

# On the Weakness of Short-Range Interactions in Fermi Gases

M. Griesemer\* and M. Hofacker†

Fachbereich Mathematik, Universität Stuttgart, D-70569 Stuttgart, Germany

## Abstract

Ultracold quantum gases of equal spin fermions with short range interactions are often considered free even in the presence of strongly binding spin-up-spin-down pairs. We describe a large class of many-particle Schrödinger operators with short-range pair interactions, where this approximation can be justified rigorously.

## 1 Introduction

Short-range interactions among equal spin fermions in ultracold quantum gases are often neglected, while at the same time the interaction between particles of opposite spin is modeled by zero-range (i.e. contact) interactions [5, 7, 16]. This can be justified rigorously by the recent approximation results for zero-range interactions in terms of short-range potentials [2, 8, 9], and by the fact that zero-range interactions among equal-spin-fermions are prohibited by the Pauli principle (see Theorem A.1). In the present paper we give a more direct analysis of the weakness of short-range interactions among equal-spin-fermions in terms of estimates for the resolvent difference of free and interacting Hamiltonians. Our main results holds for all space dimensions  $d \leq 3$ .

We consider fermionic  $N$ -particle systems in the Hilbert space

$$\mathcal{H}_f = \wedge^N L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

described by Schrödinger operators

$$H_\varepsilon = -\Delta - g_\varepsilon \sum_{i < j} V_\varepsilon(x_i - x_j) \quad (1)$$

where  $V_\varepsilon(r) = \varepsilon^{-d}V(r/\varepsilon)$ ,  $V(-r) = V(r)$ ,  $g_\varepsilon > 0$  and  $d \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . We are primarily interested in the case of an  $\varepsilon$ -independent two-particle interaction strength in the sense that two distinct particles, in their center of mass frame are described by

$$-2\Delta - g_\varepsilon V_\varepsilon, \quad \text{in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad (2)$$

---

\*marcel.griesemer@mathematik.uni-stuttgart.de

†michael.hofacker@mathematik.uni-stuttgart.de

have a binding energy  $E_\varepsilon$  that is fixed or convergent  $E_\varepsilon \rightarrow E$  with limit  $E < 0$ . It is well known in the spectral theory of Schrödinger operators what this means for  $g_\varepsilon$  [13, 17]. In fact,  $\varepsilon \mapsto g_\varepsilon$  and  $V$  can be chosen depending on  $d$  in such a way that Hamiltonian (2), as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , has a limit describing a non-trivial point interaction ( $\delta$ -potential) at the origin [1].

Assuming  $V \in L^1 \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with  $C_V = \sup_{r \in \mathbb{R}^d} |V(r)|r^2 < \infty$ , some further decay of  $V$  in the case  $d = 1$ , and

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} g_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{2-d} < \frac{d^2}{C_V N}, \quad (3)$$

we show that

$$H_\varepsilon \rightarrow -\Delta \quad (\varepsilon \rightarrow 0) \quad (4)$$

in norm resolvent sense. The rate of convergence depends on the size of  $g_\varepsilon$  and - to some extent - on the decay of  $V(x)$  as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ . When this decay is sufficient, the regularity of  $H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -functions, and hence the dimension  $d$ , begins to play a role. For the choice of  $g_\varepsilon$  described above, where  $E_\varepsilon \rightarrow E < 0$ , condition (3) is satisfied for all  $N$  if  $d \leq 2$ , and for some  $N \geq 3$  if  $d = 3$ . Surprisingly, this choice of  $g_\varepsilon$  conspires with the regularity of Sobolev functions in such a way that

$$\|(H_\varepsilon + z)^{-1} - (-\Delta + z)^{-1}\| = O(\varepsilon^2) \quad (\varepsilon \rightarrow 0)$$

independent of the space dimension  $d$ . Another choice for the coupling constant, consistent with (3) as well, is the one where  $g_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{2-d}$  is a positive constant smaller than  $d^2/C_V N$ . Then operator (2), upon a rescaling, is proportional to  $\varepsilon^{-2}$  and hence the (negative) binding energy  $E_\varepsilon$  diverges. In this case, the limit  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  amounts to a combined short-range and strong interaction limit, which is interesting and relevant physically as well [16].

In summary we can say that fully spin polarized fermi-gases in  $d \leq 2$  with short range interactions - the spin-up-spin-down interaction strength being fixed - are asymptotically free in the limit of zero-range interaction. This is true in dimension  $d = 3$  as well for suitable  $V$  and  $N \geq 3$  small, depending on  $V$ . In the case  $d \leq 2$  the result remains correct even in a suitable combined limit of short-range and strong interaction.

We conclude with some remarks on the literature: For single particles the approximation of point-like disturbances by short range potentials is discussed at length and in rich detail in [1]. See also [4]. For systems of  $N \geq 3$  particles in  $d \leq 2$  dimensions, it was recently shown in a series of papers, that contact interactions (of TMS-type) can be approximated by rescaled two-body potentials in the norm resolvent sense of  $N$ -particle Hamiltonians [2, 8–10]. From these results the mere convergence (4) can be derived by reduction of the Hilbert space to antisymmetric wave functions. This works for the very special choice of  $g_\varepsilon$  needed for the approximation of contact interactions, and for  $d \leq 2$ , only. Recall that for  $d = 3$  even the construction of a physically meaningful model for  $N \geq 3$  particles with contact interactions is a largely open problem [3].

This work is organized as follows. In Section 2 we present an explicit estimate on the norm of  $(H_{\varepsilon=1} + z)^{-1} - (-\Delta + z)^{-1}$  in terms of the pair potential  $V$ . This estimate is then used in Section 3 to prove the convergence (4) in the norm resolvent sense. Section 4 gives examples illustrating our results, in particular for  $d = 3$  and  $N = 3$ . Finally, in the appendix, we prove the impossibility of the fermionic contact interaction in  $d \geq 2$ . This

improves, for fermions, a well known result about the impossibility of contact interactions if  $d \geq 4$  [18].

## 2 The resolvent difference

Let  $H_0 = -\Delta$  in  $\mathcal{H}_f$  and let  $R_0(z) = (H_0 + z)^{-1}$ . We consider  $N$ -body Hamiltonians  $H = H_0 - W$  in  $\mathcal{H}_f$  with domain  $D(H) = D(H_0)$  and

$$W = \sum_{i < j} V_{ij}$$

where  $V_{ij}$  denotes multiplication with  $V(x_i - x_j)$  and  $V \in L^1 \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  is real-valued and even. There is no scaling parameter and no coupling constant. We assume  $d \leq 3$  and hence  $H$  is self-adjoint on  $D(H_0)$ . The result of this section, Proposition 2.1, is based on a suitable factorization  $W = A^*B$  and an iterated (second) resolvent identity related to the Konno-Kuroda formula [14]. We start by constructing the factorization.

Let

$$\mathfrak{X}_f := L^2_{\text{odd}}(\mathbb{R}^d, dr) \otimes L^2(\mathbb{R}^d, dR) \otimes \bigwedge_{i=3}^N L^2(\mathbb{R}^d, dx_i), \quad (5)$$

where  $L^2_{\text{odd}}$  denotes the subspace of odd functions from  $L^2$ . The integration variables  $r$  and  $R$  in (5) correspond to the relative and center of mass coordinates of the fermion positions  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ . This change of coordinates is implemented isometrically by the operator  $\mathcal{K} : \mathcal{H}_f \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}_f$

$$(\mathcal{K}\psi)(r, R, x_3, \dots, x_N) := \psi\left(R - \frac{r}{2}, R + \frac{r}{2}, x_3, \dots, x_N\right). \quad (6)$$

From  $\langle \varphi, V_{ij}\psi \rangle = \langle \varphi, V_{12}\psi \rangle$  and from  $\langle \varphi, V_{12}\psi \rangle = \langle \mathcal{K}\varphi, \mathcal{K}V_{12}\psi \rangle = \langle \mathcal{K}\varphi, (V \otimes 1)\mathcal{K}\psi \rangle$  it follows that

$$W = \binom{N}{2} \mathcal{K}^*(V \otimes 1)\mathcal{K}. \quad (7)$$

We therefore write  $V = vu$  with

$$\begin{aligned} v(r) &:= |V(r)|^{1/2}, \\ u(r) &:= J|V(r)|^{1/2}, \quad J := \text{sgn}(V), \end{aligned}$$

and we set

$$A := \binom{N}{2}^{1/2} (v \otimes 1)\mathcal{K}, \quad (8)$$

$$B := \binom{N}{2}^{1/2} (u \otimes 1)\mathcal{K} = JA. \quad (9)$$

Recall that  $V \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and hence  $u, v \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . The domain  $D(A)$  of  $A : D(A) \subset \mathcal{H}_f \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}_f$  is determined by the domain of the multiplication operator  $v \otimes 1$ , so it follows that  $A$  and  $B$  are densely defined and closed on  $D(A) \supset D(H_0)$ . Hence,  $H$  can be rewritten in the form

$$H = H_0 - A^*B. \quad (10)$$

By an iteration of the resolvent identity, we find

$$(H + z)^{-1} = R_0(z) + R_0(z)WR_0(z) + R_0(z)W(H + z)^{-1}WR_0(z). \quad (11)$$

Upon setting  $W = A^*B$ , Identity (11) can be written in the form

$$(H + z)^{-1} = R_0(z) + (AR_0(\bar{z}))^*S(z)BR_0(z), \quad (12)$$

$$S(z) = 1 + B(H + z)^{-1}A^*. \quad (13)$$

The following proposition is our tool for proving norm resolvent convergence in the next section.

**Proposition 2.1.** *Suppose there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $H_0 - (1 + \delta)W \geq 0$  and suppose that  $V \geq 0$ ,  $V \leq 0$ , or that  $\sum_{i < j} |V_{ij}| \leq CH_0$  with some  $C > 0$ . Then  $H \geq 0$  and, for all  $z > 0$ ,*

$$\|(H + z)^{-1} - (H_0 + z)^{-1}\| \leq C_\delta \binom{N}{2} \|v(-\Delta + z)^{-1}\|_{\text{odd}}^2,$$

where  $v = |V|^{1/2}$ , and  $C_\delta$  is a function of  $C$  and  $\delta$ . Here  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{odd}}$  denotes the operator norm in  $L^2_{\text{odd}}(\mathbb{R}^d, dr)$ .

*Proof.* Suppose, temporarily, that  $H \geq 0$  and let  $z > 0$ . Then, from (12), the definition of  $A$ , and from  $\|(-\Delta_r \otimes 1 + z)\mathcal{K}(H_0 + z)^{-1}\| \leq 1$ , it follows that

$$\|(H + z)^{-1} - R_0(z)\| \leq \binom{N}{2} \|v(-\Delta + z)^{-1}\|_{\text{odd}}^2 \|S(z)\|.$$

It remains to prove  $H \geq 0$  and  $\|S(z)\| \leq C_\delta$  under the various assumptions on  $V$ .

In the case  $V \leq 0$  we have  $J = -1$ ,  $B = -A$ , and hence,  $H = H_0 + A^*A \geq A^*A \geq 0$ . By Lemma 2.2 below, it follows that  $\|S(z)\| \leq 2$ .

In the case  $V \geq 0$  we have  $J = 1$ ,  $B = A$ , and hence the assumption  $H_0 - (1 + \delta)W \geq 0$  implies that

$$H \geq \delta W = \delta A^*A.$$

By Lemma 2.2 it follows that  $A(H + \mu)^{-1}A^* \leq 1/\delta$ , and hence  $\|S(z)\| \leq 1 + \delta^{-1}$ , by (13).

It remains to consider the case where  $V$  changes sign. The assumption  $H_0 - (1 + \delta)W \geq 0$  implies that

$$H = \frac{\delta}{1 + \delta}H_0 + \frac{1}{1 + \delta}(H_0 - (1 + \delta)W) \geq \frac{\delta}{1 + \delta}H_0.$$

Combining this with the assumption on  $|V|$ , that is, with  $CH_0 \geq \sum_{i < j} |V|_{ij} = A^*A$ , we find that

$$H \geq \frac{\delta}{1 + \delta} \frac{1}{C} A^*A.$$

This, by Lemma 2.2, implies  $A(H + \mu)^{-1}A^* \leq C(1 + \delta)/\delta$  and the desired bound on  $\|S(z)\|$  follows from (13).  $\blacksquare$

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $H, A$  be any two closed operators in a Hilbert space, with  $H^* = H \geq 0$  and  $D(A) \supset D(H)$ . If  $H \geq \lambda A^*A$  for some  $\lambda > 0$ , then  $D(A) \supset D(H^{1/2})$  and for all  $\mu > 0$ ,*

$$A(H + \mu)^{-1}A^* \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}.$$

*Proof.* The assumption means that  $\|(H + \mu)^{1/2}\psi\|^2 \geq \lambda\|A\psi\|^2$  for  $\mu > 0$  and all  $\psi \in D(H)$ . By an approximation argument this inequality extends to all  $\psi \in D(H^{1/2})$ , and  $D(A) \supset D(H^{1/2})$  follows from the closedness of  $A$ . Upon rewriting the inequality in terms of  $\varphi = (H + \mu)^{1/2}\psi \in \mathcal{H}_f$ , the assertion follows.  $\blacksquare$

### 3 The resolvent convergence

We now apply the results from the previous section to Schrödinger operators with rescaled two-body potentials, that is

$$H_\varepsilon = -\Delta - g_\varepsilon \sum_{i < j} V_{\varepsilon,ij}, \quad (14)$$

where  $g_\varepsilon > 0$  and  $V_\varepsilon(r) = \varepsilon^{-d}V(r/\varepsilon)$ . The Schrödinger operator  $\varepsilon^2 H_\varepsilon$  is unitarily equivalent to  $S_\lambda := -\Delta - \lambda \sum_{i < j} V_{ij}$  with  $\lambda = g_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{2-d}$ . We therefore define,

$$\lambda_{\max} := \sup\{\lambda \geq 0 \mid S_\lambda \geq 0\}. \quad (15)$$

Note that  $S_\lambda \geq 0$  for all  $\lambda \leq \lambda_{\max}$ . This follows from the fact that  $E_\lambda := \inf \sigma(S_\lambda)$  as a function of  $\lambda$  is concave (hence continuous) and  $E_0 = 0$ .

For Theorem 3.1, below, to be non-void we need that  $\lambda_{\max} > 0$ . This can be achieved, e.g., by assuming that

$$C_V := \operatorname{esssup}_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} V(x)|x|^2 < \infty$$

and  $C_V > 0$ . Then  $\lambda_{\max} \geq d^2/(C_V N) > 0$ , by the Hardy inequality for fermionic wave functions  $\psi \in \mathcal{H}_f$  [12],

$$\sum_{i < j} \int \frac{|\psi(x_1, \dots, x_N)|^2}{|x_i - x_j|^2} dx \leq \frac{N}{d^2} \|\nabla \psi\|^2. \quad (16)$$

Recall the Sobolev embedding  $H^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow C^{0,s}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , valid for  $s \in I_d$ , where  $I_1 = [0, 1]$ ,  $I_2 = [0, 1)$  and  $I_3 = [0, 1/2]$ . In the case  $d = 2$  we shall use a slightly improved version, which we give at the end of this section. We are now ready to state our main result:

**Theorem 3.1.** *Suppose that  $V \geq 0$ ,  $V \leq 0$ , or that  $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |V(x)||x|^2 < \infty$ . If  $\lambda_0 := \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} g_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{2-d} < \lambda_{\max}$ , then  $H_\varepsilon \geq 0$  for  $\varepsilon$  small enough, and for all  $z > 0$ ,*

$$\|(H_\varepsilon + z)^{-1} - (H_0 + z)^{-1}\| = o(g_\varepsilon) \quad (\varepsilon \rightarrow 0).$$

Moreover, the following is true:

(a) *If  $\int |V(r)||r|^{2s} dr < \infty$  for some  $s \in I_d$ , then*

$$\|(H_\varepsilon + z)^{-1} - (H_0 + z)^{-1}\| = O(g_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{2s}) \quad (\varepsilon \rightarrow 0).$$

(b) *If  $d=2$  and  $\int |V(r)||r|^2 |\log |r|| dr < \infty$ , then*

$$\|(H_\varepsilon + z)^{-1} - (H_0 + z)^{-1}\| = O(g_\varepsilon \varepsilon^2 |\log \varepsilon|) \quad (\varepsilon \rightarrow 0).$$

In the situation described in the introduction, where  $\inf \sigma(-2\Delta - g_\varepsilon V_\varepsilon)$  has a limit  $E < 0$ , the bounds (a) and (b) reveal a surprising interplay between  $g_\varepsilon$  and the (optimal) regularity of  $H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -functions: if, depending on  $d$ , we choose  $g_\varepsilon = O(1)$ ,  $g_\varepsilon = O(1/|\log \varepsilon|)$ , and  $g_\varepsilon = O(\varepsilon)$  for  $d = 1$ ,  $d = 2$ , and  $d = 3$ , respectively, then, for all  $d \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ ,

$$\|(H_\varepsilon + z)^{-1} - (H_0 + z)^{-1}\| = O(\varepsilon^2), \quad (\varepsilon \rightarrow 0)$$

provided  $V$  decays fast enough, e.g., as in the hypotheses of (b), and  $N$  is small if  $d = 3$ .

*Remarks:*

1. The theorem shows that, for a large class of potentials,

$$H_\varepsilon \rightarrow H_0 \quad (\varepsilon \rightarrow 0) \tag{17}$$

in the norm resolvent sense, provided that  $g_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{2s} \rightarrow 0$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . This is not true for the Hamiltonians  $\tilde{H}_\varepsilon$  defined by (14) on the enlarged Hilbert space  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{Nd})$ . In fact our assumptions do allow for the approximation of contact interactions as discussed in the next section.

2. For the convergence (17) in norm resolvent sense to hold, it is necessary that  $\inf \sigma(H_\varepsilon) \rightarrow \inf \sigma(H_0) = 0$ . Thus the assumption  $\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} g_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{2-d} < \lambda_{\max}$  in Theorem 3.1 cannot be relaxed much. Strong resolvent convergence has much weaker spectral implications and hence - given some decay of  $V$  - much less is needed of  $g_\varepsilon$ , see Proposition 3.2 below.
3. A result similar to Theorem 3.1 could be derived from [8, 9], as well, under fairly restrictive assumptions on  $g_\varepsilon$ .

*Proof.* We are going to apply Proposition 2.1 to the Hamiltonian  $H = H_0 - W$  with  $V = g_\varepsilon V_\varepsilon$ , and we assume that  $V$  changes sign, the other cases being easier. Due to the unitary equivalence of  $\varepsilon^2 H_\varepsilon$  and  $S_{\lambda_\varepsilon}$ , the hypotheses of Proposition 2.1 are equivalent to

$$H_0 - (1 + \delta)\lambda_\varepsilon \sum_{i < j} V_{ij} \geq 0 \tag{18}$$

$$CH_0 - \lambda_\varepsilon \sum_{i < j} |V_{ij}| \geq 0 \tag{19}$$

for some  $\delta, C > 0$ . Both, (18) and (19) are true for  $\varepsilon$  small enough. This follows from  $\lambda_0 = \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lambda_\varepsilon < \lambda_{\max}$ , from  $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |V(x)| |x|^2 < \infty$ , and from the Hardy inequality for fermions (16). Hence, by Proposition 2.1, for  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough,

$$\|(H_\varepsilon + z)^{-1} - (H_0 + z)^{-1}\| \leq C_\delta \binom{N}{2} g_\varepsilon \|v_\varepsilon(-\Delta + z)^{-1}\|_{\text{odd}}^2, \tag{20}$$

where  $v_\varepsilon(x) := |V_\varepsilon(x)|^{1/2} = \varepsilon^{-d/2} |V(x/\varepsilon)|^{1/2}$ .

By the Sobolev embedding  $H^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow C^{0,s}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , valid for  $s \in I_d$ , the elements  $\psi \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^2_{\text{odd}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  are Hölder continuous (of degree  $s$ ) odd functions. It follows that  $\psi(0) = 0$  and that

$$|\psi(x)| = \frac{|\psi(x) - \psi(0)|}{|x|^s} |x|^s \leq C_s \|\psi\|_{H^2} |x|^s. \tag{21}$$

Therefore, for all  $\psi \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^2_{\text{odd}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_\varepsilon \psi\|^2 &\leq C_s^2 \|\psi\|_{H^2}^2 \int |v_\varepsilon(x)|^2 |x|^{2s} dx \\ &= \varepsilon^{2s} C_s^2 \|\psi\|_{H^2}^2 \int |V(x)| |x|^{2s} dx. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

This is true for all  $s \in I_d$  and, combined with (20), it proves statement (a) of the theorem. To prove (b), we redo the estimates (21) and (22) with the help of Lemma 3.3.

It remains to prove the first statement. Part (a) with  $s = 0$  implies that  $\|v_\varepsilon(-\Delta + z)^{-1}\|_{\text{odd}} = O(1)$ , which can be improved as follows: let  $\chi_k$  denote the characteristic function of the ball  $|x| \leq k$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Then, by (22),

$$\|(v\chi_k)_\varepsilon(-\Delta + z)^{-1}\|_{\text{odd}}^2 = O(\varepsilon^{2s}) = o(1) \quad (\varepsilon \rightarrow 0) \quad (23)$$

for any  $s > 0$  in  $I_d$ . On the other hand,

$$\|(v - v\chi_k)_\varepsilon(-\Delta + z)^{-1}\|_{HS} \leq C \|v - v\chi_k\| = o(1) \quad (k \rightarrow \infty) \quad (24)$$

uniformly in  $\varepsilon > 0$ , where  $HS$  refers to Hilbert-Schmidt norm. The combination of (23) and (24) proves the first statement of the theorem.  $\blacksquare$

The following proposition is a consequence of Theorem A.1.

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $d \geq 2$  and suppose that  $V \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Suppose there exists  $s \geq 0$  such that  $\int V(r)^2 |r|^{2s} dr < \infty$  and  $\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} g_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{s-d/2} < \infty$ . Then,  $H_\varepsilon \rightarrow H_0$  in the strong resolvent sense as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ .*

*Proof.* In view of  $\|(H_\varepsilon + i)^{-1}\| = 1 = \|R_0(i)\|$  it suffices to prove that  $(H_\varepsilon + i)^{-1}\psi \rightarrow R_0(i)\psi$  for  $\psi$  from a dense subset of  $\mathcal{H}_f$ . By Theorem A.1, the set of all  $\psi = (H_0 + i)\varphi$  with  $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{dN} \setminus \Gamma) \cap \mathcal{H}_f$ , is dense in  $\mathcal{H}_f$ , and for such  $\psi$ ,

$$\|(H_\varepsilon + i)^{-1}\psi - R_0(i)\psi\| \leq \left\| g_\varepsilon \sum_{i < j} V_{\varepsilon, ij} \varphi \right\| \leq g_\varepsilon \binom{N}{2} \|V_{\varepsilon, 12} \varphi\|,$$

where the (anti-)symmetry of  $\varphi$  was used in the inequality. Let  $R = (x_1 + x_2)/2$ ,  $r = x_2 - x_1$ , and

$$\tilde{\varphi}(r, R, x') := \varphi(R - r/2, R + r/2, x'),$$

where  $x' = (x_3, \dots, x_N)$ . Like  $\varphi$ ,  $\tilde{\varphi}$  is compactly supported and hence  $\text{supp } \tilde{\varphi} \subset \mathbb{R}^d \times B_{N-1}$  for some ball  $B_{N-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d(N-1)}$ . It follows that, for any  $c > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|V_{\varepsilon, 12} \varphi\|^2 &= \varepsilon^{-d} \int_{B_{N-1}} dR dx' \int_{|r| \leq c} |V(r)|^2 |\tilde{\varphi}(\varepsilon r, R, x')|^2 dr \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^{-d} \int_{B_{N-1}} dR dx' \int_{|r| > c} |V(r)|^2 |\tilde{\varphi}(\varepsilon r, R, x')|^2 dr. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

By assumption on  $\varphi$ ,  $\tilde{\varphi}(r, R, x') = 0$  for  $r < \text{dist}(\text{supp } \varphi, \Gamma)$ . This means that the first summand vanishes for  $\varepsilon c < \text{dist}(\text{supp } \varphi, \Gamma)$  and that

$$|\tilde{\varphi}(r, R, x')| \leq C(\tilde{\varphi}, s)|r|^s$$

for each  $s \geq 0$ . It follows that

$$g_\varepsilon \|V_{\varepsilon, 12}\varphi\| \leq g_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{s-d/2} C(\tilde{\varphi}, s) |B_{N-1}|^{1/2} \left( \int_{|r|>c} |V(r)|^2 |r|^{2s} dr \right)^{1/2},$$

where the integral can be made arbitrarily small by choosing  $c$  large. Since  $\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} g_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{s-d/2} < \infty$ , by assumption, it follows that  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} g_\varepsilon \|V_{\varepsilon, 12}\varphi\| = 0$ , and the proof is complete.  $\blacksquare$

**Lemma 3.3.** *For all  $u \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$  and all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $y \neq 0$ , we have*

$$|u(x+y) - u(x)| \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} |y| (2 + |\log |y||)^{1/2} (\|\Delta u\|^2 + \|\nabla u\|^2)^{1/2}.$$

*Remark:* By our method of proof, this inequality can be generalized to derivatives  $\partial^\alpha u$ ,  $|\alpha| \leq k$ , of functions  $u \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$  with  $s - (n/2) = k + 1$ ,  $s \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ .

*Proof.* We first note that  $u \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$  implies that  $\hat{u} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ , and hence, for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ ,

$$u(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \hat{u}(p) \exp(ipx) dp.$$

Therefore, by Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\begin{aligned} 2\pi \frac{|u(x+y) - u(x)|}{|y|} &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{|\exp(ipy) - 1|}{|y|} |\hat{u}(p)| dp \\ &\leq I(y)^{1/2} (\|\Delta u\|^2 + \|\nabla u\|^2)^{1/2}, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where

$$I(y) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{|\exp(ipy) - 1|^2}{|y|^2} \frac{1}{|p|^4 + |p|^2} dp.$$

To estimate the integral  $I(y)$  we may assume that  $y = (|y|, 0)$ . Then, upon the substitution  $q = p|y|$ , we find that, for any  $Q > 0$ ,

$$I(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{|\exp(iq_1) - 1|^2}{|q|^4 + |y|^2|q|^2} dq \leq \int_{|q| \leq Q} \frac{q_1^2}{|q|^4 + |y|^2|q|^2} dq + \int_{|q| > Q} \frac{4}{|q|^4} dq, \quad (27)$$

where  $|\exp(iq_1) - 1| \leq |q_1|$  and  $|\exp(iq_1) - 1| \leq 2$  was used, respectively. Both integrals on the right of (27) can be computed explicitly. For the first one we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|q| \leq Q} \frac{q_1^2}{|q|^4 + |y|^2|q|^2} dq &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{|q| \leq Q} \frac{1}{|q|^2 + |y|^2} dq \\ &= \frac{\pi}{2} \log \left( 1 + \frac{Q^2}{|y|^2} \right) \leq \pi \left( |\log |y|| + |\log Q| + \frac{1}{2} \log(2) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$



where the inequality follows from  $\log(1+t) \leq |\log t| + \log 2$ , valid for all  $t > 0$ . The second integral on the right side of (27) equals  $4\pi/Q^2$ . Choosing  $Q = 2\sqrt{2}$  we find, from (27) and (28) that

$$I(y) \leq \pi(|\log |y|| + c)$$

with  $c = \frac{1}{2} + \log 4 < 2$ . This concludes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

## 4 Examples and discussion

To put Theorem 3.1 into a broader perspective and to demonstrate its dependence on the Pauli principle, we now view  $H_\varepsilon$  as the restriction

$$H_\varepsilon = \tilde{H}_\varepsilon \upharpoonright \mathcal{H}_f,$$

where  $\tilde{H}_\varepsilon$  denotes the Schrödinger operator defined by expression (14) on the enlarged Hilbert space  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{Nd})$ . We shall give choices for  $g_\varepsilon$  and  $V$ , where  $\tilde{H}_\varepsilon$ , in contrast to  $H_\varepsilon$ , has a limit  $\tilde{H}$  describing non-trivial contact interactions or no limit at all.

In the cases  $d = 1$  and  $d = 2$  we choose, for simplicity, a two-body potential  $V \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with compact support and  $\int V(r) dr = 1$ . Suppose further, that

$$\begin{aligned} g_\varepsilon &= g > 0 && \text{if } d = 1 \\ g_\varepsilon^{-1} &= \frac{|\log(\varepsilon)|}{4\pi} + a && \text{if } d = 2. \end{aligned}$$

Then  $\lambda_{\max} > 0$  and  $\lambda_0 = \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} g_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{2-d} = 0$ . So, the hypotheses of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied and hence  $H_\varepsilon \rightarrow H_0$  in norm resolvent sense. On the other hand, by [8,9],  $\tilde{H}_\varepsilon \rightarrow \tilde{H}$ , where  $\tilde{H}$  describes non-trivial contact interactions. That is,  $\tilde{H}$  is a self-adjoint extension of  $-\Delta \upharpoonright C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{Nd} \setminus \Gamma)$  distinct from  $-\Delta$ . See Section A for the definition of  $\Gamma$ .

We now turn to the more interesting case of  $N$  particles in  $d = 3$  dimensions. In the following  $N$  is exhibited in the notation: we write  $H_{N,\varepsilon}$  for  $H_\varepsilon$  and  $\tilde{H}_{N,\varepsilon}$  for  $\tilde{H}_\varepsilon$ . For the coupling constant and the two-body potential we choose  $g_\varepsilon = 2\varepsilon$  and

$$V(r) := \begin{cases} \frac{2}{|r|} - 1 & \text{if } |r| \leq 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } |r| > 1. \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

Then  $0 \leq V(r) \leq |r|^{-2}$  and hence  $C_V = \sup V(r)|r|^2 \leq 1$ . It follows that,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_0 &= \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} g_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{2-d} = 2 \\ \lambda_{\max} &\geq \frac{d^2}{NC_V} \geq \frac{9}{N}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for  $N \leq 4$  we have  $\lambda_0 < \lambda_{\max}$  and hence, by Theorem 3.1,  $H_{N,\varepsilon} \rightarrow H_0$  in norm resolvent sense. On the other hand, concerning  $\tilde{H}_{N,\varepsilon}$  the following can be said:

**Proposition 4.1.** *With the above notations, in the case  $d = 3$  we have*

(a) For  $N = 2$ ,  $\tilde{H}_{2,\varepsilon} \rightarrow \tilde{H}_2$  in norm resolvent sense, where  $\tilde{H}_2$  is a non-trivial self-adjoint extension of  $-\Delta|C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^6 \setminus \Gamma)$ .

(b) For each  $N \geq 3$  there exists a constant  $C_N < 0$  such that

$$\sigma(\tilde{H}_{N,\varepsilon}) = [C_N \varepsilon^{-2}, \infty).$$

*Proof.* With respect to center of mass and relative coordinates  $R = (x_1 + x_2)/2$  and  $r = x_2 - x_1$ , the Schrödinger operator for  $N = 2$  takes the form

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{H}_{2,\varepsilon} &= -\Delta_R/2 \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes h_\varepsilon \\ h_\varepsilon &= -2\Delta_r - g_\varepsilon V_\varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

By construction of  $V$ , the operator  $h = -\Delta - V$  has a zero energy resonance,  $h \geq 0$ , and  $z = 0$  is not an eigenvalue. It follows that  $h_\varepsilon \rightarrow -\Delta_0$  in norm resolvent sense, as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , where  $\Delta_0$  denotes a self-adjoint extension of  $\Delta|C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\})$  that is distinct from the free Laplacian [1]. Since  $-\Delta_R/2 \geq 0$ , it follows that  $\tilde{H}_{2,\varepsilon} \rightarrow -\Delta_R/2 \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes (-\Delta_0)$  in norm resolvent sense, which proves assertion (a) (for details see [11]).

In the case (b), we use that the Schrödinger operator  $\tilde{H}_{N,\varepsilon}$  is unitarily equivalent to  $\varepsilon^{-2}\tilde{H}_{N,\varepsilon=1}$ . For  $N = 3$  the presence of a zero-energy resonance in the two-body Hamiltonian leads to non-empty (in fact, infinite) discrete spectrum in the three-particle Hamiltonian with center of mass motion removed [6, 15]. This is the Efimov effect. It means, in particular, that  $C_3 := \inf \sigma(\tilde{H}_{3,\varepsilon=1}) < 0$ . By the HVZ-theorem,  $C_N := \inf \sigma(\tilde{H}_{N,\varepsilon=1}) \leq C_3$  for all  $N \geq 3$ .  $\blacksquare$

## A Absence of contact interactions for $d \geq 2$

Let  $\Gamma_{ij} := \{x = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{Nd} \mid x_i = x_j\}$  and  $\Gamma = \cup_{i < j} \Gamma_{ij}$ . Let  $\Omega_{ij} = \mathbb{R}^{Nd} \setminus \Gamma_{ij}$  and

$$\Omega = \mathbb{R}^{Nd} \setminus \Gamma = \bigcap_{i < j} \Omega_{ij}.$$

Let  $C_0^\infty(\Omega) := \{\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{Nd}) \mid \text{supp } \psi \subset \Omega\}$ , and let  $P_f : L^2(\mathbb{R}^{Nd}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^{Nd})$  denote the orthogonal projection onto  $\mathcal{H}_f$ .

**Theorem A.1.** *If  $d \geq 2$ , then  $C_0^\infty(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{H}_f$  is dense in  $H^2(\mathbb{R}^{Nd}) \cap \mathcal{H}_f$  with respect to the norm of  $H^2$ . This means that*

$$H_0^2(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{H}_f = H^2(\mathbb{R}^{Nd}) \cap \mathcal{H}_f,$$

*and it implies that the Laplacian  $\Delta$  in  $\mathcal{H}_f$  is essentially self-adjoint on  $C_0^\infty(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{H}_f$ .*

*Remark.*

1. The main point of Theorem A.1 is that elements of  $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$  vanish in an entire neighborhood of the collision set  $\Gamma$ . The elements of  $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{Nd}) \cap \mathcal{H}_f$  vanish on  $\Gamma$  too. But the weaker statement, that  $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{Nd}) \cap \mathcal{H}_f$  is dense in  $H^2(\mathbb{R}^{Nd}) \cap \mathcal{H}_f$ , is true for all  $d \geq 1$  and it easily follows from the fact that  $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{Nd})$  is dense in  $H^2(\mathbb{R}^{Nd})$ .

2. For  $d = 1$  the assertion of the theorem is false. To see this consider a sequence  $(\psi_n)$  in  $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$  with  $\psi_n \rightarrow \psi$  in the norm of  $H^2$ . Then  $\nabla\psi_n \rightarrow \nabla\psi$  in the norm of  $H^1$ . Since the trace operators  $T_{ij} : H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \rightarrow L^2(\Gamma_{ij})$  are continuous, and since, clearly,  $\nabla\psi_n = 0$  on all hyperplanes  $\Gamma_{ij}$ , it follows that

$$\nabla\psi = 0 \quad \text{on all } \Gamma_{ij}, \quad (30)$$

or, more precisely,  $T_{ij}\nabla\psi = 0$  in  $L^2(\Gamma_{ij})$ . We now give an example of an antisymmetric wave function  $\psi \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$  without property (30), which proves that  $C_0^\infty(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{H}_f$  is not dense in  $H^2(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap \mathcal{H}_f$ .

Let  $|x|^2 := \sum_{i=1}^N x_i^2$  and

$$\psi(x_1, \dots, x_N) := e^{-|x|^2} \prod_{i < j} (x_j - x_i).$$

Apart from the Gaussian, this is a Vandermonde determinant. This shows that  $\psi$  is antisymmetric. On the hyperplane  $\Gamma_{12}$  we have

$$\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial x_1} \Big|_{x_1=x_2} = -e^{-|x|^2} \prod_{j=3}^N (x_j - x_1) \prod_{2 \leq i < j} (x_j - x_i),$$

which shows that  $\nabla\psi$  does not vanish on  $\Gamma_{12}$ .

The proof of Theorem A.1 is based on the following lemmas, Lemma A.2 being the heart of it.

**Lemma A.2.** *If  $d \geq 2$ , then there exists a sequence  $u_n \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, [0, 1])$  with  $u_n(x) = 1$  if  $|x| \leq 1/n$ , and, in the limit  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\text{diam}(\text{supp } u_n) \rightarrow 0$  as well as*

$$\int |\nabla u_n|^2 dx \rightarrow 0 \quad (31)$$

$$\int |x|^2 |\Delta u_n(x)|^2 dx \rightarrow 0. \quad (32)$$

*Proof.* In the case  $d \geq 3$  we may choose any function  $u \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, [0, 1])$  with  $u(x) = 1$  for  $|x| \leq 1$  and define  $u_n(x) = u(nx)$ . Then, with the substitution  $y = nx$ , in the limit  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int |\nabla u_n(x)|^2 dx &= \int |\nabla u(y)|^2 dy \cdot n^{2-d} \rightarrow 0, \\ \int |x|^2 |\Delta u_n(x)|^2 dx &= \int |y|^2 |\Delta u(y)|^2 dy \cdot n^{2-d} \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

In the case  $d = 2$  we define  $u_n(0) := 1$  and for  $|x| > 0$  we set

$$u_n(x) := g\left(\frac{\log(n|x|)}{\log \log n}\right),$$

where  $g \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, [0, 1])$  with

$$g(s) := \begin{cases} 1 & s \leq 0 \\ 0 & s \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

It follows that  $u_n(x) = 1$  for  $|x| \leq 1/n$ ,  $u_n(x) = 0$  for  $|x| \geq (\log n)/n$  and hence that  $u_n \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, [0, 1])$ . Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int |\nabla u_n(x)|^2 dx &= \int_{1/n}^{(\log n)/n} g' \left( \frac{\log(nr)}{\log \log n} \right)^2 \frac{dr}{r} \cdot \frac{1}{(\log \log n)^2} \\ &= \int_0^1 g'(s)^2 ds \cdot \frac{1}{\log \log n}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, using that on radially symmetric functions

$$r^2 \Delta = \left( r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \right)^2$$

we find,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int |x|^2 |\Delta u_n(x)|^2 dx &= \int_{1/n}^{(\log n)/n} \left| \left( r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \right)^2 g \left( \frac{\log(nr)}{\log \log n} \right) \right|^2 \frac{dr}{r} \\ &= \int_{1/n}^{(\log n)/n} g'' \left( \frac{\log(nr)}{\log \log n} \right)^2 \frac{dr}{r} \cdot \frac{1}{(\log \log n)^4} \\ &= \int_0^1 g''(s)^2 ds \cdot \frac{1}{(\log \log n)^3}. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. ■

**Lemma A.3.** *Suppose that  $d \geq 2$  and let  $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{Nd})$  with  $\psi = 0$  on  $\Gamma$ . Then, for each pair  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ ,  $i \neq j$  and for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\psi_\varepsilon \in C_0^\infty(\Omega_{ij})$  with  $\text{supp } \psi_\varepsilon \subset \text{supp } \psi$ ,  $\psi_\varepsilon = 0$  on  $\Gamma$ , and*

$$\|(-\Delta + 1)(\psi - \psi_\varepsilon)\| < \varepsilon.$$

*Proof.* We may assume that  $(i, j) = (1, 2)$  and we introduce the relative and center of mass coordinates

$$r := x_1 - x_2, \quad R := \frac{1}{2}(x_1 + x_2).$$

Then

$$\Delta = 2\Delta_r + \frac{1}{2}\Delta_R + \Delta_{x'}, \tag{33}$$

where  $x' := (x_3, \dots, x_N)$ . Let  $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{Nd})$  with  $\psi = 0$  on  $\Gamma$  and let

$$\psi_n(x_1, \dots, x_N) = \psi(x_1, \dots, x_N) \cdot (1 - u_n(x_1 - x_2))$$

where  $u_n$  is given by Lemma A.2. In the following  $u_n$  also denotes the function  $(x_1, \dots, x_N) \mapsto u_n(x_1 - x_2)$ . Then  $\psi - \psi_n = \psi u_n$  and hence

$$\|(-\Delta + 1)(\psi - \psi_n)\| \leq \|\psi u_n\| + \|\Delta(\psi u_n)\|.$$

Clearly  $\|\psi u_n\| \rightarrow 0$  because  $|\psi u_n| \leq |\psi|$  and because  $\psi u_n \rightarrow 0$  pointwise as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . On the other hand, using (33) and the fact that  $u_n$  depends on  $r$  only,

$$\Delta(\psi u_n) = 2\Delta_r(\psi u_n) + \frac{1}{2}(\Delta_R \psi)u_n + (\Delta_{x'} \psi)u_n$$

where the first term equals

$$2\Delta_r(\psi u_n) = 2(\Delta_r\psi)u_n + 4(\nabla_r\psi)(\nabla_ru_n) + 2\psi\Delta_ru_n.$$

By the pointwise convergence  $u_n \rightarrow 0$ , as explained above,  $(\Delta_r\psi)u_n$ ,  $(\Delta_R\psi)u_n$  and  $(\Delta_{x'}\psi)u_n$  have vanishing  $L^2$ -norm in the limit  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . It remains to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_r\psi \cdot \nabla_ru_n\| &\rightarrow 0 & (n \rightarrow \infty) \\ \|\psi \cdot \Delta_ru_n\| &\rightarrow 0 & (n \rightarrow \infty). \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma A.2 we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_r\psi \cdot \nabla_ru_n\|^2 &\leq \int |\nabla_r\psi(r, R, x')|^2 |\nabla u_n(r)|^2 dr dR dx' \\ &\leq \sup_{r \in \mathbb{R}^d} \int |\nabla_r\psi(r, R, x')|^2 dR dx' \cdot \|\nabla u_n\|^2 \rightarrow 0 & (n \rightarrow \infty). \end{aligned}$$

For  $\psi\Delta u_n$  we use that  $\psi(0, R, x') = 0$  and hence that

$$\psi(r, R, x') = \int_0^1 (\nabla_r\psi)(tr, R, x') \cdot r dt.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int |\psi\Delta u_n|^2 dr dR dx' \\ &\leq \int dr dR dx' \left( \int_0^1 |\nabla_r\psi(tr, R, x')|^2 dt \right) |r|^2 |\Delta u_n(r)|^2 \\ &\leq C \int |r|^2 |\Delta u_n(r)|^2 dr \rightarrow 0, & (n \rightarrow \infty) \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma A.2, because

$$C := \sup_{r \in \mathbb{R}^d} \int dR dx' \int_0^1 |\nabla_r\psi(tr, R, x')|^2 dt < \infty.$$

■

*Proof of Theorem A.1.* For given  $\psi \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^{Nd}) \cap \mathcal{H}_f$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  it suffices to find  $\phi_\varepsilon \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$  with  $\|\psi - \phi_\varepsilon\|_{H^2} < \varepsilon$ . Then  $\psi_\varepsilon := P_f\phi_\varepsilon$  belongs to  $C_0^\infty(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{H}_f$  and

$$\|\psi - \psi_\varepsilon\|_{H^2} = \|P_f(\psi - \phi_\varepsilon)\|_{H^2} \leq \|\psi - \phi_\varepsilon\|_{H^2} < \varepsilon$$

because  $P_f$  is an orthogonal projection in  $H^2$  (if suitably normed). To find  $\phi_\varepsilon$  we may assume that  $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{Nd}) \cap \mathcal{H}_f$ , which is dense in  $H^2(\mathbb{R}^{Nd}) \cap \mathcal{H}_f$ , and we use Lemma A.3 repeatedly. That is, we use  $\{\sigma_k \mid k = 0, \dots, n\}$  to denote the set of  $n := \binom{N}{2}$  pairs  $(i, j)$ , we define  $\Omega_0 := \mathbb{R}^{Nd}$  and

$$\Omega_k := \cap_{j=1}^k \Omega_{\sigma_j}, \quad k = 1 \dots n.$$

Then we construct smooth functions  $(\gamma_k)_{k=0}^n$  recursively with  $\gamma_0 := \psi$ ,  $\text{supp}(\gamma_k) \subset \text{supp}(\gamma_{k-1}) \cap \Omega_k$ ,  $\gamma_k = 0$  on  $\Gamma$ , and  $\|\gamma_k - \gamma_{k-1}\| < \varepsilon/n$ . This is achieved with the help of Lemma A.3. The function  $\phi_\varepsilon := \gamma_n$  has the desired properties. ■

**Acknowledgement.** We thank Semjon Wugalter for pointing out reference [13].

## References

- [1] S. Albeverio, F. Gesztesy, R. Høegh-Krohn, and H. Holden. *Solvable models in quantum mechanics*. AMS Chelsea Publishing, Providence, RI, second edition, 2005. With an appendix by Pavel Exner.
- [2] Giulia Basti, Claudio Cacciapuoti, Domenico Finco, and Alessandro Teta. The three-body problem in dimension one: from short-range to contact interactions. *J. Math. Phys.*, 59(7):072104, 18, 2018.
- [3] Giulia Basti, Claudio Cacciapuoti, Domenico Finco, and Alessandro Teta. Three-body hamiltonian with regularized zero-range interactions in dimension three. arXiv:2107.07188, 2021.
- [4] Gerhard Bräunlich, Christian Hainzl, and Robert Seiringer. On contact interactions as limits of short-range potentials. *Methods Funct. Anal. Topology*, 19(4):364–375, 2013.
- [5] F. Chevy. Universal phase diagram of a strongly interacting fermi gas with unbalanced spin populations. *Phys. Rev. A*, 74:063628, Dec 2006.
- [6] V N Efimov. Weakly bound states of three resonantly interacting particles. *Yadern. Fiz. 12: 1080-91(Nov 1970)*..
- [7] Stefano Giorgini, Lev P. Pitaevskii, and Sandro Stringari. Theory of ultracold atomic fermi gases. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 80:1215–1274, Oct 2008.
- [8] Marcel Griesemer and Michael Hofacker. From short-range to contact interactions in two-dimensional many-body systems. arXiv:2103.06834, 2021.
- [9] Marcel Griesemer, Michael Hofacker, and Ulrich Linden. From short-range to contact interactions in the 1d Bose gas. *Math. Phys. Anal. Geom.*, 23(2):Paper No. 19, 28, 2020.
- [10] Yu Gu, Jeremy Quastel, and Li-Cheng Tsai. Moments of the 2d she at criticality. *Probability and Mathematical Physics*, 2(1):179–219, Mar 2021.
- [11] Michael Hofacker. From short-range to contact interactions in many-body quantum systems. Dissertation, 2022.
- [12] M. Hoffmann-Ostenhof, T. Hoffmann-Ostenhof, A. Laptev, and J. Tidblom. Many-particle hardy inequalities. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 77(1):99–115, Dec 2007.
- [13] M. Klaus and Barry Simon. Coupling constant thresholds in nonrelativistic quantum mechanics. I. Short-range two-body case. *Ann. Physics*, 130(2):251–281, 1980.
- [14] Reiji Konno and S. T. Kuroda. On the finiteness of perturbed eigenvalues. *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. I*, 13:55–63 (1966), 1966.

- [15] Yu. N. Ovchinnikov and I. M. Sigal. Number of bound states of three-body systems and Efimov's effect. *Ann. Physics*, 123(2):274–295, 1979.
- [16] Meera M. Parish. Polaron-molecule transitions in a two-dimensional fermi gas. *Phys. Rev. A*, 83:051603, May 2011.
- [17] Barry Simon. The bound state of weakly coupled Schrödinger operators in one and two dimensions. *Ann. Physics*, 97(2):279–288, 1976.
- [18] E. C. Svendsen. The effect of submanifolds upon essential selfadjointness and deficiency indices. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 80(2):551–565, 1981.