

# Self-adjointness of a class of multi-spin–boson models with ultraviolet divergences

Davide Lonigro<sup>1,2,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Bari, I-70126 Bari, Italy

<sup>2</sup>Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Bari, I-70126 Bari, Italy

\*davide.lonigro@ba.infn.it

January 26, 2023

## Abstract

We study a class of quantum Hamiltonian models describing a family of  $N$  two-level systems (spins) coupled with a structured boson field, with a rotating-wave coupling mediated by form factors possibly exhibiting ultraviolet divergences (hence, non-normalizable). Spin–spin interactions which do not modify the total number of excitations are also included. Generalizing previous results in the single-spin case, we provide explicit expressions for the self-adjointness domain and the resolvent operator of such models, both of them carrying an intricate dependence on the spin–field and spin–spin coupling via a family of concatenated propagators. This construction is also shown to be stable, in the norm resolvent sense, under approximations of the form factors via normalizable ones, for example an ultraviolet cutoff.

## 1 Introduction

Spin–boson models and their generalizations are prototypical examples of linear operators on infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces describing quantum mechanical matter interacting with an external environment, the role of the latter being taken by a structured boson field. Their physical relevance cannot be understated. From one hand, their relatively simple but rich structure accounts for an explicit discussion of their mathematical properties, e.g. their spectrum [1–17]; on the other hand, they provide a simplified but realistic discussion of many natural phenomena of theoretical and practical interest [18–25], thus finding applications in a large variety of topics ranging from open quantum system theory to theoretical quantum optics, computation and information [26–37].

In the present paper we shall focus on the following class of models. Consider an arbitrary number  $N$  of distinguishable two-level systems (hereafter, spins or atoms), whose free energy—possibly involving interactions between the spins—is to be described by a symmetric operator  $K \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{h})$ , where  $\mathfrak{h} \simeq \mathbb{C}^{2^N}$ ; and a boson field, its free energy being represented by the second quantization  $d\Gamma(\omega)$  of a self-adjoint operator  $\omega$  on some single-particle Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ ; as such,  $d\Gamma(\omega)$  acts on the Bose–Fock space  $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ . To fix ideas, we shall choose  $\mathcal{H}$  as the space of square-integrable functions,  $\mathcal{H} = L^2_\mu(X)$ , on some measure space  $(X, \mu)$ , and  $\omega$  as the multiplication operator associated with some measurable function  $X \ni k \mapsto \omega(k) \in \mathbb{R}$ , playing the role of the *dispersion relation* of the field. We shall also require  $\omega \geq m > 0$  for some  $m > 0$ .

In this framework, setting

$$\mathfrak{H} = \mathfrak{h} \otimes \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}) \simeq \mathbb{C}^{2^N} \otimes \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}), \quad H_{\text{free}} = K \otimes \mathbf{I}_{\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})} + \mathbf{I}_{\mathfrak{h}} \otimes d\Gamma(\omega), \quad (1)$$

where  $I_{\mathcal{K}}$  is the identity operator on the space  $\mathcal{K}$ , we shall consider operators on  $\mathfrak{H}$  in the form

$$H_{f_1, \dots, f_N} = H_{\text{free}} + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^N \left( \sigma_j^- \otimes a^\dagger(f_j) + \sigma_j^+ \otimes a(f_j) \right), \quad (2)$$

where

- $\sigma_j^\pm$ , for each  $j = 1, \dots, N$ , are the operators implementing a transition between the excited and ground state of the  $j$ th spin;
- $a(f_j)$ ,  $a^\dagger(f_j)$  are the annihilation and creation operators associated with a family of functions  $f_1, \dots, f_N$ , called the *form factors*;
- $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  is a coupling constant.

This operator models the physical scenario in which the spin–field coupling only involves the following transitions: either one spin, initially in its ground state, absorbs a boson and flips to its excited state; or a spin, initially in its excited state, emits a boson and decays to its ground state; the coupling between the  $j$ th spin and the field is mediated by the  $j$ th form factor. In other words, the spin–field interaction preserves the *total number of excitations*, defined as the number of boson excitations plus the number of spins in their excited state.

This model finds countless applications in many branches of physics. For one, in the case  $N = 1$  the reduced dynamics of the system represents an amplitude-damping qubit channel, one of the paradigmatic quantum channels in open quantum system theory [20]; for a monochromatic boson field, it reduces, respectively in the cases  $N = 1$  and  $N > 1$ , to the well-known Jaynes–Cummings model [29, 30, 38] and Tavis–Cummings model [39, 40]. In general, it provides an effective description of the interaction of two-level atoms with an electromagnetic field in the energy regime in which counter-rotating terms—those that do not preserve the total number of excitations—can be neglected, a procedure known as the rotating-wave approximation [41, 42]: as such, it is largely employed in the description of superradiance and subradiance phenomena [43–46], a notable example of the latter being the emergence of atom–photon bound states in the continuum [47–50]. Such states have been recently characterized, for a regular array of  $N$  quantum emitters [51–53] (also cf. [54] for the general case), via a nonperturbative approach based on the very model (2).

Of course, the expression (2) is only formal unless one specifies some constraint on the form factors  $f_1, \dots, f_N$  ensuring self-adjointness modulo a suitable choice of domain  $\mathcal{D}(H_{f_1, \dots, f_N}) \subset \mathfrak{H}$ ; furthermore, it is desirable to have an explicit expression of said domain (or, at the very least, some core). Apparently, it would be natural to require  $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{H}$ , that is, restricting ourselves to the situation in which all form factors belong to the single-particle Hilbert space—in other words, they are square-integrable (normalizable) functions:

$$\int_X |f_j(k)|^2 d\mu < +\infty, \quad j = 1, \dots, N. \quad (3)$$

In such a case, self-adjointness is ensured on the domain  $\mathcal{D}(H_{f_1, \dots, f_N}) = \mathcal{D}(H_{\text{free}}) = \mathfrak{h} \otimes \mathcal{D}(d\Gamma(\omega))$ , which, in particular, carries no dependence on the form factors at all—physically, the space of states whose energy distribution has a finite variance is the same regardless the nature and the strength of the coupling.

However, in many cases of physical interest, this assumption is *not* met. The description of physical phenomena often involves form factors whose absolute value decreases “too slowly” as  $|k| \rightarrow +\infty$ : in other words, the form factors exhibit *ultraviolet (UV) divergences*. Analogous issues are encountered for other classes of operator representing matter–field interaction, cf. the

discussion in Section 5 and related references. In the presence of UV divergences, Eq. (2) does not define, *per se*, a legitimate operator; still, it would be desirable to relax the aforementioned normalization constraint. Replacing the request (3) with the weaker constraint

$$\int_X \frac{|f_j(k)|^2}{\omega(k)} d\mu < +\infty, \quad j = 1, \dots, N, \quad (4)$$

one can, in fact, interpret Eq. (2) (as well as similar expressions) in the sense of sesquilinear forms, so that the existence of a self-adjoint model associated with such an expression can be proven [55, Prop. 4.2], at least for sufficiently small values of  $\lambda$ , as a straightforward application of the Kato–Lions–Lax–Milgram–Nelson (KLMN) theorem [56, 57]; however, no information about the self-adjointness domain nor the resolvent is retained with this strategy.

This problem was solved in the single-atom case  $N = 1$ : an explicit construction of a self-adjoint operator associated with Eq. (2) has been carried out [55, Theorem 5.5] for arbitrary values of the coupling constant  $\lambda$ . The operator provides the desired generalization of the original Hamiltonian, in the following sense: it reduces to the standard (*regular*) one when the form factor satisfies Eq. (3); if not (*singular* case), it can be approximated by sequences of regular ones—for example, by introducing an ultraviolet cutoff—in the norm resolvent sense. As expected, the actual self-adjointness domain in the singular case carries a nontrivial dependence on the form factor modulating the spin–field interaction.

Carrying forward this line of research, in this work we shall provide, for *arbitrary* values of the number of atoms  $N$ , a rigorous construction of the self-adjoint operator to be associated with the formal expression (2). Our construction will be sufficiently general to possibly accommodate spin–spin interactions, embedded in the definition of the atomic operator  $K$  in Eq. (1), as long as they do not modify the total number of spins in the ground or excited states—whence preserving, *a fortiori*, the total number of excitations of the system. While the technique employed to obtain such a result is essentially based on the same ideas at the root of the case  $N = 1$ , its extension to the multi-spin case offers, as we will see, a number of additional mathematical intricacies that deserve a separate and thorough discussion.

The paper is organized as follows. We start by briefly recalling, in Section 2, the formalism of singular annihilation and creation operators that will be used throughout the work; in Section 3 we discuss the model in the case of regular form factors, and find an useful representation; Section 4 contains the main results of the present work. Final considerations and future research outlooks are finally presented in Section 5.

## 2 Preliminaries

Throughout the paper, the scalar product on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{K}$  and its associated norm will be denoted via the following symbols:

$$\Psi, \Phi \in \mathcal{K} \mapsto \langle \Psi, \Psi \rangle_{\mathcal{K}} \in \mathbb{C}, \quad \Phi \in \mathcal{K} \mapsto \|\Phi\|_{\mathcal{K}} \in \mathbb{R}; \quad (5)$$

the scalar product is chosen to be linear at the right, and antilinear at the left. The domain of an unbounded closed linear operator  $A$  on  $\mathcal{K}$  will be denoted by  $\mathcal{D}(A)$ . If  $A$  admits an adjoint, it shall be denoted by  $A^*$ . The complex conjugate of a number  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  will be denoted by  $\bar{z}$ .

Furthermore, given two Hilbert spaces  $\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}'$ , the space of continuous (bounded) linear operators between  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $\mathcal{K}'$  will be denoted as  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}')$ ; in the case  $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}'$ , we will simply write denote it as  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ .

**Scales of Hilbert spaces.** Recall that, given a self-adjoint nonnegative operator  $A$  on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{K}$ , we can always construct a *scale of Hilbert spaces*  $\{\mathcal{K}_s\}_{s \in \mathbb{R}}$ , with  $\mathcal{K}_s$  being defined as the completion of the linear subspace  $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{D}(A^n)$  with respect to the norm

$$\|\Phi\|_{\mathcal{K}_s} := \left\| (A + 1)^{s/2} \Phi \right\|_{\mathcal{K}}. \quad (6)$$

Notice that the “+1” in the definition above can be discarded whenever  $A$  is strictly positive, that is,  $A \geq \epsilon > 0$ . We refer to the literature, e.g. [58–60], for further details.

Clearly,  $\mathcal{K}_s \subset \mathcal{K}_{s'}$  whenever  $s \geq s'$ , and  $\mathcal{K}_0 = \mathcal{K}$ . By construction, for every  $r, s \in \mathbb{R}$ , the operator  $(A + 1)^r$  can be continuously extended<sup>1</sup> to an isometry between the spaces  $\mathcal{K}_s$  and  $\mathcal{K}_{s-2r}$ . Consequently, for all  $s > 0$ , the triple  $(\mathcal{K}_{+s}, \mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}_{-s})$  is a Gel’fand triple [61–63], with the spaces  $\mathcal{K}_{\pm s}$  being mutually dual with respect to the duality pairing

$$(\Psi, \Phi) \in \mathcal{K}_{-s} \times \mathcal{K}_{+s} \mapsto (\Psi, \Phi)_{\mathcal{K}_{-s}, \mathcal{K}_s} := \left\langle (A + 1)^{-s/2} \Psi, (A + 1)^{s/2} \Phi \right\rangle_{\mathcal{K}}. \quad (7)$$

*Remark 2.1.* Throughout the paper, we shall often need the following simple, but crucial consequence of the discussion above: given *any*  $z$  in the resolvent set of  $A$ , then the resolvent operator  $(A - z)^{-1}$  itself is extended to a continuous map  $(A - z)^{-1} : \mathcal{K}_{-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{+1}$ . Indeed, by the definition on the norms  $\|\cdot\|_{\pm 1}$ , this happens if and only if the operator  $(A + 1)^{1/2}(A - z)^{-1}(A + 1)^{1/2}$  in  $\mathcal{K}$  has a bounded extension with respect to the norm of  $\mathcal{K}$ , which is clearly true.  $\triangle$

**The  $\omega$ -scale and the  $d\Gamma(\omega)$ -scale.** Following the discussion in the introductory section, given a measure space  $(X, \mu)$ , we shall set  $\mathcal{H} = L^2_\mu(X)$  and  $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}) \equiv \mathcal{F}$  as the corresponding Bose–Fock space with single-particle subspace  $\mathcal{H}$ : that is,  $\mathcal{F}$  is the space of sequences  $\{\Psi^{(n)}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , with  $\Psi^{(n)}$  being a completely symmetric  $n$ -particle wavefunction, such that

$$\|\Psi\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \int_X \left| \Psi^{(n)}(k_1, \dots, k_n) \right|^2 d^n \mu < \infty. \quad (8)$$

We refer to the literature, e.g. [64–67], for details. The vacuum state of the field, i.e. the unique (up to a global phase term) normalized element of  $\mathcal{H}^{(0)}$ , shall be denoted by  $\Omega$ .

Let us fix once and for all our assumptions about the boson field:

**Hypothesis 2.2.**  $\omega$  is a strictly positive self-adjoint multiplication operator on the single-particle subspace  $\mathcal{H}$ , with  $\omega \geq m > 0$ .

Given its second quantization  $d\Gamma(\omega)$  on  $\mathcal{F}$ , we can thus define two scales of Hilbert spaces:

- the  $\omega$ -scale  $\{\mathcal{H}_s\}_{s \in \mathbb{R}}$  associated with  $\omega$ , with

$$\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}_s}^2 = \|\omega^{s/2} \psi\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 = \int \omega(k)^s |\psi(k)|^2 d\mu; \quad (9)$$

- the  $d\Gamma(\omega)$ -scale  $\{\mathcal{F}_s\}_{s \in \mathbb{R}}$  associated with  $d\Gamma(\omega)$ , with

$$\|\Psi\|_{\mathcal{F}_s}^2 = \left\| (d\Gamma(\omega) + 1)^{s/2} \Psi \right\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2. \quad (10)$$

To ease the notation, we shall hereafter adopt the shorthands  $\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}_s} \equiv \|\psi\|_s$  (and, in particular,  $\|\psi\|_0 \equiv \|\psi\|$ ) for the norms characterizing the  $\omega$ -scale.

---

<sup>1</sup>With a slight abuse of notation, in such cases we will say that the operator can be “interpreted” either as an unbounded operator on  $\mathcal{K}$ , or as a bounded (continuous) operator between  $\mathcal{K}_s$  and  $\mathcal{K}_{s-2r}$ .

**Singular annihilation and creation operators.** It is a well-known fact (see e.g. [64, 66, 68]) that, given  $f \in \mathcal{H}$ , one can introduce two mutually adjoint closed operators  $a(f)$ ,  $a^\dagger(f)$  in  $\mathcal{F}$ , with dense domain  $\mathcal{D}(a(f)) = \mathcal{D}(a^\dagger(f)) \subset \mathcal{F}$ , acting as follows on every vector  $\Psi$  in their domain:

$$\left(a(f) \Psi^{(n)}\right)(k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}) = \sqrt{n} \int \overline{f(k_n)} \Psi^{(n)}(k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}, k_n) d\mu(k_n), \quad (11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left(a^\dagger(f) \Psi^{(n)}\right)(k_1, \dots, k_n, k_{n+1}) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}} \left( \sum_{j=1}^n \Psi^{(n)}(k_1, \dots, \overbrace{k_{n+1}, \dots, k_n}^{j\text{th}}) f(k_j) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \Psi^{(n)}(k_1, \dots, k_n) f(k_{n+1}) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

respectively for every  $n \geq 1$  and  $n \geq 0$ . These are the boson *annihilation and creation operators* associated with the function  $f$ .

The discussion above does not directly apply for  $f \notin \mathcal{H}$ : while the annihilation operator  $a(f)$  is still well-defined provided that  $f$  is measurable, it fails to be closed, so that its adjoint is not densely defined [68]; accordingly, Eq. (12) does not define an operator on  $\mathcal{F}$ . The basic idea to circumvent this issue is to define both operators, instead as unbounded operators on  $\mathcal{F}$ , as continuous maps between members of the  $d\Gamma(\omega)$ -scale. Namely:

**Proposition 2.3** ([55], Props. 3.4, 3.5 and 3.7). *Let  $\omega$  satisfy Hypothesis 2.2, and  $f \in \mathcal{H}_{-s}$  for some  $s \geq 1$ . Then the following statements hold true:*

- (i) *the operator  $a(f) : \mathcal{F}_s \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  acting as  $a(f)\Omega = 0$  and, for all  $n \geq 1$ , as in Eq. (11), is well-defined and bounded;*
- (ii) *its adjoint  $a^\dagger(f) := a(f)^* : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{-s}$  with respect to the pairing (7) is likewise well-defined and bounded, and, for all  $n$  and  $\Psi \in \mathcal{F}_{+1}$ , it acts as in Eq. (12);*
- (iii) *finally, there exists a sequence  $\{f^i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{H}$  such that*

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \left\| a(f) - a(f^i) \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}_s, \mathcal{F})} = 0, \quad \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \left\| a^\dagger(f) - a^\dagger(f^i) \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_{-s})} = 0, \quad (13)$$

*and this happens if and only if  $\|f - f^i\|_{-s} \rightarrow 0$ .*

Essentially, we are thus able to define annihilation and creation operators for functions  $f \notin \mathcal{H}$  at the price of dealing with continuous operators on the  $d\Gamma(\omega)$ -scale instead of unbounded operators in  $\mathcal{F}$ . In the remainder of the paper we shall be primarily interested in the case  $s = 1$ .

Of course, for  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  the action of these ‘‘singular’’ operators agrees with that of the ‘‘standard’’ ones on the domain of the latter, thus justifying the slight abuse of notation in using the same symbols  $a(f)$ ,  $a^\dagger(f)$ . In these cases,  $a(f)$  and  $a^\dagger(f)$  can be interpreted, in the sense discussed above, both as unbounded operators on  $\mathcal{F}$  and as continuous maps respectively between  $\mathcal{F}_{+1}$  and  $\mathcal{F}$ , and between  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{-1}$ .

### 3 The model

We shall now discuss in detail the structure of the model (2) for *regular* (i.e. normalizable) form factors  $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{H}$ , focusing on the case in which the spin Hamiltonian satisfies an additional condition which will enable us to unearth a convenient representation.

### 3.1 The spin Hamiltonian

Let us start by considering a family of  $N$  two-level systems (spins), whose configuration space, adopting a bra-ket notation, will be the  $2^N$ -dimensional Hilbert space

$$\mathfrak{h} = \bigotimes_{j=1}^N \mathfrak{h}_j, \quad \mathfrak{h}_j = \text{Span}\{|e_j\rangle, |g_j\rangle\} \simeq \mathbb{C}^2, \quad (14)$$

with  $|e_j\rangle, |g_j\rangle$  respectively representing the excited and ground state of the  $j$ th spin. In particular, the symmetric operator

$$N_{\text{exc}} = \sum_{j=1}^N \left[ \mathbb{I}_{\mathfrak{h}_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathfrak{h}_{j-1}} \otimes |e_j\rangle\langle e_j| \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathfrak{h}_{j+1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathfrak{h}_N} \right] \quad (15)$$

represents the number of spins in their excited state, and the operators

$$\sigma_j^+ = \mathbb{I}_{\mathfrak{h}_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathfrak{h}_{j-1}} \otimes |e_j\rangle\langle g_j| \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathfrak{h}_{j+1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathfrak{h}_N}; \quad (16)$$

$$\sigma_j^- = \mathbb{I}_{\mathfrak{h}_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathfrak{h}_{j-1}} \otimes |g_j\rangle\langle e_j| \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathfrak{h}_{j+1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathfrak{h}_N}; \quad (17)$$

represent a transition of the  $j$ th spin between its excited and ground state, and vice versa.

**A convenient representation.** It is straightforward to notice that the spectrum of  $N_{\text{exc}}$  comprises the eigenvalues  $0, 1, \dots, N$ , whence  $\mathfrak{h}$  can be decomposed as the direct sum of its eigenspaces:<sup>2</sup>

$$\mathfrak{h} \simeq \bigoplus_{\nu=0}^N \mathfrak{h}^{(\nu)}, \quad \dim \mathfrak{h}^{(\nu)} = \binom{N}{\nu}, \quad (18)$$

with  $N_{\text{exc}} \mathfrak{h}^{(\nu)} = \nu \mathfrak{h}^{(\nu)}$ . For example,  $\mathfrak{h}^{(0)}$  is spanned by the only vector

$$\bigotimes_{\ell=1}^N |g_\ell\rangle, \quad (19)$$

$\mathfrak{h}^{(1)}$  is spanned by the  $N$  vectors

$$\left( \bigotimes_{\ell=1}^{j-1} |g_\ell\rangle \right) \otimes |e_j\rangle \otimes \left( \bigotimes_{\ell'=j+1}^N |g_{\ell'}\rangle \right), \quad j = 1, \dots, N, \quad (20)$$

and so on. As such, the most general state  $u \in \mathfrak{h}$  can be represented as

$$u \simeq \begin{bmatrix} u_0 \\ u_1 \\ \vdots \\ u_N \end{bmatrix}, \quad u_\nu \in \mathfrak{h}^{(\nu)}, \quad (21)$$

with  $u_\nu$  representing a spin configuration in which  $\nu$  spins are in their excited state, and  $N - \nu$  are in their ground state.

---

<sup>2</sup>Notice that, to avoid misunderstandings, we shall use Greek indices  $\nu, \nu', \dots$  to label the *number* of excited spins, which ranges from 0 to  $N$ , as opposed with the Latin indices  $j, \ell, \dots$  which label the spins themselves and range from 1 to  $N$ .

**Hamiltonian of the spin subsystem.** Let  $K \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{h})$  be the operator representing the energy of the spins, possibly comprising spin–spin interactions. We shall make the following assumption on  $K$ :

**Hypothesis 3.1.**  $K \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{h})$  is a nonnegative symmetric operator which preserves the number of excited spins, that is,

$$[K, N_{\text{exc}}] = 0, \quad (22)$$

with  $N_{\text{exc}}$  as in Eq. (15).

Therefore, we are considering the situation in which  $K$  only involves spin–spin interactions which do not modify the number of excitations: for every spin undergoing a flip from the ground to the excited state, another spin undergoes the converse transition. The nonnegativity assumption on  $K$ , while not required for our results nor restrictive, will be assumed to ease the notation.

Clearly, exploiting the decomposition (18) of  $\mathfrak{h}$ ,  $K$  satisfies this hypothesis if and only if it is block-diagonal with respect to said decomposition:

$$K \simeq \begin{bmatrix} K_0 & & & \\ & K_1 & & \\ & & K_2 & \\ & & & \ddots \end{bmatrix}, \quad K_\nu \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{h}^{(\nu)}). \quad (23)$$

*Example 3.2.* The simplest case of a spin Hamiltonian involving nontrivial  $N_{\text{exc}}$ -preserving interactions, which we shall always refer to in the examples, is

$$K = \sum_{j=1}^N (e_j \sigma_j^+ \sigma_j^- + g_j \sigma_j^- \sigma_j^+) + \sum_{j \neq \ell=1}^N v_{j\ell} \sigma_j^+ \sigma_\ell^- \quad (24)$$

for some  $e_j, g_j \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $v_{j\ell}^* = v_{\ell j} \in \mathbb{C}$ , and with the operators  $\sigma_j^\pm$  defined by Eqs. (16)–(17). The first term in Eq. (24) represents the energy of the spins in the absence of spin–spin interactions, with  $e_j$  and  $g_j$  respectively representing the excitation and ground energy of the  $j$ th spin. The second term encodes spin–spin interactions, each causing the states of the  $j$ th and  $\ell$ th spin, when different from each other, to flip; in this sense, the two spins “exchange an excitation”, but the total number of excitations stays the same.  $\triangle$

We refer to Section 3.3 for a discussion on how these decompositions, as well as the block-diagonal structure of the Hamiltonian  $K$ , emerge in the simplest cases of  $N = 2$  and  $N = 3$  spins.

### 3.2 Introducing the boson field

Reprising the nomenclature of Section 2, let us consider a boson field on  $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{F}$  associated with a single-particle operator  $\omega$  satisfying Hypothesis 2.2, with second quantization  $d\Gamma(\omega)$ . The decomposition (18) of the spin subspace  $\mathfrak{h}$  naturally induces the following decomposition of the Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H} = \mathfrak{h} \otimes \mathcal{F}$  associated with the spins and the field:

$$\mathfrak{H} \simeq \bigoplus_{\nu=0}^N \mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}, \quad \mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)} = \mathfrak{h}^{(\nu)} \otimes \mathcal{F}, \quad (25)$$

with  $\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}$  thus representing the space of all spin–field states such that  $\nu$  out of  $N$  spins are in their excited state. The most general state in  $\mathfrak{H}$  can thus be represented as

$$\Psi \simeq \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_0 \\ \Psi_1 \\ \vdots \\ \Psi_N \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Psi_\nu \in \mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}. \quad (26)$$

Clearly, each  $\Psi_\nu$  can be written as a linear combination of objects in the form  $u_\nu \otimes \psi_\nu$ , with  $u_\nu \in \mathfrak{h}^{(\nu)}$  and  $\psi_\nu \in \mathcal{F}$ .

Given  $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{H}$ , let us consider the (regular) multi-spin–boson model  $H_{f_1, \dots, f_N}$  associated with the expression (2), which, as discussed in the introductory section, defines a self-adjoint operator on the (coupling-independent) domain

$$\mathcal{D}(H_{f_1, \dots, f_N}) = \mathcal{D}(H_{\text{free}}) = \mathfrak{h} \otimes \mathcal{D}(\text{d}\Gamma(\omega)). \quad (27)$$

We shall hereafter fix the coupling constant as  $\lambda = 1$  (with the exception of Remark 4.4 and Example 4.5) since it will not play any particular role in the following discussion. Let us rewrite  $H_{f_1, \dots, f_N}$  as

$$H_{f_1, \dots, f_N} = H_{\text{free}} + A + A^\dagger, \quad (28)$$

with  $H_{\text{free}}$  as in Eq. (1), and

$$A = \sum_{j=1}^N \sigma_j^+ \otimes a(f_j), \quad A^\dagger = \sum_{j=1}^N \sigma_j^- \otimes a^\dagger(f_j). \quad (29)$$

Now, the domain  $\mathcal{D}(H_{\text{free}}) = \mathfrak{h} \otimes \mathcal{D}(\text{d}\Gamma(\omega))$  of the decoupled Hamiltonian  $H_{\text{free}}$  as in Eq. (1) can be similarly decomposed as

$$\mathcal{D}(H_{\text{free}}) \simeq \bigoplus_{\nu=0}^N \mathcal{D}^{(\nu)}, \quad \mathcal{D}^{(\nu)} = \mathfrak{h}^{(\nu)} \otimes \mathcal{D}(\text{d}\Gamma(\omega)) \subset \mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}, \quad (30)$$

As long as the Hamiltonian  $K$  of the spin subsystem satisfies Hypothesis 3.1,  $H_{\text{free}}$  is block-diagonal with respect to this decomposition, i.e. for all  $\nu = 0, \dots, N$

$$H_{\text{free}} \mathcal{D}^{(\nu)} \subset \mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}, \quad (31)$$

whereas, for all  $\nu = 0, \dots, N-1$ ,

$$A \mathcal{D}^{(\nu)} \subset \mathfrak{H}^{(\nu+1)}, \quad A^\dagger \mathcal{D}^{(\nu+1)} \subset \mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}, \quad (32)$$

thus bringing about a *block-tridiagonal* decomposition for the Hamiltonian  $H_{f_1, \dots, f_N}$ :

$$H_{f_1, \dots, f_N} \simeq \begin{bmatrix} H_0 & A_{0,1}^\dagger & & & \\ A_{0,1} & H_1 & A_{1,2}^\dagger & & \\ & A_{1,2} & H_2 & A_{2,3}^\dagger & \\ & & A_{2,3} & H_3 & \ddots \\ & & & \ddots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}, \quad (33)$$

with the operators  $H_\nu$ ,  $A_{\nu, \nu+1}$  and  $A_{\nu-1, \nu}^\dagger$  respectively corresponding to the restrictions of  $H_{\text{free}}$ ,  $A$  and  $A^\dagger$  to  $\mathcal{D}^{(\nu)}$ ; in particular,  $H_\nu = K_\nu \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{F}} + \mathbb{I}_{\mathfrak{h}^{(\nu)}} \otimes \text{d}\Gamma(\omega)$ . Incidentally, we point out that

such a structure enables us to represent the Hamiltonian via a number of “blocks” which scales linearly with  $N$ , despite the fact that the dimension of the spin subspace scales exponentially with it.

The block-tridiagonal structure of  $H_{f_1, \dots, f_N}$  will prove of crucial importance in order to provide an explicit and rigorous generalization of the Hamiltonian to the case  $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{H}_{-1}$ ; this will be discussed in Section 4. This will essentially require the formalism of singular annihilation and creation operators presented in Section 2, and an explicit computation of the resolvent operator brought about by the block-tridiagonal structure of the Hamiltonian.

### 3.3 Simplest cases

We shall conclude this section by briefly discussing the particular cases of  $N = 2, 3$  spins, showing how these decompositions come into play.

*Example 3.3* (Case  $N = 2$ ). This case was briefly introduced in [55, 69]. The spin subspace  $\mathfrak{h}$  decomposes as  $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{h}^{(0)} \oplus \mathfrak{h}^{(1)} \oplus \mathfrak{h}^{(2)}$ , where

$$\mathfrak{h}^{(0)} = \text{Span} \{ |g, g\rangle \}; \quad (34)$$

$$\mathfrak{h}^{(1)} = \text{Span} \{ |e, g\rangle, |g, e\rangle \}; \quad (35)$$

$$\mathfrak{h}^{(2)} = \text{Span} \{ |e, e\rangle \}, \quad (36)$$

where  $|g, g\rangle := |g_1\rangle \otimes |g_2\rangle$ ,  $|e, g\rangle := |e_1\rangle \otimes |g_2\rangle$ , and so on.

We shall consider an Hamiltonian as in Eq. (24). A direct check yields the following structure:

$$\begin{aligned} K &= \sum_{j=1,2} \left( e_j \sigma_j^+ \sigma_j^- + g_j \sigma_j^- \sigma_j^+ \right) + v \sigma_1^+ \sigma_2 + v^* \sigma_2^+ \sigma_1^- \\ &\simeq \left[ \begin{array}{c|cc|c} g_1 + g_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & e_1 + g_2 & v & 0 \\ 0 & v^* & g_1 + e_2 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & e_1 + e_2 \end{array} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

with  $e_j, g_j \in \mathbb{R}$  respectively corresponding to the energies of the excited and ground states of the  $j$ th spin, and  $v \in \mathbb{C}$  modulating the spin–spin interaction, which flips the states of both spins; the distinction between sectors having the same number of excited spins has been stressed.

With this decomposition in mind, the most general vector in  $\mathfrak{h}$  can be written as

$$\Psi \simeq \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_{gg} \\ \Psi_{eg} \\ \Psi_{ge} \\ \Psi_{ee} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Psi_{gg}, \Psi_{eg}, \Psi_{ge}, \Psi_{ee} \in \mathcal{F}, \quad (38)$$

with  $\Psi_{xx'}$ ,  $x, x' \in \{e, g\}$ , corresponding to the states of the boson field when the two spins are, respectively, in the  $x$  and  $x'$  state. Given two form factors  $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{H}$ , the Hamiltonian  $H_{f_1, f_2}$ , defined by

$$H_{f_1, f_2} = H_{\text{free}} + \sum_{j=1,2} \left( \sigma_j^- \otimes a^\dagger(f_j) + \sigma_j^+ \otimes a(f_j) \right) \quad (39)$$

acquires the following matrix structure:

$$H_{f_1, f_2} = \left[ \begin{array}{c|cc|c} H_{gg} & a^\dagger(f_1) & a^\dagger(f_2) & \\ \hline a(f_1) & H_{eg} & v & a^\dagger(f_2) \\ a(f_2) & v^* & H_{ge} & a^\dagger(f_1) \\ \hline & a(f_2) & a(f_1) & H_{ee} \end{array} \right], \quad (40)$$

where  $H_{xx'} = d\Gamma(\omega) + x_1 + x'_2$ ,  $x, x' \in \{e, g\}$ . The block-tridiagonal structure (33) is thus recovered with

$$H_0 = H_{gg}, \quad H_1 = \begin{bmatrix} H_{eg} & v \\ v^* & H_{ge} \end{bmatrix}, \quad H_2 = H_{ee} \quad (41)$$

and

$$A_{0,1} = \begin{bmatrix} a(f_1) \\ a(f_2) \end{bmatrix}, \quad A_{1,2} = \begin{bmatrix} a(f_2) & a(f_1) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (42)$$

△

*Example 3.4* (Case  $N = 3$ ). An analogous reasoning allows us to treat the case  $N = 3$ , again assuming spin–spin interactions as in Example 3.2. Now the spin subspace decomposes as  $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{h}^{(0)} \oplus \mathfrak{h}^{(1)} \oplus \mathfrak{h}^{(2)} \oplus \mathfrak{h}^{(3)}$ , where

$$\mathfrak{h}^{(0)} = \text{Span} \{|g, g, g\rangle\}; \quad (43)$$

$$\mathfrak{h}^{(1)} = \text{Span} \{|e, g, g\rangle, |g, e, g\rangle, |g, g, e\rangle\}; \quad (44)$$

$$\mathfrak{h}^{(2)} = \text{Span} \{|e, e, g\rangle, |e, g, e\rangle, |g, e, e\rangle\}; \quad (45)$$

$$\mathfrak{h}^{(3)} = \text{Span} \{|e, e, e\rangle\}, \quad (46)$$

where  $|g, g, g\rangle := |g_1\rangle \otimes |g_2\rangle \otimes |g_3\rangle$ ,  $|e, g, g\rangle := |e_1\rangle \otimes |g_2\rangle \otimes |g_3\rangle$ , and so on.

We shall directly present the matrix structure of the total Hamiltonian  $H_{f_1, f_2, f_3}$ , which can be obtained via a long but straightforward check. Representing the most general vector in  $\mathfrak{H}$  as

$$\Psi \simeq \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_{ggg} \\ \Psi_{egg} \\ \Psi_{geg} \\ \Psi_{gge} \\ \Psi_{eeg} \\ \Psi_{ege} \\ \Psi_{gee} \\ \Psi_{eee} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Psi_{ggg}, \Psi_{egg}, \dots, \Psi_{eee} \in \mathcal{F}, \quad (47)$$

by a direct inspection we have

$$H_{f_1, f_2, f_3} = \begin{bmatrix} H_{ggg} & a^\dagger(f_1) & a^\dagger(f_2) & a^\dagger(f_3) & & & & & \\ a(f_1) & H_{egg} & v_{12} & v_{13} & a^\dagger(f_2) & a^\dagger(f_3) & 0 & & \\ a(f_2) & v_{12}^* & H_{geg} & v_{23} & a^\dagger(f_1) & 0 & a^\dagger(f_3) & & \\ a(f_3) & v_{13}^* & v_{23}^* & H_{gge} & 0 & a^\dagger(f_1) & a^\dagger(f_2) & & \\ & a(f_2) & a(f_1) & 0 & H_{eeg} & v_{23} & v_{13} & a^\dagger(f_3) & \\ & a(f_3) & 0 & a(f_1) & v_{23}^* & H_{ege} & v_{12} & a^\dagger(f_2) & \\ & 0 & a(f_3) & a(f_2) & v_{13}^* & v_{12}^* & H_{gee} & a^\dagger(f_1) & \\ & & & & a(f_3) & a(f_2) & a(f_1) & H_{eee} & \end{bmatrix}, \quad (48)$$

with  $H_{xx'x''} = d\Gamma(\omega) + x_1 + x'_2 + x''_3$ ,  $x, x', x'' \in \{e, g\}$ . Again, a block-tridiagonal structure as in Eq. (33) emerges; in particular,

$$A_{0,1} = \begin{bmatrix} a(f_1) \\ a(f_2) \\ a(f_3) \end{bmatrix}, \quad A_{1,2} = \begin{bmatrix} a(f_2) & a(f_1) & 0 \\ a(f_3) & 0 & a(f_1) \\ 0 & a(f_3) & a(f_2) \end{bmatrix}, \quad A_{2,3} = \begin{bmatrix} a(f_3) & a(f_2) & a(f_1) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (49)$$

△

We remark that, in all cases, the expression of all blocks (cf. Eqs. (42) and (49)) crucially depends on the particular (and arbitrary) choice of order in which the various possible spin configurations appear; choosing another ordering would yield different expressions—of course, with the dimensions of the blocks being the same.

## 4 Resolvent and singular coupling

We shall now consider the case  $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{H}_{-1}$ . In this case, when  $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{H}_{-1} \in \mathcal{H}_{-1} \setminus \mathcal{H}$ , clearly the operators  $A_{\nu, \nu+1}, A_{\nu, \nu+1}^\dagger$  as in Eq. (33) cease to be well-defined as unbounded operators (respectively on  $\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}$  and  $\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu+1)}$ ).

The formalism of scales of Hilbert spaces will enable us to circumvent this problem. Recalling the discussion in Section 2, let us define, for all  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ , a scale of spaces  $\{\mathfrak{H}_s\}_{s \in \mathbb{R}}$  by

$$\mathfrak{H}_s = \mathfrak{h} \otimes \mathcal{F}_s, \quad (50)$$

with  $\{\mathcal{F}_s\}_{s \in \mathbb{R}}$  being the  $d\Gamma(\omega)$ -scale. These spaces can be decomposed analogously as in Eq. (18):

$$\mathfrak{H}_s = \bigoplus_{\nu=0}^N \mathfrak{H}_s^{(\nu)}, \quad \mathfrak{H}_s^{(\nu)} = \mathfrak{h}^{(\nu)} \otimes \mathcal{F}_s. \quad (51)$$

Clearly, the family of spaces  $\{\mathfrak{H}_s^{(\nu)}\}_{s \in \mathbb{R}}$  itself, endowed with the norms generated by  $H_\nu$  along the lines depicted in Section 2, coincides with the  $H_\nu$ -scale of Hilbert spaces. Besides, as a direct consequence of Prop. 2.3, we are provided with two continuous maps ( $\nu = 0, \dots, N-1$ )

$$A_{\nu, \nu+1} : \mathfrak{H}_{+1}^{(\nu)} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}^{(\nu+1)}, \quad A_{\nu, \nu+1}^\dagger : \mathfrak{H}^{(\nu+1)} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}_{-1}^{(\nu)}, \quad (52)$$

which are also mutually adjoint with respect to the duality pairing between the two spaces.

Therefore, provided that the maps  $A_{\nu, \nu+1}$  and  $A_{\nu, \nu+1}^\dagger$  are interpreted in the sense of Eq. (52), the block-tridiagonal map in Eq. (33), while no longer directly defining a self-adjoint operator on  $\mathfrak{H}$ , does define a continuous map between  $\mathfrak{H}_{+1}$  and  $\mathfrak{H}_{-1}$ . Our goal will be to find a suitable domain  $\mathcal{D}(H_{f_1, \dots, f_N}) \subset \mathfrak{H}$  such that the restriction of said map to  $\mathcal{D}(H_{f_1, \dots, f_N})$  defines an unbounded operator on  $\mathfrak{H}$  having all desired properties:

- it should be self-adjoint for all choices of  $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{H}_{-1}$ ;
- when  $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{H}$  (regular case), it should coincide with the regular spin–boson model studied in the previous section;
- if not (singular case), it should be possible to approximate it, in a suitable topology, via some sequence of regular spin–boson models.

Like in the case  $N = 1$ , the new domain is expected to differ from  $\mathcal{D}(H_{\text{free}})$ : it must contain additional terms which, heuristically, will cause an overall “cancellation of the divergences” produced by the maps  $A_{\nu, \nu+1}^\dagger$ .

### 4.1 A family of concatenated propagators

Let us start with a preliminary lemma, which provides a nontrivial generalization of [55, Lemma 5.3] to the multi-spin case.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $\omega$  be a single-particle operator on  $\mathcal{H}$  satisfying Hypothesis 2.2,  $K$  a spin Hamiltonian satisfying Hypothesis 3.1,  $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{H}_{-1}$ , and for all  $\nu = 0, \dots, N$  let  $H_\nu, A_{\nu, \nu+1}$  and  $A_{\nu, \nu+1}^\dagger$  as defined in Eq. (33). For all  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ , let  $\mathcal{S}_\nu(z), \mathcal{G}_\nu(z)$  be defined via the recurrence relations*

$$\mathcal{S}_0(z) = 0, \quad (53)$$

$$\mathcal{G}_\nu(z) = H_\nu - z - \mathcal{S}_\nu(z), \quad \nu = 0, \dots, N, \quad (54)$$

$$\mathcal{S}_\nu(z) = A_{\nu-1, \nu} \mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}^{-1}(z) A_{\nu-1, \nu}^\dagger, \quad \nu = 1, \dots, N. \quad (55)$$

Then, for all  $\nu$ ,

(i)  $\mathcal{S}_\nu(z)$  is a bounded operator on  $\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}$  which

- satisfies  $\mathcal{S}_\nu(z)^* = \mathcal{S}_\nu(\bar{z})$ , and
- for all  $\Psi \in \mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}$ ,

$$\frac{\operatorname{Im} \langle \Psi, \mathcal{S}_\nu(z) \Psi \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}}}{\operatorname{Im} z} \geq 0; \quad (56)$$

(ii)  $\mathcal{G}_\nu(z)$  is an unbounded operator on  $\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}$ , with domain  $\mathcal{D}^{(\nu)}$  and form domain  $\mathfrak{H}_{+1}^{(\nu)}$ , which

- satisfies  $\mathcal{G}_\nu(z)^* = \mathcal{G}_\nu(\bar{z})$ , and
- for all  $\Psi \in \mathfrak{H}_{+1}^{(\nu)}$ ,

$$\frac{\operatorname{Im} \langle \Psi, \mathcal{G}_\nu(z) \Psi \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}}}{\operatorname{Im} z} \leq -\|\Psi\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}}^2 \leq 0; \quad (57)$$

- it admits a bounded inverse  $\mathcal{G}_\nu^{-1}(z) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)})$ , with operator norm

$$\left\| \mathcal{G}_\nu^{-1}(z) \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)})} \leq \frac{1}{|\operatorname{Im} z|}, \quad (58)$$

which continuously extends to a bounded map between  $\mathfrak{H}_{-1}^{(\nu)}$  and  $\mathfrak{H}_{+1}^{(\nu)}$ .

*Proof.* Recall that, by the properties of Hilbert scales (cf. Remark 2.1),  $H_\nu$  and  $(H_\nu - z)^{-1}$  extend to continuous operators respectively from  $\mathfrak{H}_{+1}^{(\nu)}$  to  $\mathfrak{H}_{-1}^{(\nu)}$ , and vice versa. The claim is thus true for  $\nu = 0$ . We shall prove it for  $\nu \geq 1$  by mathematical induction.

Suppose that the claim is true for  $\nu - 1$ . Then  $\mathcal{S}_\nu(z)$  is a bounded operator on  $\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}$  since, taking into account Eq. (52), we have

$$\mathcal{S}_\nu(z) : \quad \mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)} \xrightarrow{A_{\nu,\nu+1}^\dagger} \mathfrak{H}_{-1}^{(\nu-1)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}^{-1}(z)} \mathfrak{H}_{+1}^{(\nu-1)} \xrightarrow{A_{\nu,\nu+1}} \mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}; \quad (59)$$

the property  $\mathcal{S}_\nu(z)^* = \mathcal{S}_\nu(\bar{z})$  also follows directly from the fact that, by the induction assumption,  $\mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}(z)^* = \mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}(\bar{z})$ , and by the properties of  $A_{\nu-1,\nu}$  and  $A_{\nu-1,\nu}^\dagger$ . Besides, given  $\Psi \in \mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Im} \langle \Psi, \mathcal{S}_\nu(z) \Psi \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}} &= \operatorname{Im} \left\langle \Psi, A_{\nu-1,\nu} \mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}^{-1}(z) A_{\nu-1,\nu}^\dagger \Psi \right\rangle_{\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2i} \left\langle \Psi, A_{\nu-1,\nu} \left\{ \mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}^{-1}(z) - \mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \right\} A_{\nu-1,\nu}^\dagger \Psi \right\rangle_{\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2i} \left\langle \Psi, A_{\nu-1,\nu} \mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}^{-1}(z) \left\{ \mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}(\bar{z}) - \mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}(z) \right\} \mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}^{-1}(\bar{z}) A_{\nu-1,\nu}^\dagger \Psi \right\rangle_{\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}} \\ &= -\operatorname{Im} \left\langle \mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}^{-1}(\bar{z}) A_{\nu-1,\nu}^\dagger \Psi, \mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}(z) \mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}^{-1}(\bar{z}) A_{\nu-1,\nu}^\dagger \Psi \right\rangle_{\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Noticing that  $\mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}^{-1}(\bar{z}) A_{\nu-1,\nu}^\dagger \Psi \in \mathfrak{H}_{+1}^{(\nu)}$ , by the properties of  $\mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}(z)$  we have  $\operatorname{Im} \langle \Psi, \mathcal{S}_\nu(z) \Psi \rangle \geq 0$  whenever  $\operatorname{Im} z > 0$  and vice versa, completing the proof of (i).

We must now prove that  $\mathcal{G}_\nu(z)$ , as defined in Eq. (54), has the desired properties. Clearly, being a bounded perturbation of  $H_\nu - z$ , the operator is well-defined on the dense domain  $\mathcal{D}^{(\nu)}$  and its adjoint is  $\mathcal{G}_\nu(z)^* = \mathcal{G}_\nu(\bar{z})$ . The second property follows directly from the definition (54) of  $\mathcal{G}_\nu(z)$ :

$$\operatorname{Im} \langle \Psi, \mathcal{G}_\nu(z) \Psi \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}} = -\operatorname{Im} z \|\Psi\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}}^2 - \operatorname{Im} \langle \Psi, \mathcal{S}_\nu(z) \Psi \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}}, \quad (61)$$

which, by (i), implies

$$\frac{\operatorname{Im} \langle \Psi, \mathcal{G}_\nu(z) \Psi \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}}}{\operatorname{Im} z} = -\|\Psi\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}}^2 - \frac{\operatorname{Im} \langle \Psi, \mathcal{S}_\nu(z) \Psi \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}}}{\operatorname{Im} z} \leq -\|\Psi\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}}^2. \quad (62)$$

To prove that  $\mathcal{G}_\nu(z)$  has a bounded inverse, notice that

$$|\langle \Psi, \mathcal{G}_\nu(z) \Psi \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}}| \geq |\operatorname{Im} \langle \Psi, \mathcal{G}_\nu(z) \Psi \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}}| \geq |\operatorname{Im} z| \|\Psi\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}}^2, \quad (63)$$

whence, applying the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and recalling that  $\mathcal{G}_\nu(z)^* = \mathcal{G}_\nu(\bar{z})$ ,

$$\|\mathcal{G}_\nu(z) \Psi\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}} \geq |\operatorname{Im} z| \|\Psi\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}}, \quad \|\mathcal{G}_\nu(z)^* \Psi\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}} \geq |\operatorname{Im} z| \|\Psi\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}}; \quad (64)$$

these conditions imply that  $\mathcal{G}_\nu(z)$  has a bounded inverse in  $\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}$ , see e.g. [70, Theorem 3.3.2], whose operator norm satisfies Eq. (58).

Finally, by the properties of Hilbert scales (cf. Remark 2.1),  $\mathcal{G}_\nu^{-1}(z)$  extends to a continuous map from  $\mathfrak{H}_{-1}^{(\nu)}$  to  $\mathfrak{H}_{+1}^{(\nu)}$  if and only if the operator on  $\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}$ , with domain  $\mathfrak{H}_{+1}^{(\nu)}$ , acting as

$$(H_\nu + 1)^{1/2} \mathcal{G}_\nu^{-1}(z) (H_\nu + 1)^{1/2} \quad (65)$$

extends to a bounded operator in  $\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}$ . Now, recalling again the definition (54) of  $\mathcal{G}_\nu(z)$  and applying the second resolvent identity, we get

$$\begin{aligned} (H_\nu + 1)^{1/2} \mathcal{G}_\nu^{-1}(z) (H_\nu + 1)^{1/2} &= (H_\nu + 1)^{1/2} (H_\nu - z)^{-1} (H_\nu + 1)^{1/2} \\ &\quad - (H_\nu + 1)^{1/2} \mathcal{G}_\nu^{-1}(z) \mathcal{S}_\nu(z) (H_\nu - z)^{-1} (H_\nu + 1)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

The first term clearly extends to a bounded operator on  $\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}$ ; likewise, the operator  $(H_\nu - z)^{-1} (H_\nu + 1)^{1/2}$  extends to a bounded operator on  $\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}$ , whence the claim follows from the boundedness of  $\mathcal{S}_\nu(z)$  and  $\mathcal{G}_\nu^{-1}(z)$  and the fact that the latter has values in  $\mathcal{D}^{(\nu)} \subset \mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}$ .  $\square$

*Remark 4.2.* As a consequence of Lemma 4.1, both functions  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathcal{S}_\nu(z), \mathcal{G}_\nu^{-1}(z) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{(\nu)})$  are operator-valued Nevanlinna (or Herglotz) functions [71, 72], that is: (a) they are holomorphic, and (b) map the upper (resp. lower) complex half-plane in the set of operators with nonnegative (resp. nonpositive) antisymmetric part. Indeed, (a) is, for both functions, a direct consequence of their definition; as for (b), for  $\mathcal{S}_\nu(z)$  it is simply the content of Eq. (56), while for  $\mathcal{G}_\nu^{-1}(z)$  it can be proven via an analogous reasoning as in Eq. (60):

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Im} \langle \Psi, \mathcal{G}_\nu(z) \Psi \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}} &= \operatorname{Im} \langle \Psi, \mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}^{-1}(z) \Psi \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2i} \langle \Psi, \{ \mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}^{-1}(z) - \mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \} \Psi \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2i} \langle \Psi, \mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}^{-1}(z) \{ \mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}(\bar{z}) - \mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}(z) \} \mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \Psi \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}} \\ &= -\operatorname{Im} \langle \mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \Psi, \mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}(z) \mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \Psi \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}}, \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

and using Eq. (62).  $\triangle$

*Example 4.3* (Case  $N = 2$ ). We shall take a look at the explicit structure of the propagators in the case  $N = 2$  (cf. Example 3.3), in which  $\nu = 0, 1, 2$ , making use of Eq. (40) and, in particular, Eq. (42) for the structure of the maps  $A_{0,1}$ ,  $A_{1,2}$ , and their adjoints. For simplicity, let us consider the case in which spin–spin interactions are absent—that is,  $v = 0$  in Eq. (40). For  $\nu = 0$ , we simply have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_0(z) &= 0, & \mathcal{G}_0(z) &= H_0 - z \\ & & &= H_{\text{gg}} - z; \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

for  $\nu = 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}_1(z) &= \begin{bmatrix} a(f_1) \\ a(f_2) \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{G}_0^{-1}(z) \begin{bmatrix} a^\dagger(f_1) & a^\dagger(f_2) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} a(f_1) \frac{1}{H_{gg}-z} a^\dagger(f_1) & a(f_1) \frac{1}{H_{gg}-z} a^\dagger(f_2) \\ a(f_2) \frac{1}{H_{gg}-z} a^\dagger(f_1) & a(f_2) \frac{1}{H_{gg}-z} a^\dagger(f_2) \end{bmatrix},\end{aligned}\quad (69)$$

whence

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}_1(z) &= H_1 - z - \mathcal{S}_1(z) \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} H_{ge} - z - a(f_1) \frac{1}{H_{ee}-z} a^\dagger(f_1) & -a(f_1) \frac{1}{H_{ee}-z} a^\dagger(f_2) \\ -a(f_2) \frac{1}{H_{ee}-z} a^\dagger(f_1) & H_{eg} - z - a(f_2) \frac{1}{H_{ee}-z} a^\dagger(f_2) \end{bmatrix}.\end{aligned}\quad (70)$$

Interestingly, the two diagonal terms of both  $\mathcal{S}_1(z)$  and  $\mathcal{G}_1(z)$  respectively correspond to the values of the self-energy and the propagator in the case  $N = 1$  [55]. Finally, for  $\nu = 2$ ,

$$\mathcal{S}_2(z) = \begin{bmatrix} a(f_2) & a(f_1) \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{G}_1^{-1}(z) \begin{bmatrix} a^\dagger(f_2) \\ a^\dagger(f_1) \end{bmatrix},\quad (71)$$

$$\mathcal{G}_2(z) = H_{ee} - z - \begin{bmatrix} a(f_2) & a(f_1) \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{G}_1^{-1}(z) \begin{bmatrix} a^\dagger(f_2) \\ a^\dagger(f_1) \end{bmatrix};\quad (72)$$

clearly, the dependence of both maps  $\mathcal{S}_2(z)$ ,  $\mathcal{G}_2(z)$  on the inverse of  $\mathcal{G}_1(z)$  makes their exact expression, while still explicitly computable for  $N = 2$ , already involved—even in the absence of spin–spin interactions.  $\triangle$

*Remark 4.4* (Perturbative expansions). The example above clearly shows that, even in the simplest cases, the explicit structure of the propagators  $\mathcal{G}_\nu(z)$  readily becomes involved for  $\nu > 1$  because of their intricate concatenated expression. Still, *approximate* expressions, potentially useful for applications (e.g. for spectral estimates), can be found in a quite straightforward way. We shall briefly introduce this point.

To this purpose, recall that the original expression of the model, cf. (2), involves a coupling constant  $\lambda$ , which we elsewhere set to unity to ease the notation—its value being immaterial to the results that we aim to show in Section 4.2. Taking into account (*only* in the remainder of this subsection) a generic  $\lambda$ , and using the symbols  $\mathcal{S}_\nu(z, \lambda)$ ,  $\mathcal{G}_\nu(z, \lambda)$ , such operators are now given by the recurrence relations

$$\mathcal{S}_0(z, \lambda) = 0,\quad (73)$$

$$\mathcal{G}_\nu(z, \lambda) = H_\nu - z - \lambda^2 \mathcal{S}_\nu(z, \lambda),\quad \nu = 0, \dots, N,\quad (74)$$

$$\mathcal{S}_\nu(z, \lambda) = A_{\nu-1, \nu} \mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}^{-1}(z, \lambda) A_{\nu-1, \nu}^\dagger,\quad \nu = 1, \dots, N.\quad (75)$$

Now, we can write the inverse of each propagator as the sum of a zeroth order term, plus an (at most)  $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^2)$  correction:

$$\mathcal{G}_{\nu-1}^{-1}(z, \lambda) = (H_{\nu-1} - z)^{-1} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2),\quad (76)$$

whence

$$\mathcal{S}_\nu(z, \lambda) = A_{\nu-1, \nu} (H_{\nu-1} - z)^{-1} A_{\nu-1, \nu}^\dagger + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2)\quad (77)$$

and thus

$$\mathcal{G}_\nu(z, \lambda) = H_\nu - z - \lambda^2 A_{\nu-1, \nu} (H_{\nu-1} - z)^{-1} A_{\nu-1, \nu}^\dagger + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^4).\quad (78)$$

In the *small-coupling regime*  $\lambda \ll 1$ , we may discard all terms of order larger than two: by doing so, all propagators  $\mathcal{G}_\nu(z)$  can be written via a self-contained expression only depending on  $H_\nu$ ,  $H_{\nu-1}$ ,  $A_{\nu-1,\nu}$  and  $A_{\nu-1,\nu}^\dagger$ , and can thus be computed independently of the previous ones.

Of course, a more careful analysis would require an estimate of the error that is made by discarding higher-order terms—that is, of the operator norm of the  $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^4)$  correction in Eq. (78); this may be done by evaluating the operator norms of  $A_{\nu,\nu+1}, A_{\nu,\nu+1}^\dagger$  (which will ultimately depend on the norms  $\|f_1\|_{-1}^2, \dots, \|f_N\|_{-1}^2$ , cf. [55, Props. 3.4–3.5]) and using the estimate (58). We shall not enter in such details here.  $\triangle$

*Example 4.5* (Case  $N = 2$ , small-coupling regime). Taking into account the discussion in Remark 4.4, we can now reprise the case  $N = 2$  with a coupling constant  $\lambda \ll 1$ . Using Eq. (78) and Eq. (42), we immediately obtain

$$\mathcal{G}_0(z, \lambda) = H_{\text{gg}} - z, \quad (79)$$

$$\mathcal{G}_1(z, \lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} H_{\text{ge}} - z - \lambda^2 a(f_1) \frac{1}{H_{\text{ee}} - z} a^\dagger(f_1) & -\lambda^2 a(f_1) \frac{1}{H_{\text{ee}} - z} a^\dagger(f_2) \\ -\lambda^2 a(f_2) \frac{1}{H_{\text{ee}} - z} a^\dagger(f_1) & H_{\text{eg}} - z - \lambda^2 a(f_2) \frac{1}{H_{\text{ee}} - z} a^\dagger(f_2) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (80)$$

$$\mathcal{G}_2(z, \lambda) \approx H_{\text{ee}} - z - \lambda^2 \left( a(f_1) \frac{1}{H_{\text{eg}} - z} a^\dagger(f_1) + a(f_2) \frac{1}{H_{\text{ge}} - z} a^\dagger(f_2) \right), \quad (81)$$

the last expression being obtained by discarding terms of order larger than two in the coupling constant  $\lambda$ .

Analogous expressions (exact for  $\nu = 0, 1$ , approximated for  $\nu = 2, 3$ ) can be obtained in the case  $N = 3$  by using Eq. (78) and Eq. (49).  $\triangle$

## 4.2 The singular multi-spin–boson model

In order to present the main result of the work, it will be useful to introduce yet some other families of  $z$ -dependent maps.

**Lemma 4.6.** *Given  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ , the maps*

$$\gamma_{\nu,\nu+1}(z) : \mathfrak{H}_{-1}^{(\nu)} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}^{(\nu+1)}, \quad \gamma_{\nu,\nu+1}(z) := -A_{\nu,\nu+1} \mathcal{G}_\nu^{-1}(z); \quad (82)$$

$$\gamma_{\nu,\nu+1}^\dagger(z) : \mathfrak{H}^{(\nu+1)} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}_{+1}^{(\nu)}, \quad \gamma_{\nu,\nu+1}^\dagger(z) := -\mathcal{G}_\nu^{-1}(z) A_{\nu,\nu+1}^\dagger, \quad (83)$$

and more generally, for all  $\nu' > \nu$ ,

$$\gamma_{\nu,\nu'}(z) : \mathfrak{H}_{-1}^{(\nu)} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}^{(\nu')}, \quad \gamma_{\nu,\nu'}(z) = \gamma_{\nu'-1,\nu'}(z) \cdots \gamma_{\nu+1,\nu+2}(z) \gamma_{\nu,\nu+1}(z); \quad (84)$$

$$\gamma_{\nu,\nu'}^\dagger(z) : \mathfrak{H}^{(\nu')} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}_{+1}^{(\nu)}, \quad \gamma_{\nu,\nu'}^\dagger(z) = \gamma_{\nu,\nu+1}^\dagger(z) \gamma_{\nu+1,\nu+2}^\dagger(z) \cdots \gamma_{\nu'-1,\nu'}^\dagger(z), \quad (85)$$

are well-defined; besides, if  $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{H}$ , then, for all  $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}^{(\nu')}$ ,  $\gamma_{\nu,\nu'}^\dagger(z) \Phi \in \mathcal{D}^{(\nu)}$ .

*Proof.* The first statement is a simple consequence of the fact that, by Lemma 4.1,  $\mathcal{G}_\nu^{-1}(z) : \mathfrak{H}_{-1}^{(\nu)} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}_{+1}^{(\nu)}$ . Indeed,

$$\gamma_{\nu,\nu+1}(z) : \mathfrak{H}_{-1}^{(\nu)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}_\nu^{-1}(z)} \mathfrak{H}_{+1}^{(\nu)} \xrightarrow{A_{\nu,\nu+1}} \mathfrak{H}^{(\nu+1)}; \quad (86)$$

$$\gamma_{\nu,\nu+1}^\dagger(z) : \mathfrak{H}^{(\nu+1)} \xrightarrow{A_{\nu,\nu+1}^\dagger} \mathfrak{H}_{-1}^{(\nu)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}_\nu^{-1}(z)} \mathfrak{H}_{+1}^{(\nu)}. \quad (87)$$

Iterating this argument, the well-definiteness of all  $\gamma_{\nu,\nu'}(z)$  and  $\gamma_{\nu,\nu'}^\dagger(z)$  is readily proven.

The second one follows from the fact that, if  $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}^{(\nu+1)} \subset \mathfrak{H}_{+1}^{(\nu+1)}$  and all form factors are regular, then the creation operators in the map  $A_{\nu,\nu+1}^\dagger$  can be interpreted in the standard sense, whence  $A_{\nu,\nu+1}^\dagger \Phi \in \mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}$ ; thus  $\mathcal{G}_\nu^{-1}(z)$  can, as well, be interpreted as a bounded operator on  $\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)}$  with range equal to the domain of  $\mathcal{G}_\nu(z)$ , which is  $\mathcal{D}^{(\nu)}$ ; hence  $\gamma_{\nu,\nu+1}^\dagger(z)$  maps  $\mathcal{D}^{(\nu+1)}$  in  $\mathcal{D}^{(\nu)}$ . Similar argument for  $\gamma_{\nu,\nu}^\dagger(z)$ .  $\square$

We can thus introduce the following maps:

$$\mathcal{L}^{-1}(z) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & & & & \\ \gamma_{0,1}(z) & \mathbf{I} & & & \\ \gamma_{0,2}(z) & \gamma_{1,2}(z) & \mathbf{I} & & \\ \gamma_{0,3}(z) & \gamma_{1,3}(z) & \gamma_{2,3}(z) & \mathbf{I} & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}, \quad (88)$$

$$\mathcal{U}^{-1}(z) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \gamma_{0,1}^\dagger(z) & \gamma_{0,2}^\dagger(z) & \gamma_{0,3}^\dagger(z) & \cdots \\ & \mathbf{I} & \gamma_{1,2}^\dagger(z) & \gamma_{1,3}^\dagger(z) & \cdots \\ & & \mathbf{I} & \gamma_{2,3}^\dagger(z) & \cdots \\ & & & \mathbf{I} & \cdots \\ & & & & \ddots \end{bmatrix}, \quad (89)$$

with  $\mathcal{L}^{-1}(z) : \mathfrak{H}_{-1} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}_{-1}$  and  $\mathcal{U}^{-1}(z) : \mathfrak{H}_{+1} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}_{+1}$ ; notice that, to ease the notation, all subscripts on the identity operators in Eqs. (88)–(89) are thereafter left understood.

**Theorem 4.7.** *Let  $\omega$  be a single-particle operator on  $\mathcal{H}$  satisfying Hypothesis 2.2,  $K$  a spin Hamiltonian satisfying Hypothesis 3.1,  $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{H}_{-1}$ , and for all  $\nu = 0, \dots, N$  let  $H_\nu$ ,  $A_{\nu,\nu+1}$  and  $A_{\nu,\nu+1}^\dagger$  as defined in Eq. (33). Let  $H_{f_1, \dots, f_N}$  be the operator on  $\mathfrak{H}$  acting as in Eq. (33) on the domain*

$$\mathcal{D}(H_{f_1, \dots, f_N}) = \left\{ \Phi = \mathcal{U}^{-1}(z_0) \tilde{\Phi} : \tilde{\Phi} \in \mathcal{D}(H_{\text{free}}), z_0 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R} \right\} \subset \mathfrak{H}_{+1}, \quad (90)$$

with  $\mathcal{U}^{-1}(z)$  as in Eq. (89). Then the following facts hold:

(i) for all  $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{H}_{-1}$ ,  $H_{f_1, \dots, f_N}$  is a self-adjoint operator on  $\mathfrak{H}$ , with resolvent

$$\frac{1}{H_{f_1, \dots, f_N} - z} = \mathcal{U}^{-1}(z) \mathcal{G}^{-1}(z) \mathcal{L}^{-1}(z), \quad (91)$$

with  $\mathcal{L}^{-1}(z)$ ,  $\mathcal{U}^{-1}(z)$  as in Eqs. (88)–(89), and  $\mathcal{G}^{-1}(z) = \text{diag} \left\{ \mathcal{G}_0^{-1}(z), \dots, \mathcal{G}_N^{-1}(z) \right\}$ ;

(ii) if  $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{H}$ ,  $H_{f_1, \dots, f_N}$  coincides with the (regular) multi-spin-boson model with domain  $\mathcal{D}(H_{\text{free}})$ ;

(iii) given  $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{H}_{-1} \setminus \mathcal{H}$ , there exist sequences  $\{f_1^i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, \dots, \{f_N^i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{H}$  such that

$$H_{f_1^i, \dots, f_N^i} \rightarrow H_{f_1, \dots, f_N} \quad (i \rightarrow \infty) \quad \text{in the norm resolvent sense}, \quad (92)$$

and this happens if and only if  $\|f_j^i - f_j\|_{-1} \rightarrow 0$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, N$ .

*Proof.* First of all, recall that, given a family of form factors  $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{H}_{-1}$ , the operator  $H_{f_1, \dots, f_N}$  in Eq. (33) can be interpreted as a continuous map between the spaces  $\mathfrak{H}_{+1}$  and  $\mathfrak{H}_{-1}$ . We shall solve the equation

$$(H_{f_1, \dots, f_N} - z) \Phi = \Psi, \quad \Phi \in \mathfrak{H}_{+1}, \Psi \in \mathfrak{H}_{-1}, \quad (93)$$

for  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ . This requires computing the inverse of an operator-valued block-tridiagonal matrix, which will be done by exploiting a convenient version of the LU factorization of block-tridiagonal matrices (see e.g. [73]). We have

$$H_{f_1, \dots, f_N} - z = \mathcal{L}(z) \mathcal{G}(z) \mathcal{U}(z), \quad (94)$$

where  $\mathcal{G}(z) = \text{diag} \{ \mathcal{G}_0(z), \mathcal{G}_1(z), \dots \}$  and

$$\mathcal{L}(z) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & & & & \\ -\gamma_{0,1}(z) & \mathbf{I} & & & \\ & -\gamma_{1,2}(z) & \mathbf{I} & & \\ & & -\gamma_{2,3}(z) & \mathbf{I} & \\ & & & \ddots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}, \quad (95)$$

$$\mathcal{U}(z) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & -\gamma_{0,1}^\dagger(z) & & & \\ & \mathbf{I} & -\gamma_{1,2}^\dagger(z) & & \\ & & \mathbf{I} & -\gamma_{2,3}^\dagger(z) & \\ & & & \mathbf{I} & \ddots \\ & & & & \ddots \end{bmatrix}, \quad (96)$$

with  $\mathcal{U}(z) : \mathfrak{H}_{+1} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}_{+1}$  and  $\mathcal{L}(z) : \mathfrak{H}_{-1} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}_{-1}$  being the operator-valued block-triangular matrices appearing in the LU decomposition, and the maps  $\gamma_{\nu, \nu+1}(z)$ ,  $\gamma_{\nu, \nu+1}^\dagger(z)$  as given by Eqs. (82)–(83). Notice that, in particular,

$$\mathcal{L}(z) \mathfrak{H} \subset \mathfrak{H}, \quad \mathcal{L}^{-1}(z) \mathfrak{H} \subset \mathfrak{H}. \quad (97)$$

Because of their triangular structure, the inverses of  $\mathcal{L}(z)$  and  $\mathcal{U}(z)$  exist and are given by Eqs. (88)–(89), whence the operator

$$\mathcal{U}^{-1}(z) \mathcal{G}^{-1}(z) \mathcal{L}^{-1}(z) : \mathfrak{H}_{-1} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}_{+1}, \quad (98)$$

with  $\mathcal{L}^{-1}(z)$  and  $\mathcal{U}^{-1}(z)$  as in Eqs. (88)–(89), corresponds to the inverse of  $H_{f_1, \dots, f_N} - z$  interpreted as a continuous map between  $\mathfrak{H}_{+1}$  and  $\mathfrak{H}_{-1}$ .

We claim that the restriction of  $H_{f_1, \dots, f_N}$  to the domain (90) is a well-defined, self-adjoint operator in  $\mathfrak{H}$  whose resolvent is given by the restriction of the map (98) to  $\mathfrak{H}$ . Indeed, given  $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(H_{f_1, \dots, f_N})$ , using Eq. (94) we have

$$(H_{f_1, \dots, f_N} - z_0) \Phi = \mathcal{L}(z_0) \mathcal{G}(z_0) \tilde{\Phi}, \quad (99)$$

and, since  $\tilde{\Phi} \in \mathcal{D}(H_{\text{free}})$ ,  $\mathcal{G}(z_0) \tilde{\Phi} \in \mathfrak{H}$  whence, by Eq. (97),  $\mathcal{L}(z_0) \mathcal{G}(z_0) \tilde{\Phi} \in \mathfrak{H}$  as well; therefore, we have  $H_{f_1, \dots, f_N} \Phi \in \mathfrak{H}$ , proving well-definiteness. Furthermore, by construction, given any  $\Psi \in \mathfrak{H}$  and  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ , the equation

$$(H_{f_1, \dots, f_N} - z) \Phi = \Psi \quad (100)$$

admits a unique solution given, by Eq. (98), by  $\Phi = \mathcal{U}^{-1}(z)\mathcal{G}^{-1}(z)\mathcal{L}^{-1}(z)\Psi$ ; but, since  $\Psi \in \mathfrak{H}$ , by Eq. (97)  $\mathcal{L}^{-1}(z)\Psi \in \mathfrak{H}$  as well, and thus  $\mathcal{G}^{-1}(z)\mathcal{L}^{-1}(z)\Psi \in \mathcal{D}(H_{\text{free}})$ , implying that the unique solution can be written as  $\Phi = \mathcal{U}^{-1}(z)\tilde{\Phi}$  for some  $\tilde{\Phi} \in \mathcal{D}(H_{\text{free}})$  and thus belongs to  $\mathcal{D}(H_{\text{free}})$ . The arbitrariness of  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$  implies self-adjointness, finally proving (i).

To prove (ii) just notice that, if  $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{H}$ , the second part of Lemma 4.6 implies that  $\mathcal{U}^{-1}(z)$  maps  $\mathcal{D}(H_{\text{free}})$  into itself, whence  $\mathcal{D}(H_{f_1, \dots, f_N}) = \mathcal{D}(H_{\text{free}})$ : the two domains thus coincide, whence the corresponding operators coincide.

Let us finally prove (iii). Since  $\mathcal{H}$  is densely embedded in  $\mathcal{H}_{-1}$ , for all  $j = 1, \dots, N$  there exists a sequence  $\{f_j^i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that

$$\|f_j^i - f_j\|_{-1} \rightarrow 0 \quad (i \rightarrow \infty), \quad (101)$$

and by Prop. 2.3 this implies  $a^\dagger(f_j^i) \rightarrow a^\dagger(f_j)$  (resp.  $a(f_j^i) \rightarrow a(f_j)$ ) in the norm of  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_{-1})$  (resp.  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}_{+1}, \mathcal{F})$ ). As a direct consequence, denoting by  $\mathcal{S}_\nu^i(z), \mathcal{G}_\nu^i(z)$  the operators associated with the form factors  $f_1^i, \dots, f_N^i$  as per Eqs. (55)–(54), we have  $\mathcal{S}_\nu^i(z) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_\nu(z)$  in the norm of  $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)})$ . This also implies  $[\mathcal{G}_\nu(z)]^{-1} \rightarrow [\mathcal{G}_\nu^i(z)]^{-1}$  in the norm of  $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)})$ : indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{G}_\nu(z)]^{-1} - [\mathcal{G}_\nu^i(z)]^{-1} &= [\mathcal{G}_\nu^i(z)]^{-1} [\mathcal{G}_\nu^i(z) - \mathcal{G}_\nu(z)] [\mathcal{G}_\nu(z)]^{-1} \\ &= [\mathcal{G}_\nu^i(z)]^{-1} [\mathcal{S}_\nu^i(z) - \mathcal{S}_\nu(z)] [\mathcal{G}_\nu(z)]^{-1} \end{aligned} \quad (102)$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|[\mathcal{G}_\nu(z)]^{-1} - [\mathcal{G}_\nu^i(z)]^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)})} &\leq \|[\mathcal{G}_\nu^i(z)]^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)})} \|[\mathcal{S}_\nu^i(z) - \mathcal{S}_\nu(z)] [\mathcal{G}_\nu(z)]^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)})} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|\text{Im } z|} \|[\mathcal{S}_\nu^i(z) - \mathcal{S}_\nu(z)] [\mathcal{G}_\nu(z)]^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}^{(\nu)})} \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

where we also used the bound (58) in Lemma 4.1. This also readily implies that the corresponding maps  $\gamma_{\nu, \nu'}^i(z)$  as in Eqs. (82)–(85) satisfy  $\gamma_{\nu, \nu'}^i(z) \rightarrow \gamma_{\nu, \nu'}(z)$ , whence, by Eq. (98), norm resolvent convergence is ensured.  $\square$

Theorem 4.7 provides the desired generalization of [55, Theorem 5.5] to the multi-spin case. For the class of multi-spin–boson models considered in this work, all form factors in the class  $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{H}_{-1}$  can be accommodated via a suitable domain choice. Furthermore, the procedure is constructive: explicit expressions for both the self-adjointness domain and the resolvent have been found. This is essentially a consequence of the block-tridiagonal structure (33), which in turn follows from the fact that the model preserves the number of excitations. As such, one may also investigate the spectral properties of the model. Of course, one needs to compute all propagators—or, at the very least, find some approximate expressions e.g. along the lines sketched in Remark 4.4.

*Remark 4.8.* In the expression (90) for the domain, we might have equivalently fixed the parameter  $z_0$  beforehand—that is, only consider states in the form  $\Phi = \mathcal{U}^{-1}(z_0)\tilde{\Phi}$  for some  $\tilde{\Phi} \in \mathcal{D}(H_{\text{free}})$  and *one common choice* of  $z_0 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ . Indeed, take  $\Phi = \mathcal{U}^{-1}(z_0)\tilde{\Phi}$ ; then, for any  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\Phi = \mathcal{U}^{-1}(z)\mathcal{U}(z)\mathcal{U}^{-1}(z_0)\tilde{\Phi}; \quad (104)$$

but since, by Lemma 4.6, all operators  $\gamma_{\nu, \nu'}^\dagger(z)$  map  $\mathcal{D}^{(\nu')}$  into  $\mathcal{D}^{(\nu)}$ , then both  $\mathcal{U}(z)$  and  $\mathcal{U}^{-1}(z_0)$  map  $\mathcal{D}(H_{\text{free}})$  into itself; whence  $\Phi = \mathcal{U}^{-1}(z)\tilde{\Phi}'$  with  $\tilde{\Phi}' \in \mathcal{D}(H_{\text{free}})$ .  $\triangle$

*Remark 4.9.* It is instructive to take a closer look to the explicit expression of  $\mathcal{D}(H_{f_1, \dots, f_N})$ . Using the explicit expression (89), the most generic vector in the domain can be expressed as

$$\left[ \begin{array}{c} \tilde{\Phi}_0 + \gamma_{0,1}^\dagger(z_0)\tilde{\Phi}_1 + \gamma_{0,2}^\dagger(z_0)\tilde{\Phi}_2 + \dots + \gamma_{0,N-1}^\dagger(z_0)\tilde{\Phi}_{N-1} + \gamma_{0,N}^\dagger(z_0)\tilde{\Phi}_N \\ \tilde{\Phi}_1 + \gamma_{1,2}^\dagger(z_0)\tilde{\Phi}_2 + \dots + \gamma_{1,N-1}^\dagger(z_0)\tilde{\Phi}_{N-1} + \gamma_{1,N}^\dagger(z_0)\tilde{\Phi}_N \\ \tilde{\Phi}_2 + \dots + \gamma_{2,N-1}^\dagger(z_0)\tilde{\Phi}_{N-1} + \gamma_{2,N}^\dagger(z_0)\tilde{\Phi}_N \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{\Phi}_{N-1} + \gamma_{N-1,N}^\dagger(z_0)\tilde{\Phi}_N \\ \tilde{\Phi}_N \end{array} \right] \quad (105)$$

for some  $z_0 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$  and  $\tilde{\Phi}_0 \in \mathcal{D}^{(0)}, \dots, \tilde{\Phi}_N \in \mathcal{D}^{(N)}$ ; that is, each component  $\tilde{\Phi}_\nu$  of the generic state  $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(H_{f_1, \dots, f_N})$  is given by

$$\Phi_\nu = \tilde{\Phi}_\nu + \sum_{\nu'=\nu+1}^N \gamma_{\nu,\nu'}^\dagger(z_0)\tilde{\Phi}_{\nu'}, \quad (106)$$

thus effectively involving a coupling between the  $\nu$ -excited spins component and the ones in which  $\nu' > \nu$  spins are excited. Analogously as in the single-spin case, the role of such terms is to “cancel out” the “divergent” terms (i.e. those outside  $\mathfrak{H}$ ) produced by the creation operators contained in the maps  $A_{\nu,\nu+1}^\dagger$ ; those terms are not needed in the regular case.

In particular, given  $\nu_0 = 1, \dots, N$ , any state characterized by  $\Psi_\nu = \Psi_{\nu_0} \delta_{\nu_0,\nu}$  for all  $\nu$  is *not* in the domain  $\mathcal{D}(H_{f_1, \dots, f_N})$  (unless all form factors are regular), since, were it the case, all components with  $\nu < \nu_0$  should gain a nonzero value as well. Physically, these are the states in which  $\nu_0$  spins are in their excited state and the boson field is in its vacuum state; the total energy distributions in such configurations is thus characterized by an infinite variance (but a finite average value). Again, this generalizes what was obtained in the single-spin case: the excited state of the spin, coupled with the vacuum of the field, yields a global state that does not belong to the operator domain of the model.  $\triangle$

## 5 Concluding remarks

In this work we have constructed an extension of the class of Hamiltonians (2), describing a family of  $N$  spins interacting with a boson field via a rotating-wave coupling mediated by form factors  $f_1, \dots, f_N$  possibly not belonging to the single-particle Hilbert space of the boson field. The latter condition was replaced by a weaker growth constraint,  $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{H}_{-1}$ , which, physically, allows form factors exhibiting sufficiently “mild” ultraviolet divergences, like the ones found in most applications, to be included. An explicit evaluation of the operator domain and the resolvent of the singular model, relying on a suitable representation of the spin subsystem which brings about a block-tridiagonal structure, was provided: both quantities were shown to depend on a family of concatenated propagators, given by a recurrence relation, whose main mathematical properties can nonetheless be investigated. Remarkably, spin–spin interactions can be naturally accommodated in this scheme as long as they preserve the number of excitations as well. This property, together with the fact that many systems of physical interest describing matter–field interaction (e.g. in waveguide and cavity quantum electrodynamics) described by form factors with similarly mild UV divergences, makes our results potentially relevant for diverse applications.

These results complement and extend those found in [55], in which such an explicit construction was provided for the case  $N = 1$ , and only perturbative results not providing information

about neither the domain nor the resolvent were applicable to the case  $N > 1$ . Once adopting a suitable representation of the spin subspace, the extension of such results to the multi-spin case proved to be a conceptually straightforward, albeit technically nontrivial and intriguing, refinement of the techniques adopted in the single-spin case. Essentially, what makes such models explicitly solvable is the emergence of the block-tridiagonal structure (33), together with the fact that, in such a structure, annihilation and creation operators—whose singular counterparts behave in a starkly different way in regards to their regularity—do not “mix”. Models exhibiting a matter–field coupling with a similar rotating-wave structure, as argued in [69], can be expected to behave similarly: the singular nature of the annihilation and creation operators forces the domain to acquire a nontrivial dependence on the coupling, similarly depending on a family of propagators akin to the one governing the models studied here.

A natural line of future research would be a further extension of our results to the case of form factors belonging to the larger class  $\mathcal{H}_{-2}$ , that is, exhibiting “more wild” ultraviolet divergences—for instance, Dirac-like (point) interaction in one dimension. In the case  $N = 1$ , as shown again in [55], the same construction can be further generalized to accommodate such a form factor at the price of a novel ingredient—a *renormalization* of the excitation energy of the spin. Whether an extension of such results to the multi-spin case can be similarly obtained via a technical refinement of those in the single-spin case (possibly at the price of additional assumptions) remains, at the present stage, an open and intriguing question, which will be addressed elsewhere.

Finally, it is worth pointing out that, more generally, UV divergences often come into play when dealing with models of quantum mechanical matter interacting with boson fields. In this direction, Teufel and Tumulka [74, 75] recently proposed a method to tackle such issues based on the use of *interior-boundary conditions* (IBCs) [76], that is, abstract boundary conditions relating sectors with different number of particles. Such a technique, essentially based on a restriction–extension procedure [77, 78], was successfully applied to other particle–field Hamiltonians [79, 80], and, as argued in [69], does provide compatible results with the ones in [55] for the spin–boson models with  $N = 1$ . Future research will be devoted to this point.

## Acknowledgments

We acknowledge support by MIUR via PRIN 2017 (Progetto di Ricerca di Interesse Nazionale), project QUSHIP (2017SRNBRK). This work is partially supported by Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare (INFN) through the project “QUANTUM” and by the Italian National Group of Mathematical Physics (GNFM-INdAM).

## References

- [1] M. Hirokawa. “Remarks on the ground state energy of the spin-boson model: an application of the Wigner-Weisskopf model”. *Reviews in Mathematical Physics* **13** (2001), 221–251.
- [2] M. Hübner and H. Spohn. “Spectral properties of the spin-boson Hamiltonian”. *Annales de l’I.H.P. Physique théorique* **62** (1995), 289–323.
- [3] M. Hirokawa. “An expression of the ground state energy of the Spin-Boson model”. *Journal of Functional Analysis* **162** (1999), 178–218.
- [4] A. Arai. “An asymptotic analysis and its application to the nonrelativistic limit of the Pauli–Fierz and a spin-boson model”. *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **31** (1990), 2653–2663.
- [5] A. Amann. “Ground states of a spin-boson model”. *Annals of Physics* **208** (1991), 414–448.
- [6] E. B. Davies. “Symmetry breaking for molecular open systems”. *Annales de l’I.H.P. Physique théorique* **35** (1981), 149–171.

- [7] M. Fannes, B. Nachtergaele, and A. Verbeure. “The equilibrium states of the spin-boson model”. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **114** (1988), 537–548.
- [8] M. Hübner and H. Spohn. “Radiative decay: nonperturbative approaches”. *Reviews in Mathematical Physics* **7** (1995), 363–387.
- [9] J. Reker. “Existence of resonances for the spin-boson model with critical coupling function”. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* **483** (2020), 123628.
- [10] D. Hasler, B. Hinrichs, and O. Siebert. “On existence of ground states in the spin boson model”. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **388** (2021), 419–433.
- [11] A. Arai and M. Hirokawa. “On the existence and uniqueness of ground states of a generalized spin-boson model”. *Journal of Functional Analysis* **151** (1997), 455–503.
- [12] A. Arai. “Essential spectrum of a self-adjoint operator on an abstract Hilbert space of Fock type and applications to quantum field Hamiltonians”. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* **246** (2000), 189–216.
- [13] A. Arai and M. Hirokawa. “Ground states of a general class of quantum field Hamiltonians”. *Reviews in Mathematical Physics* **12** (2000), 1085–1135.
- [14] M. Falconi. “Self-adjointness criterion for operators in Fock spaces”. *Mathematical Physics, Analysis and Geometry* **18** (2015), 2.
- [15] T. Takaesu. “On generalized spin-boson models with singular perturbations”. *Hokkaido Mathematical Journal* **39** (2010), 317–349.
- [16] N. Teranishi. “Self-adjointness of the generalized spin-boson Hamiltonian with a quadratic boson interaction”. *Hokkaido Mathematical Journal* **44** (2015), 409–423.
- [17] N. Teranishi. “Absence of ground states of generalized spin-boson models”. *Kyushu Journal of Mathematics* **72** (2018), 1–14.
- [18] U. Weiss. *Quantum dissipative systems*. Vol. 13. World scientific, 2012.
- [19] A. J. Leggett, S. Chakravarty, A. T. Dorsey, M. P. A. Fisher, A. Garg, and W. Zwerger. “Dynamics of the dissipative two-state system”. *Reviews of Modern Physics* **59** (1987), 1.
- [20] H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione. *The theory of open quantum systems*. Oxford University Press on Demand, 2002.
- [21] G.-L. Ingold. “Path integrals and their application to dissipative quantum systems”. *Coherent Evolution in Noisy Environments*. Springer, 2002, 1–53.
- [22] M. Grifoni, E. Paladino, and U. Weiss. “Dissipation, decoherence and preparation effects in the spin-boson system”. *The European Physical Journal B: Condensed Matter and Complex Systems* **10** (1999), 719–729.
- [23] M. Thorwart, E. Paladino, and M. Grifoni. “Dynamics of the spin-boson model with a structured environment”. *Chemical Physics* **296** (2004), 333–344.
- [24] G. Clos and H.-P. Breuer. “Quantification of memory effects in the spin-boson model”. *Physical Review A* **86** (2012), 012115.
- [25] T. A. Costi and R. H. McKenzie. “Entanglement between a qubit and the environment in the spin-boson model”. *Physical Review A* **68** (2003), 034301.
- [26] I. Bloch, J. Dalibard, and S. Nascimbene. “Quantum simulations with ultracold quantum gases”. *Nature Physics* **8** (2012), 267–276.
- [27] R. Blatt and C. F. Roos. “Quantum simulations with trapped ions”. *Nature Physics* **8** (2012), 277–284.
- [28] D. Porras, F. Marquardt, J. Von Delft, and J. I. Cirac. “Mesoscopic spin-boson models of trapped ions”. *Physical Review A* **78** (2008), 010101.
- [29] W. Vogel and R. L. de Matos Filho. “Nonlinear Jaynes-Cummings dynamics of a trapped ion”. *Physical Review A* **52** (1995), 4214.

- [30] S. J. D. Phoenix and P. L. Knight. “Establishment of an entangled atom-field state in the Jaynes-Cummings model”. *Physical Review A* **44** (1991), 6023.
- [31] X. Hao, N.-H. Tong, and S. Zhu. “Dynamics of the quantum Fisher information in a spin-boson model”. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **46** (2013), 355302.
- [32] R.-C. Ge, M. Gong, C.-F. Li, J.-S. Xu, and G.-C. Guo. “Quantum correlation and classical correlation dynamics in the spin-boson model”. *Physical Review A* **81** (2010), 064103.
- [33] A. Lemmer, C. Cormick, D. Tamascelli, T. Schaetz, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio. “A trapped-ion simulator for spin-boson models with structured environments”. *New Journal of Physics* **20** (2018), 073002.
- [34] J. Leppäkangas, J. Braumüller, M. Hauck, J.-M. Reiner, I. Schwenk, S. Zanker, L. Fritz, A. V. Ustinov, M. Weides, and M. Marthaler. “Quantum simulation of the spin-boson model with a microwave circuit”. *Physical Review A* **97** (2018), 052321.
- [35] H. Wipf, D. Steinbinder, K. Neumaier, P. Gutsmedl, A. Magerl, and A. J. Dianoux. “Influence of the electronic state on H tunnelling in niobium”. *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **4** (1987), 1379.
- [36] A. Suárez and R. Silbey. “Hydrogen tunneling in condensed media”. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **94** (1991), 4809–4816.
- [37] F. Guinea, V. Hakim, and A. Muramatsu. “Bosonization of a two-level system with dissipation”. *Physical Review B* **32** (1985), 4410.
- [38] B. W. Shore and P. L. Knight. “The Jaynes-Cummings model”. *Journal of Modern Optics* **40** (1993), 1195–1238.
- [39] N. Bogoliubov, R. Bullough, and J. Timonen. “Exact solution of generalized Tavis-Cummings models in quantum optics”. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **29** (1996), 6305.
- [40] J. Fink, R. Bianchetti, M. Baur, M. Göppl, L. Steffen, S. Filipp, P. J. Leek, A. Blais, and A. Wallraff. “Dressed collective qubit states and the Tavis-Cummings model in circuit QED”. *Physical Review Letters* **103** (2009), 083601.
- [41] G. S. Agarwal. “Rotating-wave approximation and spontaneous emission”. *Physical Review A* **4** (1971), 1778.
- [42] G. S. Agarwal. “Rotating-wave approximation and spontaneous emission”. *Physical Review A* **7** (1973), 1195.
- [43] R. H. Dicke. “Coherence in spontaneous radiation processes”. *Physical Review* **93** (1954), 99.
- [44] M. Gross and S. Haroche. “Superradiance: An essay on the theory of collective spontaneous emission”. *Physics reports* **93** (1982), 301–396.
- [45] M. G. Benedict and A. Ermolaev. *Super-radiance: Multiatomic coherent emission*.
- [46] A. F. Van Looy, A. Fedorov, K. Lalumière, B. C. Sanders, A. Blais, and A. Wallraff. “Photon-mediated interactions between distant artificial atoms”. *Science* **342** (2013), 1494–1496.
- [47] U. Dörner and P. Zoller. “Laser-driven atoms in half-cavities”. *Physical Review A* **66** (2002), 023816.
- [48] T. Tufarelli, F. Ciccarello, and M. Kim. “Dynamics of spontaneous emission in a single-end photonic waveguide”. *Physical Review A* **87** (2013), 013820.
- [49] E. Sánchez-Burillo, D. Zueco, L. Martín-Moreno, and J. J. García-Ripoll. “Dynamical signatures of bound states in waveguide QED”. *Physical Review A* **96** (2017), 023831.
- [50] A. González-Tudela, V. Paulisch, H. Kimble, and J. I. Cirac. “Efficient multiphoton generation in waveguide quantum electrodynamics”. *Physical Review Letters* **118** (2017), 213601.
- [51] P. Facchi, M. S. Kim, S. Pascazio, F. V. Pepe, D. Pomarico, and T. Tufarelli. “Bound states and entanglement generation in waveguide quantum electrodynamics”. *Physical Review A* **94** (2016), 043839.
- [52] P. Facchi, D. Lonigro, S. Pascazio, F. V. Pepe, and D. Pomarico. “Bound states in the continuum for an array of quantum emitters”. *Physical Review A* **100** (2019), 023834.

- [53] D. Lonigro, P. Facchi, S. Pascazio, F. V. Pepe, and D. Pomarico. “Stationary excitation waves and multimerization in arrays of quantum emitters”. *New Journal of Physics* **23** (2021), 103033.
- [54] D. Lonigro. “The self-energy of Friedrichs-Lee models and its application to bound states and resonances”. *The European Physical Journal Plus* **137** (2022), 492.
- [55] D. Lonigro. “Generalized spin-boson models with non-normalizable form factors”. *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **63** (2022), 072105.
- [56] G. Teschl. “Mathematical methods in quantum mechanics”. *Graduate Studies in Mathematics* **99** (2009), 106.
- [57] B. Simon. *Quantum mechanics for Hamiltonians defined as quadratic forms*. Princeton University Press, 2015.
- [58] S. Albeverio and P. Kurasov. *Singular perturbations of differential operators: solvable Schrödinger-type operators*. Vol. 271. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [59] S. Albeverio, S. Kuzhel, and L. Nizhnik. “Singularly perturbed self-adjoint operators in scales of Hilbert spaces”. *Ukrainian Mathematical Journal* **59** (2007), 787–810.
- [60] B. Simon. “Spectral analysis of rank one perturbations and applications”. *CRM Lecture Notes*. Vol. 8. 1995, 109–149.
- [61] A. Bohm. *Rigged Hilbert space and quantum mechanics*. Tech. rep. Texas Univ., Austin (USA). Center for Particle Theory, 1974.
- [62] R. De La Madrid. “The role of the rigged Hilbert space in quantum mechanics”. *European Journal of Physics* **26** (2005), 287.
- [63] A. Bohm and M. Gadella. *Dirac Kets, Gamow Vectors and Gel’fand Triplets: The Rigged Hilbert Space Formulation of Quantum Mechanics. Lectures in Mathematical Physics at the University of Texas at Austin*. Springer, 1989.
- [64] M. Reed and B. Simon. *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics II: Fourier Analysis, Self-Adjointness*. Vol. 2. Elsevier, 1975.
- [65] J. Dereziński and C. Gérard. *Mathematics of Quantization and Quantum Fields*. Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- [66] O. Bratteli and D. W. Robinson. *Operator Algebras and Quantum Statistical Mechanics 1:  $C^*$ - and  $W^*$ -Algebras. Symmetry Groups. Decomposition of States*. Operator Algebras and Quantum Statistical Mechanics. Springer, 1987.
- [67] G. B. Folland. *Quantum field theory: a tourist guide for mathematicians*. Vol. 149. American Mathematical Soc., 2021.
- [68] E. Nelson. “Interaction of nonrelativistic particles with a quantized scalar field”. *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **5** (1964), 1190–1197.
- [69] D. Lonigro. “Renormalization of spin–boson interactions mediated by singular form factors”. arXiv:2210.15267 [math-ph]. 2022.
- [70] J. Dereziński. “Unbounded linear operators”. Lecture Notes, in <http://www.fuw.edu.pl/~derezins/mat-u.pdf>. 2013.
- [71] F. Gesztesy and E. Tsekanovskii. “On matrix-valued Herglotz functions”. *Mathematische Nachrichten* **218** (2000), 61–138.
- [72] F. Gesztesy, N. J. Kalton, K. A. Makarov, and E. Tsekanovskii. “Some applications of operator-valued Herglotz functions”. *Operator theory, system theory and related topics*. Springer, 2001, 271–321.
- [73] G. Meurant. “A review on the inverse of symmetric tridiagonal and block tridiagonal matrices”. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* **13** (1992), 707–728.
- [74] S. Teufel and R. Tumulka. “Avoiding Ultraviolet Divergence by Means of Interior–Boundary Conditions”. *Quantum Mathematical Physics: A Bridge between Mathematics and Physics*. Ed. by F. Finster, J. Kleiner, C. Röken, and J. Tolksdorf. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2016, 293–311.

- [75] S. Teufel and R. Tumulka. “Hamiltonians without ultraviolet divergence for quantum field theories”. *Quantum Studies: Mathematics and Foundations* **8** (2021), 17–35.
- [76] T. Binz and J. Lampart. “An abstract framework for interior-boundary conditions”. [arXiv:2103.17124](https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.17124) (2021).
- [77] A. Posilicano. “Self-adjoint extensions of restrictions”. *Operators and Matrices* **2** (2008), 483–506.
- [78] A. Posilicano. “On the self-adjointness of  $H+A^*+A$ ”. *Mathematical Physics, Analysis and Geometry* **23** (2020), 1–31.
- [79] J. Lampart, J. Schmidt, S. Teufel, and R. Tumulka. “Particle creation at a point source by means of interior-boundary conditions”. *Mathematical Physics, Analysis and Geometry* **21** (2018), 1–37.
- [80] J. Lampart and J. Schmidt. “On Nelson-type Hamiltonians and abstract boundary conditions”. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **367** (2019), 629–663.