Understanding physics of quantum emitters strongly interacting with quantized electromagnetic continuum is one of the primary goals in the emergent field of waveguide quantum electrodynamics (QED). When the light-matter coupling strength is comparable to or even exceeds energies of elementary excitations, conventional approaches based on perturbative treatment of light-matter interactions, two-level description of matter excitations, and photon-number truncation are no longer sufficient. Here we study in and out of equilibrium properties of waveguide QED in such nonperturbative regimes by developing a comprehensive and rigorous theoretical approach using an asymptotic decoupling unitary transformation. In the transformed frame, factorization between light and matter becomes exact in the strong-coupling limit and an accurate effective model can be derived for arbitrary interaction strengths. We uncover several surprising features ranging from symmetry-protected many-body bound states in the continuum to strong renormalization of the effective mass and potential; the latter may explain recent experiments demonstrating cavity-induced changes in chemical reactivity as well as enhancements of ferromagnetism or superconductivity. We demonstrate these results by applying our general formalism to a model of coupled cavity arrays, which is relevant to experiments in superconducting qubits interacting with microwave resonators or atoms coupled to photonic crystals. We examine the relation between our results and delocalization-localization transition in the spin-boson model; notably, we point out that one can find a quantum phase transition akin to the superradiant transition in multi-emitter waveguide QED systems with superlinear photonic dispersion. Besides waveguide resonators, we discuss possible applications of our framework to other light-matter systems relevant to quantum optics, condensed matter physics, and quantum chemistry.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

Quantum many-body states arising from coherent interactions between light and matter are of fundamental interest in modern physics and lie at the heart of quantum technologies. Historically, analysis of light-matter systems focused on the perturbative regime [1, 2], since interaction of atomic dipoles with vacuum electromagnetic fields is weak due to the smallness of the fine structure constant \( \alpha = 1/137 \). Recent progress has led to the realization of new platforms in which electromagnetic continuum is modified to reach stronger light-matter coupling. In particular, (artificial) atoms coupled to one-dimensional continuum of photons at microwave [3–10] or optical [11–16] frequencies achieve enhancement of light-matter interaction through strong spatial confinement of electromagnetic modes. This rapidly growing field of research has been dubbed waveguide quantum electrodynamics (QED).

There exist many conceptual similarities between the questions addressed in waveguide QED and the problems analyzed in the context of quantum dissipative systems [17–20]; in the latter, bosonic modes represent phonons or other collective excitations of condensed matter systems. More recently, light-matter interaction has also been the subject of intense research in the fields of polaritonic chemistry [21–30] and nanostructured plasmonics [31–35]. In light of such broad relevance, models of quantum emitters interacting with a continuum of bosonic excitations have played a crucial role not only in quantum information science, but also in condensed matter physics and quantum chemistry. An outstanding challenge here is to uncover the novel physical phenomena in nonperturbative regimes, where strong interaction leads to the formation of quantum many-body states with large entanglement between emitters and bosonic excitations of the continuum.

Despite recent remarkable advances, our understanding of waveguide QED at strong couplings is far from complete. Due to virtual excitation of many photons, the problem becomes intrinsically nonperturbative and standard approximations of quantum optics fail in many crucial aspects. First and foremost, it is known that the usual rotating wave approximation becomes no longer valid [2] due to the processes that create or annihilate pairs of excitations. Moreover, the inclusion of the diamagnetic \( \hat{A}^2 \) term and the multilevel structure of emitters becomes more essential at larger coupling strengths. Importantly, the latter indicates that the comprehensive understanding of strong coupling physics cannot be achieved unless one goes beyond the standard two-level descriptions. Such multilevel structure of quantum emitters is also of current technological importance. For instance, superconducting transmon qubits are rarely operated as perfect two-level systems [36] and such multilevel structures are potentially useful for the purpose of performing certain quantum information operations [37, 38].

While significant efforts have been devoted to elucidating the strong and ultrastrong coupling regimes in this decade...
The physics of waveguide QED in the realms of even stronger light-matter interactions, namely, the deep [60] and extremely strong [61] coupling regimes, remains largely unexplored. There, the coupling strength becomes comparable to elementary excitation energies or exceeds them, and qualitatively different phenomena are expected to occur since vacuum fluctuations alone can lead to large populations of photons in every coupled mode. However, due to the aforementioned difficulties, a reliable theoretical approach for unveiling those potentially new phenomena is currently lacking. One of the key goals of this paper is to present a comprehensive theoretical framework that solves this issue, allowing one to study strongly interacting light-matter systems in the previously unexplored regimes.

On another front, the spin-boson model, a supposedly effective description of waveguide QED systems (e.g., Ref. [44]), has long been known to exhibit the delocalization-localization transition at strong couplings [62, 63]. Nevertheless, the breakdown of the usual two-level description [61, 64] and the relevance of the diamagnetic term [61, 64–71] make it unclear how these known results for quantum dissipative systems should be interpreted in the context of waveguide QED. More specifically, the conditions under which a counterpart of the delocalization-localization transition exists should be carefully examined by using the full-fledged QED Hamiltonian. One intriguing possibility is that such a quantum phase transition can be extended to multi-emitter systems and provide a new route toward realizing a superradiant transition without external driving [72–74].

In view of recent experimental developments in realizing stronger light-matter interactions [35, 50, 75], the time is ripe to explore in and out of equilibrium physics of nonperturbative waveguide QED in a comprehensive manner. Specifically, we will ask the following questions:

(A) What are the defining physical features of waveguide QED in the previously unexplored nonperturbative regimes?

(B) How can one construct a proper effective model of waveguide QED at strong couplings, where existing theoretical descriptions are expected to fail?

(C) Starting from a fully microscopic theory, is it possible to identify a quantum phase transition akin to the superradiant transition in waveguide QED setups?

The aim of this paper is to develop a consistent and rigorous framework to address these questions from a unified perspective (see Fig. 1(a)). Below we summarize the main results at a nontechnical level before presenting a detailed theoretical formulation in subsequent sections.

**B. Summary of the main results**

The first part of this paper develops a general theory of quantum emitters interacting with arbitrary quantum electromagnetic continuum. This is done by extending the asymptotic light-matter decoupling unitary transformation that we introduced earlier in the context of single-mode cavity QED [61] to the present waveguide QED setups. Previously, most of the studies in waveguide QED approximate an emitter as a simplified two-level system, which, however, is not necessarily appropriate for many experimentally relevant systems, including superconducting qubits as mentioned above [38, 76–78]. The validity of the two-level approximation becomes particularly questionable in the nonperturbative regimes due to
significant renormalization of both the effective mass and potential as we demonstrate later (see e.g., Fig. 5 in Sec. IV C). To provide an adequate model of the multilevel structure in realistic physical systems, in the present work we model a quantum emitter as a charged particle moving in a potential with two degenerate minima (see Fig. 1(a)).

Our first main result is the appearance of a ladder of many-body bound states (BS) and the many-body bound states in the continuum (BIC) in nonperturbative regimes (see Fig. 1(b)). We point out formation of increasingly many low-lying bound states whose energies decrease as $\propto g^{-1}$ in the limit of strong light-matter coupling $g$. Interestingly, we find that the exact BICs emerge as a consequence of the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-symmetry protection, which is naturally satisfied in the standard QED Hamiltonian, without artificial fine-tuning of microscopic parameters such as emitter positions/wavelength as previously pursued [79–84]. Even when the exact symmetry is broken, the lifetime of these states diverges as $\propto g^{1/2}$ in the strong-coupling limit, and thus they still behave as so-called quasi BIC (see Fig. 3 in Sec. IV). We note that the BICs have recently attracted significant attention in light of their potential applications to realize quantum memory [85] and nondissipative emitter interactions [86, 87]. It is in general challenging to detect BICs in standard photon scattering experiments, since bound states are orthogonal to delocalized states in the continuum. Instead, we propose and numerically demonstrate an experimentally feasible quench protocol to excite those states in a concrete model of cavity array, which is fairly standard in quantum optics [88–90]. These results establish one of the defining features in the nonperturbative regimes of waveguide QED and thus address question (A).

We remark that the present work should be contrasted to earlier studies of atom-field dressed bound states [91] in several crucial aspects. In Refs. [48, 49, 57, 92–98], the existence of bound states was predicted in perturbative regimes on the basis of the rotating wave approximation. However, it turns out that these bound states in general become resonances with finite lifetimes once the counter rotating terms are included [46, 56]. In contrast, our analysis does not rely on those simplifying approximations and rigorously establishes the presence of bound states at arbitrary coupling strengths for general photonic dispersions. In particular, a ladder of bound states revealed by our analysis is appreciable only after multilevel structure of emitters is consistently included in theory. Said differently, this feature cannot be addressed within any of previous frameworks that rely on the two-level descriptions. More importantly, to our knowledge, the existence of (quasi) BICs in nonperturbative waveguide QED systems has been pointed out in this paper for the first time. We emphasize that the BICs found here are genuine quantum many-body states that are distinct from one-body wave phenomena, which have been the focus of earlier studies [99].

The second important result of our work is construction of proper effective models for waveguide QED that remain valid at arbitrary coupling strengths. This is made possible through the use of a unitary transformation that achieves asymptotic decoupling of emitter and photon degrees of freedom in the limit where light-matter interaction becomes the dominant energy scale (see Fig. 1(a)). We point out that conventional descriptions become inapplicable in the nonperturbative regimes because of uncontrolled level truncations in the Coulomb or Power-Zienau-Woolley (i.e., dipole) gauges. In contrast, following the unitary transformation used in the present work, such truncations are well-justified owing to vanishingly small light-matter entanglement at strong couplings, ensuring the validity of effective models constructed in this new frame of reference. The obtained effective models take the same standard forms as the Jaynes-Cummings-type Hamiltonian for a single-emitter case (see Eq. (53) in Sec. IV) and the inhomogeneous transverse-field Ising Hamiltonian for a multi-emitter case (see Eq. (84) in Sec. V), but with suitably renormalized parameters. More generally, our theory features a fully microscopic treatment of waveguide QED and allows one to seamlessly analyze the entire coupling region at both qualitative and quantitative levels. These results thus address question (B).

Finally, building on these analyses, we answer question (C) in the affirmative way. Specifically, we show that the infrared divergence of the renormalized emitter mass occurs for a certain gapless photonic dispersion. This in turn implies the exact two-fold degeneracy of the ground state and thus leads to the transition to the symmetry-broken (i.e., localized) phase in the thermodynamic limit. Our results are qualitatively consistent with the ones previously obtained for the spin-boson model, except for the reentrance into the delocalized phase in the extremely strong coupling regimes which originates from the diamagnetic term (see Fig. 8 in Sec. VI). We then discuss the extension of these results to multi-emitter cases and point out that a waveguide QED system with superlinear photonic dispersion (corresponding to sub-Ohmic bath) provides a promising candidate to realize the superradiant transition (at least) for sufficiently small emitter frequencies.

Overall, it is notable that the key features revealed by this paper do not rely on fine-tuning of parameters, but should appear generally in strongly coupled light-matter systems. To obtain these results, it is crucial to accurately perform analysis without resorting to uncontrolled approximations that cannot be justified in the nonperturbative regimes. While the emphasis of our discussion is on the waveguide setups, the present formalism is equally applicable to other electromagnetic environments in arbitrary geometries. Examples include cavity QED systems in 2D materials or polaritonic chemistry, in which the inclusion of multiple photonic modes becomes crucial depending on the cavity geometry and the coupling strength. Our work thus establishes a foundation for studying strongly coupled light-matter systems lying at the intersection of quantum optics, condensed matter physics, and quantum chemistry in genuinely nonperturbative regimes.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we present a general theoretical framework for a quantum emitter coupled to electromagnetic continuum on the basis of the asymptotically decoupling unitary transformation. In Sec. III, we unravel key physical features emerging in nonperturbative regimes of waveguide QED. In Sec. IV, we illustrate the general properties by providing an explicit numerical solution of a concrete model of coupled cavity arrays. In
II. ASYMPTOTIC LIGHT-MATTER DECOUPLING: GENERAL FORMALISM

We begin by developing a general theory of a single quantum emitter coupled to arbitrary quantized electromagnetic environment. To analyze nonperturbative regimes, we use a disentangling unitary transformation that can asymptotically decouple light and matter degrees of freedom in the strong-coupling limit. This asymptotically decoupled (AD) frame significantly simplifies the analysis of strongly interacting light-matter systems, which allows us to explore the entire coupling region, even beyond the ultrastrong coupling regimes. We will later apply the framework to a concrete model of coupled cavity array in Sec. IV. While a single-emitter setup is considered in this section, we will generalize the whole formalism to multi-emitter cases in Sec. V.

A. QED Hamiltonian in the Coulomb gauge

We consider a quantum emitter that is locally coupled to quantized electromagnetic modes in arbitrary geometries. The emitter is modeled as a quantum particle of mass $m$ and charge $q$ trapped by a potential $V$, while the electromagnetic environment is represented as a sum of harmonic oscillators with frequencies $\omega_k$. The corresponding QED Hamiltonian in the Coulomb gauge is given by

$$\hat{H}_C = \left(\frac{\hat{P} - q\hat{A}}{2m}\right)^2 + V(\hat{Q}) + \sum_k \hbar \omega_k \hat{a}_k^\dagger \hat{a}_k,$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $\hat{Q}$ ($\hat{P}$) is the position (momentum) operator of the emitter and $\hat{a}_k$ ($\hat{a}_k^\dagger$) is the annihilation (creation) operator of photons in mode $k$, which satisfy the commutation relations

$$[\hat{Q}, \hat{P}] = i\hbar, \quad [\hat{a}_k, \hat{a}_{k'}^\dagger] = \delta_{kk'}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

We denote the vector potential operator as

$$\hat{A} = \sum_k f_k (\hat{a}_k + \hat{a}_k^\dagger),$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where $f_k$ characterizes the electromagnetic amplitude of mode $k$.

It is useful to diagonalize the quadratic photon part of $\hat{H}_C$ as follows (see Appendix A for details):

$$\hat{H}_C = \frac{\hat{P}^2}{2m} + V(\hat{Q}) - \hat{P} \sum_n \zeta_n (\hat{b}_n + \hat{b}_n^\dagger) + \sum_n \hbar \Omega_n \hat{b}_n^\dagger \hat{b}_n,$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

where we perform the canonical transformation to introduce a squeezed photon operator $\hat{b}_n$ labeled by $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ via

$$\hat{a}_k = \sum_n (O)_{kn} \left[ \cosh (r_{nk}) \hat{b}_n - \sinh (r_{nk}) \hat{b}_n^\dagger \right],$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

and $\zeta_n$ is given as

$$\zeta_n = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{m \Omega_n}} \sum_k g_k O_{kn}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

Here, $O_{kn}$ is an orthogonal matrix that satisfies

$$\sum_{kk'} (O^T)_{nk} (\delta_{kk'} \omega_k^2 + 2g_k g_{k'}) O_{k'm} = \delta_{nm} \Omega_n^2,$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

where $\Omega_n$ is an eigenfrequency of mode $n$, $r_{nk}$ is a squeezing parameter defined by $e^{r_{nk}} \equiv \sqrt{\Omega_n / \omega_k}$, and $g_k$ characterizes a coupling strength to mode $k$:

$$g_k \equiv q f_k \sqrt{\frac{\omega_k}{m \hbar}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

We note that the magnitudes of $g_k$ depend on the system size $L$ (i.e., the total number $L$ of electromagnetic modes) via $g_k \propto f_k \propto L^{-1/2}$.

Before proceeding further, we make two remarks. First, while we follow the standard notation in atomic QED to write down the Hamiltonian (1), the present formulation is equally applicable to circuit QED setups regardless of the physical nature of each variable. In superconducting circuits, artificial atoms are locally coupled to the continuum of microwave electromagnetic fields in a transmission line. There is a well-established analogy between circuit and atomic QED systems; the charge number operator of a transmon qubit and its conjugate phase operator precisely correspond to $\hat{P}$ and $\hat{Q}$ in Eq. (1), respectively, and the charge bias induced by the electromagnetic fields of microwave resonator plays the role of the vector potential $\hat{A}$. The same analogy holds true also for a flux qubit, where $\hat{Q}$ is coupled to photons through the dipole-type coupling $\hat{Q} \cdot \hat{E}$ with $\hat{E}$ being the electric field; one can use the Power-Zienau-Woolley (PZW) transformation [100, 101] to change this circuit Hamiltonian back to the standard form as in Eq. (1) (see e.g., Ref. [64] or Eq. (40) below). In practice, coefficients of the $\hat{A}^2$ term in circuit setups may have to be modified depending on resonator geometries. Our formalism below can readily be generalized to include such specifics.

Second, we invoke neither the two-level approximation of an emitter nor the rotating wave approximation (RWA), which are often used in the literature but will break down when the light-matter interaction becomes sufficiently strong. In particular, it will be crucial to take into account the multilevel structure of an emitter to unveil the key physics in nonperturbative regimes as we demonstrate later. We also note that the $\hat{A}^2$ term must be incorporated to retain the gauge invariance of the theory, and its inclusion becomes particularly essential when one goes beyond the ultrastrong coupling regime. Meanwhile, we assume that the length scale of a quantum emitter is much smaller than the photon wavelength in such a way that the $\hat{Q}$ dependence of the vector potential $\hat{A}$ can be
the eigenvalue problem (7). The label \( n \neq 0 \) indicates the dominant electromagnetic mode with the largest eigenfrequency. The length scales \( \xi_n \) in Eq. (11) are normalized by \( x_\omega \) in Eq. (20) and characterize the effective light-matter coupling strengths for the dominant \( n = 0 \) and the other modes \( n \neq 0 \) in the transformed frame. The effective mass \( m_{\text{eff}} \) is defined by Eq. (15) with the renormalization factor (16). The two lowest rows correspond to the expectation values of the total photon numbers with respect to the low-energy eigenstates in the transformed frame (denoted by \( U \)) or in the Coulomb gauge (denoted by \( C \)); see Eqs. (30) and (38).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>USC</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>ESC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \Omega_0/\omega )</td>
<td>( g/\omega \sim 0.1 )</td>
<td>( \sim \sqrt{1 + 2g^2/\omega^2} )</td>
<td>( \sim g )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Omega_{n\neq0}/\omega )</td>
<td>( \approx 1 )</td>
<td>( \approx 1 )</td>
<td>( \approx g^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \xi_0/x_\omega )</td>
<td>( \approx g^2/\omega^2 )</td>
<td>( \approx \sqrt{g^2/\omega^2} )</td>
<td>( \approx g^{-1/2} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \xi_{n\neq0}/x_\omega )</td>
<td>( \approx g/\sqrt{\Lambda} )</td>
<td>( \approx \sqrt{g^2/\omega^2} )</td>
<td>( \approx g^{-1} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( m_{\text{eff}}/m )</td>
<td>( \approx 1 )</td>
<td>( \approx 1 + 2g^2/\omega^2 )</td>
<td>( \approx g^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \langle \sum_n \hat{b}_n^\dagger \hat{b}_n \rangle_U )</td>
<td>( = O(g^2/\omega^2) )</td>
<td>( \approx \sqrt{g^2/\omega^2} )</td>
<td>( \approx g^{-3}, g^{-2} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \langle \sum_k \hat{a}_k^\dagger \hat{a}_k \rangle_C )</td>
<td>( = O(g^2/\omega^2) )</td>
<td>( \approx \sqrt{g^2/\omega^2} )</td>
<td>( \approx g )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The resulting Hamiltonian in the asymptotically decoupled frame is

\[
\hat{H}_U = \hat{U}^\dagger \hat{H}_C \hat{U} = \frac{\hat{P}^2}{2m_{\text{eff}}} + V(\hat{Q} + \hat{\Xi}) + \sum_n \hbar \Omega_n \hat{b}_n^\dagger \hat{b}_n. \tag{14}
\]

Here the effective mass is defined as

\[
m_{\text{eff}} \equiv m(1 + 2\Theta), \tag{15}
\]

where the mass enhancement is characterized by the dimensionless quantity \( \Theta \) whose expression (16) follows from Eq. (7). This renormalization comes from the \( \hat{P}^2 \) terms arising from the residual contributions generated by displacing the \( \hat{P} \cdot (\hat{b} + \hat{b}^\dagger) \) and \( \hat{b} \hat{b}^\dagger \) terms. After the transformation, the light-matter interaction is incorporated in the external potential \( V \) in the form of the gauge-field-dependent shift of the emitter, and its effective coupling strength is characterized by \( \xi_n \) instead of the bare coupling \( g_k \).

Hereafter we first focus on the case of a gapped dispersion with frequencies \( \omega_k > 0 \) \( \forall k \), for which \( \Theta \) remains finite. This includes experimentally relevant systems such as coupled cavity arrays and open microwave transmission lines. The case of a gapless dispersion should be analyzed separately, since one can find an infrared divergence of \( \Theta \) in that case; we will revisit this issue in Sec. VI.

C. Scaling analysis of the effective parameters

To demonstrate the asymptotic light-matter decoupling, we perform the scaling analysis of the renormalized parameters

neglected. This long-wave assumption ultimately puts an upper limit on the light-matter coupling when the confinement length scale of the emerging localized mode analyzed below becomes comparable to the emitter size.

B. Asymptotic decoupling transformation

We now introduce a unitary transformation to asymptotically decouple light and matter degrees of freedom [61]:

\[
\hat{U} = \exp \left( -\frac{i}{\hbar} \hat{P} \hat{\Xi} \right), \tag{9}
\]

where \( \hat{\Xi} \) is given as

\[
\hat{\Xi} \equiv \sum_n i\xi_n (\hat{b}_n^\dagger - \hat{b}_n), \tag{10}
\]

\[
\xi_n \equiv \frac{\zeta_n}{\Omega_n}. \tag{11}
\]

This transformation acts on individual operators via

\[
\hat{U}^\dagger \hat{Q} \hat{U} = \hat{\Xi} + \hat{\Xi}, \tag{12}
\]

\[
\hat{U}^\dagger \hat{b}_n \hat{U} = \hat{b}_n + \frac{\xi_n \hat{P}}{\hbar}, \tag{13}
\]

where the emitter position is shifted by the gauge-field-dependent displacement \( \Xi \) while each photon mode is subject to the momentum-dependent shift \( \xi_n \hat{P}/\hbar \). We note that the displacement variables \( \xi_n \) in Eq. (11) are chosen in such a way that the \( \hat{P} \cdot (\hat{b} + \hat{b}^\dagger) \) term in Eq. (4) will be precisely cancelled by the contributions arising from the displacement of the \( \hat{b} \hat{b}^\dagger \) term via Eq. (13).
with respect to the interaction strength. To this end, we introduce the characteristic photonic frequency \( \omega \) and the coupling strength \( g \) as follows:

\[
\omega^2 = \sum_k \omega_k^2/L, \quad g^2 = \sum_k g_k^2,
\]

(17) \hspace{1cm} (18)

where we note \( g = O(L^0) \) with \( g_k \ll L^{-1/2} \). We begin by considering the regime \( g/\omega > 1 \) in which the coupling strength is dominant over other energy scales; we shall refer to it as the extremely strong coupling (ESC) regime [61]. There, the eigenvalue problem (7) has a single dominant mode (which we label \( n = 0 \)) with the largest eigenfrequency \( \Omega_0 \propto g \) and \( \sum_k g_k O_{0k} \simeq g \), while the other frequencies remain \( \Omega_{n \neq 0} = O(\omega) \) with \( \sum_k g_k O_{n \neq 0k} \simeq O(g^{-1}) \). This leads to the scalings \( \xi_0 \propto g^{-1/2} \) and \( \xi_{n \neq 0} \propto g^{-1} \), i.e., the light-matter interaction in \( \hat{H}_U \) asymptotically vanishes in the strong-coupling limit.

In the deep strong coupling (DSC) regime \( g/\omega \ll 1 \) [60], one can continue the scaling analysis in the similar manner and obtain slightly refined expressions as summarized in Table I. There, we denote the variance of a photonic dispersion (or the effective bandwidth) as

\[
\delta^2 = \sum_k (\omega_k - \omega)^2/L, \quad x_\omega = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{m_\omega}},
\]

and normalize the length scale by the characteristic one

\[
x_\omega = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{m_\omega}}.
\]

(19) \hspace{1cm} (20)

In Table I, we also summarize the scaling relations in the ultrastrong coupling (USC) regime \( g/\omega \sim 0.1 \), which can readily be obtained by the perturbative analysis. All these scalings will later be demonstrated in a case study of coupled cavity arrays (see Fig. 2 below).

Besides the asymptotic decoupling in the strong-coupling limit, one notable result of this scaling analysis is that the displacement parameters \( \xi_n \) and consequently the effective light-matter couplings in the AD frame remain small over the entire region of \( g \). As detailed below, this fact allows us to significantly simplify the analysis in a broad range of coupling strengths, including the realms beyond the USC regime which are otherwise challenging to investigate in any previous theoretical approaches.

D. Vacuum-dressed potential and decoupled excitations

To analyze low-energy eigenstates of \( \hat{H}_U \), it is useful to rewrite it in the following manner:

\[
\hat{H}_U = \hat{H}_{\text{matter}} + \hat{H}_{\text{int}} + \hat{H}_{\text{light}},
\]

(21)

where we define the matter Hamiltonian by

\[
\hat{H}_{\text{matter}} = \hat{P}^2/2m_{\text{eff}} + V_{\text{eff}}(\hat{Q})
\]

(22)

with \( m_{\text{eff}} \) being the renormalized mass (15) and \( V_{\text{eff}} \) being the dressed potential given as

\[
V_{\text{eff}}(Q) = V(Q) + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{\xi^{2l}(2l)!}{l!} V^{(2l)}(Q),
\]

(23)

\[
\xi^2 = \sum_n \xi_n^2,
\]

(24)

where \( V^{(l)} \) is the l-th derivative of \( V \). The interaction Hamiltonian is given by

\[
\hat{H}_{\text{int}} = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{\xi^l}{l!} \hat{V}^{(l)}(\hat{Q}),
\]

(25)

where \( \hat{V} \) is the total normal ordering of reactive operators with \( |0\rangle \) being the vacuum state in the AD frame:

\[
|\psi_n(\hat{Q})\rangle = 0 \quad \forall n.
\]

(26)

We emphasize that this vacuum state is distinct from the original vacuum of \( \alpha \) operators in the Coulomb gauge due to the squeezing (cf. Eq. (5)). Finally, we denote the photon Hamiltonian as

\[
\hat{H}_{\text{light}} = \sum_n \hbar \Omega_n \hat{b}_n^\dagger \hat{b}_n.
\]

(27)

Equations (23) and (25) can be obtained by expanding the interaction term in Eq. (14) with respect to \( \hat{\Xi} \) and using the relations \( \langle 0|\hat{\Xi}^2|0\rangle = (2l - 1)!\xi^{2l} \) and \( \langle 0|\hat{\Xi}^{2l+1}|0\rangle = 0 \).

Arguably, the most celebrated signature of quantum fluctuations of the electromagnetic field for an isolated ground-state atom is the Lamb shift. Incorporation of light-matter coupling exclusively through a modification of the external potential \( V(Q + \hat{\Xi}) \) renders the origin of the Lamb shift explicit; fluctuations in \( \hat{\Xi} \) add to the intrinsic fluctuations of \( \hat{Q} \) to enhance the variance of the effective particle position. This feature manifests itself as the nonvanishing dressing in the effective potential (23) without any externally excited photons; it originates from the zero-point fluctuations of the electromagnetic fields. Here, the dominant contribution to the dressing strength \( \xi_n \) comes from the mode \( n = 0 \) and thus \( \xi_n \) basically obeys the same scaling relation satisfied by \( \xi_0 \) in Table I. If necessary, the summation over \( l \) can in practice be truncated at a certain order that scales inversely with the coupling strength \( g \) owing to the asymptotic vanishment of \( \xi_n \). In particular, in the limit of weak light-matter coupling, the energy shift of the ground state is captured by the \( l = 1 \) term of Eq. (23). We emphasize however that the effective-mass enhancement also modifies the ground-state energy.

Because of the decoupling \( \xi_0 \propto g^{-1/2} \) and enhancement of the effective photon frequency \( \Omega_0 \propto g \), low-energy eigenstates of \( \hat{H}_U \) in the strong-coupling limit can be written as a product of the emitter eigenstates and the photon vacuum as follows:

\[
|\Psi_\alpha\rangle_U = |\psi_\alpha\rangle|0\rangle,
\]

(28)

where \( |\psi_\alpha\rangle \) with \( \alpha = 1, 2, \ldots \) are single-particle eigenstates of \( \hat{H}_{\text{matter}} \) in Eq. (22); we then represent it as

\[
\hat{H}_{\text{matter}} = \sum_\alpha E_\alpha(g)|\psi_\alpha\rangle \langle \psi_\alpha|.
\]

(29)
with $E_1 \leq E_2 \leq \cdots$ being the corresponding eigenenergies. These single-particle energies $E_n$ provide asymptotically exact excitation energies of the total Hamiltonian $H_U$, which in the original Coulomb gauge corresponds to an intrinsically many-body problem with highly entangled light-matter degrees of freedom (cf. Eq. (1)). We note that the mass enhancement $m_{\text{eff}} \propto g^2$ leads to the tight localization of $|\psi_{n}\rangle$ around the bottom of $V_{\text{eff}}$; accordingly, the excitation energies $\delta E_n \equiv E_n - E_1$ decrease as $\delta E_n \propto g^{-1}$ in the nonperturbative regimes as long as $V_{\text{eff}}$ has well-defined minima.

E. Few-photon many-body ansatz at arbitrary coupling strengths

The scaling analysis indicates that the total number of photons in the AD frame remains small over the entire coupling region (cf. Table I). In particular, in the ESC regime, the standard perturbation theory predicts that the photon number in the ground state is on the order of $(g\omega L)^2$ around the bottom of $V_{\text{eff}}$; for $g = \frac{3}{5}$, the excitation energies are localized to the emitter degree of freedom and cannot decay to the continuum at all. This motivates us to consider two-level description of an emitter, on which most of the previous studies rely, becomes invalid once one enters into the DSC and ESC regimes as detailed below. We will show that it is actually such multilevel structure that leads to a defining feature of the waveguide QED in genuinely nonperturbative regimes. Our approach gets around these difficulties encountered in previous studies by employing the (asymptotically exact) disentangling unitary transformation, after which the whole low-energy eigenstates are well restricted into the few-photon manifold (31) at any coupling strengths.

III. GENERIC FEATURES OF NONPERTURBATIVE WAVEGUIDE QED

We next delineate key physical features of waveguide QED that emerge when one enters into the nonperturbative regimes on the basis of the theoretical formalism developed in Sec. II. To understand the qualitative physics, it is sufficient, as a first step, to consider the decoupled excitations (28) that belong to the simplest, zero-photon subspace $H_0$. The results discussed here establish universal nonperturbative features which hold true independent of specific choices of microscopic parameters. We will make these predictions quantitatively accurate in the next section by extending the analysis to the few-photon many-body ansatz in the subspace $H_{N_c > 0}$.

A. Ladder of many-body bound states

One of the most surprising results is the appearance of a ladder of many-body bound states. To see this, we recall that the excitation energies of the decoupled states (28) decrease as $\delta E_n \propto 1/g$ due to the mass enhancement, and eventually lie outside of the photon continuum,

$$\delta E_n \notin [\hbar \omega_{L(U)}, \hbar \omega_U],$$

where $\omega_{L(U)}$ represents the lower (upper) frequency limit of the photon dispersion. These states are energetically separated from scattering states and thus form bound states (BS), i.e., the excitation energies are localized to the emitter degree of freedom and cannot decay to the continuum at all. This emergence of multiple low-lying BS is inaccessible by the com-
monly used two-level treatments that can be valid only up to the USC regime. For this reason, the appearance of BS ladder can be considered as one of the defining features of the DSC and ESC regimes of waveguide QED.

Interestingly, these bound states appear with equal energy spacing that narrows as \( \delta E \propto 1/g \). This results from the increase of the emitter mass \( m_{\text{eff}} \propto g^2 \) and the ensuing tight localization of the wavefunction, which can be best understood in the AD frame. The low-energy spectrum then reduces to the harmonic one as long as the potential is well-behaved and can be expanded quadratically around the minima. Importantly, in the original frame, these states behave as the many-body BS, which are strongly entangled states including high-momentum emitter states and exponentially localized (virtual) photons. It is worthwhile to note that photon localization in these bound states becomes increasingly tight at greater \( g \) and can be much smaller than the (bare) emitter-transition wavelength; this feature should be contrasted to usual atom-field dressed bound states [91].

**B. Many-body bound states in the continuum**

Even when the decoupled excitations (28) lie within the photon continuum, they can behave as either symmetry-protected bound states in the continuum (BIC) or quasi BIC with lifetime that diverges in the strong-coupling limit. First, to understand the origin of such symmetry-protected BIC, suppose that the potential respects the inversion symmetry, \( V(Q) = V(-Q) \). The total light-matter Hamiltonian then satisfies the following \( Z_2 \) symmetry:

\[
\hat{P}^{-1} \hat{H}_U \hat{P} = \hat{H}_U, \quad \hat{P}^2 = 1, \tag{34}
\]

\[
\hat{P}^{-1} \hat{Q} \hat{P} = -\hat{Q}, \tag{35}
\]

where \( \hat{P} \) acts on the emitter operators as \( \hat{P}^{-1} \hat{P} \hat{P} = -\hat{P} \), \( \hat{P}^{-1} \hat{Q} \hat{P} = -\hat{Q} \), and also transforms the photon field via \( \hat{P}^{-1} \hat{b}_n \hat{P} = -\hat{b}_n \). It is clear that, if a decoupled excitation lying in the photon continuum has a different parity from that of scattering states, it leads to the exact BIC protected by the above \( Z_2 \) symmetry. For instance, the lowest photon continuum has the odd parity, while a half of the decoupled excitations (28) have the even parity and thus can behave as the BIC when the excitation energies lie within the continuum.

Interestingly, even if a decoupled excitation has the same parity as scattering states, it can still behave as a long-lifetime resonance, which is often called quasi BIC. Indeed, the scaling analysis of its decay rate given by the Fermi’s golden rule results in

\[
\Gamma_{\text{qBIC}} \propto g^{-3/2}, \tag{36}
\]

which vanishes in the strong-coupling limit. The same argument also applies to the case when the \( Z_2 \) symmetry is not exact due to, e.g., the broken inversion symmetry, \( V(Q) \neq V(-Q) \); the symmetry-protected BIC discussed above then become resonances in this case, however, their lifetimes still diverge in the strong-coupling limit. Physically, these (quasi) BIC originate from the strong light-matter interaction containing the diamagnetic effect, which tends to prevent scattering photons from interacting with the many-body BS consisting of virtual photons localized around the emitter. We emphasize that the physics of (quasi) BIC discussed here qualitatively remains the same also in the case of a gapless dispersion unless \( \Theta \) diverges (see Sec. V).

It is worthwhile to note that fine-tuning of the coupling strength is not necessary to observe the (quasi) BIC here. Specifically, there always exists a nonzero measure parameter regime of \( g \) such that a certain excitation lies in the photon continuum,

\[
\delta E_\alpha(g) \in [\hbar \omega_L, \hbar \omega_U]. \tag{37}
\]

The reason for this is as follows. At zero coupling, one can find an emitter state lying above the continuum, i.e., \( \delta E_\alpha(g = 0) > \hbar \omega_U \). In the ESC regime, this excitation energy asymptotically decreases as \( \delta E_\alpha(g) \propto g^{-1} \) and ultimately converges to zero. Thus, between these two limits, there must exist an intermediate coupling regime such that the relation (37) is satisfied. The metastability of these states stems from the fact that radiation field modes that are resonant with them have small amplitudes at the emitter position.

**C. Vacuum-induced suppression in potential barrier**

Yet another common feature in the nonperturbative regimes is the vacuum-induced suppression of potential barrier in \( V_{\text{eff}} \). This can readily be understood from Eq. (23), where the vacuum fluctuations decrease (increase) the energies at local maxima (minima), thus lowering the potential barrier felt by the particle when tunneling to a different local minimum (see Fig. 4 below for an illustrative example of the double-well potential). The amount of this suppression nonmonotonically depends on the coupling strength, since it is solely determined by the displacement parameter \( \xi \) that exhibits the nonmonotonic \( g \) dependence (see Eq. (24) and Table I).

When one considers quantum tunneling, the mass renormalization eventually dominates the barrier suppression and thus the tunneling rate is ultimately exponentially suppressed in the strong coupling limit. In contrast, if thermal activation over the barrier, i.e., thermal escape, is of interest, the escape rate is basically characterized by the ratio of the potential barrier to the temperature, but independent of the mass. Thus, it is a universal feature that a thermal escape should be enhanced by strong light-matter couplings owing to the vacuum-induced suppression of the barrier. This may provide a physical explanation of recent experimental observations in polaritonic chemistry [27–29], where the thermally activated chemical reaction was found to be enhanced due to cavity confinement.

**D. Breakdown of level truncations in the Coulomb and PZW gauges**

We finally point out that an analysis relying on the Coulomb or PZW gauges must in general become invalid at a suffi-
ciently strong light-matter coupling. This difficulty arises from the breakdown of level truncations in photon and emitter degrees of freedom in the nonperturbative regimes. Specifically, we first note that the mean photon number in the Coulomb gauge grows as (cf. Table I)

$$\langle \sum_k \hat{a}_k^\dagger \hat{a}_k \rangle_C \propto g. \quad (38)$$

The same scaling also applies to the photon-number fluctuations. The number of photon basis required to analyze the Coulomb-gauge Hamiltonian (1) thus exponentially diverges as $g$ is increased. This eventually invalidates truncation of photon levels, which is actually inevitable in almost any analysis of bosonic many-body systems.

Similarly, the truncation of matter levels also becomes ill-justified at a sufficiently large $g$ in the conventional gauges; in particular, this fact indicates the breakdown of the usual two-level descriptions of quantum emitters in the nonperturbative regimes. To see this, we use the unitary transformation (9) to express the decoupled states (28) in the Coulomb gauge

$$|\Psi_\alpha\rangle_C = \hat{U}|\psi_\alpha\rangle|0\rangle = \int dP \psi_\alpha(P)|P\rangle e^{-i\hat{P}^\dagger|0\rangle}, \quad (39)$$

where we expand an emitter state $|\psi_\alpha\rangle$ in terms of the momentum eigenstates $|P\rangle$. In the strong-coupling limit, the variance of the momentum distribution $|\psi_\alpha(P)|^2$ diverges with $\sigma_P \propto g$ due to the mass renormalization $m_{\text{eff}} \propto g^2$. Thus, an energy eigenstate in the Coulomb gauge is a strongly entangled emitter-photon state consisting of a superposition of higher momentum states at larger $g$. This fact eventually invalidates the common analyses that rely on either two-level approximation or a fixed momentum cutoff for an emitter.

Note that these difficulties are carried over in the PZW gauge (also known as the dipole gauge). To see this, we recall that the corresponding Hamiltonian in the long-wavelength limit is given by $H_{\text{PZW}} = \hat{U}_{\text{PZW}}^\dagger H_C \hat{U}_{\text{PZW}}$ with the PZW transformation $\hat{U}_{\text{PZW}} = \exp(i\hat{Q}A/\hbar)$:

$$\hat{H}_{\text{PZW}} = \frac{\hat{P}^2}{2m} + V(\hat{Q}) + mg^2\hat{Q}^2 + g\hat{Q}\hat{E} + \sum_k \hbar \omega_k \hat{a}_k^\dagger \hat{a}_k, \quad \hat{E} \equiv \sum_k i\hbar \omega_k (\hat{a}_k^\dagger - \hat{a}_k). \quad (40)$$

As is the case with the Coulomb gauge, the mean/fluuctuation of the photon number in this gauge rapidly grows at strong couplings, while the mass remains at the bare value which leads to eventual breakdown of matter-level truncation. In contrast, the AD frame makes both photon- and emitter-level truncations well-justified and allows us to reveal the key features in the nonperturbative regimes as outlined above.

IV. APPLICATION TO COUPLED CAVITY ARRAY

We here demonstrate all the generic features discussed in Sec. III by analyzing a concrete model of coupled cavity ar-

FIG. 2. (a) Renormalized photon frequencies $\Omega_n$ in Eq. (7), (b) displacement parameters $\xi_n$ in Eq. (11), and (c) expectation values of the total photon number plotted against the light-matter coupling strength $g$ in Eq. (45). In (a,b), the red solid (blue dashed) curve shows the values corresponding to the dominant mode $n = 0$ (the other modes $n \neq 0$), where the dominant mode is characterized by the highest frequency $\Omega_0 \approx \sqrt{\omega_c^2 + 2g^2}$. Note that only a part of $n \neq 0$ modes is plotted for the sake of visibility. In (c), the red solid curves show the total number of dressed photons for the two-lowest eigenstates in the asymptotically decoupled (AD) frame (cf. Eq. (30)), while the blue dashed ones show the corresponding number of bare photons in the Coulomb gauge (cf. Eq. (38)). Parameters are $J = 0.2$ in (a,b), and $J = 0.2, v = 0.5$, and $d = 1.2$ in (c). All the numerical values are shown in the unit $\omega_c = \hbar = m = 1$ throughout this paper.
We model a quantum emitter as a charged particle trapped in the standard double-well potential,
\[ V(Q) = v \left(1 - \frac{Q^2}{d^2}\right)^2, \tag{46} \]
where \( v \) is a potential depth and \( d \) characterizes a position of the potential minima. While we here focus on this minimal model for a quantum emitter, our theoretical formalism is equally applicable to a general potential landscape that may be more complex depending on each specific system or problem, such as transmon/flux qubits or chemical reactions.

Figure 2(a,b) shows the renormalized parameters in the AD frame at different coupling strengths, which are fully consistent with the scaling analysis summarized in Table I. Specifically, beyond the USC regime, a single mode labeled by \( n = 0 \) turns out to have a large renormalized eigenfrequency and dominantly couples to the emitter, while the other modes with \( n \neq 0 \) basically remain at the bare frequencies and are almost decoupled from the emitter. As shown in Fig. 2(c), the total photon number in the AD frame vanishes as \( \propto g^{-1} \) as consistent with the scalings \( \Omega_0 \propto g \) and \( \zeta_0 \propto g^{-1/2} \), while in the Coulomb gauge the photon number increases as \( \propto g \).

A. Bound states, symmetry-protected BIC, quasi BIC

Figure 3 shows the low-energy excitation spectrum of a quantum emitter coupled to the cavity array in a broad range of the coupling strength \( g \). This spectrum is obtained by the exact diagonalization of the QED Hamiltonian in the AD frame (14) within the few-photon many-body ansatz (31) (see Appendix B for details about the method). We note that the emitter parameters \( v \) and \( d \) in Fig. 3 are chosen in such a way that the bare emitter frequency is resonant to the cavity frequency, i.e., \( (E_2 - E_1)/\hbar \simeq \omega_c \) at \( g = 0 \).

The eigenstates insensitive to \( g \) and staying in the photonic band,
\[ \delta E_{\text{sc}} \in [\hbar \omega_c - J, \hbar \omega_c + J], \tag{47} \]
correspond to the single-photon scattering states, which are extended over the waveguide and constitute the energy continuum in the thermodynamic limit. In contrast, the eigenstates lying out of the band continuum,
\[ \delta E_{\text{BS}} \notin [\hbar \omega_c - J, \hbar \omega_c + J], \tag{48} \]
behave as the bound states and are accompanied by virtual photons localized around the emitter. In the nonperturbative regimes, the energies of these bound states decrease as \( \delta E_{\text{BS}} \propto g^{-1} \) and are asymptotically determined by the excitation energies \( \delta E_\alpha \) of the decoupled states (28). This point is confirmed in the left panel of Fig. 3, where the exact spectrum (blue solid curves) eventually agrees with the asymptotic values (red dashed curves).
As discussed earlier, when these bound states lie in the band continuum,
\[ \delta E_{(q)\text{BIC}} \in [\hbar \omega_c - J, \hbar \omega_c + J], \]  
they behave either as the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-symmetry-protected BIC or as the quasi BIC. These features manifest themselves as the absence of anticrossings in the finite-size spectrum (Fig. 3(a)) or as the presence of tiny anticrossings with scattering states (Fig. 3(b)), respectively. We note that this tiny anticrossing of the quasi BIC originates from its vanishingly small decay rate, which can be estimated as (cf. Eq. (36) and the related discussions in Sec. III B)
\[ \Gamma_{q\text{BIC}} \sim \frac{(J/\hbar)^2}{g \sqrt{m \omega_c^3 d^3}} \left( \frac{v^3}{m_{\text{eff}}} \right)^{1/4} \propto g^{-3/2}. \]  
In the ESC regime, the origin of these bound states can also be understood from the fact that the cavity mode spatially overlapping with the emitter is shifted in frequency outside the photonic continuum and thereby hopping to neighboring cavities is strongly suppressed. All the excited light-emitter states within the photonic continuum will then become (quasi) BIC because of this suppression.

We also remark that, in Fig. 3, one can also find several continuum spectra that connect the two-photon continuum with the single-photon one as $g$ is increased. Physically, these states consist of the single-photon scattering states on top of the first, second, and third excited bound states. The $g$ dependence of those energies can be understood as follows. They first rapidly decrease with increasing $g$ until $g/\omega_c \approx 5$. There, bound-state energies are initially above the height of the potential barrier at $Q = 0$ and hence there are no double degeneracies. As we increase $g$ further and bound-state energies go well below the potential barrier, these states become nearly degenerate because they now form a pair of symmetric and antisymmetric combinations of excitations localized around each of the two minima in the double-well potential. For instance, in Fig. 3 the energy of the third excited state eventually approaches that of the second excited state and they begin to overlap and become doubly degenerate from $g/\omega_c > 5$.

**B. Dressed potential**

The effective emitter potential (23) in the AD frame is dressed by vacuum electromagnetic fields. In the present case of the double-well potential, the corresponding dressed potential is given by
\[ V_{\text{eff}}(Q) = v_{\text{eff}} \left( 1 - \frac{Q^2}{d^2_{\text{eff}}} \right)^2, \]  
where we neglect an irrelevant constant, introduce the renormalized potential barrier $v_{\text{eff}}$ as
\[ v_{\text{eff}} = \begin{cases} 
 v \left( 1 - \frac{3g^2}{\omega_c^2 d} \right)^2 \xi \leq \frac{d}{\sqrt{3}} \\
 0 \quad \xi > \frac{d}{\sqrt{3}}
\end{cases}, \]  
and define the effective dipole length by $d_{\text{eff}} = (v_{\text{eff}}/v)^{1/4}$.

As expected from the general argument in Sec. III C, the barrier $v_{\text{eff}}$ is always suppressed compared to the bare value $v$ and the suppression is most significant when $\xi$ becomes maximum, which occurs around the DSC regime (see Fig. 4(a)). Interestingly, when the displacement parameter $\xi$ becomes sufficiently large such that $\xi > d/\sqrt{3}$, even the full suppression of the potential barrier, i.e., $v_{\text{eff}} = 0$, is possible. Nevertheless, this does not mean that the entire potential is suppressed because the dipole length $d_{\text{eff}}$ in Eq. (51) also converges to zero in this case; the resulting potential is the quartic one with the single minimum (see Fig. 4(b) for an illustrative example).

**C. Two-level effective model and its breakdown in the Coulomb gauge**

Construction of the Jaynes-Cummings-type effective model is often useful to simplify the analysis of the original QED Hamiltonian, especially when low-energy excitations are of interest. This can be done by performing the two-level truncation of the emitter and assuming the rotating wave approximation. In the AD frame, such procedure leads to the standard Jaynes-Cummings Hamiltonian, but with the suitably renor-
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*FIG. 4*. Potential barrier $v_{\text{eff}}$ of the vacuum-dressed effective potential $V_{\text{eff}}(Q)$ at different coupling strengths $g$ (see Eq. (52)). The suppression and eventual restoration of the barrier arises from the nonmonotonic $g$ dependence of $\xi$ in Eq. (24) (cf. Fig. 2(b)). Insets show typical spatial profiles of the effective potential in each regime. Parameters are $J = 0.1$, $v = 0.5$, and $d = 1$ in (a), and $J = 0.1$, $v = 0.5$, and $d = 0.6$ in (b).
malized parameters,

\[ H_{UC}^{\text{eff}} = \frac{\hbar}{2} \hat{\Delta} \hat{\sigma}^z + \left( \hat{\sigma}^+ \sum_n h \hat{g}_n \hat{b}_n^\dagger + \text{H.c.} \right) + \sum_n h \Omega_n \hat{b}_n^\dagger \hat{b}_n, \]  

where the renormalized emitter frequency \( \Delta_g \) and the effective coupling strengths \( \tilde{g}_n \) are defined by

\[ \Delta_g \equiv \frac{E_2 - E_1}{\hbar} > 0, \quad (54) \]

\[ \tilde{g}_n \equiv \frac{\xi_n}{\hbar} \left( \frac{dV}{dQ} \right) |\psi_1\rangle \cdot |\psi_2\rangle. \quad (55) \]

We recall that \( E_{1,2} \) (\(|\psi_{1,2}\rangle\)) represent the two-lowest eigenenergies (eigenstates) of the renormalized emitter Hamiltonian \( (22) \), and thus depend on the coupling strength \( g \) through \( m_{\text{eff}} \) and \( V_{\text{eff}} \).

Importantly, since the effective spin-bath couplings \( \tilde{g}_n \) remain small over the entire region (cf. Fig. 2(b)), the rotating wave approximation in Eq. (53) can be performed even beyond the USC regime. Also, the two-level truncation for the emitter in the AD frame here should remain meaningful as discussed in Sec. III D. We thus expect the effective model \( H_{UC}^{\text{eff}} \) to be valid not only at weak \( g \), but also in the nonperturbative regimes.

To demonstrate this, we plot in Fig. 5 the lowest excitation energy \( E_{\text{ex}} \) of \( H_{UC}^{\text{eff}} \) which is obtained from the following analytic relation for the single-excitation subspace,

\[ E_{\text{ex}} - \Delta_g = \sum_n \frac{\tilde{g}_n^2}{E_{\text{ex}} - \Omega_n}. \quad (56) \]

Indeed, it agrees well with the exact values even in the DSC regime. In contrast, the conventional two-level model constructed from the Coulomb-gauge Hamiltonian is given by

\[ H_{UC}^{\text{Coul}} = \frac{\hbar}{2} \hat{\Delta} \hat{\sigma}^z + \left( \hat{\sigma}^+ \sum_k h \hat{g}_k \hat{a}_k^\dagger + \text{H.c.} \right) + \sum_k h \omega_k \hat{a}_k^\dagger \hat{a}_k, \]  

where \( \Delta \) and \( \hat{g}_k \) are the bare parameters defined by

\[ \Delta \equiv \Delta_g = 0, \quad (58) \]

\[ \hat{g}_k \equiv \frac{g}{\sqrt{L}} x_{\omega_k} \langle \psi_{\text{q}} | \hat{Q}^0 \rangle |\psi_2\rangle \quad (59) \]

with \( x_{\omega_k} = \sqrt{\hbar/m_\omega \omega_k} \). This simplified Hamiltonian \( H_{UC}^{\text{Coul}} \) takes exactly the same form as \( H_{UC}^{\text{eff}} \) in Eq. (53), but with unrenormalized parameters. While this construction is valid at weak \( g \), it is well-known that such a naïve two-level description in the Coulomb gauge breaks down once one enters into the USC regime in which nonresonant processes become relevant and the two-level truncation becomes ill-justified (see the red dashed curve in Fig. 5).

In this respect, the AD frame significantly expands the applicability of the Jaynes-Cummings description beyond the weak coupling regimes, and thus allows one to use the standard techniques valid within the rotating wave approximation, such as the Wigner-Weisskopf theory, in a broad range of \( g \). Nevertheless, we remark that the effective Hamiltonian \( H_{UC}^{\text{eff}} \) constructed in the AD frame should also ultimately become invalid when \( \Delta_g \ll g_n \ll \omega_c \), where the counter rotating terms turn out to be equally important as rotating ones; this typically occurs in \( g \gtrsim 5 \). Instead, a more accurate description including the counter rotating terms, i.e., the quantum Rabi model, still remains valid even in such ESC regime.

**D. Quench dynamics**

The many-body bound states and the BIC lead to rich nonequilibrium dynamics in the nonperturbative regimes. To be concrete, we consider the quench protocol with the emitter parameter \( d \) in the double-well potential \( (46) \) being abruptly changed as \( d_i \rightarrow d_f \) at time \( t = 0 \) while keeping all the other parameters constant. This effectively changes the positions of the minima of \( V_{\text{eff}} \) and also modifies the qubit frequency. The initial state \( |\Psi(0)\rangle\) is chosen to be the ground state of the QED Hamiltonian at \( d = d_i \) and large fixed \( g \). We emphasize that, in the Coulomb gauge, this initial state is already a strongly entangled light-matter state consisting of virtual photons localized around the emitter. The quench protocol discussed here should be realized in the current experimental techniques of, e.g., circuit QED that deals with photons in microwave regime. As detailed below, this procedure provides a feasible way to experimentally detect the signature of the predicted many-body BIC, which cannot be excited by a single-photon scattering by definition.

We calculate the real-time dynamics by transforming to the AD frame, since the analysis in the Coulomb gauge becomes exponentially hard at large \( g \) as discussed earlier. Specifically, we exactly diagonalize the post-quench Hamiltonian \( H_U \) at
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FIG. 6. (a-c) Spatiotemporal dynamics of photon occupancy $n_x = \langle \hat{a}_x^\dagger \hat{a}_x \rangle_C$ after the quench at different coupling strengths $g$. (a,b) Excitations of propagating photons in the deep strong coupling regimes, and (c) photon confinement around the emitter at $x=0$ in the extremely strong coupling regime. (d-f) Corresponding dynamics of the photon occupancy $n_x=0$ at the emitter position, and (g-i) the initial weights in terms of eigenstates of the post-quench Hamiltonian (cf. Eq. (60)). In (d,e), the excitations of the (quasi) BIC lead to the slow, long-lasting oscillatory dynamics whose period is characterized by the bound-state energies. In (f), a ladder of bound states manifests itself as the oscillatory dynamics with a long period $T_{osc} = 2\pi/\omega_{osc}$ that diverges in the strong-coupling limit (cf. Eq. (62)). Parameters are $g = 1.2$, $J = 0.1$, $v = 0.5$, $d_i = 0.6$, and $d_f = 0.87$ in (a,d,g), $g = 1.3$, $J = 0.2$, $v = 1$, $d_i = 0.9$, and $d_f = 2.7$ in (b,e,h), and $g = 5$, $J = 0.1$, $v = 1$, $d_i = 2$, and $d_f = 2.5$ in (c,f,i).

To gain further insights into the oscillatory dynamics, we plot the time evolution of the photon occupancy at the origin $x=0$ in Fig. 6(d,e). We also show the corresponding initial weights $|c_i|$ in Fig. 6(g,h), where the blue shaded regions represent the energy continuum. One can see that the quench protocol excites the (quasi) BIC and the bound states with substantial weights and that their frequencies characterize the long-period oscillation in the dynamics, which typically has a period $T = O(10)$. Thus, those bound states manifest themselves as the long-lasting oscillatory behavior that associates with photons bouncing back and forth around the emitter.

In the ESC regime, photons are so strongly bound by the emitter that they cannot propagate into the waveguide (see Fig. 6(c)). Besides such photon confinement, the dynamics exhibits the increasingly slow coherent oscillation at larger $g$ (see Fig. 6(f)). This oscillatory behavior can be understood as follows. In the AD frame, the emitter and photons are asymptotically disentangled and the low-energy dynamics is solely governed by the renormalized emitter Hamiltonian (22) with no photon excitations. The present quench protocol then corresponds to the sudden shift of the potential minima of $V_{eff}$. Because the mass is enhanced as $m_{eff} \propto g^2$ and the

d = d_f$ (see Appendix B for details) and obtain the time evolution via

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle_U = e^{-iH_Ut}|\Psi(0)\rangle_U = \sum_i c_i e^{-iE_i t} |\Psi_i\rangle_U,$$

where $E_i (|\Psi_i\rangle_U)$ are the corresponding energies (eigenstates), and $c_i$ are expansion coefficients of the initial state. We then calculate the evolution of an observable $\hat{O}$ in the original Coulomb gauge through the unitary transformation

$$\langle \hat{O} \rangle_C = \langle \hat{U}^\dagger \hat{O} \hat{U} \rangle_U.$$

Figure 6(a,b) shows the typical spatiotemporal dynamics of photon occupancy $n_x = \langle \hat{a}_x^\dagger \hat{a}_x \rangle_C$ in the DSC regimes. One can find the nondecaying oscillatory dynamics that is most pronounced around the emitter position $x=0$ as well as the emission of propagating photons. The former originates from the existence of the many-body bound states and the (quasi) BIC, while the latter can be considered as the analogue of the dynamical Casimir effect in which physical photons are generated by quenching the vacuum $[104, 105]$. 

To gain further insights into the oscillatory dynamics, we plot the time evolution of the photon occupancy at the origin $x=0$ in Fig. 6(d,e). We also show the corresponding initial weights $|c_i|$ in Fig. 6(g,h), where the blue shaded regions represent the energy continuum. One can see that the quench protocol excites the (quasi) BIC and the bound states with substantial weights and that their frequencies characterize the long-period oscillation in the dynamics, which typically has a period $T = O(10)$. Thus, those bound states manifest themselves as the long-lasting oscillatory behavior that associates with photons bouncing back and forth around the emitter.

In the ESC regime, photons are so strongly bound by the emitter that they cannot propagate into the waveguide (see Fig. 6(c)). Besides such photon confinement, the dynamics exhibits the increasingly slow coherent oscillation at larger $g$ (see Fig. 6(f)). This oscillatory behavior can be understood as follows. In the AD frame, the emitter and photons are asymptotically disentangled and the low-energy dynamics is solely governed by the renormalized emitter Hamiltonian (22) with no photon excitations. The present quench protocol then corresponds to the sudden shift of the potential minima of $V_{eff}$. Because the mass is enhanced as $m_{eff} \propto g^2$ and the

$$\begin{align*}
\langle \hat{O} \rangle_C &= \langle \hat{U}^\dagger \hat{O} \hat{U} \rangle_U, \\
\sum_i c_i e^{-iE_i t} |\Psi_i\rangle_U,
\end{align*}$$

and obtain the time evolution via

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle_U = e^{-iH_Ut}|\Psi(0)\rangle_U = \sum_i c_i e^{-iE_i t} |\Psi_i\rangle_U,$$
wavepacket is tightly localized, this quench initiates the oscillatory dynamics where the wavepacket (initially localized at \( d \approx d_f \)) oscillates around the new minima at \( d \approx d_f \). Such oscillation frequency can be estimated as

\[
\omega_{\text{osc}} = \sqrt{\frac{8 U}{d_f^3 m_{\text{eff}}}} \left(1 - \frac{3 \xi^2}{d_f^2}\right) \propto g^{-1},
\]

which vanishes in the strong-coupling limit. The estimated period \( T_{\text{osc}} = 2\pi/\omega_{\text{osc}} \) agrees well with the observed long-period oscillation in Fig. 6(f). In the energy basis, this slow coherent dynamics manifests itself as excitations of a ladder of bound states corresponding to the decoupled eigenstates (28) (see Fig. 6(i)).

V. EXTENSION TO MULTIPLE QUANTUM EMITTERS

We now extend our theoretical formalism to the case of multiple quantum emitters. We discuss several limiting cases and construct the effective two-level model that is valid in a broad range of the light-matter coupling strength.

A. General formalism

We consider \( N \) emitters of mass \( m_j \) that are subject to potential \( V_j \) and locally interact with the common electromagnetic modes at positions \( x_j \) with \( j = 1, 2, \ldots, N \). We thus start from the multi-emitter QED Hamiltonian in the Coulomb gauge,

\[
\hat{H}_C = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left( \frac{\hat{P}_j - q \hat{A}_{x_j}}{2m_j} \right)^2 + V_j(\hat{Q}_j) + \sum_{kj} \hbar \omega_k \hat{a}_k^\dagger \hat{a}_k,
\]

where the position and momentum operators of the emitters satisfy

\[
[\hat{Q}_i, \hat{P}_j] = i\hbar \delta_{ij},
\]

and the vector potential is given by

\[
\hat{A}_{x_j} = \sum_k f_{kj} \left( \hat{a}_k e^{ikx_j} + \hat{a}_k^\dagger e^{-ikx_j} \right)
\]

with \( f_{kj} \) characterizing an electromagnetic coupling between photonic mode \( k \) and emitter \( j \); for the sake of simplicity, we assume \( f_{kj} = f_{-kj} \).

Generalizing the unitary transformation (9) to such multi-emitter case, we obtain the following Hamiltonian (see Appendix C for details):

\[
\hat{H}_U = \hat{H}_{\text{matter}} + \hat{H}_{\text{int}} + \hat{H}_{\text{light}},
\]

where the emitter part is given by

\[
\hat{H}_{\text{matter}} = \sum_j \left( \frac{\hat{\mathcal{H}}_j^2}{2m_{\text{eff},j}} + V_{\text{eff},j}(\hat{Q}_j) \right) + \sum_{i>j} \mu_{ij} \hat{P}_i \hat{P}_j
\]

with

\[
\mu_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + 2G\right)^{-1} \xi_{ij},
\]

\[
m_{\text{eff},j} = m_j/ \left(1 + 2G\right) \xi_{jj},
\]

Here, \( G \) is the \( N \times N \) matrix defined by

\[
G_{ij} = \sum_k \frac{g_{kj} g_{j}^*}{\omega_k} \cos(k(x_i - x_j)),
\]

\[
g_{kj} = q f_{kj} \sqrt{\omega_k m_j h},
\]

Physically, \( m_{\text{eff},j} \) in Eq. (68) represents the renormalized mass similar to \( m_{\text{eff}} \) in the single-emitter case considered before except for its dependence on emitter positions through \( G \). The coupling \( \mu_{ij} \) in Eq. (69) represents the waveguide-mediated interaction between emitters; in the original Coulomb gauge, this corresponds to the nondissipative coupling mediated by virtual photons in the waveguide.

In the renormalized multi-emitter Hamiltonian (67), the vacuum-dressed effective potentials \( V_{\text{eff},j} \) are given by

\[
V_{\text{eff},j}(Q) = V_j(Q) + \sum_{l=1}^{N} \xi_{ij} \| V_j^{(2l)}(Q) \|
\]

The interaction Hamiltonian is

\[
\hat{H}_{\text{int}} = \sum_j : V_j(\hat{Q}_j + \hat{\mathcal{H}}_j) :
\]

with

\[
\hat{\mathcal{H}}_j = \sum_n \xi_{nj} \hat{b}_n^\dagger - \xi_{nj}^* \hat{b}_n,
\]

where the displacement parameters \( \xi_{nj} \) characterize the effective coupling strengths between dressed photon mode \( n \) and emitter \( j \). The photon part \( \hat{H}_{\text{light}} \) takes the same form as the single-emitter case in Eq. (27) [106].

To be concrete, from now on we consider the case of identical emitters with \( m_j = m, V_j = V \), and \( f_{kj} = f_k \forall j \). This simplification leads to the identical bare light-matter couplings, \( g_{kj} = g_k \forall j \). In contrast, we note that the effective masses \( m_{\text{eff},j} \), the displacement parameters \( \xi_{nj} \), and the dressed potentials \( V_{\text{eff},j} \) still depend on the emitter positions, and thus we need subscript \( j \) to distinguish them. While we only illustrate key aspects of several limiting cases below, the multi-emitter formulation developed here establishes a solid starting point to accurately analyze arbitrary multi-emitter waveguide QED systems in a broad range of the light-matter coupling strength.

B. Two emitters

We begin by discussing the two-emitter case. Figure 7 plots the waveguide-mediated coupling \( \mu_{21} \) and the effective mass \( m_{\text{eff}} \) against the emitter separation at different coupling
strengths $g$. We here assume the waveguide to be the same cavity array as considered in Sec. IV. In the USC regime, the coupling $\mu_{21}$ exhibits the oscillatory behavior and can be long-ranged. As $g$ is further increased, it becomes increasingly short-ranged with oscillations being damped (see Fig. 7(a)). Such suppression can be interpreted as a nonperturbative effect originating from the tighter confinement of virtual photons around the emitters.

Figure 7(b) shows that the effective mass monotonically increases at larger $g$. As noted earlier, the effective mass in multi-emitter systems is sensitive to the emitter separation; for the two-emitter case, it starts from $m_{21}^{(1+2\Theta)}$ at zero separation and eventually saturates to the single-emitter limit $m(1+2\Theta)$ when the separation surpasses the cavity length $x_{\omega_c} = 1$ (cf. Eq. (15) and (16)).

### C. Localized $N$ emitters

We next consider the case in which all the emitters are coupled to the waveguide at the same position $x_1 = \cdots = x_N = 0$. This corresponds to the case of $N$ (artificial) atoms collectively coupled to the common electromagnetic fields, which is relevant to various experimental setups. It is useful to introduce the collective momentum and coordinate by

$$
\mathbf{\hat{P}}_{\text{CM}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathbf{N}}} \sum_j \mathbf{\hat{P}}_j, \quad \mathbf{\hat{Q}}_{\text{CM}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathbf{N}}} \sum_j \mathbf{\hat{Q}}_j, \quad (76)
$$

as well as the relative ones via

$$
\mathbf{\hat{p}}_j \equiv \mathbf{\hat{P}}_j - \frac{\mathbf{\hat{P}}_{\text{CM}}}{\sqrt{\mathbf{N}}}, \quad \mathbf{\hat{q}}_j \equiv \mathbf{\hat{Q}}_j - \frac{\mathbf{\hat{Q}}_{\text{CM}}}{\sqrt{\mathbf{N}}}. \quad (77)
$$

The Hamiltonian can be rewritten as

$$
\hat{H}_U = \hat{H}_{\text{CM}} + \hat{H}_{\text{int}} + \hat{H}_{\text{light}} + \hat{H}_{\text{rel}}, \quad (78)
$$

governs the dynamics of the collective mode with the effective mass

$$
M_{\text{eff}} = m(1 + 2N\Theta). \quad (80)
$$

The electromagnetic interaction between the collective mode and photons is given by

$$
\hat{H}_{\text{int}} = :NV\left(\frac{\mathbf{\hat{Q}}_{\text{CM}}}{\sqrt{\mathbf{N}}} + \mathbf{\hat{\Xi}}\right) :. \quad (81)
$$

The relative motion of emitters is governed by

$$
\hat{H}_{\text{rel}} = \sum_j \left[\frac{\mathbf{\hat{p}}_j^2}{2m} + V\left(\mathbf{\hat{q}}_j + \frac{\mathbf{\hat{Q}}_{\text{CM}}}{\sqrt{\mathbf{N}}} + \mathbf{\hat{\Xi}}\right) - V\left(\frac{\mathbf{\hat{Q}}_{\text{CM}}}{\sqrt{\mathbf{N}}} + \mathbf{\hat{\Xi}}\right)\right]. \quad (82)
$$

Here we recall that the relative variables satisfy the constraints $\sum_j \mathbf{\hat{p}}_j = \sum_j \mathbf{\hat{q}}_j = 0$ and thus they contain $N-1$ degrees of freedom.

Since the collective mode dominantly couples to the electromagnetic fields in the present case, one may neglect dynamics of the relative degrees of freedom. The total QED Hamiltonian (78) then becomes equivalent to the single-emitter one (14) upon the replacements $Q \rightarrow \mathbf{\hat{Q}}_{\text{CM}}$, $P \rightarrow \mathbf{\hat{P}}_{\text{CM}}$, $g_k \rightarrow \sqrt{\mathbf{N}}g_k$, $d \rightarrow \sqrt{\mathbf{N}}d$, and $v \rightarrow Nv$. This equivalence is nothing but the well-known $\sqrt{N}$ collective enhancement of the dipole and the coupling strength. Nevertheless, we emphasize that our analysis puts no limitations on the coupling strength and rigorously shows that the $\sqrt{N}$ enhancement (which was previously discussed up to the USC regime) is present at arbitrary coupling strengths, even in the DSC/ESC regimes where the multilevel nature of emitters becomes crucial.

### D. Two-level effective model

We next extend the construction of the two-level effective model discussed in Sec. IV C to arbitrary multi-emitter systems. The projection onto the two-lowest dressed emitter states in the AD frame results in the effective model

$$
\hat{H}_U = \hat{H}_{\text{Ising}} + \hat{H}_{\text{int}}^{\text{Ising}} + \hat{H}_{\text{light}}, \quad (83)
$$

where the matter part corresponds to the (inhomogeneous) transverse-field Ising model,

$$
\hat{H}_{\text{Ising}} = \sum_j \frac{\hbar \Delta g_j}{2} \mathbf{\hat{\sigma}}_j^z + \sum_{i>j} J_{ij} \mathbf{\hat{\sigma}}_i^x \mathbf{\hat{\sigma}}_j^x \quad (84)
$$

FIG. 7. Renormalized parameters in the two-emitter case. (a) Waveguide-mediated emitter-emitter interaction strength $\mu_{21}$ in Eq. (69) and (b) effective mass $m_{\text{eff}}$ in Eq. (68) are plotted against the emitter separation at different light-matter couplings $g$. The waveguide is assumed to be the coupled cavity array as in Sec. IV and we set $J = 0.2$. 
with \( J_{ij} \) being the waveguide-mediated qubit-qubit interaction given by

\[
J_{ij} = \hbar^2 \mu_{ij} \langle \psi_{1i} | \partial Q_j | \psi_{2i} \rangle \langle \psi_{1j} | \partial Q_j | \psi_{2j} \rangle. \tag{85}
\]

Here, \( |\psi_{1,2j}\rangle \) represent the two-lowest eigenstates of the renormalized emitter Hamiltonian \( \hat{P}_j^2/2m_{\text{eff},j} + V_{\text{eff},j} \), and \( \Delta_{x,j} > 0 \) is the corresponding excitation energy. We recall that \( \Delta_{x,j} \) depends on emitter positions through \( m_{\text{eff},j} \) and \( V_{\text{eff},j} \). The Jaynes-Cummings-type light-matter interaction is

\[
\hat{H}_{\text{int}} = \sum_j \hat{\sigma}_j^z \sum_n \hbar \tilde{g}_{nj} \hat{b}_n^\dagger + \text{H.c.}, \tag{86}
\]

where \( \tilde{g}_{nj} \) are the effective qubit-boson couplings given by

\[
\tilde{g}_{nj} = \frac{\xi_{nj}}{\hbar} \langle \psi_{1j} | \frac{dV_j}{dQ} | \psi_{2j} \rangle. \tag{87}
\]

As discussed before, in contrast to the Coulomb/PZW gauges, our construction in the AD frame remains valid even at large \( g \) because the level truncations can increasingly be well-justified in the strong-coupling limit. The two-level effective model (83) thus should accurately capture low-energy physics of the original multi-emitter QED Hamiltonian in a broad range of the coupling strength.

In the single-emitter case, we recall that the asymptotic decoupling and the enhanced photon frequency led to the decoupled eigenstates (28). Similarly, in the present multi-emitter case, one can set the photon state to be the vacuum and reduce the whole problem to the Ising Hamiltonian (84), from which the ground-state properties and elementary excitations can be extracted. This treatment becomes exact in the strong-coupling limit and should capture the qualitative physics in the nonperturbative regimes at large, but finite \( g \). To make the results quantitatively accurate, one can extend the analysis to the few-photon sector in the same manner as done in Sec. IV when necessary.

It is worthwhile to discuss a simple case of homogeneous configuration, in which the emitters are periodically placed with the same separation. In this case, the renormalized frequency and the spin-boson couplings are independent of an emitter, \( \Delta_{x,j} = \Delta_g \), \( \tilde{g}_{nj} = \tilde{g}_n \), and the spin-spin interaction becomes translationally invariant \( J_{ij} = J_{|j-i|} \). Then, the multi-emitter Hamiltonian (84) reduces to the standard homogeneous transverse-field Ising model with couplings \( J_{|j-i|} \) that are in general long-ranged. In particular, in the limit of zero emitter separation, the effective Hamiltonian reduces to the Lipkin-Meshkov-Glick (LMG) model:

\[
\hat{H}_{\text{LMG}} = \frac{\hbar \Delta_g}{2} \hat{S}^z + J'(\hat{S}^z)^2, \tag{88}
\]

where \( J' < 0 \) is the all-to-all ferromagnetic coupling, \( \hat{S}^\gamma \equiv \sum_j \hat{\sigma}_j^\gamma \) are the collective spin operators with \( \gamma \in \{x, y, z\} \), and we neglect the irrelevant constant.

These simplifications in the AD frame allow us to export the insights and techniques originally developed in studies of the transverse-field Ising models to the analysis of the multi-emitter QED Hamiltonian in the nonperturbative regimes. Indeed, it is known that, in the many-emitter limit \( N \to \infty \), such model exhibits rich phase diagrams depending on dimension, lattice geometry, or decay exponent of the long-range coupling \( J_{|j-i|} \) \([107–110]\). Moreover, a disordered transverse-field Ising model is argued to realize many-body localization \([111, 112]\), and such disorder is fairly ubiquitous in the multi-emitter Hamiltonian (84) where disorder comes into play through emitter positions. While we leave the full understanding of such multi-emitter physics at strong light-matter couplings to future investigations, our analysis provides a reliable starting point for this and shows promise for realizing the above exotic phases in the waveguide QED.

VI. QUANTUM PHASE TRANSITIONS WITH GAPLESS DISPERSIONS

We finally turn our attention to the case of gapless dispersions. Specifically, we consider the photon frequencies that scale as

\[
\omega_k \propto k^l, \tag{89}
\]

which correspond to the spectral function

\[
J(\omega) \equiv \pi \sum_k g_k^2 \delta(\omega - \omega_k) \propto \omega^{1/l} \tag{90}
\]

with \( l > 0 \) being an exponent characterizing the gapless dispersion. This type of dispersions can be realized in waveguide QED systems by using transmission lines or by designing mode frequencies with fabricated resonators. Note that the couplings scale as \( g_k \propto L^{-1/2} \) in our notation (cf. Eq. (8)).

One of the key questions here is whether or not a waveguide QED system governed by the Hamiltonian (1) undergoes a quantum phase transition as the light-matter coupling is increased. For instance, in the single-emitter case \( N = 1 \), such a class of models constitutes a prototypical system for investigating quantum dissipation \([17–20]\), and it has been known that (depending on \( l \)) a quantum phase transition can occur in the thermodynamic limit of bosonic modes \( L \to \infty \).

Below we revisit this fundamental problem and discuss the related issues from a new perspective of the AD frame. We show that the presence or absence of transition can be understood in a very simple and unified manner in terms of the mass renormalization after the unitary transformation. We then extend the analysis to multi-emitter cases and point out that the superradiant phase, which is known to be absent in cavity QED setups with a single photonic mode, can in general occur in waveguide QED systems with a superlinear gapless dispersion.

A. Delocalization-localization transition in the single-emitter case

The ground state of a single-emitter system displays either delocalized or localized phase that is characterized by the fol-
lowing order parameter

\[ q \equiv \lim_{\hbar \to 0} \lim_{L \to \infty} \langle \hat{Q} \rangle_{h,C} \]
\[ = \lim_{\hbar \to 0} \lim_{L \to \infty} \langle \hat{Q} + \hat{\Xi} \rangle_{h,U}, \]

where \( \langle \hat{Q} \rangle_{h,C} \) represents an emitter displacement in the ground state of the QED Hamiltonian in the Coulomb gauge (1) with a bias potential \(-h\hat{Q}\) being added to \(V(Q)\); we here assume \(V\) to be the standard double-well potential (46) though our arguments can be applied to a generic potential profile. In the AD frame, this order parameter corresponds to an expectation value of \(\langle \hat{Q} + \hat{\Xi} \rangle_{U}\) (cf. Eq. (61)). The delocalized phase is characterized by the vanishing order parameter \(q = 0\) and the unique, nondegenerate ground state. In contrast, in the localized phase, the ground state exhibits the two-fold degeneracy in the thermodynamic limit \(L \to \infty\) corresponding to localization to each of the two minima in the potential. In this case, the order parameter takes a nonzero value \(q > 0\), which indicates the broken \(\mathbb{Z}_2\) symmetry in Eq. (34).

To understand whether or not the ground state exhibits the two-fold degeneracy in the thermodynamic limit \(L \to \infty\) originating from the infrared one. It is worthwhile to note that recent experiments have indeed reached such regime that originates from the infrared one. It is worthwhile to note that the same argument also rules out the possibility of a phase transition for general gapped dispersions, which include some experimentally relevant situations, such as cavity array and open transmission lines.

### Superlinear

The integral in \(\Theta\) exhibits the infrared divergence for superlinear dispersion with \(l > 1\) (often called the sub-Ohmic case), where the effective mass grows as \(m_{\text{eff}} \propto L^{l-1}\). One can also check that such superlinear dispersion leads to the polynomial divergence of \(\xi\) in the dressed emitter potential (23); the resulting effective potential \(V_{\text{eff}}\) then has the unique minimum at \(Q = 0\) (cf. Eq. (52)) and becomes infinitely tight in \(L \to \infty\) [115]. Thus, in the thermodynamic limit, the emitter wavefunction in the AD frame is completely localized at \(Q = 0\), and the total system is solely governed by the photonic part

\[ \hat{H}_U = : V(\hat{\Xi}) : + \sum_n \hbar \omega_n \hat{b}_n^\dagger \hat{b}_n. \]

An order of its ground state is characterized by the expectation value of \(\langle \hat{\Xi} \rangle_U\) (see Eq. (92)). Building up on this observation, we now argue that both delocalized and localized phases are possible depending on the potential depth \(v\).

### Sublinear

When the dispersion is sublinear with \(l < 1\) (also known as the super-Ohmic bath), the integral in \(\Theta\) converges and thus the effective mass always remains finite \(m_{\text{eff}} < \infty\). Thus, the whole results discussed in Secs. II-IV for a gapped dispersion qualitatively remain the same, except for the point that all the bound states now behave as the (quasi) BIC in the present gapless case. Importantly, the ground state can thus be well-approximated by the lowest decoupled eigenstate \(|\psi_0\rangle|0\rangle\) (cf. Eq. (28)), which has \(q = 0\) and provides the unique ground state due to the nonvanishing excitation energy \(\Delta_g > 0\) (see Eq. (94)). Note that, while \(\Delta_g\) can be exponentially small as \(g\) is increased, it still remains nonzero in \(L \to \infty\) at any finite \(g\). Thus, the system cannot exhibit the exact two-fold degeneracy, and we conclude that it resides in the delocalized phase at arbitrary coupling strengths in a sublinear case \(l < 1\). It is worthwhile to note that the same argument also rules out the possibility of a phase transition for general gapped dispersions, which include some experimentally relevant situations, such as cavity array and open transmission lines.

![FIG. 8. Schematic figure illustrating the ground-state phase diagram of the full QED Hamiltonian (1) with a superlinear photonic dispersion and the double-well emitter potential (46). It is qualitatively consistent with what has been found in the sub-Ohmic spin-boson model, except that the QED system here should ultimately reenter into the delocalized phase at a sufficiently large light-matter coupling due to the diamagnetic term (red dashed horizontal arrow).](image-url)
First, in the limit of a deep potential with large $v$, the first term in Eq. (95) is dominant, and the ground state should exhibit the two-fold degeneracy at $\langle \hat{\Xi} \rangle_U = \pm \Delta$ in $L \to \infty$. This leads to the localized phase with $q > 0$. Second, in the opposite limit of a shallow potential, the second (harmonic) term in Eq. (95) dominates over the potential term, and the vacuum state gives the unique ground state, which has $\langle \hat{\Xi} \rangle_U = 0$ and leads to the delocalized phase with $q = 0$. Finally, in between these two limits, the potential landscape effectively changes from the double-well profile to the harmonic one, and accordingly, the order parameter $q$ continuously decreases from $d$ and vanishes at certain $v^* > 0$. We recall that, in general, a deep (shallow) potential depth $v$ corresponds to a small (large) bare qubit frequency $\Delta$. Altogether, one expects a continuous quantum phase transition between the localized phase at strong $v$ (resp. small $\Delta$) and the delocalized phase at weak $v$ (resp. large $\Delta$); see the blue dashed vertical arrow in Fig. 8. We remark that this conclusion is fully consistent with the numerical renormalization group results of the sub-Ohmic spin-boson model (see e.g., Ref. [116]).

The present consideration of the full QED Hamiltonian also reveals an intriguing new possibility beyond the usual spin-boson model. Namely, due to the nonmonotonic $g$ dependence of $\xi_n$ (cf. Fig. 2(b)), the system should again transition into the delocalized phase at a sufficiently large light-matter coupling (see the red dashed horizontal arrow in Fig. 8). This is expected to occur in the ESC regime, where the coupling strength dominates the other energy scales. Physically, the origin of this favoring of the delocalized phase can be traced back to the diamagnetic $\Lambda^2$ term that suppresses the displacements of the bosonic modes from the vacuum. The latter prohibits populating a macroscopic number of low-momentum photons, which is necessary to induce the transition to the localized phase [117]; this is reminiscent of what has been discussed in the context of the no-go theorems of the superradiant transition [64–69]. Nevertheless, we emphasize that our analysis here does not disprove the well-established results in the standard spin-boson Hamiltonian, but rather point out the crucial role of the diamagnetic term in the QED systems, which was not manifestly taken into account in the original spin-boson model.

**Linear**

Finally, the special case of $l = 1$ corresponds to the so-called Ohmic bath, which is a rather marginal case due to the infrared logarithmic divergence. On one hand, one may argue that the well-known mapping between the Ohmic spin-boson model and the anisotropic Kondo model [17, 62] can be used in this case, from which the Kosterlitz-Thouless-type transition from the delocalized to localized phase is expected at a finite light-matter coupling. On the other hand, however, the validity of such argument needs to be carefully reexamined in the present context of the nonperturbative waveguide QED, because the relevance of the diamagnetic term and the possible breakdown of the two-level description may make an important difference between the usual spin-boson model and the full QED Hamiltonian. Our preliminary analysis indicates that both $m_{\text{eff}}$ and $\xi$ exhibit the logarithmic divergence. Thus, (at least for the double-well potential) we expect the situation to be analogous to what has been discussed in the sub-Ohmic case above, but with the suppressed parameter region for the localized phase. Nevertheless, the issue of how the known results of the Ohmic spin-boson model can be related to the full-fledged QED Hamiltonian with a linear dispersion is an ongoing subject especially in the context of the resistively shunted Josephson junction [118, 119]; we leave its full analysis to a future publication.

**B. Superradiant phase transition in multi-emitter cases**

Our arguments above can be generalized to the case of multi-emitter systems with large, but finite $N$. First, when all the emitters are collectively coupled to the waveguide at the same position as discussed in Sec. V C, the analysis of the ground-state physics can be reduced to that of the collective-mode Hamiltonian (79). One can then follow the same arguments above by replacing the single-emitter effective mass $m_{\text{eff}}$ by the multi-emitter one $M_{\text{eff}}$ in Eq. (80). Namely, as long as the renormalized mass remains finite $\lim_{N \to \infty} M_{\text{eff}} < \infty$, the ground state should be unique with vanishing order parameter, which leads to the disordered phase. This occurs when the phononic dispersion is either gapped or gapless but with the sublinear exponent $l < 1$. In particular, this conclusion is consistent with the known no-go theorems of the superradiant phase transition in cavity QED systems that accompany only a single (gapped) photonic mode. In this context, our analysis greatly extends the applicability of those no-go theorems to the realm of a multimode waveguide QED system with a gapped/sublinear photonic dispersion.

Remarkably, in contrast, when the dispersion is gapless with superlinear exponent $l > 1$, transition to the superradiant phase with nonvanishing order parameter is expected to occur. The reason is that, as discussed above, the effective mass $M_{\text{eff}}$ diverges polynomially in the thermodynamic limit $L \to \infty$ in this case and, following the same arguments below Eq. (95), we conclude that the ground state should be two-fold degenerate at a sufficiently large $v$, i.e., at small qubit frequencies $\Delta$ (see Fig. 8). To our knowledge, this provides yet another pathway to realize the genuine superradiant transition originally pursued along the line of the Dicke model. We expect that our conclusion remains valid also when emitters are placed at different positions, since the mass divergence originates from the infrared divergence in the infinite-wavelength limit, where emitter separation should not play a significant role.

Meanwhile, we note that taking the limit of many emitters $N \to \infty$ provides alternative way to realize a quantum phase transition. Importantly, this is the case even when the dispersion is gapped/sublinear for which transition is not expected at finite $N$ as discussed above. As detailed in Sec. V C, one can use the two-level effective model (84) to determine the ground-state properties in these cases. This mapping to the transverse-field Ising model immediately indicates the possibilities of inducing a transition between the disordered (i.e.,
delocalized) phase and the ferromagnetic ordered (i.e., localized) phase or realizing exotic phases such as the many-body localized phase.

VII. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSIONS

We analyzed equilibrium and dynamical properties of light-matter systems consisting of quantum emitters strongly interacting with quantized electromagnetic continuum in the nonperturbative regimes, including the previously unexplored deep and extremely strong coupling regimes. There, traditional theoretical approaches utilizing the Coulomb or PZW gauges are no longer sufficient, since substantial light-matter entanglement invalidates truncations of emitter/photon levels in these gauges. We resolved this problem by using the unitary transformation (9) that asymptotically disentangles emitter and photon degrees of freedom in the strong-coupling limit; this new frame of reference then enabled us to construct an accurate theoretical framework at any finite interaction strengths. Our formulation puts no limitations on the light-matter coupling and allows for consistently analyzing the entire coupling region of waveguide QED systems at both qualitative and quantitative levels.

We first applied this new formalism to the single-emitter system (see Eq. (14)), and elucidated the essential features in the nonperturbative regimes on the basis of general arguments. In particular, we demonstrated the emergence of a ladder of many-body bound states and the (quasi) BIC, the vacuum fluctuations induced suppression of potential barrier, and the strong renormalization of the effective mass. We then analyzed these nonperturbative features in a concrete model of cavity-array waveguide. All of these results have relevance to ongoing experiments in superconducting qubits interacting with microwave resonators or atoms coupled to photonic crystals. We proposed that the BIC can experimentally be observed by analyzing nonequilibrium dynamics induced by the quench of a parameter in the waveguide QED Hamiltonian. This protocol should be implemented in circuit QED systems using currently available experimental techniques. The parameter regimes we studied are either directly relevant to state-of-the-art experimental systems in, e.g., superconducting devices [50, 75] and plasmonic crystals [35] or (at least) expected to be accessible in the near future in view of rapid developments in achieving stronger light-matter coupling regimes [58, 59]. To explore those nonperturbative regimes in setups of atoms coupled to photonic crystals, one can utilize Rydberg atoms [120–122] and/or the collective enhancement of the light-matter coupling by exciting a large number of weakly coupled components [123] as discussed in Sec. V C. We envision that the predicted tightly localized bound states in the waveguides can be used as a photon storage in quantum information applications.

We next extended the analysis to the multi-emitter case and established a general framework for studying multi-emitter QED systems without relying on uncontrolled approximations or assumptions. Building on this formalism, we showed that the ground-state physics can be understood from the perspective of the standard transverse-field Ising model (84) but with suitably renormalized parameters. Finally, we analyzed the case of gapless photonic dispersions and argued that a quantum phase transition can in general occur if the renormalized mass diverges in the thermodynamic limit, while transition is not expected when the mass remains finite. In certain special limits, this analysis led to the conclusions that are consistent with previous results of the delocalization-localization transition in the spin-boson model and the no-go theorems for the superradiant transition in cavity QED. In this respect, one of the conceptual advantages in our approach is establishing a unified perspective on these seemingly unrelated phenomena. Most interestingly, we pointed out the possibility of realizing the superradiant phase by coupling (artificial) atoms to electromagnetic modes with superlinear dispersion, which should provide a new twist to ongoing discussions about the possibility of the superradiant transition in multimode QED setups (see e.g., Ref. [124]).

Several open questions remain for future studies. First, it merits further study to figure out how losses and decoherence either for emitters or photons can affect the present results. While the waveguide coupling efficiency can be made close to the unit fidelity in, e.g., superconducting devices [9], losses are still ubiquitous in atoms coupled to photons in optical domains [125]. These issues can be addressed by combining the present nonperturbative QED formalism with the standard framework of Markovian open systems [126]. Second, it will be intriguing to analyze the multi-emitter QED systems in more detail, especially in view of its mapping to the inhomogeneous long-range Ising model. Third, instead of the exact diagonalization performed here, one can apply more efficient numerical methods, such as the matrix-product-states calculations [44, 46, 51, 84] or a hybrid variational approach [127], to analyze the asymptotically decoupled QED Hamiltonian within the few-photon ansatz (31). This should be particularly useful when one is interested in a larger system with many emitters being coupled to common multiple electromagnetic modes.

Finally, while the emphasis was placed on the waveguide QED in this paper, our theory is equally applicable to cavity QED setups with multiple photonic modes (see e.g., Ref. [128]) whose inclusion is often important depending on the cavity geometry and the coupling strength. In this respect, our study is also relevant to a variety of strongly coupled light-matter systems recently realized by using both solid state and quantum chemistry platforms. For instance, the predicted vacuum-induced suppression of the potential barrier may lie at the heart of the enhanced chemical reactivity observed in polaritonic chemistry [27–29] as discussed in Sec. III C. More generally, our study reveals that the mass enhancement is one of the universal features of strongly interacting light-matter systems. This naturally associates with the higher density of states, which could lead to enhancements of certain many-body properties, including superconductivity or ferromagnetism [129–137].
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Appendix A: Diagonalization of the quadratic photon Hamiltonian

Here we provide details about the diagonalization of the quadratic photon Hamiltonian including the $\hat{A}^2$ term in the Coulomb gauge. To this end, we introduce the conjugate pairs of variables via

\[
\hat{X}_k = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{2\omega_k}} (\hat{a}_k + \hat{\alpha}_k^\dagger), \quad (A1)
\]

\[
\hat{P}_k = i\sqrt{\frac{\hbar\omega_k}{2}} (\hat{a}_k - \hat{\alpha}_k^\dagger), \quad (A2)
\]

and rewrite the quadratic part of $\hat{H}_C$ in Eq. (1) as

\[
\frac{q^2 \hat{A}^2}{2m} + \sum_k \hbar\omega_k \hat{a}_k^\dagger \hat{a}_k = \sum_k \frac{\hat{P}_k^2}{2} + \sum_{kk'} \left( \delta_{kk'} \omega_k^2 + 2g_k g_{k'} \right) \hat{X}_k \hat{X}_{k'}. \quad (A3)
\]

The last term in Eq. (A3) can readily be diagonalized by an orthogonal transformation,

\[
\hat{P}_k = \sum_n O_{kn} \hat{\rho}_n, \quad \hat{X}_k = \sum_n O_{kn} \hat{\alpha}_n, \quad (A4)
\]

where an orthogonal matrix $O$ satisfies Eq. (7). The quadratic photon Hamiltonian then becomes

\[
\frac{1}{2} \sum_n \left( \hat{\rho}_n^2 + \Omega_n^2 \hat{\alpha}_n^\dagger \hat{\alpha}_n \right) = \sum_n \hbar\Omega_n \hat{b}_n^\dagger \hat{b}_n, \quad (A5)
\]

where we introduce the annihilation operator after the orthogonal transformation by

\[
\hat{b}_n = \sqrt{\frac{\Omega_n}{2\hbar}} \hat{\alpha}_n + \frac{i}{\sqrt{2\hbar\Omega_n}} \hat{\rho}_n, \quad (A6)
\]

which gives Eq. (5). Using these squeezed photon operators $\hat{b}_n$, the total Hamiltonian in the Coulomb gauge is now given by Eq. (4) in the main text.

Appendix B: Numerical diagonalization

We describe details about the method used in Sec. IV to numerically diagonalize the QED Hamiltonian in the AD frame. We begin with folding the electromagnetic modes of the cavity array onto even and odd modes with respect to the spatial parity. Since only the even modes,

\[
\hat{a}_x^e = \hat{a}_x = 0, \quad a_{x>0}^e = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\hat{a}_x + \hat{a}_{-x}), \quad (B1)
\]

interact with the emitter, we neglect contributions from the odd modes. The photon Hamiltonian in the real-space basis is then written as

\[
\hat{H}_{\text{light}} = -\frac{J}{\sqrt{2}} \left( \hat{a}_{x=0}^e \hat{a}_{x=1}^e + \text{H.c.} \right) + \frac{J}{2} \left( \hat{a}_{x=0}^e \hat{a}_{x=1}^e + \text{H.c.} \right) \sum_{x=0}^{(L-1)/2} \hat{a}_x^e \hat{a}_x^e \equiv \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \hbar\omega_p \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_p, \quad (B2)
\]

where we use an orthogonal matrix $M$ to obtain the diagonalized form (B2) with

\[
\hat{a}_x^e = \sum_{p=0}^{(L-1)/2} M_{xp} \hat{a}_p. \quad (B3)
\]

The vector field is expressed in this basis as

\[
\hat{A}_{x=0} = A (\hat{a}_{x=0} + \hat{a}_{-x}^\dagger) = \sum_{p=0}^{(L-1)/2} A M_{0p} (\hat{a}_p + \hat{a}_p^\dagger), \quad (B4)
\]

which results in the electromagnetic amplitudes (cf. Eq. (3))

\[
f_p = A M_{0p}. \quad (B5)
\]

We use the frequencies $\omega_p$ and the amplitudes $f_p$ to diagonalize the photon Hamiltonian including the $\hat{A}^2$ term as explained in Appendix A. Then, we perform the unitary transformation (9) and arrive at the Hamiltonian in the AD frame

\[
\hat{H}_U = \frac{\hat{P}^2}{2m_{\text{eff}}} + V_{\text{eff}}(\hat{Q}) + \sum_{l=1}^{L-1/2} \frac{i}{l!} \hat{V}^{(l)}(\hat{Q}) + \sum_{n=0}^{(L-1)/2} \hbar\Omega_n \hat{b}_n \hat{b}_n. \quad (B6)
\]

To numerically diagonalize this Hamiltonian efficiently, we employ the few-photon many-body ansatz (31) and express the matrix elements of $\hat{H}_U$ in terms of the basis

\[
|\psi_{\alpha}\rangle_{\text{emitter}} \otimes |n_0 n_1 \cdots n_{(L-1)/2}\rangle_{\text{photon}} \quad (B7)
\]

with level truncations,

\[
\alpha = 1, 2, \ldots , \alpha_c, \quad \sum_{j=0}^{(L-1)/2} n_j \leq N_c. \quad (B8)
\]
We recall that \(|\psi_0\rangle\) are single-particle eigenstates of the renor-
malized emitter Hamiltonian (22), and \(|n_0n_1 \cdots n_{(L-1)/2}\rangle\) is a many-body bosonic Fock state in terms of \(\hat{b}_n\) operators with \(n_j = 0, 1, \cdots\). The corresponding Hilbert-space dimension is

\[
D = \alpha_c \frac{N_c}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N_c} \frac{((L+1)/2)^i}{(L+1)/2 - 1},
\]

which grows polynomially with the system size \(L\). Figure 9 demonstrates that the numerical results converge very efficiently with \(N_c\) in a broad range of the light-matter coupling strength. It typically suffices to set \(N_c = 2\) and \(\alpha_c = O(10)\) to achieve the accuracy with an error below \(\sim 1\%\). When only the low-energy spectrum is of interest, one can use the Lanczos method to further reduce the computational cost.

Appendix C: Derivation of the multi-emitter Hamiltonian in the
asymptotically decoupled frame

We here derive the asymptotically decoupled multi-emitter Hamiltonian discussed in Sec. V. As we have done for the single-emitter case, we first diagonalize the quadratic photon part of the Coulomb-gauge Hamiltonian including the \(\hat{A}^2\) term. To do so, we introduce the position-dependent multi-emitter coupling strengths by

\[
g^c_{kj} = q f_{kj} \sqrt{\frac{\omega_k}{m_j \hbar}} \cos(kx_j),
\]

\[
g^s_{kj} = q f_{kj} \sqrt{\frac{\omega_k}{m_j \hbar}} \sin(kx_j),
\]

and rewrite the quadratic part as (aside constant)

\[
\sum_j q^2 \hat{A}^2_{j} = \sum_k \hbar \omega_k \hat{a}_k^\dagger \hat{a}_k
\]

\[
= \sum_{kk'} \left( \delta_{kk'} + \frac{2}{\omega_k} \sum_j \frac{g_{kj}^c g_{k'j}^c}{\omega_k \omega_{k'}} \hat{P}_k \hat{P}_{k'} \right) \frac{\hat{X}_k \hat{X}_{k'}}{2}
\]

\[
+ \sum_{kk'} \left( \delta_{kk'} \omega_k^2 - \frac{2}{\omega_k} \sum_j \frac{g_{kj}^c g_{k'j}^c}{\omega_{k'}} \right) \left( \hat{X}_k \hat{P}_{k'} + \hat{P}_k \hat{X}_{k'} \right),
\]

where we recall that the conjugate operators \(\hat{X}_k\) and \(\hat{P}_k\) are defined by Eqs. (A1) and (A2). Equation (C3) can then be diagonalized by the symplectic transformation,

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\hat{X} \\
\hat{P}
\end{pmatrix} = S \begin{pmatrix}
\hat{X} \\
\hat{P}
\end{pmatrix} 
\equiv \begin{pmatrix}
S^{XX} & S^{XP} \\
S^{PX} & S^{PP}
\end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix}
\hat{X} \\
\hat{P}
\end{pmatrix},
\]

where the matrix \(S\) satisfies

\[
S \sigma S^T = \sigma
\]

with \(\sigma = i \sigma_n \otimes I_L\) and \(I_L\) being the \(L \times L\) identity matrix. This leads to the diagonalized form

\[
\sum_j q^2 \hat{A}^2_{j} = \sum_k \hbar \omega_k \hat{a}_k^\dagger \hat{a}_k
\]

\[
= \sum_n \hbar \Omega_n \hat{b}_n^\dagger \hat{b}_n,
\]

where we define the squeezed photon operators \(\hat{b}_n\) in the same manner as in Eq. (A6).
In terms of these new photon operators, the Coulomb-gauge Hamiltonian is expressed as
\[
\hat{H}_C = \sum_j \left[ \frac{\hat{p}_j^2}{2m_j} + V(\hat{Q}_j) \right] - \sum_{jn} \hat{P}_j \left( \xi_{nj} \hat{b}_n + \xi_{nj}^* \hat{b}_n^\dagger \right) + \sum_n \hbar \Omega_n \hat{b}_n^\dagger \hat{b}_n ,
\]
where we define
\[
\xi_{nj} = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{m_j \Omega_n}} \times \sum_k \left[ g_{kj}^S S_{kn}^{XX} - g_{kj}^e S_{kn}^{XX} + i \left( g_{kj}^S S_{kn}^{XP} - g_{kj}^e S_{kn}^{XP} \right) \right] .
\]

We now introduce the multi-emitter extension of the asymptotically decoupling unitary transformation by
\[
\hat{U} = \exp \left[ \frac{1}{\hbar} \sum_j \hat{P}_j \left( \xi_{nj} \hat{b}_n + \xi_{nj}^* \hat{b}_n^\dagger \right) \right] = \exp \left[ -\frac{i}{\hbar} \sum_j \hat{P}_j \hat{\Xi}_j \right] ,
\]
where we recall \( \hat{\Xi}_j = \sum_n i \left( \xi_{nj} \hat{b}_n^\dagger - \xi_{nj}^* \hat{b}_n \right) \) with the displacement parameters
\[
\xi_{nj} = \frac{\xi_{nj}}{\Omega_n} .
\]

This transformation acts on the photon and emitter operators as
\[
\hat{U}^\dagger \hat{b}_n \hat{U} = \hat{b}_n + \sum_j \xi_{nj} \hat{P}_j, \quad (C11)
\]
\[
\hat{U}^\dagger \hat{Q}_j \hat{U} = \hat{Q}_j + \hat{\Xi}_j, \quad (C12)
\]
and transforms Eq. (C7) to the following form:
\[
\hat{H}_U = \hat{U}^\dagger \hat{H}_C U
\]
\[
= \sum_j \left[ \frac{\hat{p}_j^2}{2m_{\text{eff},j}} + V(\hat{Q}_j + \hat{\Xi}_j) \right] - \sum_{i>j} \mu_{ij} \hat{P}_i \hat{P}_j + \sum_n \hbar \Omega_n \hat{b}_n^\dagger \hat{b}_n ,
\]
which gives Eq. (66) in the main text. Here, we introduce the effective mass \( m_{\text{eff},j} \) for each emitter and the emitter-emitter coupling \( \mu_{ij} \) as
\[
m_{\text{eff},j} = \frac{m_j}{1 - \sum_n \frac{2m_j |\xi_{nj}|^2}{\hbar \Omega_n}^2} , \quad (C14)
\]
\[
\mu_{ij} = \sum_n \frac{2 \xi_{nj} \xi_{ni}}{\hbar \Omega_n} , \quad (C15)
\]
The expressions (68) and (69) in Sec. V follow from the relations (C6) and (C8).
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