Dear Editor,

Thank you for sending us the referee’s report. Our response to the referee’s comments and a list of changes are as follows.

Comment from editor: Units are needed unless quantities plotted are dimensionless. The ideal format for units in figures is to set them in parentheses, following the quantity being plotted. Alternatively the units can be included in the figure caption.

Response: quantities in all figures are dimensionless.

Comments from referee:

Comment: I miss a small discussion from the end of the paper on how feasible  
is to experimentally realize such a system.

Response: At the end of the paper, we added a small discussion on the experimental feasibility of the realization of our system.

Comment: How difficult is to create a squeezed vacuum described by Eq.(8)?

Response: In theory, it is plausible to split the squeezed vacuum into two beams and inject them into opposite ends of the waveguide.

Comment: The result that "the final state is just the direct product of the  
steady state of independent atoms" suggests that dipole-dipole  
interaction plays no role. Does this stem from a special property of  
the squeezed vacuum?

Response: The dipole-dipole interaction plays a significant role in the evolution of the system, whose effect is shown in Fig. 4. However, it just doesn’t affect the final steady state.

Comment: What justifies the usage of the rotating wave approximation in  
Eq.(10)?  
Response: The coupling between atoms and the squeezed vacuum is weak, so using rotating wave approximation to get rid of the highly oscillating terms in Eq.(10) is reasonable since the average contribution of those terms is 0.

Comment: What does the following expression mean after Eq.(15)? "k = 1 ∼ N"

Response: k is the subscript for summation, so k adopts the value from 1 to N, and sum them in Eq. (15)

List of changes:

1, At the end of the paper, we added a small discussion on the experimental feasibility of the realization of our system.