Gauge ambiguities in QED: Jaynes-Cummings physics remains valid in the ultrastrong-coupling regime
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Ultrastrong-coupling between an effective two-level system and radiation offers immense potential for advancing both fundamental and applied quantum electrodynamics (QED). Such regimes are identified by the break down of the rotating-wave approximation, which applied to the quantum Rabi model yields the apparently less fundamental Jaynes-Cummings model. However, the implications of gauge-freedom for ultrastrong-coupling QED are yet to be fully recognised. Here we show that when truncating the material system to only two levels, each gauge gives a different effective description whose predictions can vary significantly for ultrastrong-coupling. Rabi models are obtained through specific gauge choices, but so too is a Jaynes-Cummings model without needing the rotating-wave approximation. Analysing a circuit QED setup, we find that this Jaynes-Cummings model is often more accurate than the Rabi model. Thus, Jaynes-Cummings physics is not restricted to light-matter coupling below the ultrastrong limit. Among the many implications of this finding is that the system’s ground state is not necessarily highly entangled, which is usually considered a hallmark of the ultrastrong-coupling regime.

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

Progress in experimental cavity and circuit quantum electrodynamics has granted unprecedented access to the strong, ultrastrong, and deep-strong light-matter coupling regimes [1–12]. Recently circuit QED experiments involving a single LC-oscillator mode with frequency $\omega$ coupled to a flux-qubit with transition frequency $\omega_m$ have realised couplings $g$ as large as $g/\omega$ ranging from 0.72 to 1.34, with $g/\omega_m \gg 1$ [11]. Such regimes offer a new testing ground for the foundations of quantum theory, and offer opportunities for the development of quantum technologies.

Our interest is in material systems that posses anharmonic spectra such that they can be treated as effective two-level systems (qubits). For such systems conventional forms of light-matter interaction Hamiltonian yield the so-called quantum Rabi model (QRM), which consists of a linear interaction between the radiation mode and the qubit. Performing the rotating-wave approximation (RWA) then yields the celebrated Jaynes-Cummings model (JCM), which owing to its simple exact solution, has provided deep physical understanding in a wide range of contexts [13–16]. In the ultrastrong-coupling regime $0.1 < g/\omega < 1$ the RWA is no longer valid [3, 5, 11] and it is therefore widely believed that the Jaynes-Cummings model breaks down. For this reason the QRM is considered indispensable and has found myriad applications in condensed matter, quantum optics, and quantum information theory [17–22]. A disadvantage of the QRM when compared to the JCM is the lack of any simple solution, which makes its physical interpretation more difficult [23]. Despite this difficulty, the QRM is known to possess some markedly different physical features compared to the JCM. For example, the JCM predicts that there is no atom-photon entanglement within the ground state, while the ground state of the QRM is highly entangled within the ultrastrong-coupling regime [24].

It has been shown in the traditional setting of a single atom weakly-coupled to a (multimode) radiation reservoir that number-conserving (JCM-type) light-matter interaction Hamiltonians can be obtained without recourse to the RWA [25–27]. Here, we are concerned with ultrastrong-light-matter coupling attainable for a single radiation mode, whereby the RWA is no longer valid. We show that the breakdown of the RWA in these regimes does not imply a breakdown of the JCM and the ensuing departure from Jaynes-Cummings physics. This finding occurs as an implication of a more general result that corresponding to a given unique light-matter Hamiltonian there is a continuous infinity of non-equivalent two-level models, each of which corresponds to a different choice of gauge.

The prospect of gauge non-invariance when only a subset of states is retained was considered sometime ago in the context of scattering theory [28–32]. Yet, when the coupling is weak it is possible to elicit gauge-invariance through systematically accounting for the effects of the truncation [33], and the choice of gauge has no practical implications for the qualitative physical conclusions. Very recently, the validity of two-level truncations performed in specific gauges has been assessed [34, 35]. However, the fundamental implications of gauge freedom reported here are only revealed by allowing the gauge to be arbitrary. We employ a more general approach than
has been considered previously in which gauge freedom is encoded into the value of a single real parameter. We thereby obtain the most general possible Hermitian interaction operator that is bilinear in qubit and oscillator raising and lowering operators, and which is therefore more general than the JCM or QRM forms. We show that a specific choice of gauge, which we call the JC-gauge, yields a JCM without any need for the RWA. There are also two gauges that yield distinct QRMs.

Our methods are applicable to arbitrary systems in QED including both cavity and circuit QED implementations. To understand the implications of our approach within the ultrastrong-coupling regime we consider in detail a fluxonium—$L_C$ oscillator circuit QED system. The key findings reported here are as follows:

(i) A finite-level truncation of the matter system runs the gauge-invariance of the theory. In the ultrastrong-coupling regime, the predictions relating to the same physical observable are generally significantly different within any two distinct two-level models. However, it remains meaningful to ask which truncation produces the best approximation of the unique physics. We are able to determine the accuracy of approximate two-level models by benchmarking against the unique predictions of the non-truncated (exact and gauge-invariant) theory.

(ii) Each two-level model admits a RWA, which yields a corresponding JCM. The only exception to this occurs in the case of the two-level model associated with the JC-gauge wherein the counter-rotating terms are automatically absent. This JCM is valid far beyond the regime of validity of the RWA as applied to the QRM.

(iii) When focusing on predictions that involve the lowest-lying energy eigenstates of the composite system, the JC-gauge two-level model nearly always outperforms the available QRMs within the regimes of interest. Thus, the JCM can and should be used in various situations previously thought to require use of the QRM.

II. LIGHT-MATTER HAMILTONIAN

We first present our approach within the context of cavity QED. We consider a material system with charge $e$ and mass $m$ described by position and velocity variables $\mathbf{r}$ and $\dot{\mathbf{r}}$ and with potential energy $V(\mathbf{r})$. The material system interacts with an electromagnetic field described by the gauge-invariant transverse vector potential $\mathbf{A}$ and the associated transverse electric field $-\mathbf{E}_T$. The scalar potential $A_0$ accompanying $\mathbf{A}$ is, up to a factor of $e$, the Coulomb potential. As is well-known, the Maxwell-Lorentz equations are invariant under a gauge transformation taking the form $A_0 \rightarrow A_0 - \partial \chi / \partial t$, $\mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{A} + \nabla \chi$ where $\chi$ is an arbitrary function. Here we employ a formulation in which this gauge freedom is contained within a single real parameter $\alpha$, which determines the gauge through the function $\chi_\alpha$. The value $\alpha = 0$ specifies the Coulomb gauge and the associated Lagrangian is denoted $L_0$. More generally the $\alpha$-gauge Lagrangian yielding the same correct equations of motion as $L_0$ is $L_\alpha = L_0 - d\chi_\alpha / dt$. Along with the Coulomb gauge, the Poincaré (multipolar) gauge is also commonly used in atomic physics and is obtained by choosing $\alpha = 1$.

Moving to the Hamiltonian description canonical momenta are defined in the usual way as $p_\alpha = \partial L_\alpha / \partial \dot{\mathbf{r}}$ and $\Pi_\alpha = \delta L_\alpha / \delta \dot{\mathbf{A}}$. Quantisation of the system is carried out using Dirac’s method [36] full details of which are given in supplementary material VII A. Restricting our attention to a single cavity mode and making the electric dipole approximation, which does not effect the gauge-invariance of the theory, the $\alpha$-gauge canonical momenta $p_\alpha$, $\Pi_\alpha$ are such that

$$m \dot{\mathbf{r}} = p_\alpha + e(1 - \alpha)\mathbf{A}, \quad E_T = -\Pi_\alpha - \frac{\alpha e (\mathbf{d} \cdot \mathbf{e})}{v},$$ \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $\mathbf{d} = -e \mathbf{r}$ is the material dipole moment, $v$ denotes the cavity volume, $\omega$ denotes the cavity frequency, and $\mathbf{e}$ is a cavity unit polarisation vector. The Hamiltonian is the sum of material and cavity energies

$$H = H_{\text{matter}} + H_{\text{cavity}},$$ \hspace{1cm} (2)

where $H_{\text{matter}} = m \dot{\mathbf{r}}^2 / 2 + V(\mathbf{r})$ and $H_{\text{cavity}} = e(\mathbf{d} \cdot \mathbf{E}_T) + \omega^2 A_T^2)/2$. The Hamiltonian is expressible in terms of the $\alpha$-gauge canonical operators using Eqs. (1), with the well-known Coulomb-gauge ($\alpha = 0$) and Poincaré-gauge ($\alpha = 1$) forms obtained as specific examples.

The energy is a particular example of a gauge-invariant observable, which in Eq. (2) has been expressed as a function of the elementary gauge-invariant observables $\mathbf{x} = \{ r, \dot{r}, \mathbf{A}, E_T \}$. More generally when written in terms of $\mathbf{x}$ any observable $O$ possesses a unique functional form $O \equiv O(\mathbf{x})$. The theory is gauge-invariant in that the predictions concerning any gauge-invariant observable can be calculated using any gauge and these predictions are unique. The canonical momenta $\{ p_\alpha, \Pi_\alpha \}$ are however, manifestly gauge-dependent in that for each different $\alpha$ they constitute different functions of the gauge-invariant observables $\mathbf{x}$. When written in terms of canonical operators $y_\alpha = \{ r, p_\alpha, \mathbf{A}, \Pi_\alpha \}$, an observable $O$ generally possesses an $\alpha$-dependent functional form $O = o^\alpha(y_\alpha)$. The canonical operators belonging to fixed gauges $\alpha$ and $\alpha'$ are related using the unitary gauge-fixing transformation $R_{\alpha\alpha'} = \exp[i(\alpha - \alpha')\mathbf{d} \cdot \mathbf{A}]$. This implies that distinct functional forms $o^\alpha$ and $o^{\alpha'}$ of the observable $O$ are related according to

$$O = o^\alpha(y_\alpha) = R_{\alpha\alpha'} o^{\alpha'}(y_{\alpha'}) R_{\alpha\alpha'}^{-1} \equiv o^{\alpha'}(y_{\alpha'}).$$ \hspace{1cm} (3)

This equation expresses the uniqueness of physical observables independent of the chosen gauge.
The unitarity of the gauge transformation $R_{\alpha\alpha'}$ also ensures that in all gauges the canonical operators satisfy the canonical commutation relations $[\hat{r}_1, \hat{p}_{\alpha,j}] = i\delta_{1j}$, $[A_\alpha, \Pi_\alpha] = i\varepsilon_\alpha\varepsilon_j/v$ with all remaining commutators between canonical operators being zero. These relations allow us to decompose the state space $\mathcal{H}$ of the light-matter system into $\alpha$-dependent matter and cavity state spaces $\mathcal{H}_m^\alpha$ and $\mathcal{H}_c^\alpha$ such that $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_m^\alpha \otimes \mathcal{H}_c^\alpha$. The eigenstates of the canonical operators $r, p_\alpha$ provide a basis for the material space $\mathcal{H}_m^\alpha$ while the eigenstates of the canonical operators $A, \Pi_\alpha$ provide a basis for the cavity space $\mathcal{H}_c^\alpha$. It is not possible to define gauge-invariant ($\alpha$-independent) light and matter quantum subsystem state spaces directly in terms of the gauge-invariant observables $x$, because Eqs. (1) and the canonical commutation relations imply that $[\hat{r}_{\alpha,i}, \hat{E}_{T,j}] = -i\varepsilon_\alpha\varepsilon_j/v \neq 0$.

The present theory yields unique physical predictions despite the $\alpha$-dependence of the quantum subsystems. This is because the representation of an observable by operators is unique as expressed by Eq. (3), which implies that the average of an observable $\hat{O}$ in the state $\langle \psi \rangle$ is unambiguously $\langle \psi | \hat{O} | \psi \rangle$. The $\alpha$-dependence of the quantum subsystems is however an important feature of the theory, which is made transparent within our formulation. An approximation performed on one of the quantum subsystems will constitute a different approximation in each gauge, and may therefore ruin the gauge-invariance of the theory.

### III. Non-Equivalent Two-Level Models

In conventional approaches a gauge is chosen at the outset and the Hamiltonian is partitioned into matter and cavity bare energies plus an interaction part. Here we follow this same procedure, but with the important exception that the gauge is left open rather than fixed. This is achieved through substitution of Eqs. (1) into Eq. (2), which casts the total Hamiltonian in the form $H = H_m^\alpha(r, p_\alpha) + \int_0^1 \xi d \alpha' H_m^{\alpha'}(A, \Pi_\alpha') + V^\alpha(y_\alpha)$ where $I_m^\alpha$ and $I_2^\alpha$ are the identity operators acting within $\mathcal{H}_m^\alpha$ and $\mathcal{H}_c^\alpha$ respectively. The eigenstates of the bare energies $H_m^\alpha$ and $H_c^\alpha$ span the subsystem state spaces $\mathcal{H}_m^\alpha$ and $\mathcal{H}_c^\alpha$ respectively.

One of the most useful and widespread approximations in light-matter theory is a two-level truncation of the material system whereby only the first two eigenstates of $H_m^\alpha$ are retained. Our approach reveals that this procedure ruins the uniqueness of physical predictions that results from Eq. (3). We will show further that the ensuing ambiguity becomes significant when the light-matter coupling is sufficiently strong. We first define the projection onto the lowest two energy eigenstates $|\xi_0^\alpha\rangle, |\xi_1^\alpha\rangle$ of $H_m^\alpha$ as $P^\alpha = |\xi_0^\alpha\rangle \langle \xi_0^\alpha| + |\xi_1^\alpha\rangle \langle \xi_1^\alpha|$. The material bare-energy admits the two-level truncation $H_{m,2}^\alpha = P^\alpha H_m^\alpha P^\alpha = \xi_0^\alpha + \omega^\alpha_{\alpha} \sigma_\alpha^+ \sigma_\alpha$ where $\omega^\alpha_{\alpha} = \xi_1^\alpha - \xi_0^\alpha$, $\sigma_\alpha^+ = |\xi_1^\alpha\rangle \langle \xi_0^\alpha|$ and $\sigma_\alpha = |\xi_0^\alpha\rangle \langle \xi_1^\alpha|$. In practice two-level model Hamiltonians are found by first defining the interac­tion Hamiltonian as $V_q^\alpha = V^\alpha(P^\alpha y_\alpha P^\alpha)$ and then combining this interaction with the bare energies to obtain the total Hamiltonian $H_2^\alpha = H_{m,2}^\alpha + H_c^\alpha + V_q^\alpha$. If the interaction Hamiltonian $V^\alpha$ is linear in $r$ and $p_\alpha$ then the two-level model Hamiltonian can also be written $H_2^\alpha = P^\alpha H P^\alpha$. In applications the energy, atomic populations and coherences, and various cavity properties are of primary interest. It is however possible to go further by defining the two-level representation of any additional observable of interest $\hat{O}$ as $O_{2}^\alpha = P^\alpha \hat{O} P^\alpha$. Restricting the state space $\mathcal{H}_m^\alpha$ to the two-dimensional subspace spanned by the eigenstates $|\xi_0^\alpha\rangle, |\xi_1^\alpha\rangle$ then completes the construction of the two-level model.

Two-level models corresponding to distinct gauges $\alpha$ and $\alpha'$ must be distinguished, because when $\alpha \neq \alpha'$ the projection $P^\alpha$ involves all eigenstates of $H_m^\alpha$, and similarly $P^{\alpha'}$ involves all eigenstates of $H_m^{\alpha'}$. This is because the gauge transformation does not have product form; $R_{\alpha\alpha'} \neq R_m \otimes R_c$. A pictorial representation of the relationship between different gauges and their associated two-level models is given in Fig. 1. After a two-level truncation the uniqueness of the representation of observables expressed by Eq. (3) no longer holds, that is, $O_{2}^\alpha \neq O_{2}^{\alpha'}$ when $\alpha \neq \alpha'$. Distinct two-level models will therefore give different predictions for the same physical quantity. It is however possible to determine which two-level model is the most accurate through comparison of

![FIG. 1: A pictorial representation of the relationship between the α = 0, α = α_{JC} and α = 1 gauges, and their associated two-level truncations.](image-url)
its predictions with those of the exact (non-truncated) theory. Such a comparison requires that we determine how a given physical state is represented within each two-level model. To achieve this we select an observable $A$ with the property that both the exact representation $A$ and the two-level model representation $A^2$ possess non-degenerate discrete spectra. Denoting corresponding eigenstates by $|A_n\rangle$ and $|A^2_{n}\rangle$, respectively, an arbitrary state $|\psi\rangle = \sum_n \psi_n |A_n\rangle$, $\sum_n |\psi_n|^2 = 1$ within the exact theory, is represented within the $\alpha$-gauge two-level model by $|\psi^\alpha\rangle = \sum_n \psi_n |A^2_{n}\rangle$. The most accurate two-level model for the purpose of predicting the average $\langle \psi | O | \psi \rangle$ of an arbitrary observable $O$ is found by selecting the gauge $\alpha$ for which there is a difference between the exact and two-level model prediction, $z^\alpha |\psi\rangle = |\langle \psi | O | \psi \rangle - \langle \psi^\alpha | O | \psi^\alpha \rangle|$, is minimised.

Since two-level models are indispensable practical tools within cavity and circuit QED it is important to ascertain which two-level models yield the best approximations of observable averages that are of interest in applications. An observable of particular importance is the energy, which we focus on hereafter. Using the conventional definition $H^2_\alpha = \frac{\hbar}{2m} |\omega\rangle \langle \omega | + V(\mathbf{r})$ of the material bare energy, the two-level model defined by the associated projection $P^\alpha$ has Hamiltonian

$$H^2_\alpha = \omega_m \sigma_\alpha^+ \sigma_\alpha^- + \omega_\alpha \left( c_\alpha^\dagger c_\alpha + \frac{1}{2} \right) + \Delta_\alpha + i u^-_\alpha (\sigma_\alpha^+ c_\alpha^- - \sigma_\alpha^- c_\alpha^+ ) + i u^+_\alpha (\sigma_\alpha^+ c_\alpha^- - \sigma_\alpha^- c_\alpha^+ ) \quad (4)$$

where $u^\pm = \pm (\mathbf{d} \cdot \mathbf{e}) |\omega_m + \omega_\alpha | / \sqrt{2 \omega_m \omega_\alpha}$ and $\Delta_\alpha = \epsilon_0 + \alpha^2 (\mathbf{d} \cdot \mathbf{e})^2 / 2v$ is an $\alpha$-dependent zero-point shift. The transition dipole moment $\mathbf{d} = (e \alpha^\dagger | \epsilon \alpha^\dagger |)$, which is assumed to be real, is $\alpha$-independent, because $\mathbf{r}$ commutes with $R_{\alpha \alpha}$. The eigenvalues $\epsilon_0$ and $\epsilon_\alpha$ are chosen corresponding to $|\epsilon_0\rangle$ and $|\epsilon_\alpha\rangle$ respectively, are also $\alpha$-independent because $H^2_\alpha = R_{\alpha \alpha} H^2_\alpha R_{\alpha \alpha}^{-1}$. The $c_\alpha^\dagger$, $c_\alpha^-$ are renormalised cavity ladder operators satisfying $|c_\alpha^\dagger c_\alpha^- | = 1$ with corresponding renormalised cavity frequency $\omega_\alpha = \sqrt{1 + e^2 (1 - \alpha)^2 / m \omega_m^2}$. This renormalisation has the effect of absorbing the term $e^2 (1 - \alpha)^2 \mathbf{A}^2 / 2m$ that results when the Hamiltonian of the interacting system is expressed in terms of $\mathbf{y}_\alpha$, into the definition of the cavity energy.

In general, the Hamiltonian in Eq. (4) is of neither JC nor Rabi form, because $|u^+\alpha\rangle \neq |u^-\alpha\rangle$ and $u^+\alpha \neq 0$ except when particular values of $\alpha$ are chosen. Specifically, two distinct QRMs are obtained for the choices $\alpha = 0$ and $\alpha = 1$, which are nothing but the Coulomb and Poincaré-gauge QRMs frequently encountered in quantum optics. On the other hand, by choosing $\alpha = \alpha_{JC}$, which solves the coupled equations $\alpha_{JC}(\omega_m + \omega_{JC}) = \omega_m$ and $\omega_{JC}^2 = \omega^2 + e^2 (1 - \alpha_{JC})^2 / 2m$ we obtain $u^+_{JC} \equiv 0$ and $u^-_{JC} = -2\omega_{JC}(\mathbf{d} \cdot \mathbf{e}) \omega_\alpha \omega_m / (\omega_{JC} + \omega_m)$ and this choice therefore yields a JC Hamiltonian without any need for the RWA. The JCM derived in this way possesses the same advantage of exact solvability as conventional JCMs obtained as RWAs of the Coulomb and Poincaré-gauge QRMs. However, the states $|\epsilon_{JC}\rangle$, operators $\sigma_{JC}$, and parameters $u_{JC}$, $\omega_{JC}$ are different to their counterparts within conventional JCMs. In particular, the renormalised cavity frequency $\omega_{JC}$ together with the zero-point shift $\Delta_{JC}$ yield a ground state energy that is a non-constant function of the Coulomb-gauge and multipolar-gauge QRM coupling parameters.

There is generally no simple relation between distinct two-level model Hamiltonians $H^\alpha$ and $H^\beta$ when $\alpha \neq \beta$. However, it is possible to explicitly demonstrate that certain two-level model predictions are gauge-invariant up to order $d^2$ (supplementary material VI C). Since such an expansion is clearly a weak light-matter coupling approximation, one expects predictions of two-level models corresponding to different gauges to be significantly different for sufficiently strong coupling.

To see how the relative accuracies of two-level models can be determined let us temporarily restrict our attention to quantities $z^\alpha|O, \psi\rangle$ where $|O\rangle$ denotes the ground state of the composite system. An artificial example in which certain $z^\alpha$ can be calculated exactly consists of a charge confined in all directions except the direction $\mathbf{e}$ of the cavity mode polarisation. In this direction it oscillates harmonically with bare frequency $\omega_m$. In the gauge specified by choosing $\alpha = \alpha_g = \omega_m / (\omega_m + \omega)$, the matter oscillator can be described by ladder operators for which the interaction Hamiltonian takes number-conserving form [25]. The exact ground state $|G\rangle$ is then the vacuum state of these modes, and the projection $P^\alpha$ onto the first two material levels defines a two-level JCM with ground state $|\alpha^\dagger\rangle = P^\alpha |G\rangle$. It follows that $z^\alpha|O, \psi\rangle = 0$ for all $O$ with $O^\dagger = P^\alpha O P^\alpha$. Thus, if the material system is a harmonic oscillator, it is possible to derive a JC that is necessarily more accurate than any derivable QRM for finding ground state averages.

IV. APPLICATION TO ULTRASTRONG COUPLING IN CIRCUIT QED

When considering less artificial systems than a material oscillator the quantities $z^\alpha|O, \psi\rangle$ are typically more difficult to calculate. We now consider an experimentally relevant circuit QED setup consisting of a fluxonium atom coupled to an $LC$-oscillator. The fluxonium is described by the flux variables $\phi$, $\phi$ and the external flux $\phi_{\text{ext}}$, along with three energy parameters $E_c$, $E_J$ and $E_i$ which are the capacitive energy, tunnelling Josephson energy and inductive energy respectively. The external flux $\phi_{\text{ext}} = \pi / 2e$ specifies maximum frustration of the atom. The $LC$-oscillator is described by analogous flux variables $\theta$, $\theta$, with inductance $L$ and capacitance $C$ defining the oscillator frequency $\omega = 1 / \sqrt{LC}$.

In terms of $\mathbf{x} = \{ \phi, \theta, \phi, \theta \}$ the functional form of an observable $O$ is unique $O \equiv O(\mathbf{x})$. On the other hand different canonical operators $y^\alpha = \{ \phi, \xi_\alpha, \theta_\alpha, \zeta_\alpha \}$ are related by $\theta_\alpha = R_{0a}^{-1} \theta_R R_{0a}$ and $\xi_\alpha = R_{0a}^{-1} \xi_R R_{0a}$ where $R_{0a} = e^{i \alpha \zeta \phi}$ is a unitary gauge transformation with $\alpha$
real and dimensionless. The gauge choices $\alpha = 0$ and $\alpha = 1$ are called the charge-gauge and flux-gauge respectively [37]. The Hamiltonian $H$ describing the system is derived in supplementary material VI.B. The projection $P_\alpha$ onto the first two eigenstates $|e^0_\alpha\rangle$, $|e^1_\alpha\rangle$ of the material bare energy $H^\alpha_m$ yields an $\alpha$-dependent two-level model Hamiltonian

$$H^\alpha_2 = \omega_m \sigma^+_\alpha \sigma^-_\alpha + \omega_a \left( c^+_a c_a + \frac{1}{2} \right) + \Delta_\alpha + u_\alpha \left( \sigma^+_\alpha c_a + \sigma^-_\alpha c_a^+ \right) + u^{\dagger}_\alpha \left( \sigma^+_\alpha c^+_a + \sigma^-_\alpha c_a \right).$$

where $u_\alpha^\dagger = \varphi [\alpha \omega_m \mp (1 - \alpha) \omega_a]/\sqrt{2\omega_m L}$ and $\Delta_\alpha = \epsilon_0 + \alpha^2 \varphi^2 / 2L$ in which $\varphi = \langle e^1_\alpha | \phi | e^0_\alpha \rangle = \varphi^*$ and $\epsilon_0$ denotes the ground energy of $H^\alpha_m$. The two-level system parameters $\omega_m$, $\varphi$ and $\epsilon_0$ depend implicitly on $E_c$, $E_f$, $E_l$ and $\phi_{\text{ext}}$. The renormalised cavity frequency is $\omega_c = \omega \sqrt{1 + 2E_c (1 - \alpha)^2 / \epsilon_0^2}$. In further analogy to the cavity QED case the charge and flux-gauges yield distinct Rabi Hamiltonians, but there also exists a value $\alpha = \alpha_{JC} = \omega_m / (\omega_m + \omega_{JC})$ such that $u_\alpha^\dagger \equiv 0$, which casts the Hamiltonian in JC form.

The ratio $\delta = \omega / \omega_m$ in which $\omega_m$ is taken as the qubit transition at maximal frustration $\phi_{\text{ext}} = \pi / 2\epsilon$ specifies the relative qubit-oscillator detuning. To quantify the relative coupling strength we use the ratio $\eta = g / \omega$ where $g = \varphi \sqrt{\omega / 2L}$. The parameters $g$ and $\omega$ are the coupling strength and cavity frequency of the flux-gauge QRM, but we note that the corresponding parameters associated with any other two-level model could also be used. For different $\alpha$ the $\alpha$-dependent two-level truncation yields different predicted behaviour of physical observables as functions of the model parameters $\delta$, $\eta$ and $\phi_{\text{ext}}$. In contrast the exact predictions resulting from the non-truncated model are $\alpha$-independent (gauge-invariant). We begin by determining how the ground energy $G$ and first excited energy $E$ vary with the detuning $\delta$ at maximal frustration $\phi_{\text{ext}} = \pi / 2\epsilon$ and fixed coupling $\eta = 1$ (Fig. 2). Of the two available QRMs the flux-gauge QRM is more accurate for smaller $\delta$ whereby the fluxonium transition is large compared to the oscillator frequency, so the system is more “flux-like”. The charge-gauge QRM is more accurate for large $\delta$ whereby the oscillator frequency is large and the system is more “charge-like”.

Regimes with large $\delta$ are presently more experimentally relevant [11, 38], yet, unless $\delta$ is relatively small ($\delta < 1$), we find that all two-level models become inaccurate in predicting dressed energies $N > E$. Indeed, deviations from the predictions of the QRM have been observed experimentally for dressed energies $N > E$ within the ultrastrong-coupling regime [38]. For the first two-levels however, two level models remain accurate well into the ultrastrong-coupling regime. For these lowest two dressed energies the JC-gauge two-level model gives the best agreement with exact results over the full range of $\delta$ shown in Fig. 2. This can be understood by noting that the JC-gauge interpolates between the flux and charge-gauges.

Hereafter we consider the most experimentally relevant regime $\delta > 1$ [11, 38] by choosing $\delta = 5$. Other detunings may also be considered and various results for the cases $\delta = 1$ (resonance) and $\delta = 1/5$ are presented in supplementary material VI.D, VI.D. In Figs. 3 (a) and 3 (b) we compare the ground and first excited dressed energies found using various two-level models with the

FIG. 2: (a) $E_l = 0.33\mu eV$, $E_f = 10E_l = E_c$, $\phi_{\text{ext}} = \pi / 2\epsilon$ and $\eta = 1$. The ground energy is plotted with $\delta$ for the flux-gauge (gold) and charge-gauge (blue) QRMs, for the JC-gauge two-level model (dashed green), for the exact model (solid red). The inset shows the corresponding results found using the flux-gauge (gold) and charge-gauge (blue) JCIs that are obtained as RWA of the corresponding Rabi models. (b) Same as (a) for the first excited energy.

FIG. 3: In all plots $E_l = 0.33\mu eV$, $E_f = 10E_l = E_c$, $\delta = 5$ and $\phi_{\text{ext}} = \pi / 2\epsilon$. (a) The ground energy is plotted with $\eta$ for the flux-gauge (gold) and charge-gauge (blue) QRMs, for the JC-gauge two-level model (green), for the exact model (solid red), and for the charge-gauge JC obtained via the RWA (dot-dash dark blue). The flux-gauge JC is extremely inaccurate in this regime and is not shown. (b) Same as (a) for the first excited energy. (c) The ground state fidelity $F^\alpha_\alpha$ is plotted with $\eta$ for the flux-gauge $\alpha = 1$ (gold) and charge-gauge $\alpha = 0$ (blue) QRMs, for the JC-gauge (green) and for charge-gauge JC that is obtained as the RWA of the corresponding Rabi model. (d) Same as (c) for the first excited state.
The Lamb transition shift is the difference between the ground and excited energies within the ultrastrong-coupling regime. Indeed, the JC-gauge two-level model is necessarily inaccurate in predicting dressed energies within the ultrastrong-coupling regime. Instead of attempting to obtain accurate lowest energy eigenstates we compute the ground and first excited state fidelities \( F_\alpha^G = |\langle G | \alpha \rangle|^2 \) and \( F_\alpha^E = |\langle E_\alpha | E \rangle|^2 \) where \(|G\rangle\) and \(|E\rangle\) are the exact ground and first excited eigenstates of the non-truncated Hamiltonian \( H \), while \(|G_\alpha^0\rangle\) and \(|E_\alpha^0\rangle\) are the corresponding eigenstates of \( H_\alpha^0 \). Figs. 3 (c) and 3 (d) show that the JC-gauge model is more accurate than both QRM, and much more accurate than conventional JCMs, especially in the case of the ground state.

To link with recent experiments in which circuit properties are measured for varying external flux \( \phi_{ext} \), Fig. 4 shows the behaviour with \( \phi_{ext} \) of the lowest dressed energies when \( \eta = 1/2 \). The JC-gauge again yields the most accurate two-level model (Fig. 4 (a), (b)) despite the clear breakdown of the RWA (Fig. 4 (c), (d)). It follows that Jaynes-Cummings physics is not synonymous with the RWA, and that a departure from Jaynes-Cummings physics is not implied within the ultrastrong-coupling regime. For larger \( \eta \) two-level models become increasingly inaccurate, though the JC-gauge continues to give the best agreement with exact energies even within the deep-strong coupling regime (supplementary material VID1).

Finally, we comment on alternative regimes of detuning, \( \delta = 1 \) and \( \delta = 1/5 \) that are considered in supplementary material VID2 and VID3, respectively. For these smaller values of \( \delta \) the JC-gauge two-level model is again more accurate than conventional JCMs and the charge-gauge QRM. Although the accuracy of the flux-gauge QRM increases significantly the JC-gauge two-level model typically remains more accurate for predictions made in the ground state. However, the flux-gauge QRM remains accurate for levels \( N > E \) provided \( \eta \) does not become too large (supplementary material VID3). We also note that one can consider observables other than the energy. In supplementary material VIE we analyse various oscillator number averages in the states \(|G\rangle\) and \(|E\rangle\). We again find that within the regime of validity of two-level models the JC-gauge two-level model is typically the most accurate.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We have derived arbitrary gauge descriptions of cavity and circuit QED systems comprised of an atomic system interacting with a single oscillator. Each gauge incurs a different approximate model via truncation of the atomic bare-energy eigenstates. These different truncated models can at best be expected to agree up to second order in the atomic dipole moment. The Rabi and Jaynes-Cummings models are special cases of a more general form of interaction. A fluxonium-oscillator system was considered, and the JCM was shown to be accurate beyond the regime of validity of the RWA. It was also found
to be more accurate than the QRM in various situations.

A more general form of two-level model has also been derived in which the gauge is left open. For a specific choice of gauge this model is capable (albeit fortuitously) of exactly predicting a given energy value, but it remains to be understood in more detail. The dependence on arbitrary gauge parameters of weaker truncations such as three-level atomic models remains to be investigated as does the generalisation to multi-mode situations. We note that issues with the single-mode approximation have been recognised and discussed elsewhere [5, 40], but that this approximation does not result in a breakdown of gauge-invariance and does not therefore effect the results reported here. Within exact (non-truncated) models determining the dependence on the gauge parameter of light-matter entanglement, as well as averages of local light and matter observables such as photon number, is of experimental relevance and is important for applications. This is left for further work.
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VI. SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

A. Arbitrary gauge quantisation of the matter-radiation system

In this part of the supplementary material our aim is to start from first principles with the Maxwell-Lorentz system of equations and derive a quantum Hamiltonian, that describes the interaction of a material system with a single-mode of radiation. Throughout the derivation we will carefully keep track of the gauge-freedom that is inherent within the electromagnetic potentials. In doing so we arrive at the final result given in the main text wherein the gauge freedom is parametrised by $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$.

For notational simplicity we used $A$ to denote the transverse component of the vector potential in the main text. However, here we will deal with both the transverse and full vector potentials. We denote the total vector potential by $A$ while its gauge-invariant transverse component is denoted $A_T$. The scalar potential is denoted $A_0$. A gauge transformation of the potentials

$$A_0 \rightarrow A_0 - \chi, \quad A \rightarrow A + \nabla \chi$$

where $\chi$ is arbitrary, leaves the Maxwell-Lorentz equations invariant. By defining $B = \nabla \times A$ the non-dynamical Maxwell equation $\nabla \cdot B = 0$ is satisfied identically. On the other hand the non-dynamical Gauss law $\nabla \cdot E = \rho$ where $\rho$ is the charge density, is a primary constraint, which generates gauge transformations, and which indicates redundancy within the unconstrained theory. The remaining constraint required to eliminate this redundancy is a gauge-fixing condition. As will be made precise in what follows, a convenient method of handling the gauge freedom uses the arbitrary transverse component of the green’s function $g$ for the divergence operator [41, 42];

$$\nabla \cdot g(x, x') = \delta(x - x').$$

We consider bound charges $-e$ and $+e$ where the charge $+e$ is stationary and fixed at the origin. For generality we include an additional external potential $V_{ext}(r)$ acting on the charge $-e$ at $r$. We define the gauge-invariant non-relativistic Lagrangian as [41]

$$L(t) := \frac{1}{2} m \dot{r}^2 - V_{ext}(r) - \int d^3x \left( \rho A_0 - J \cdot A \right) + \frac{1}{2} \int d^3x \left( E^2 - B^2 \right) - \frac{d}{dt} \int d^3x A \cdot P$$

where $\rho(x) = -e\delta(x - r) + e\delta(x)$, $J(x) = -e\delta(x - r)$ and

$$P(x) := -\int d^3x' g(x, x') \rho(x').$$

In (8) $E$ and $B$ are electric and magnetic fields respectively. For each time $t$ the components of these vector fields belong to the real Hilbert space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$. The final term in (8) is a total time derivative, so it does not effect the equations of motion. It does however ensure that the Lagrangian (8) is gauge-invariant. The gauge-invariance of $L(t)$ can easily be verified by making a gauge transformation of the potentials, followed by integration by parts, and then use of the continuity equation $\dot{\rho} = -\nabla \cdot J$.

We identify two constraint functions, which are the Gauss law and a gauge-fixing constraint

$$C_1 := \rho - \nabla \cdot E, \quad C_2 := \int d^3x' g(x', x) \cdot A(x').$$

We thank Zach Blunden-Codd for useful discussions.
The constraint \( C_2 = 0 \) is chosen such that the final term in (8), which is a total time derivative, vanishes. A set of vector potentials satisfying \( C_2 = 0 \) identically, are those such that

\[
A(x) = A_T(x) + \nabla \int d^3x' \mathbf{g}(x', x) \cdot A_T(x') \equiv A_T(x) + A_L(x).
\]

Thus, we can use the components of the gauge invariant transverse vector potential \( A_T \) to specify any total vector potential in the field configuration space that satisfies \( C_2 = 0 \). Notice that the freedom in choosing \( g_T \) implies a concurrent freedom in choosing \( A_L \), but this is necessarily a gauge freedom. This means that the gauge can be specified completely by choosing a particular transverse Green’s function \( g_T \). Since \( A_T \) is the vector potential associated with the Coulomb gauge, we deduce that the scalar potential \( A_0 \) accompanying the vector potential \( A \) given in Eq. (11) is

\[
A_0(x) = \phi_{\text{coul}}(x) - \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int d^3x' \mathbf{g}(x', x) \cdot A_T(x')
\]

where \( \phi_{\text{coul}} \) is, up to a factor of \( e \), the Coulomb potential associated with the charge density \( \rho \). If we substitute Eqs (11) and (12) into (8) and use \( C_1 = 0 \) we obtain

\[
L(t) = L_0(t) - \frac{d}{dt} \chi(t)
\]

where \( L_0(t) \) is the Lagrangian associated with the Coulomb gauge and is given by

\[
L_0(t) = \frac{1}{2} m \dot{r}^2 - V(r) + \int d^3x \mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{A}_T + \frac{1}{2} \int d^3x \left( \mathbf{E}_T^2 - \mathbf{B}^2 \right).
\]

The arbitrary function \( \chi(t) \) appearing in (13) is determined through a choice of gauge \( g_T \), and is given by

\[
\chi(t) = \int d^3x \mathbf{A}_T \cdot \mathbf{P} = \int d^3x \mathbf{A}_T \cdot \mathbf{P}_T, \quad \mathbf{P}(x) := - \int d^3x' \mathbf{g}(x, x') \rho(x').
\]

In Eq. (14) \( V(r) = V_{\text{ext}}(r) + V_{\text{coul}}(r) \) with

\[
V_{\text{coul}}(r) = \frac{1}{2} \int d^3x \rho(x) \phi_{\text{coul}}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \int d^3x \mathbf{E}_L(x)^2 = \frac{1}{2} \int d^3x \mathbf{P}_L(x)^2.
\]

This term includes the divergent Coulomb self-energy of each charge as well as the inter-charge Coulomb energy. Note that since \( L_0(t) \) and \( L(t) \) differ by a total time derivative they necessarily yield the same equations of motion.

We can conveniently parametrise the choice of gauge by restricting our attention to functions \( g_T \) that have the form

\[
g_{T, i}(x, x') := -\alpha \int_0^1 d\lambda \lambda x'_j \delta^T_{ij}(x - \lambda x')
\]

where \( \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \) is arbitrary. When \( \alpha = 0 \) we have \( A = A_T \), which specifies the Coulomb gauge. When \( \alpha = 1 \) Eqs. (9) and (17) yield the well-known multipolar transverse polarisation field in closed form

\[
P_{T, i}(x)|_{\alpha = 1} = P_{\text{mult, } i}(x) = -e \int_0^1 d\lambda x_j \delta^T_{ij}(x - \lambda x).
\]

This polarisation field represents a continuum of infinitesimal dipoles each consisting of charges \(+e\) and \( -e \) that are stacked end-on-end, and which start at the charge \(+e\) located at \( \mathbf{0} \) and end at the charge \(-e\) located at \( \mathbf{r} \). The vector potential corresponding to \( \alpha = 1 \) is

\[
A(x) = A_T(x) - \nabla \int_0^1 d\lambda x \cdot A_T(\lambda x),
\]

which satisfies \( x \cdot A(x) = 0 \). Denoting the Fourier transform of \( A \) by \( \hat{A} \) we see that \( x \cdot A(x) = 0 \) is the position-space version of the condition \( \mathbf{k} \cdot \hat{A}(\mathbf{k}) = 0 \) that defines the Coulomb gauge. The gauge defined by \( x \cdot A(x) = 0 \) is called the Poincaré or multipolar gauge [30].
With the restriction (17) the Lagrangian (13) becomes
\[ L(t) \equiv L_\alpha(t) = L_0(t) - \frac{d}{dt} \chi_\alpha(t) \] (20)
where
\[ \chi_\alpha(t) = \alpha \int d^3x A_T \cdot P_{\text{mult}}. \] (21)

Using \( L_\alpha(t) \) we can define the following canonical momenta
\[ p_\alpha = \frac{\partial L_\alpha}{\partial \dot{r}} = m\dot{r} - eA_T(r) + \alpha \nabla \int_0^1 d\lambda \; r \cdot A_T(\lambda r), \quad \Pi_{T,\alpha} = \frac{\delta L_\alpha}{\delta \dot{A}_T} = \dot{A}_T - \alpha P_{\text{mult}} = -E_T - \alpha P_{\text{mult}} \] (22)

where in finding the expression for \( p_\alpha \) we have used
\[ -\frac{\partial}{\partial \dot{r}} \frac{d\chi_\alpha}{dt} = e\alpha \int_0^1 d\lambda \left[ A_T(\lambda r) + r, \nabla A_{T,i}(\lambda r) \right] = e\alpha \nabla \int_0^1 d\lambda \; r \cdot A_T(\lambda r). \] (23)

Here the repeated index is summed and the first equality follows from (21) and the chain rule
\[ \frac{d}{dt} A_{T,i}(\lambda r(t), t) = \dot{A}_{T,i}(\lambda r(t), t) + \dot{r}(t) \cdot \nabla A_{T,i}(\lambda r(t), t). \] (24)

Although we have been able to exhibit expressions for the canonical momenta in an arbitrary gauge \( \alpha \), in order to pass to the canonical formalism we need to determine the algebraic properties of the canonical momenta and the position variables \( r \) and \( A_T \). The Lie algebra of these variables must be consistent with the constraints, and must also suffice to obtain the correct equations of motion once we have obtained the Hamiltonian. Before we impose the constraints \( C_1 = 0 = C_2 \) and before we commit to the specific form of \( g_T \) given in Eq. (17), we will quantise the classical description while keeping \( g_T \) completely arbitrary. This is achieved using Dirac’s method \[36\], which yields the Hamiltonian
\[ H = \frac{1}{2m} \left( \mathbf{p} + e \left[ A_T(r) + \nabla \int d^3x \; g(x, r) \cdot A_T(x) \right] \right)^2 + V(r) + \frac{1}{2} \int d^3x \left[ \left( \Pi_T - \int d^3x' \; g_T(x, x') \rho(x') \right)^2 + (\nabla \times A_T)^2 \right] \] (25)

where the canonical variables \( \{ r, p, A_T, \Pi_T \} \) are fully specified by the commutation relations
\[ [r_i, p_j] = i\delta_{ij}, \quad [A_{T,i}(x), \Pi_{T,j}(x')] = i\delta_{ij}'(x - x'). \] (26)

All other commutators between elements of \( \{ r, p, A_T, \Pi_T \} \) vanish identically. All observables are expressed as functions of these operators and the relations (26) and the Hamiltonian (25) provide all that is needed to obtain the time evolution of a given observable. In particular it is straightforward to verify that the Hamiltonian (25) yields the correct Maxwell-Lorentz equations. The gauge-invariant vector potential \( A_T \) appearing in (25) belongs to the Coulomb gauge in the sense that \( A \equiv A_T \) in this gauge, but the Hamiltonian itself has been expressed in an arbitrary gauge \( g \), which is determined by \( g_T \). Using the Heisenberg equation we see that the arbitrary \( g \)-gauge canonical momenta \( p \) and \( \Pi_T \) can be identified in terms of the gauge-invariant observables \( \{ r, A_T, \dot{r}, \dot{A}_T = -E_T \} \), and the gauge dependent function \( g_T \), as
\[ p = m\dot{r} - e \left( A_T(r) + \nabla \int d^3x \; g_T(x, r) \cdot A_T(x) \right) \equiv m\dot{r} - eA_T(r), \quad \Pi_T(x) = -E_T(x) - P_T(x) \] (27)

where \( P_T \) is given by (9). This shows clearly that the canonical momenta \( p \) and \( \Pi_T \) are manifestly gauge-dependent. Upon restricting ourselves to the specific form of \( g_T \) given in (17) the canonical momenta in (27) are seen to coincide with those given in (22). Using (27) we see that in any gauge \( H \) can be written entirely in terms of gauge-invariant observables as the sum of material and field energies;
\[ H = H_{\text{mat}} + H_{\text{field}}, \quad H_{\text{mat}} := \frac{1}{2} m\dot{r}^2 + V(r), \quad H_{\text{field}} := \frac{1}{2} \int d^3x \; (E_T^2 + B^2). \] (28)
A unitary gauge-fixing transformation out of the gauge $g$ to the gauge $g'$ can be defined as

$$R_{gg'} := \exp \left[ i \int d^3x \left( \mathbf{P}_{g'}(x) - \mathbf{P}_g(x) \right) \cdot \mathbf{A}_T(x) \right]$$

(29)

where $\mathbf{P}_g$ is defined using (9) and the function $g$, while $\mathbf{P}_{g'}$ is defined using the alternative choice $g'$. Let us now return to the specific form of $\mathbf{g}_T$ given in (17), wherein the freedom to choose a gauge reduces to the freedom to choose the value of the real parameter $\alpha$. In terms of this form of $\mathbf{g}_T$ the canonical momenta and Hamiltonian are found using Eqs. (27) and (25). As noted previously, in this case the canonical momenta are seen to coincide with those given in (22). The unitary gauge-fixing transformation between different gauges $\alpha$ and $\alpha'$ takes the form of a generalised Power-Zienau-Woolley transformation:

$$R_{\alpha\alpha'} := \exp \left[ i(\alpha - \alpha') \int d^3x \mathbf{P}_{\text{mult}}(x) \cdot \mathbf{A}_T(x) \right].$$

(30)

The usual Power-Zienau-Woolley transformation, which is used to relate the Coulomb and Poincaré gauges is obtained if $\alpha - \alpha' = 1$. The $\alpha$-gauge polarisation field is $\alpha\mathbf{P}_{\text{mult}}$. A multipole expansion of the polarisation field allows one to perform the electric-dipole approximation as $P^{\text{EDA}}_{\text{mult},ij} = -e_r \delta^{T}_{ij}(x)$. Equivalently, the dipole approximation can be realised via

$$g^{\text{EDA}}_{T,ij}(x, x') = -\alpha x'_j \delta^{T}_{ij}(x).$$

(31)

The dipole approximated $\alpha$-gauge canonical momenta can then be read-off from (27) as

$$\mathbf{p}_\alpha = m \mathbf{\tilde{r}} - e(1 - \alpha) \mathbf{A}_T(0), \quad \Pi_{T,\alpha,ij}(x) = -E_{T,ij}(x) - \alpha d_j \delta^{T}_{ij}(x)$$

(32)

where $d = -e\mathbf{r}$. The unitary gauge-fixing transformation becomes

$$R_{\alpha\alpha'} := \exp \left[ i(\alpha - \alpha') \mathbf{d} \cdot \mathbf{A}_T(0) \right].$$

(33)

Since the gauge-fixing transformation remains unitary the dipole approximation does not destroy the gauge-invariance of the theory. The dipole approximated Hamiltonian is

$$H = \frac{1}{2m} |\mathbf{p}_\alpha + e(1 - \alpha) \mathbf{A}_T(0)|^2 + V(\mathbf{r}) + \frac{1}{2} \int d^3x \left( |\Pi_{T,\alpha,ij}(x) + \alpha d_j \delta^{T}_{ij}(x)|^2 + |\nabla \times \mathbf{A}_T(x)|^2 \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2m} |\mathbf{p}_\alpha + e(1 - \alpha) \mathbf{A}_T(0)|^2 + V(\mathbf{r}) + \frac{1}{2} \int d^3k \left( |\tilde{\Pi}_{T,\alpha}(k) + \frac{\alpha}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_\lambda \varepsilon_\lambda(k)[\mathbf{d} \cdot \varepsilon_\lambda(k)]^2 + |k \times \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_T(k)|^2 \right)$$

(34)

where $\varepsilon_\lambda(k)$, $\lambda = 1, 2$ are mutually orthogonal unit polarisation vectors that are both orthogonal to $k$, and $\tilde{f}$ denotes the Fourier transform of $f$. We have also used

$$P^{\text{EDA}}_{\text{mult},ij}(x) = d_j \delta^{T}_{ij}(x) = \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_\lambda \varepsilon_{\lambda,i}(k)[\mathbf{d} \cdot \varepsilon_\lambda(k)] e^{ik \cdot x}.$$  

(35)

The above expressions are applicable for general field operators $\mathbf{A}_T$ and $\Pi_{T,\alpha}$. We define the operator

$$a_{\alpha,\lambda}(k) := \sqrt{\frac{1}{2\omega}} \left( \omega \hat{A}_{T,\lambda}(k) + i\hat{\Pi}_{T,\alpha,\lambda}(k) \right)$$

(36)

where $\hat{A}_{T,\lambda}(k) = \varepsilon_\lambda(k) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{A}}_T(k)$ and $\hat{\Pi}_{T,\alpha,\lambda}(k) = \varepsilon_\lambda(k) \cdot \hat{\Pi}_{T,\alpha}(k)$. From the transverse canonical commutation relation

$$[\mathbf{A}_{T,ij}(x), \Pi_{T,\alpha,j}(x')] = i\delta^{T}_{ij}(x - x')$$

(37)

it follows that

$$[a_{\alpha,\lambda}(k), a^\dagger_{\alpha',\lambda'}(k')] = \delta_{\lambda\lambda'} \delta(k - k').$$

(38)
The operators \( a_{\alpha, \lambda}(k) \) and \( a_{\alpha, \lambda}^\dagger(k) \) are recognisable as annihilation and creation operators for a photon with momentum \( k \) and polarisation \( \lambda \). In terms of these operators the canonical fields support the Fourier representations

\[
A_T(x) = \int d^3k \sum_\lambda \! g \varepsilon_\lambda(k) \left( a_{\alpha, \lambda}^\dagger(k) e^{-ik \cdot x} + a_{\alpha, \lambda}(k) e^{ik \cdot x} \right),
\]

\[
\Pi_{T, \alpha}(x) = i \int d^3k \sum_\lambda \! \omega g \varepsilon_\lambda(k) \left( a_{\alpha, \lambda}^\dagger(k) e^{-ik \cdot x} - a_{\alpha, \lambda}(k) e^{ik \cdot x} \right)
\]

where \( \omega = |k| \) and \( g := 1/\sqrt{2\omega(2\pi)^3} \).

If we assume an implicit cavity with volume \( v \) that satisfies periodic boundary conditions, the continuous label \( k \) becomes discrete. The pair \( k \lambda \) then labels a radiation mode. As a less realistic, but simpler model for the cavity we may restrict our attention to a single mode, in which case the field operators become

\[
A_T = g \varepsilon \left( a_{\alpha}^\dagger + a_{\alpha} \right), \quad \Pi_{T, \alpha} = i \omega g \varepsilon \left( a_{\alpha}^\dagger - a_{\alpha} \right), \quad [a_{\alpha}, a_{\lambda}^\dagger] = 1
\]

where \( g = 1/\sqrt{2\omega v} \). Eqs. (40) imply that the cavity canonical operators now satisfy the commutation relation

\[
[A_{T,i}, \Pi_{T, \alpha,j}] = \frac{i \varepsilon \varepsilon_i}{v}
\]

as specified in the main text. For consistency with Eqs. (27) and (32) within the single-mode approximation we must also restrict the Fourier transform of the polarisation field \( \mathbf{P}_{\text{mult}} \) in (35) to a single mode such that the transverse electric field satisfies \( \mathbf{E}_T = -\dot{A}_T = -\Pi_{T, \alpha} - \alpha \mathbf{P}_{\text{mult}} \). If in the single-mode approximation we write the Hamiltonian (34) as

\[
H = \frac{1}{2m}(p_\alpha + e(1 - \alpha)A_T)^2 + V(r) + \frac{v}{2} \left( \Pi_{T, \alpha} + \frac{\alpha \varepsilon (d \cdot \varepsilon)}{v} \right)^2 + \omega^2 A_T^2
\]

where we have restricted the polarisation field to a single polarisation as \( \alpha \mathbf{P}_{\text{mult}} = \alpha \varepsilon (d \cdot \varepsilon)/v \), we obtain

\[
\mathbf{E}_T = -\dot{A}_T = -g \varepsilon \left( a_{\alpha}^\dagger + a_{\alpha} \right) = -i \omega g \varepsilon \left( a_{\alpha}^\dagger - a_{\alpha} \right) - \frac{\alpha \varepsilon (d \cdot \varepsilon)}{v} = -\Pi_{T, \alpha} - \alpha \mathbf{P}_{\text{mult}}
\]

as required. We therefore obtain a consistent single-mode theory with Hamiltonian given by Eq. (42), and cavity canonical operators \( A_T \) and \( \Pi_{T, \alpha} \) fully specified by Eqs. (40). Like the dipole approximation the single-mode approximation preserves the gauge-invariance of the theory, because it does not alter the unitary property of the gauge-fixing transformation \( R_{\alpha \alpha'} \), which retains the form given in Eq. (33) but with \( A_T \) specifying the single-mode vector potential from Eq. (40). The Hamiltonian and the Heisenberg equation yield

\[
m \dot{\mathbf{r}} = p_\alpha + e(1 - \alpha)A_T, \quad \mathbf{E}_T = -\Pi_{T, \alpha} - \frac{\alpha \varepsilon (d \cdot \varepsilon)}{v}
\]

which are the single-mode versions of Eqs. (32). Eqs. (44) allow us to write the Hamiltonian as \( H = E_{\text{matter}} + E_{\text{cavity}} \) where \( E_{\text{matter}} = m \dot{\mathbf{r}}^2/2 + V(r) \) and \( E_{\text{cavity}} = v(E_T^2 + \omega^2 A_T^2)/2 \). This is merely the dipole-approximated single-mode version of Eq. (28).

In summary, the restriction to functions \( g_T \) of the form given in (17), together with the electric-dipole approximation, and the restriction to a single-mode of radiation yield the expressions given in the main text. For simplicity, in the main text we use the notation \( A \) for \( A_T \) and \( \Pi_\alpha \) for \( \Pi_{T, \alpha} \). The gauge is completely determined by \( \alpha \). The theory is gauge-invariant in the sense that the predictions concerning any gauge-invariant observable can be calculated using any gauge and these predictions are unique. Choosing a specific gauge is merely a matter of convenience for performing calculations. As explained in the main text this is no longer the case within two-level models for the material system.

### B. Fluxonium LC-oscillator Hamiltonian

Here we derive the full Hamiltonian describing a fluxonium–LC oscillator circuit. The fluxonium is described by flux operator \( \phi \) with conjugate momentum \( \xi \) such that \( [\phi, \xi] = i \). The Hamiltonian is [37]

\[
H_m = \frac{Ec}{\varepsilon^2} \xi^2 - E_I \cos(2\varepsilon |\phi - \phi_{\text{ext}}|) + 2\varepsilon E_I \phi^2
\]

(45)
where $E_c$, $E_J$ and $E_l$ are the capacitive, Josephson and inductive energies respectively, and $\phi_{\text{ext}}$ is the applied external flux. The LC-oscillator is described by flux operator $\theta$ with conjugate momentum $\zeta$ such that $[\theta, \zeta] = i$. Its Hamiltonian is

$$H_{LC} = \frac{\zeta^2}{2C} + \frac{\theta^2}{2L}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (46)

where $C$ and $L$ are the capacitance and inductance respectively.

There is considerable freedom in describing the coupling between the fluxonium and the oscillator. Capacitively coupling the systems is achieved through the replacement $\xi \rightarrow \xi + \zeta$. This can be viewed as analogous to the replacement $p \rightarrow p + eA$, which results in the Coulomb-gauge coupling between an atom and a cavity. Inductively coupling the fluxonium and oscillator is achieved through the replacement $\theta \rightarrow \theta + \phi$, which can be viewed as analogous to the replacement $\Pi \rightarrow \Pi + \epsilon(e \cdot d)/\hbar$ that gives the Poincaré-gauge coupling between an atom and a cavity. We have already seen in the context of an atom-cavity system that this freedom in the description of the coupling is a gauge-freedom, and that the different descriptions are unitarily related. Analogously we call the capacitive coupling the charge-gauge description, and we call the inductive coupling the flux-gauge description. Making the replacement $\xi \rightarrow \xi + \zeta$ in the Hamiltonian in Eq. (45) and adding the bare oscillator Hamiltonian in Eq. (46) yields the Hamiltonian expressed in the charge-gauge:

$$H = \frac{E_c}{e^2}(\xi + \zeta)^2 - E_J \cos (2e[\phi - \phi_{\text{ext}}]) + 2e^2E_l\phi^2 + \frac{\zeta^2}{2C} + \frac{\theta^2}{2L}. \hspace{1cm} (47)$$

If we define the unitary gauge transformation $R_{01} = e^{i\alpha_0}$ then we can define new canonical operators $\xi_1 = R_{01}^{-1}\xi_{01}$ and $\theta_1 = R_{01}^{-1}\theta_{01}$ in terms of which the Hamiltonian is expressed in the flux-gauge;

$$H = \frac{E_c}{e^2}\xi_1^2 - E_J \cos (2e[\phi - \phi_{\text{ext}}]) + 2e^2E_l\phi^2 + \frac{\zeta^2}{2C} + \frac{1}{2L}(\theta_1 + \phi)^2. \hspace{1cm} (48)$$

More generally, we define the unitary gauge transformation $R_{0\alpha} = e^{i\alpha_0}$ and associated $\alpha$-gauge canonical operators by $\xi_\alpha = R_{0\alpha}^{-1}\xi_{0\alpha}$ and $\theta_\alpha = R_{0\alpha}^{-1}\theta_{0\alpha}$. The Hamiltonian expressed in terms of the $\alpha$-gauge canonical operators $y_\alpha = \{\phi, \xi_\alpha, \theta_\alpha, \zeta\}$ is

$$H = \frac{E_c}{e^2}[(1 - \alpha)\zeta + (1 - \alpha)\xi + (1 - \alpha)\zeta + (1 - \alpha)\xi] + 2e^2E_l\phi^2 - E_J \cos (2e[\phi - \phi_{\text{ext}}]) + \frac{\zeta^2}{2C} + \frac{1}{2L}(\theta + \alpha\phi)^2. \hspace{1cm} (49)$$

In all gauges the canonical operators satisfy the canonical commutation relations due to the unitarity of the gauge transformation. The Hamiltonian $H$ has $\alpha$-independent (gauge-invariant) spectrum. More generally, the predictions for any observable $O = o^\alpha(y_\alpha)$ can be calculated using any gauge and these predictions are unique. The charge and flux-gauge descriptions are obtained by choosing $\alpha = 0$ and $\alpha = 1$ respectively. The $\alpha$-gauge two-level model is obtained in exact analogy with the atom-cavity formalism by using the projection $P^\alpha$ onto the first two eigenstates of the $\alpha$-gauge bare fluxonium Hamiltonian

$$H_{m}^{\alpha} = \frac{E_c}{e^2}\xi_\alpha^2 - E_J \cos (2e[\phi - \phi_{\text{ext}}]) + 2e^2E_l\phi^2. \hspace{1cm} (50)$$

\hspace{1cm} C. \hspace{0.5cm} Gauge-invariant predictions of two-level models in the weak-coupling regime

The Hamiltonian in Eq. (4) is not the only possible form of two-level model Hamiltonian due to additional ambiguity in the application of the Thomas-Reiche-Kuhn sum rule [43]

$$\sum_{r, s} \epsilon_{rs}d_r^\dagger d_s^\dagger = \frac{e^2}{2m} \delta_{ij} \hspace{1cm} (51)$$

where $d_r^\dagger = \langle \epsilon_r \rangle - e r_i \langle \epsilon^*_i \rangle$ and $\epsilon_{rs} = \epsilon_r - \epsilon_s$. In the full Hilbert space the right-hand-side of this identity is independent of the dipole level $s$. Yet, when considering a two-level dipole, for the ground state $\sigma_\alpha^-\sigma^-_\alpha$ Eq. (51) becomes $\omega_m(d \cdot e)^2 = e^2/2m$ while for the excited state $\sigma_\alpha^+\sigma^-_\alpha$ Eq. (51) becomes $\omega_m(d \cdot e)^2 = -e^2/2m$. These relations cannot be simultaneously satisfied. Furthermore, the second relation implies that $m < 0$. Nevertheless, if within the two-level truncation we apply these relations separately to the coefficient of $\sigma^-_\alpha\sigma^+_\alpha$ and $\sigma^-_\alpha\sigma^-_\alpha$ in the self-energy term $e^2(1 - \alpha)^2A^2/2m$ we obtain $-\omega_m(d \cdot e)^2(1 - \alpha)^2\sigma^-_\alpha A^2$ where $\sigma^-_\alpha = [\sigma^+_\alpha, \sigma^-_\alpha]$. All dependence on the
bare mass $m$ has now been eliminated from the theory and we obtain a well-defined two-level model Hamiltonian given by

$$
\tilde{H}^\alpha = \omega_m \sigma_\alpha^+ \sigma_\alpha^- + \Delta_\alpha + \omega_m (1 - \alpha)(d \cdot A) \sigma_\alpha^+ + \alpha(d \cdot \Pi_\alpha) \sigma_\alpha^- - \omega_m (d \cdot \varepsilon)^2 (1 - \alpha)^2 \sigma_\alpha^+ A^2 + \omega \left( a_\alpha^+ a_\alpha + \frac{1}{2} \right)
$$

where $\sigma_\alpha^y = i(\sigma_\alpha^- - \sigma_\alpha^+)$ and $\sigma_\alpha^z = \sigma_\alpha^+ + \sigma_\alpha^-$. 

In contrast to $H^\alpha$ a simple approximate relation can be given between the average energy found using distinct two-level model Hamiltonians $\tilde{H}^\alpha$ and $H^\alpha$ when $\alpha \neq \alpha'$. To see this we note that $R_{\text{bs}} \equiv R_{\alpha} (y)$ where $y \equiv y_0$, and we define the unitary operator $U_\alpha = R_{\alpha} (p^0 y P^0) = \cos(\alpha d \cdot A) - i \alpha \sigma^k \sin(\alpha d \cdot A)$ where $\sigma^k \equiv \sigma^k_\alpha$, $k = \pm, x, y, z$. Noting further that $\tilde{H}^\alpha \equiv \tilde{H}^0 (\sigma^z)$ it is straightforward to show using this notation that $U_\alpha \tilde{H}^\alpha (\sigma^z) U_\alpha^{-1} \approx H^\alpha (\sigma^z)$ where the approximate equality means that equality holds up to second order in $\eta$. If in the Coulomb gauge two-level model with Hamiltonian $\tilde{H}^0$ we represent an arbitrary state $S$ by $|\psi^0\\rangle = \sum_n \psi_n |h^0_n\\rangle$, then in the $\alpha$-gauge two-level model with Hamiltonian $H^\alpha$, $S$ is represented by $|\psi^\alpha\\rangle = \sum_n \psi_n |h^\alpha_n\\rangle \approx U_\alpha |\psi^0\\rangle$ and we therefore obtain $\langle \psi^0 | \tilde{H}^0 | \psi^0 \rangle \approx \langle \psi^\alpha | H^\alpha | \psi^\alpha \rangle$. Similarly, if we consider the two-level model Hamiltonian $H^\alpha$ given in Eq. (4), second order perturbation theory and judicious use of the relations $\omega_m (d \cdot \varepsilon)^2 = \epsilon^2/2m$ and $\omega_m (d \cdot \varepsilon)^2 = -\epsilon^2/2m$ yield $\alpha$-independent expressions for the ground and first excited energies. The ground energy of $H^\alpha$ found using second order perturbation theory in the interaction Hamiltonian is

$$
\langle g^\alpha | H^\alpha | g^\alpha \rangle \approx \frac{\omega_\alpha}{2} + \Delta_\alpha - \frac{\omega_\alpha^2}{\omega_m + \omega_\alpha}.
$$

Upon use of $\omega_m (d \cdot \varepsilon)^2 = \epsilon^2/2m$ appropriate for the ground state we obtain to order $d^2$ the $\alpha$-independent result

$$
\langle g^\alpha | H^\alpha | g^\alpha \rangle \approx \epsilon_0 + \frac{\omega}{2} + |gd \cdot \varepsilon|^2 \frac{\omega_m \omega}{\omega_m + \omega}.
$$

Similarly, the first excited energy of $H^\alpha$ is to order $d^2$ given by

$$
\langle e^\alpha | H^\alpha | e^\alpha \rangle \approx \frac{\omega_\alpha}{2} + \Delta_\alpha + \frac{\omega_\alpha^2}{\omega_m - \omega_\alpha} \approx \epsilon_0 + \frac{\omega}{2} + |gd \cdot \varepsilon|^2 \frac{\omega_m \omega}{\omega_m - \omega},
$$

where in writing the second equality we have used $\omega_m (d \cdot \varepsilon)^2 = -\epsilon^2/2m$ appropriate for the excited state. In any two-level model one can at best expect to obtain $\alpha$-independent predictions up to order $d^2$. 

### D. Alternative parameter regimes

Here we provide further analysis of two-level models via comparison with exact predictions.

1. $\delta = 5$

We begin again with the most experimentally relevant regime presently, $\delta = 5$. We show in Fig. 5 how the first two dressed energies behave as $\phi_{\text{ext}}$ is varied within the deep-strong coupling regime $\eta = 1.5$. The JC-gauge two-level model provides reasonable qualitative agreement with the exact energies while the flux and charge-gauge QRMs are significantly less accurate. The flux and charge-gauge JCMs are also inaccurate as expected.

We now restrict our attention to the maximal frustration $\phi_{\text{ext}} = \pi/2e$ and look to determine optimal two-level models. We therefore consider how predictions vary with $\alpha$ while other parameters are held fixed. Fig. 6 shows how the dressed energies of the general two-level model varies with $\alpha$ when $\eta = 1$. All two-level models become inaccurate for dressed levels $N > E$. For the specified parameters two-level models with $\alpha$ near to $\alpha_{JC} = 0.132$ are accurate in predicting the first two energy values. Fig. 7 shows how the ground and excited state state fidelities $F_g^{\alpha,e}$ vary with $\alpha$ for various couplings. For sufficiently small $\eta$ the JC-gauge two-level model is always close to the optimal two-level model for representing the ground state. For larger $\eta$ degeneracy points of the first two-levels occur for certain values of $\alpha$. For such $\alpha$ a transfer of population within the exact ground state $|G\\rangle$ from the ground state $|G_2\\rangle$ into the excited state $|E_2\\rangle$ occurs, such that the state $|E_2\\rangle$ becomes a better representation of the true ground state $|G\\rangle$. In fact for large enough $\eta$ there exists a value $\alpha_{\text{opt}}$ that through $|E_2^{\text{opt}}\\rangle$ gives the best possible representation of $|G\\rangle$, i.e., is such that $|\langle E_2^{\text{opt}} | G \rangle|^2 \geq F_g^{\alpha}$, $\forall \alpha$. 

FIG. 5: In all plots \( E_l = 0.33 \mu \text{eV}, E_J = 10E_l = E_c, \delta = 5 \) and \( \eta = 1.5 \).  
(a) The ground energy is plotted with \( \phi_{\text{ext}} \) for the flux-gauge (gold) and charge-gauge (blue) QRM, for the JC-gauge two-level model (green) and for the exact model (solid red).  
(b) Same as (a) for the first excited energy.  
(c) For the same range as (a) the ground energy is plotted with \( \phi_{\text{ext}} \) for the flux-gauge (gold) and charge-gauge (blue) JCM, and for the exact model (solid red).  
(d) Same as (c) for the first excited energy.

FIG. 6: \( E_l = 0.33 \mu \text{eV}, E_J = 10E_l = E_c, \delta = 5, \phi_{\text{ext}} = \pi/2e \) and \( \eta = 1 \).  
The first five Hamiltonian energies are plotted as functions of \( \alpha \).  
The dashed lines give the \( \alpha \)-independent exact energies, while the solid curves give the corresponding energies found within the two-level truncation.  
The vertical line specifies the value \( \alpha_{JC} \).
FIG. 7: $E_l = 0.33\mu eV$, $E_J = 10E_l = E_c$, $\delta = 5$ and $\phi_{ext} = \pi/2e$. The ground state fidelity of two-level model states $|G_\alpha^2\rangle$ and $|E_\alpha^2\rangle$ in the ground state $|G\rangle$ are plotted as functions of $\alpha$ for $\eta = 1$, 1.5, 2. The straight dashed lines show the values of $F_{JC}^{G\alpha}$ for the same three coupling strengths. The dash-dotted lines show the overlap $|\langle E_\alpha^2 |G \rangle|^2$ as a function of $\alpha$ for $\eta = 1$, 1.5, 2.

2. $\delta = 1$

Next we consider the case of resonance $\delta = 1$. Here the flux-gauge QRM becomes more accurate and is typically more accurate than the charge-gauge QRM. For the first two levels the JC-gauge two-level model again provides energies closest to the exact energies. The JC-gauge again provides the best representation of the ground state (Fig 8). However, for $\eta > 0.4$ the excited state of the flux-gauge QRM has larger overlap with the exact excited state. Two-level models remain largely inaccurate for levels $N > E$ in this regime of detuning, although the flux-gauge QRM accurately predicts certain energies for levels $N > E$ e.g. $n = 3$, 5, 8 as shown in Fig. 10 for $\eta = 1$.

FIG. 8: In all plots $E_l = 0.33\mu eV$, $E_J = 10E_l = E_c$, $\delta = 5$ and $\phi_{ext} = \pi/2e$. (a) The ground energy is plotted with $\eta$ for the flux-gauge (gold) and charge-gauge (blue) QRMs, for the JC-gauge two-level model (green), for the exact model (solid red), and for the charge-gauge JCM obtained via the RWA (dot-dash dark blue). (b) Same as (a) for the first excited energy. (c) The ground state fidelity $F_{G\alpha}^\eta$ is plotted with $\eta$ for the flux-gauge $\alpha = 1$ (gold) and charge-gauge $\alpha = 0$ (blue) QRMs, for the JC-gauge (green) and for charge-gauge JCM. (d) Same as (c) for the first excited energy.
FIG. 9: In all plots $E_l = 0.33\mu$eV, $E_J = 10E_l = E_c$, $\delta = 1$ and $\eta = 1/2$. (a) The ground energy is plotted with $\phi_{\text{ext}}$ for the flux-gauge (gold) and charge-gauge (blue) QRM$s$, for the JC-gauge two-level model (green) and for the exact model (solid red). (b) Same as (a) for the first excited energy. (c) For the same range as (a) the ground energy is plotted with $\phi_{\text{ext}}$ for the flux-gauge (gold) and charge-gauge (blue) JCM$s$, and for the exact model (solid red). (d) Same as (c) for the first excited energy.

FIG. 10: $E_l = 0.33\mu$eV, $E_J = 10E_l = E_c$, $\delta = 1$, $\phi_{\text{ext}} = \pi/2e$ and $\eta = 1$. The first 11 Hamiltonian energies are plotted as functions of $\alpha$. The dashed lines give the $\alpha$-independent exact energies, while the solid curves give the corresponding energies found within the two-level truncation. The vertical lines specify the value $\alpha_{\text{JC}}$ and the flux-gauge $\alpha = 1$ respectively.

3. $\delta = 1/5$

Next we consider the regime $\omega_0 > \omega$ by letting $\delta = 1/5$. Here the flux-gauge QRM becomes yet more accurate while the charge-gauge QRM becomes yet more inaccurate. For the first two levels the JC-gauge two-level model again provides energies closest to the exact energies. As in the case of the charge-gauge QRM in the regime $\delta = 5$ the RWA is seen to incur very little error when applied to the flux-gauge QRM in the regime $\delta = 1/5$. The flux-gauge JCM therefore occasionally outperforms the charge-gauge QRM. The JC-gauge again provides the best representation of the ground state (Fig 11). The flux-gauge QRM becomes more accurate at predicting energy values for levels $N > E$ as shown in Fig. 13. Again all two-level models breakdown for these levels, when the coupling is sufficiently large.
FIG. 11: In all plots $E_l = 0.33\mu$eV, $E_J = 10E_l = E_c$, $\delta = 1/5$ and $\phi_{ext} = \pi/2e$. (a) The ground energy is plotted with $\eta$ for the flux-gauge (gold) and charge-gauge (blue) QRM$\text{s}$, for the JC-gauge two-level model (green), for the exact model (solid red), and for the charge-gauge JCM obtained via the RWA (dot-dash dark blue). (b) Same as (a) for the first excited energy. (c) The ground state fidelity $F^\alpha_G$ is plotted with $\eta$ for the flux-gauge $\alpha = 1$ (gold) and charge-gauge $\alpha = 0$ (blue) QRM$\text{s}$, for the JC-gauge (green) and for charge-gauge JCM. (d) Same as (c) for the first excited energy.

FIG. 12: In all plots $E_l = 0.33\mu$eV, $E_J = 10E_l = E_c$, $\delta = 1/5$ and $\eta = 1/2$. (a) The ground energy is plotted with $\phi_{ext}$ for the flux-gauge (gold) and charge-gauge (blue) QRM$\text{s}$, for the JC-gauge two-level model (green) and for the exact model (solid red). (b) Same as (a) for the first excited energy. (c) For the same range as (a) the ground energy is plotted with $\phi_{ext}$ for the flux-gauge (gold) and charge-gauge (blue) JCM$\text{s}$, and for the exact model (solid red). (d) Same as (c) for the first excited energy.
As an example of an observable different from the energy we consider here photon number. Each different gauge $\alpha$ has an associated photon number operator $c_\alpha^\dagger c_\alpha$. This definition of photon number implicitly includes the oscillator self-energy contribution $E_c(1 - \alpha)^2\zeta^2/e^2$ such that the photon energy operator including this contribution is $\omega_\alpha(c_\alpha^\dagger c_\alpha + 1/2)$ with $\omega_\alpha^2 = \omega^2 + E_c(1 - \alpha)^2C\zeta^2/e^2$. For each $\alpha$ there is also a photon number operator $a_\alpha^\dagger a_\alpha$ with associated energy $\omega(a_\alpha^\dagger a_\alpha + 1/2)$ that does not include the contribution $E_c(1 - \alpha)^2\zeta^2/e^2$. Only when $\alpha = 1$ such that this additional term vanishes do we obtain $c_\alpha^\dagger c_\alpha = a_\alpha^\dagger a_\alpha$. Here we focus on the renormalised photon number $c_\alpha^\dagger c_\alpha$.

The flux-gauge number operator $c_1^\dagger c_1$ can be expressed in terms of canonical operators associated with any other gauge $\alpha \neq 1$ by using the unitary relation between different gauges. Fig. 14 shows the averages $\langle c_1^\dagger c_1 \rangle_G$ and $\langle c_1^\dagger c_1 \rangle_E$ in the ground and first dressed states found using various two-level models and the exact model. The JC-gauge two-level model is more accurate than the flux-gauge QRM, the flux and charge-gauge JCMs, and is comparable to the charge-gauge QRM.

As a different example we can consider the JC-gauge photon number operator $c_{JC}^\dagger c_{JC}$. In the ground state of the JC-gauge two-level model the average of this observable is zero for all coupling strengths. Thus, the exact average should be approximately zero for coupling strengths for which higher material levels can be neglected within the JC-gauge. Fig 15 shows that the exact average is zero for sufficiently small coupling, but begins to grow for larger coupling strengths, which gives an indication of the relative validity of the JC-gauge two-level truncation. The flux-gauge QRM significantly overestimates the average and is always less accurate than the JC-gauge two-level model.
FIG. 14: In all plots $E_l = 0.33\mu$eV, $E_J = 10E_l = E_c$, $\delta = 5$ and $\phi_{ext} = \pi/2e$. (a) The dressed ground state average flux-gauge photon number is plotted with coupling $\eta$, for the flux-gauge (gold dashed) and charge-gauge (blue dashed) QRM’s, for the JC-gauge two-level model (green dashed), the exact theory (solid red), and the charge-gauge JCM (dot-dash dark blue). The flux-gauge JCM is inaccurate in the regime considered and is not shown. (b) Same as (a) for the first excited dressed state average.

FIG. 15: In all plots $E_l = 0.33\mu$eV, $E_J = 10E_l = E_c$, $\delta = 5$ and $\phi_{ext} = \pi/2e$. (a) The dressed ground state average JC-gauge photon number is plotted with coupling $\eta$, for the flux-gauge (gold dashed) and the exact theory (solid red). The flux-gauge QRM overestimates the average considerably in the ultrastrong-coupling regime. The exact result remains approximately zero well into this regime indicating that the JC-gauge two-level model remains accurate. (b) Same as (a) for the first excited dressed state average.