach to inversion-based control," *Automatica*, vol. 95, pp. 433–445, 2018.
- [72] R. Romagnoli and E. Garone, "A general framework for approximated model stable inversion," *Automatica*, vol. 101, pp. 182–189, 2019.
- [73] V. K. Mishra, A. Iannelli, and N. Bajcinca, "A data-driven approach to system invertibility and input reconstruction," in *2023 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2023, pp. 671–676.
- [74] M. Yanagisawa, "Zero, pole and fragility of quantum systems," in *2007 46th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 2007, pp. 1216–1220.
- [75] Z. Dong, G. Zhang, and H. W. J. Lee, "On poles and zeros of linear quantum systems," in *2024 IEEE 55th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, accepted, (<https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.03177>), 2024.
- [76] J. Gough and M. R. James, "The series product and its application to quantum feedforward and feedback networks," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 54, no. 11, pp. 2530–2544, 2009.
- [77] —, "Quantum feedback networks: Hamiltonian formulation," *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, vol. 287, no. 3, pp. 1109–1132, 2009.
- [78] J. E. Gough, M. R. James, and H. I. Nurdin, "Squeezing components in linear quantum feedback networks," *Physical Review A*, vol. 81, no. 2, p. 023804, 2010.
- [79] G. Zhang and M. R. James, "On the response of quantum linear systems to single photon input fields," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 58, no. 5, pp. 1221–1235, 2013.
- [80] S. Grivopoulos, G. Zhang, I. R. Petersen, and J. Gough, "The Kalman decomposition for linear quantum stochastic systems," in *2017 American Control Conference (ACC)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1073–1078.
- [81] J. D. Louck, "Doubly stochastic matrices in quantum mechanics," *Foundations of Physics*, vol. 27, no. 8, pp. 1085–1104, 1997.
- [82] J. M. Maciejowski, *Multivariable Feedback Design*. Addison-Wesley, 1989.
- [83] M. V. Larsen, X. Guo, C. R. Breum, J. S. Neergaard-Nielsen, and U. L. Andersen, "Deterministic multi-mode gates on a scalable photonic quantum computing platform," *Nature Physics*, vol. 17, no. 9, pp. 1018–1023, 2021.
- [84] A. Sakaguchi, S. Konno, F. Hanamura, W. Asavanant, K. Takase, H. Ogawa, P. Marek, R. Filip, J.-i. Yoshikawa, E. Huntington *et al.*, "Nonlinear feedforward enabling quantum computation," *Nature Communications*, vol. 14, no. 1, p. 3817, 2023.
- [85] M. R. James, H. I. Nurdin, and I. R. Petersen, " $H^\infty$  control of linear quantum stochastic systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 53, no. 8, pp. 1787–1803, 2008.
- [86] Y. Xiong and M. Saif, "Unknown disturbance inputs estimation based on a state functional observer design," *Automatica*, vol. 39, no. 8, pp. 1389–1398, 2003.
- [87] M. O. Scully and M. S. Zubairy, *Quantum Optics*. Cambridge university press, 1997.
- [88] G. Zhang and M. R. James, "Direct and indirect couplings in coherent feedback control of linear quantum systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 56, pp. 1535–1550, 2011.
- [89] J. E. Gough and S. Wildfeuer, "Enhancement of field squeezing using coherent feedback," *Physical Review A*, vol. 80, p. 042107, 2009.
- [90] C. Bian, G. Zhang, and H. W. J. Lee, "Squeezing enhancement of degenerate parametric amplifier via coherent feedback control," *International Journal of Control*, vol. 85, no. 12, pp. 1865–1875, 2012.
- [91] J. C. Doyle, B. A. Francis, and A. R. Tannenbaum, *Feedback Control Theory*. Courier Corporation, 2013.
- [92] K. J. Aström and R. Murray, *Feedback Systems: An Introduction for Scientists and Engineers*. Princeton university press, 2021.