

SELF-ADJOINTNESS AND DOMAIN OF GENERALIZED SPIN–BOSON MODELS WITH MILD ULTRAVIOLET DIVERGENCES

SASCHA LILL¹  AND DAVIDE LONIGRO^{2,3} 

ABSTRACT. We provide a rigorous construction of a large class of generalized spin–boson models with ultraviolet-divergent form factors. This class comprises various models of many possibly non-identical atoms with arbitrary but finite numbers of levels, interacting with a boson field. Ultraviolet divergences are assumed to be mild, such that no self-energy renormalization is necessary. Our construction is based on recent results by A. Posilicano, which also allow us to state an explicit formula for the domain of self-adjointness for our Hamiltonians.

Keywords: Spin–boson model; renormalization; ultraviolet divergence; self-adjointness domain; interior–boundary conditions; scales of Hilbert spaces.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULT

We consider a quantum mechanical system, described by a common finite–dimensional Hilbert space $\mathfrak{h} := \mathbb{C}^D$, coupled to a single boson field, described by an abstract single-particle Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . The Hilbert space of the entire system is given by

$$\mathfrak{H} := \mathfrak{h} \otimes \mathcal{F}, \quad \mathcal{F} := \mathcal{F}^+(\mathcal{H}) = \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} S_n \mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}, \quad (1)$$

with S_n being the symmetrization operator, and \mathcal{F} the *bosonic Fock space*. The Hamiltonian of the non-interacting system is of the form

$$H_{\text{free}} := K \otimes I + I \otimes d\Gamma(\omega), \quad (2)$$

where $K \in \mathbb{C}^{D \times D}$ is a self-adjoint matrix describing the energy of the atoms, and $d\Gamma(\omega)$ is the second quantization of some positive self-adjoint operator $\omega \geq m_0 > 0$ defined on a dense subspace of \mathcal{H} . m_0 is also called the *mass of the boson*. Without loss of generality, and for physical convenience, we will fix \mathcal{H} as the space of square-integrable complex-valued functions on some measure space (X, Σ, μ) , and ω as the multiplication by some measurable real-valued function $k \in X \mapsto \omega(k) \in \mathbb{R}$.

The interaction between the quantum system and the field will be constructed as follows. Given $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we take a family of matrices $B_j \in \mathbb{C}^{D \times D}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, and a form factor f_j , $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, which is a measurable function $f_j : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. We consider an interaction term in the form $A^* + A$, where, formally,

$$A := \sum_{j=1}^N B_j^* \otimes a(f_j), \quad A^* := \sum_{j=1}^N B_j \otimes a^*(f_j), \quad (3)$$

¹DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA FEDERIGO ENRIQUES, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI MILANO, I-20133 MILAN, ITALY

²DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI BARI ALDO MORO, I-70125 BARI, ITALY

³ISTITUTO NAZIONALE DI FISICA NUCLEARE, SEZIONE DI BARI, I-70126 BARI, ITALY

E-mail addresses: sascha.lill@unimi.it, davide.lonigro@ba.infn.it.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 46N50, 47A10, 47B25, 81Q10, 81T16.

with $a^*(f_j), a(f_j)$ (formally) being the bosonic creation/annihilation operators on \mathcal{F} defined by requiring

$$\begin{aligned} a^*(f_j)S_n(\phi_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \phi_n) &:= \sqrt{n+1} S_n(f_j \otimes \phi_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \phi_n), \\ a(f_j)S_n(\phi_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \phi_n) &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} S_n \sum_{\ell=1}^n \langle f_j, \phi_\ell \rangle (\phi_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \phi_{\ell-1} \otimes \phi_{\ell+1} \otimes \dots \otimes \phi_n) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

for any $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n \in \mathcal{H}$ and $n \geq 0$ (for $a^*(f_j)$) or $n \geq 1$ (for $a(f_j)$), respectively. One easily checks that these operators satisfy the canonical commutation relations (CCR)

$$[a(f), a(g)] = [a^*(f), a^*(g)] = 0, \quad [a(f), a^*(g)] = \langle f, g \rangle. \quad (5)$$

Thus, the total Hamiltonian formally reads

$$\begin{aligned} H &= H_{f_1, \dots, f_N} := H_{\text{free}} + A^* + A \\ &= H_{\text{free}} + \sum_{j=1}^N [B_j \otimes a^*(f_j) + B_j^* \otimes a(f_j)]. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Such models, denoted as *generalized spin-boson (GSB) models*, were first introduced, to our best knowledge, in [1] as a generalization of the well-known spin-boson model; their mathematical properties have been extensively addressed in the literature, cf. [2–11] for the spin case and [12–17] for the general one.

The aim of this work is to give, for a general choice of (N, D) and of the operators B_1, \dots, B_N , a rigorous interpretation of Eq. (6) as a self-adjoint operator on a dense subspace of \mathfrak{H} in the case in which the form factors f_1, \dots, f_N are not square-integrable—a problem that is also called *non-perturbative renormalization problem*. At this point, we did not specify yet in which function space the form factors f_j have to be accommodated. And indeed, the difficulty of the renormalization problem heavily depends on the growth properties of f_j .

To elucidate how the difficulty of the renormalization problem depends on the growth of f_j , let us state some well-known results in the case $N = D = 1$, also known as the *van Hove model* [18]. In that case, we only have one form factor $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. Depending on the behavior of f with respect to the dispersion relation ω , one can now essentially distinguish 4 difficulty classes for the renormalization problem.

Case 0: $\int |f|^2 < \infty \Leftrightarrow f \in \mathcal{H}$. This is the simplest case. Both A^* and A are Kato perturbations of H_{free} , so Eq. (6) readily defines a self-adjoint operator H on $\text{Dom}(H) = \text{Dom}(H_{\text{free}})$.

Case 1: $\int |f|^2 = \infty$, but still, $\int \frac{|f|^2}{\omega} < \infty$. In this case, $A^* + A$ is still a form perturbation of H_{free} , so the KLMN theorem allows defining H as a self-adjoint operator. However, the perturbation changes the domain.

Case 2: $\int \frac{|f|^2}{\omega} = \infty$, but still, $\int \frac{|f|^2}{\omega^2} < \infty$. Here, we can no longer make sense of Eq. (6) without further modifications. In fact, one needs a *self-energy renormalization procedure*, to obtain a well-defined Hamiltonian: for some sequence of UV-cutoffs $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, one introduces the regularized form factors $f_\Lambda \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $\lim_{\Lambda \rightarrow \infty} f_\Lambda = f$ in a suitable sense. Substituting f by f_Λ in H then yields the regularized Hamiltonians H_Λ , which are well-defined on a dense subspace of \mathcal{F} . By subtracting from them the *self-energies* $E_\Lambda := -\int \frac{|f_\Lambda|^2}{\omega} \in \mathbb{R}$, one may then obtain a renormalized Hamiltonian:

$$\tilde{H} := \lim_{\Lambda \rightarrow \infty} (H_\Lambda - E_\Lambda), \quad (7)$$

which is self-adjoint on a dense domain in $\mathcal{F} \simeq \mathfrak{H}$.

In fact, using a (unitary) *dressing operator* $W_\Lambda := \exp(a(\omega^{-1}f_\Lambda) - a^*(\omega^{-1}f_\Lambda))$, it turns out that

$$W_\Lambda^* H_\Lambda W_\Lambda = H_{\text{free}} + E_\Lambda, \quad (8)$$

so W_Λ extracts the self-energy. In particular,

$$\tilde{H} = W H_{\text{free}} W^*, \quad (9)$$

with the unitary dressing operator $W := \exp(a(\omega^{-1}f) - a^*(\omega^{-1}f))$, so the dynamics generated by \tilde{H} are unitarily equivalent to those of H_{free} .

Case 3: $\int \frac{|f|^2}{\omega^2} = \infty$. This is the most singular case. Formally, Eq. (9) would yield a renormalized operator \tilde{H} that is equivalent to H_{free} , but since W is ill-defined, Eq. (9) makes mathematically no sense. One way out of this problem is to interpret H as in Eq. (6) as an element of a suitably defined *-algebra \mathcal{A} and to replace the conjugation with W by an (algebraic) *Weyl transformation* $\mathcal{V}_W : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ that maps $H \mapsto H_{\text{free}}$. As \mathcal{V}_W preserves the commutation relations, one may see H_{free} as a legitimate renormalized Hamiltonian, which is self-adjoint on a dense domain in \mathcal{F} [19, Sect. 3].¹

Another way out is to interpret W as a map from a subspace of \mathcal{F} to some Fock space extension $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$, and to define $E := -\int \frac{|f|^2}{\omega}$ as an element of a suitable vector space [20, 21]. This way, one can give a precise mathematical meaning to the equation

$$H_{\text{free}} = W(H - E)W^*, \quad (10)$$

and interpret H_{free} as the renormalized Hamiltonian.

Coming back to the general case, let us mention that in **Case 0**, i.e., $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{H}$ for $N, D \in \mathbb{N}$, the renormalization problem is easily solved: $A^* + A$ is again a Kato perturbation of H_{free} , so H as in Eq. (6) is self-adjoint with coupling-independent domain $\text{Dom}(H) = \text{Dom}(H_{\text{free}}) = \mathfrak{h} \otimes \text{Dom}(d\Gamma(\omega))$.

In this work, we address the renormalization problem for general values of $N, D \in \mathbb{N}$, and form factors f_1, \dots, f_N corresponding to **Case 1**. Our proofs essentially rely on a recent work by Posilicano [22], which introduces an abstract machinery for renormalizing Hamiltonians of the form $H_{\text{free}} + A^* + A$ and finding their domains. This paper thus demonstrates how these results can be successfully be applied to generalized spin–boson models. To our best knowledge, the present work is the first rigorous proof of a renormalization in Case 1 for this kind of models with a general choice of B_1, \dots, B_N : while the existence of a self-adjoint operator associated with Eq. (6) is in fact guaranteed by the KLMN theorem (cf. [23, Proposition 4.2]), explicit expressions for the domain were only obtained in particular cases [23–25].

Within **Case 2**, the application of the abstract results from [22], while still possible, offers new challenges—as it will be elucidated in Section 3 for the abstract case, an unambiguous identification of a self-adjoint operator associated with Eq. (6) is no longer viable. One needs to specify a suitably choice of a “regularizing operator” T which must be both mathematically admissible and physically meaningful. This problem will be investigated elsewhere. It would be highly desirable to also achieve self-adjointness results in **Case 3**; however, the construction of a suitable dressing transformation W for general values of N and D is far more challenging than within the van Hove model. We hope to achieve this goal in future research.

For other models of matter–field interaction, there exists an extensive mathematical literature on the non-perturbative renormalization problem. Some references about successful renormalization schemes in Cases 1 and 2 include [26–31]. A successful renormalization in Case 3 was achieved for a related model by Gross [32]. We refer to [20, Sect. 1.3] for a more detailed discussion of the related literature. We also point out that there exists a recently introduced renormalization technique based on the so-called “interior–boundary conditions” (IBC) [33–39],

¹More precisely, one considers a subalgebra $\mathcal{A}_{\text{obs}} \subset \mathcal{A}$, containing all relevant observables, and constructs a representation π of \mathcal{A}_{obs} on some domain $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{F}$, in which $\pi(H) = H_{\text{free}}$. So, H acts as if it were a free Hamiltonian. However, in this representation, $\pi(a^*(\varphi)), \pi(a(\varphi))$ for $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$ (if they are defined) do not act like creation/annihilation operators in Eq. (4), and there is also no unitary operator $W : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ that makes $W\pi(a^*(\varphi))W^*, W\pi(a(\varphi))W^*$ act like creation/annihilation operators. So π is inequivalent to the standard Fock representation. Equivalently, one also says that π is a non-Fock representation, or that H leaves the Fock space.

which is closely related to the work of Posilicano and ours. IBC has successfully rendered renormalized Hamiltonians together with their domains in Cases 1 and 2. For a more detailed overview about the recent IBC literature, we refer the reader to [20, Sect. 1.4].

Furthermore, the renormalization problem has been addressed and solved in the context of Constructive Quantum Field Theory (CQFT), e.g., [40–44]. Here, Haag’s Theorem [45, 46] requires to “leave the Fock space”, as in Case 3 above, while relativistic causality admits the employment of further techniques (e.g., Segal’s theorem [47], which circumvents the search for a dressing transformation). We refer to [48, 49] for an extensive overview of the literature on CQFT.

For generalized spin–boson models, there is a plenitude of applications in the physics literature, often requiring UV-divergent form factors [50–52], common examples being the description of subradiance and superradiance phenomena in quantum optics [53–55], e.g., bound states in the continuum in photonic waveguides [56–61], or toy models of quantum Markovian systems [62, 63]. On the mathematical side, there is a rich literature about the spectrum and dynamics of the spin–boson model, see e.g., [8, 11, 17, 64–67] and the references therein; however, the form factors often contain a UV-cut-off and the renormalization problem is not addressed. Concerning the renormalization of the spin–boson model, we point out a recent result by Dam and Møller [68], proving that certain spin-boson models with $\mathfrak{h} = \mathbb{C}^2$ in Case 3 renormalize to a direct sum of two van Hove Hamiltonians for an appropriately chosen dressing transformation. Finally, an explicit renormalization of a particular class of spin–boson models was recently addressed by one of the authors, first for $N = 1$ in Cases 1 and 2 [23, 24] and then for $N > 1$ in Case 1 [25]. However, the present article is, up to our best knowledge, the first work establishing self-adjointness *and* a formula for the domain in the general case.

To achieve this result, we will resort to the formalism of *scales of Hilbert spaces* [69–71]. Essentially, one introduces two scales of spaces $\{\mathcal{H}_s\}_{s \in \mathbb{R}}, \{\mathcal{F}_s\}_{s \in \mathbb{R}}$, obtained as the completion of a space of sufficiently well-behaved vectors under the norms

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_s} := \|\omega^{s/2} f\|_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad \|\Psi\|_{\mathcal{F}_s} := \|(d\Gamma(\omega) + 1)^{s/2} \Psi\|_{\mathcal{F}}. \quad (11)$$

Of course, for $s = 0$ one obtains the original spaces, and $\mathcal{H}_{+s} \subset \mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{H}_{-s}$, as well as $\mathcal{F}_{+s} \subset \mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}_{-s}$ for any $s \geq 0$, with all inclusions being dense. Mathematically, \mathcal{H}_{-s} is a space of non-normalizable functions which, however, satisfy a growth constraint weaker than the one of L^2 : a more negative $-s$ correspond to stronger allowed growths where $\omega(k)$ is large, that is, to stronger UV-singularities. In fact, we can conveniently express the divergence case in terms of the index s :

- **Case 0:** $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_0$;
- **Case 1:** $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{H}_{-1} \setminus \mathcal{H}_0$;
- **Case 2:** $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{H}_{-2} \setminus \mathcal{H}_{-1}$;
- **Case 3:** $f_1, \dots, f_N \notin \mathcal{H}_{-2}$.

Within this formalism, given $s \geq 1$ and $f \in \mathcal{H}_{-s}$, one can define two continuous linear operators $a(f) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}_{+s}, \mathcal{F})$ and $a^*(f) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_{-s})$, whose action is compatible with the “regular” creation and annihilation operators (4) for $f \in \mathcal{H}$, and which can be approximated, in the respective operator norms, by sequences of regular creation and annihilation operators (see e.g., [23, Proposition 3.7]).

1.1. Main result. Our results are based on a recent work by Posilicano [22], which provides abstract conditions for the self-adjointness of Hamiltonians corresponding to the formal expression $H_{\text{free}} + A^* + A$, see Section 3. The conditions on the matrices B_j , under which the results of [22] apply to our Hamiltonian H in Eq. (6), can be concluded as follows:

Assumption 1.1. The interaction matrices B_j , $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, are chosen such that:

- (i) every B_j is normal, i.e., $B_j^* B_j = B_j B_j^*$,
- (ii) $[B_j, B_\ell] = 0$, $j, \ell = 1, \dots, N$, and

$$(iii) \bigcap_{j=1}^N \text{Ker } B_j = \{0\}.$$

As discussed, we will examine the case $f_1, \dots, f_N \notin \mathcal{H}$. In fact, we will even require the stronger assumption that no linear combination of the f_j lies in \mathcal{H} (except for the trivial one, of course).

Definition 1.2 (\mathcal{H} -independence; [69, Def. 3.1.1]). A family $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{H}_{-s} \setminus \mathcal{H}$, $s > 0$ is called \mathcal{H} -independent, if and only if for all $c_1, \dots, c_N \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^N c_j f_j \notin \mathcal{H}, \quad \text{unless } c_j = 0 \forall j. \quad (12)$$

A fortiori, an \mathcal{H} -independent family of form factors is also a family of linearly independent elements of \mathcal{H}_s .

Also notice that there is no loss of generality in requiring the operators B_j 's to be linearly independent: if this is not the case, i.e., if there exist $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{N-1} \in \mathbb{C}$ such that (up to permutations) $B_N = \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \alpha_j B_j$, then

$$A = \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} B_j^* \otimes a(f_j) + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \overline{\alpha_j} B_j^* \otimes a(f_N) = \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} B_j^* \otimes a(f_j + \alpha_j f_N).$$

This request is compatible with the \mathcal{H} -independence of the form factors: given an \mathcal{H} -independent set $\{f_j\}_{j=1, \dots, N}$, the set of form factors after the rearrangement, $\{f_j + \alpha_j f_N\}_{j=1, \dots, N-1}$, is still \mathcal{H} -independent.

Theorem 1.3 (Main Result). *Let $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{H}_{-s} \setminus \mathcal{H}$, $s \leq 1$, be a family of \mathcal{H} -independent form factors and let $B_1, \dots, B_N \in \mathbb{C}^{D \times D}$ satisfy Assumption 1.1. Then the following statements hold true:*

- (a) *The operator $H = H_{\text{free}} + A^* + A$ as in Eq. (6), with H_{free} as in Eq. (2) and A, A^* as in Eq. (3), is well-defined and self-adjoint on the domain*

$$\text{Dom}(H) = \left\{ \Psi \in \mathfrak{H} : \left[1 + (H_{\text{free}} - z_0)^{-1} A^* \right] \Psi \in \text{Dom}(H_{\text{free}}) \right\}, \quad (13)$$

where $z_0 \in \rho(H_{\text{free}}) \cap \mathbb{R}$.

- (b) *For every $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, there exists an approximating sequence $\{f_{j,n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{H}$ with $\|f_{j,n} - f_j\|_{\mathcal{H}_{-s}} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, such that, defining*

$$A_n := \sum_{j=1}^N B_j^* \otimes a(f_{j,n}), \quad A_n^* := \sum_{j=1}^N B_j \otimes a^*(f_{j,n}), \quad (14)$$

we have

$$(H_{\text{free}} + A_n^* + A_n) \rightarrow (H_{\text{free}} + A^* + A) \quad (15)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the norm resolvent sense.

In the above statement, it is understood that the annihilation and creation operators in the definition of A and A^* , whenever involving form factors $f_j \notin \mathcal{H}$, are to be interpreted as elements, respectively, of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}_{+1}, \mathcal{F})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_{-1})$, cf. Proposition 4.1.

Remark 1.4 (Identical atom spaces). In the case in which the quantum system is composed by N d -dimensional smaller systems (atoms) each separately interacting with the boson field, it is common to associate to each atom a Hilbert space \mathbb{C}^d , so $\mathfrak{h} = \mathbb{C}^{d^N}$, i.e., $D = d^N$. Typically, B_j then only acts on the tensor factor of the j -th spin, which means it takes the form

$$B_j = I \otimes \dots \otimes \underbrace{b_j}_{j\text{-th}} \otimes \dots \otimes I \quad (16)$$

for some $b_j \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$. This is a special case of our model (6). All examples introduced in Section 2 will fall in this class.

With this choice, (i) in Assumption 1.1 becomes equivalent to $b_j^* b_j = b_j b_j^*$ and (ii) is trivially satisfied. Point (iii) is fulfilled, if and only if at least one of the matrices b_1, \dots, b_N has full rank. To see the latter statement, first observe that if some b_j has full rank, then $\text{Ker } b_j = \{0\} \Rightarrow \text{Ker } B_j = \{0\} \Rightarrow \bigcap_j \text{Ker } B_j = \{0\}$. Conversely, if no b_j has full rank, then we can find one $0 \neq u^{(j)} \in \mathbb{C}^d$ for each b_j , such that $b_j u^{(j)} = 0$. But then, $0 \neq u^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes u^{(N)} \in \bigcap_j \text{Ker } B_j = \{0\}$. \triangle

Remark 1.5 (Infinite-dimensional \mathfrak{h}). It is not too difficult to see that our result also holds true if \mathfrak{h} is infinite-dimensional and B_j are compact operators satisfying Assumption 1.1. In fact, the properties of B_j only enter in Propositions 4.3 and 4.4, as well as in Eq. (70). In the latter equation, the boundedness of all B_j is exploited to prove that certain operators are closable. Proposition 4.3 also holds true for B_j being generic bounded operators. In Proposition 4.4, we construct a common eigenbasis of $\{B_j\}_{j=1}^N$, which would also be possible if B_j were compact operators. It is easy to see that in this case, the proof of Proposition 4.4 (with an infinite eigenbasis) would still go through.

In the case in which all B_j are bounded and satisfy Assumption 1.1, the proof of Proposition 4.4 has to be modified using spectral calculus in order to obtain an analogue of Theorem 1.3. This generalization is straightforward but technical. To keep the current article short, we postpone it to a future publication. \triangle

2. SOME EXAMPLES

Before starting with the proof of Theorem 1.3, let us discuss some particular instances of Hamiltonians in the form (6) to which Theorem 1.3 applies.

The σ_x spin-boson model. Consider the following expression on $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{F}$:

$$H = \frac{\eta}{2} \sigma_z \otimes I + I \otimes d\Gamma(\omega) + \sigma_x \otimes (a^*(f) + a(f)), \quad (17)$$

where $f \in \mathcal{H}_{-s}$, $s \leq 1$, and $\eta \geq 0$; furthermore, σ_x and σ_z denote the first and third Pauli matrices, respectively:

$$\sigma_x = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \sigma_z = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (18)$$

This is the model usually referred to as “the” spin-boson model in the mathematical literature, cf. [2–9]. Physically, it describes a two-level system (qubit), whose energy levels differ by a quantity η , undergoing *decay* dynamics as a result of its interaction with the boson field; for example, it is employed in quantum optics to describe the interaction of a two-level atom with an electromagnetic field. In the monochromatic case ($\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}$), it reduces to the well-known Rabi model [72–75].

This model clearly belongs to the class of operators analyzed in the present work, corresponding to the case $D = 2$, $N = 1$, and with $K = \eta/2 \sigma_z$, $B = \sigma_x$ (thus $A = \sigma_x \otimes a(f)$). As such, Theorem 1.3 applies. Using the obvious isomorphism $\mathfrak{H} = \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{F} \simeq \mathcal{F} \oplus \mathcal{F}$ —that is, representing the most general element of \mathfrak{H} as

$$\Psi = \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_e \\ \Psi_g \end{bmatrix} : \quad \Psi_e, \Psi_g \in \mathcal{F}, \quad (19)$$

with Ψ_e and Ψ_g respectively playing the role of the “excited” and “ground” wavefunction of the boson field, we can conveniently rewrite Eq. (17) as

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \begin{bmatrix} d\Gamma(\omega) + \frac{\eta}{2} & a^*(f) + a(f) \\ a^*(f) + a(f) & d\Gamma(\omega) - \frac{\eta}{2} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} d\Gamma(\omega) + \frac{\eta}{2} & \\ & d\Gamma(\omega) - \frac{\eta}{2} \end{bmatrix}}_{H_{\text{free}}} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} & a^*(f) \\ a^*(f) & \end{bmatrix}}_{A^*} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} & a(f) \\ a(f) & \end{bmatrix}}_A. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Clearly, Assumption 1.1 is satisfied since σ_x is Hermitian (thus normal) and invertible. By Theorem 1.3, the expression above defines a self-adjoint operator on the domain

$$\text{Dom}(H) = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_e \\ \Psi_g \end{bmatrix} : \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_e + \frac{1}{d\Gamma(\omega) + \frac{\eta}{2} - z_0} a^*(f) \Psi_g \\ \Psi_g + \frac{1}{d\Gamma(\omega) - \frac{\eta}{2} - z_0} a^*(f) \Psi_e \end{bmatrix} \in \text{Dom}(H_{\text{free}}) \right\}, \quad (21)$$

with $\text{Dom}(H_{\text{free}}) = \text{Dom}(d\Gamma(\omega)) \oplus \text{Dom}(d\Gamma(\omega))$ in this representation. Here, z_0 is any fixed real number in the resolvent set of H_{free} .

This expression should be compared with the one in [23, Sections 5–6], where the *rotating-wave approximation* (RWA) spin-boson model was investigated. The RWA corresponds (cf. [76]) to replacing $\sigma_x \otimes (a(f) + a^*(f))$ by $\sigma_+ \otimes a(f) + \sigma_- \otimes a(f)$, where

$$\sigma_+ = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \sigma_-^*, \quad \sigma_x = \sigma_+ + \sigma_-; \quad (22)$$

physically, counter-rotating terms are removed. The expression of the domain without suppressing such terms is indeed more involved—the “excited” and “ground” components of the total state acquire a *mutual* interdependence, differently from what happens in the rotating-wave case in which only the ground component depends on the excited one. Note that, since σ_+ has a nontrivial kernel and is not normal, Theorem 1.3 does not apply to the RWA spin-boson model; nevertheless, the self-adjointness domain provided in [23] is in fact compatible with Eq. (13), cf. [24, Section 6]. We briefly comment on this point in Section 5.

Multi-atom generalization. The discussion above can be immediately generalized to the case of N atoms, cf. Remark 1.4. Given $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider the following expression on $\mathbb{C}^{2^N} \otimes \mathcal{F}$:

$$H = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\eta_j}{2} \sigma_{z,j} \otimes I + I \otimes d\Gamma(\omega) + \sum_{j=1}^N \sigma_{x,j} \otimes (a^*(f_j) + a(f_j)), \quad (23)$$

where f_1, \dots, f_N constitute an \mathcal{H} -independent family of form factors in \mathcal{H}_{-s} , $s \leq 1$, and $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_N \geq 0$. The operators $\sigma_{x,j}$, $\sigma_{z,j}$ are defined as in Eq. (16), i.e.,

$$\sigma_{x,j} = I \otimes \dots \otimes \underbrace{\sigma_x}_{j\text{-th}} \otimes \dots I, \quad \sigma_{z,j} = I \otimes \dots \otimes \underbrace{\sigma_z}_{j\text{-th}} \otimes \dots I. \quad (24)$$

Again, with this choice of parameters, Assumption 1.1 is satisfied (cf. Remark 1.4) and Theorem 1.3 applies.

Similarly, as in the case $N = 1$, one may find explicit representations of the action of H in matrix form, as well as its self-adjointness domain $\text{Dom} H$ in vector form, by exploiting the obvious isomorphism

$$\mathfrak{H} = \mathbb{C}^{2^N} \otimes \mathcal{F} \simeq \overbrace{\mathcal{F} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{F}}^{2^N \text{ times}}. \quad (25)$$

This is a natural choice (though possibly not the most natural one) obtained by representing the tensor product in \mathbb{C}^{2^N} as a Kronecker product. As an example, we shall present the case $N = 2$ and, for the ease of exposition, we shall set $\eta_1 = \eta_2 \equiv \eta$. The most general element of \mathfrak{H} is represented as

$$\Psi = \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_{ee} \\ \Psi_{eg} \\ \Psi_{ge} \\ \Psi_{gg} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Psi_{ee}, \Psi_{eg}, \Psi_{ge}, \Psi_{gg} \in \mathcal{F}, \quad (26)$$

and, in this representation, Eq. (23) reads

$$\begin{aligned}
H &= \begin{bmatrix} d\Gamma(\omega) + \eta & a^*(f_2) + a(f_2) & a^*(f_1) + a(f_1) & \\ a^*(f_2) + a(f_2) & d\Gamma(\omega) & & a^*(f_1) + a(f_1) \\ a^*(f_1) + a(f_1) & & d\Gamma(\omega) & a^*(f_2) + a(f_2) \\ & a^*(f_1) + a(f_1) & a^*(f_2) + a(f_2) & d\Gamma(\omega) - \eta \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} d\Gamma(\omega) + \eta & & & \\ & d\Gamma(\omega) & & \\ & & d\Gamma(\omega) & \\ & & & d\Gamma(\omega) - \eta \end{bmatrix}}_{H_{\text{free}}} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} & a^*(f_2) & a^*(f_1) & \\ a^*(f_2) & & a^*(f_1) & \\ a^*(f_1) & & a^*(f_2) & \\ & a^*(f_1) & a^*(f_2) & \end{bmatrix}}_{A^*} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} & a(f_2) & a(f_1) & \\ a(f_2) & & a(f_1) & \\ a(f_1) & & a(f_2) & \\ & a(f_1) & a(f_2) & \end{bmatrix}}_A, \tag{27}
\end{aligned}$$

from which one can reconstruct the analogue of Eq. (21) for $N = 2$ atoms.

We remark that, while we have only considered here the case in which H_{free} does not involve off-diagonal terms (spin–spin interactions), Theorem 1.3 also covers this possibility—of course, in such a case all expressions, e.g., Eq. (27) in the case $N = 2$, will acquire additional terms and become more involved. Finally, like in the single-atom case, the RWA of this model with mild divergences (which is not covered by Theorem 1.3) was covered in [25].

The σ_z (dephasing) spin–boson model. Let us consider the following expression:

$$H = \frac{\eta}{2} \sigma_z \otimes I + I \otimes d\Gamma(\omega) + \sigma_z \otimes (a^*(f) + a(f)), \tag{28}$$

again with $f \in \mathcal{H}_{-s}$, $s \leq 1$, and $\eta \geq 0$. So the (off-diagonal) σ_x -interaction from above has been replaced with a (diagonal) σ_z -interaction. Physically, Eq. (28) describes a two-level system undergoing *decoherence* as a result of its interaction with the boson field. Using the same representation as before, we can write it as

$$\begin{aligned}
H &= \begin{bmatrix} d\Gamma(\omega) + \frac{\eta}{2} + a^*(f) + a(f) & & \\ & d\Gamma(\omega) - \frac{\eta}{2} + a^*(f) + a(f) & \\ & & \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} d\Gamma(\omega) + \frac{\eta}{2} & & \\ & d\Gamma(\omega) - \frac{\eta}{2} & \end{bmatrix}}_{H_{\text{free}}} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} a^*(f) & \\ & a^*(f) \end{bmatrix}}_{A^*} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} a(f) & \\ & a(f) \end{bmatrix}}_A. \tag{29}
\end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 1.3, this expression defines a self-adjoint operator on the domain

$$\text{Dom}(H) = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_e \\ \Psi_g \end{bmatrix} : \begin{bmatrix} (1 + \frac{1}{d\Gamma(\omega) + \frac{\eta}{2} - z_0} a^*(f)) \Psi_e \\ (1 + \frac{1}{d\Gamma(\omega) - \frac{\eta}{2} - z_0} a^*(f)) \Psi_g \end{bmatrix} \in \text{Dom}(H_{\text{free}}) \right\}, \tag{30}$$

which, differently from the σ_x -case, involves no mutual dependence between the two components Ψ_e, Ψ_g , due to the inherently diagonal nature of the interaction. In particular, Eq. (29) can be regarded as a direct sum of two van Hove models with different energy offsets $\pm \frac{\eta}{2}$.

Similar expressions can be found for the multi-atom version of the model, following the same arguments presented for the σ_x model—however, while in the previous case the structure of the multi-atom model for $N > 1$ becomes quickly involved, this model will preserve a relatively simple, diagonal structure. For instance, in the case $N = 2$ (and again setting $\eta_1 = \eta_2 \equiv \eta$), one

has

$$H = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} d\Gamma(\omega) + \eta & & & \\ & d\Gamma(\omega) & & \\ & & d\Gamma(\omega) & \\ & & & d\Gamma(\omega) - \eta \end{bmatrix}}_{H_{\text{free}}} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} a^*(f_+) & & & \\ & a^*(f_-) & & \\ & & -a^*(f_-) & \\ & & & -a^*(f_+) \end{bmatrix}}_{A^*} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} a(f_+) & & & \\ & a(f_-) & & \\ & & -a(f_-) & \\ & & & -a(f_+) \end{bmatrix}}_A, \quad (31)$$

where $f_{\pm} := f_1 \pm f_2$. Of course, the \mathcal{H} -independence of the form factors f_1 and f_2 ensures that $f_{\pm} \in \mathcal{H}_{-1} \setminus \mathcal{H}$, so both combinations are UV-divergent.

3. SELF-ADJOINTNESS OF $H_{\text{free}} + A^* + A$

3.1. Generalized setting for $H_{\text{free}} + A^* + A$. We shall start by revising the main results obtained in [22] (with a slightly modified notation). These results hold for \mathfrak{H} being any Hilbert space, and H_{free} any densely defined, self-adjoint operator on \mathfrak{H} with domain $\text{Dom}(H_{\text{free}}) \subset \mathfrak{H}$. Besides, we will assume H_{free} to be bounded from below; to simplify the notation, we will then assume $H_{\text{free}} \geq 0$, the general case being recovered by a simple shift. We can then define the Hilbert scale $\{\mathfrak{H}_s\}_{s \in \mathbb{R}}$ associated with H_{free} in the usual way: for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathfrak{H}_s := \overline{\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Dom}(H_{\text{free}}^n)}^{\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{H}_s}}, \quad \|\Psi\|_{\mathfrak{H}_s} := \left\| (H_{\text{free}} + 1)^{s/2} \Psi \right\|_{\mathfrak{H}}, \quad (32)$$

with $\mathfrak{H}_{+s} \subset \mathfrak{H}_0 = \mathfrak{H} \subset \mathfrak{H}_{-s}$ for any $s \geq 0$, and the spaces $\mathfrak{H}_{\pm s}$ being naturally dual. Notice that $\mathfrak{H}_{+s} = \text{Dom}(H_{\text{free}}^{s/2})$ for any $s \geq 0$. With a slight abuse of notation, the duality pairing between the two spaces $\mathfrak{H}_{\pm s}$ will sometimes be denoted like the scalar product on \mathfrak{H} by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ or $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{F}_{-s}, \mathcal{F}_s}$. Notice that the inclusions

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}_{+s}, \mathfrak{H}_{-s}) \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}_{+s'}, \mathfrak{H}_{-s'}) \quad (33)$$

hold for all $s' > s > 0$. With this formalism, H_{free} can be interpreted as a continuous operator from \mathfrak{H}_s to \mathfrak{H}_{s-2} for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, i.e., it decreases the regularity by 2. Now, suppose that for some $s' \geq 1$, we have $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}_{+s'}, \mathfrak{H})$ and $A^* \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}, \mathfrak{H}_{-s'})$. These two statements are expected to hold if A^*, A involve linear couplings to a boson field with form factors $f_j \in \mathcal{H}_{-s'}$ (in our case, $f_j \in \mathcal{H}_{-s}, s \leq 1 \Rightarrow f_j \in \mathcal{H}_{-1}$). If they do hold, then the following operator is already well-defined and continuous:

$$(H_{\text{free}} + A^* + A) : \mathfrak{H}_{+s'} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}_{-s'}. \quad (34)$$

However, in order to obtain quantum dynamics, we need an operator defined on a dense subspace of \mathfrak{H} with values in \mathfrak{H} (that is, it “does not leave” the Hilbert space \mathfrak{H}) and which is self-adjoint. It turns out that in our less singular Case 1 (so $s \in (0, 1]$), this can be achieved by restricting $H_{\text{free}} + A^* + A$ to a suitable domain $\text{Dom}(H)$. The more singular Case 2 (so $s \in (1, 2]$), is expected to require a further modification of Eq. (34), which is formally equivalent to subtracting an infinite self-energy. We comment on this in Remark 3.6.

The domain $\text{Dom}(H)$ given by [22] is conveniently described in terms of the resolvents

$$R_z := (H_{\text{free}} - z)^{-1}, \quad z \in \rho(H_{\text{free}}) \supset \mathbb{C}. \quad (35)$$

To simplify notation, as in [22], we fix some $z_0 \in \rho(H_{\text{free}}) \cap \mathbb{R}$ and set $R := R_{z_0}$. Since $H_{\text{free}} \geq 0$, it is no loss to choose $z_0 = -1$. All resolvents improve regularity by 2, in the sense that they can be interpreted as continuous operators $R_z, R : \mathfrak{H}_s \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}_{s+2}$ for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Furthermore, the resolvent vanishes as z moves away from the spectrum in the following sense.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $s \in [0, 2)$, $\{z_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{C}$, $\text{Im } z_n \leq 0$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(z_n, \sigma(H_{\text{free}})) = \infty$. Then, for any $r \in \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|R_{z_n}\|_{\mathfrak{H}_{r-s} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}_r} = 0. \quad (36)$$

Proof. We first consider the case $r = 0$. By spectral calculus, for $\Psi \in \mathfrak{H}_{-s}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_{z_n} \Psi\|_{\mathfrak{H}} &= \|(H_{\text{free}} - z_n)^{-1} \Psi\|_{\mathfrak{H}} \leq \left\| \frac{(H_{\text{free}} + 1)^{\frac{s}{2}}}{H_{\text{free}} - z_n} \right\|_{\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}} \|(H_{\text{free}} + 1)^{-\frac{s}{2}} \Psi\|_{\mathfrak{H}} \\ &\leq \sup_{\lambda \in \sigma(H_{\text{free}})} \left| \frac{(\lambda + 1)^{\frac{s}{2}}}{\lambda - z_n} \right| \|\Psi\|_{\mathfrak{H}_{-s}} \leq \sup_{\lambda} \left| \frac{\lambda + 1}{\lambda - z_n} \right|^{\frac{s}{2}} |\lambda - z_n|^{-1 + \frac{s}{2}} \|\Psi\|_{\mathfrak{H}_{-s}} \\ &\leq \left(\underbrace{\inf_{\lambda} \frac{\lambda}{|\lambda - z_n|}}_{\leq 1} + \underbrace{\inf_{\lambda} \frac{1}{|\lambda - z_n|}}_{\rightarrow 0} \right)^{\frac{s}{2}} \underbrace{\text{dist}(z_n, \sigma(H_{\text{free}}))^{-1 + \frac{s}{2}}}_{\rightarrow 0} \|\Psi\|_{\mathfrak{H}_{-s}}. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

The statement for general $r \in \mathbb{R}$ immediately follows, as for any $\Phi \in \mathfrak{H}_{r-s}$ and $\Psi := (H_{\text{free}} + 1)^{\frac{r}{2}} \Phi \in \mathfrak{H}_{-s}$, we have

$$\|R_{z_n} \Phi\|_{\mathfrak{H}_r} = \|R_{z_n} (H_{\text{free}} + 1)^{-\frac{r}{2}} \Psi\|_{\mathfrak{H}_r} = \|(H_{\text{free}} + 1)^{-\frac{r}{2}} R_{z_n} \Psi\|_{\mathfrak{H}_r} = \|R_{z_n} \Psi\|_{\mathfrak{H}}, \quad (38)$$

and $\|\Psi\|_{\mathfrak{H}_{-s}} = \|\Phi\|_{\mathfrak{H}_{r-s}}$. \square

Now, $\text{Dom}(H)$ as in [22] (also cf. [35]–[36]) involves vectors of the form

$$\Psi \in \mathfrak{H} : (I + RA^*)\Psi = \Psi_0 \in \text{Dom}(H_{\text{free}}). \quad (39)$$

The results of [22] are valid in Cases 1 and 2, viz. $s \in (0, 2]$. Now, a direct check shows that a vector Ψ as in Eq. (39) does *not* belong to \mathfrak{H}_{+s} whenever $s > 1$, so that the action of A on Ψ is ill-defined for $s \in (1, 2]$. For that reason, in [22] a modification A_T of A is introduced, which is indexed by a symmetric operator $T : \text{Dom}(T) \subset \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$ and defined as

$$\text{Dom}(A_T) = \{\Psi \in \mathfrak{H} : \exists \Phi \in \text{Dom}(T) \text{ s.t. } \Psi + RA^*\Phi \in \text{Dom}(H_{\text{free}})\}, \quad (40)$$

$$A_T \Psi = A(\Psi + RA^*\Phi) + T\Phi. \quad (41)$$

Since $\Psi + RA^*\Phi \in \text{Dom}(H_{\text{free}}) = \mathfrak{H}_{+2} \subset \mathfrak{H}_{+s}$, the operator A_T is well-defined also for $1 < s \leq 2$ (in contrast to A). We conclude that the modified Hamiltonian

$$\text{Dom}(H_T) = \{\Psi \in \text{Dom}(T) : (I + RA^*)\Psi = \Psi_0 \in \text{Dom}(H_{\text{free}})\} \subset \text{Dom}(A_T) \quad (42)$$

$$H_T = H + A^* + A_T \quad (43)$$

is also well-defined. In particular, on $\text{Dom}(H_T)$, the operator A_T defined in [22, Sect. 3] acts as²

$$A_T \Psi = A(\Psi + RA^*\Psi) + T\Psi = A\Psi_0 + T\Psi. \quad (44)$$

As [22] makes statements about H_T , we need to find out which T makes H_T correspond to $H = H_{\text{free}} + A^* + A$ in case $s \in (0, 1]$. A short calculation reveals

$$H_0 \Psi = (H_{\text{free}} + A^*)\Psi + A\Psi_0 = (H_{\text{free}} + A^*)\Psi + A\Psi + ARA^*\Psi. \quad (45)$$

Thus, to obtain a renormalized Hamiltonian H_T that physically corresponds to our model Hamiltonian $H_{\text{free}} + A^* + A$, we need to “manually add” the interaction

$$T = -ARA^* \quad (46)$$

²We remark that the definition of A_T in [22, Sect. 3] requires a unique splitting $\Psi = \Psi_0 - RA^*\Phi$ with $\Psi_0 \in \mathfrak{H}_2$. In case of our multi-spin-boson model (6), this splitting is only unique if $s > 0$. Otherwise, RA^* maps $\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}_2$, and we can arbitrarily shift vectors between Ψ_0 and $RA^*\Phi$. So the machinery of [22] strictly applies to Cases 1 and 2 ($s \in (0, 2]$) and not to the less singular Case 0 ($s \leq 0$).

to H_0 . In fact, for $s \leq 1$ we have $ARA^* \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})$, whereas ARA^* is ill-defined for $s > 1$, since we have the mappings and inclusions

$$\mathfrak{H} \xrightarrow{A^*} \mathfrak{H}_{-s} \xrightarrow{R} \mathfrak{H}_{-s+2} \begin{cases} \subset \mathfrak{H}_{+s} \xrightarrow{A} \mathfrak{H}, & 0 \leq s \leq 1; \\ \supset \mathfrak{H}_{+s} & 1 < s \leq 2. \end{cases} \quad (47)$$

In case $s > 1$, a different choice of T , involving an infinite self-energy, would become necessary, as we explain in Remark 3.6.

3.2. Self-adjointness and convergence results. In [22], it is now shown that, under suitable assumptions on A , the operator H_T is self-adjoint on $\text{Dom}(H_T)$, as defined in Eqs. (42)–(43), for a large class of choices of T (including all bounded operators). Furthermore, [22] provides conditions for when H_T is the norm resolvent limit of some regularized operators $H_n := H_{\text{free}} + A_n^* + A_n$, as they are used in cutoff renormalization [26–31]. In the following, we summarize some of these results. Let us introduce the following notation: for every $z \in \rho(H_{\text{free}})$, we define $M(z)$ as the bounded operator on \mathfrak{H} given by

$$M(z) := A(R_z - R)A^*. \quad (48)$$

This is indeed a bounded operator on \mathfrak{H} whenever $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}_2, \mathfrak{H})$ (or, a fortiori, $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}_s, \mathfrak{H})$ for some $s \in (0, 2]$) since, by the second resolvent identity, the difference between the resolvents of H_{free} , evaluated in two distinct points of its resolvent, maps \mathfrak{H}_{-2} into \mathfrak{H}_{+2} . With this notation, combining [22, Lemma 3.6] and [22, Corollary 3.7], we now get the following result.

Theorem 3.2. *Let H_{free} be a self-adjoint operator, $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}_s, \mathfrak{H})$ for some $s \in (0, 2)$, with $A^* \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}, \mathfrak{H}_{-s})$ its dual, and $T : \text{Dom}(T) \subset \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$ self-adjoint. Suppose that*

- (i) $\text{Ker } A|_{\mathfrak{H}_2}$ and $\text{Ran } A|_{\mathfrak{H}_2}$ are dense in \mathfrak{H} ;
- (ii) there exists $z \in \rho(H_{\text{free}})$ such that $M(z) - T$ has a bounded inverse;
- (iii) there exists $t \in [0, 1 - \frac{s}{2})$ such that $\text{Dom}(T) \supset \mathfrak{H}_{2t}$ and $T|_{\mathfrak{H}_{2t}} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}_t, \mathfrak{H})$.

Then, the following statement holds true:

- (a') The operator H_T defined by

$$\text{Dom}(H_T) = \{\Psi \in \mathfrak{H}_{2-s} : (I + RA^*)\Psi \in \text{Dom}(H_{\text{free}})\}; \quad (49)$$

$$H_T = H_{\text{free}} + A^* + A_T \quad (50)$$

is self-adjoint, and its resolvent is given by [22, (3.11)]:

$$(H_T - z)^{-1} = (H_{\text{free}} - z)^{-1} - [R_z A^* \quad R_z] \begin{bmatrix} A_T R_z A^* & AR_z + 1 \\ R_z A^* + 1 & R_z \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} AR_z \\ R_z \end{bmatrix}. \quad (51)$$

Note that requirement (ii) is automatically satisfied whenever T itself has a bounded inverse.

Proof. [22, Corollary 3.7] implies that (a') holds if we can verify (i) and the assumptions of [22, Lemma 3.6]. The latter lemma, in turn, assumes that (ii) and (iii) hold, as well as $\exists \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|\gamma|$ large enough, such that $(1 - G_{\pm i\gamma})^{-1}$ and $(1 - G_{\pm i\gamma}^*)^{-1}$ are bounded operators on \mathfrak{H} , where $G_z := -R_z A^*$. But now,

$$\|G_{\pm i\gamma}\|_{\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}} \leq \|A^*\|_{\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}_{-s}} \|R_{\pm i\gamma}\|_{\mathfrak{H}_{-s} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}}. \quad (52)$$

By Lemma 3.1, this norm becomes arbitrarily small as $|\gamma| \rightarrow \infty$, eventually dropping below 1, so $(1 - G_{\pm i\gamma})$ has a bounded inverse for large enough $|\gamma|$. The same reasoning applies to $(1 - G_{\pm i\gamma}^*)$. So the additional invertibility condition is automatically satisfied. \square

Although the above conditions for self-adjointness of H_T are already very useful, [22] provides another incarnation of its main result, which applies even more conveniently to the case of bounded T .

Theorem 3.3 ([22, Theorem 3.13]). *Let H_{free} be a self-adjoint nonnegative operator, $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}_{+s}, \mathfrak{H})$ for some $s \in (0, 2)$, with $A^* \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}, \mathfrak{H}_{-s})$ its dual, and $T : \text{Dom}(T) \subset \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$ self-adjoint. Suppose that*

(i) $\text{Ker } A|_{\mathfrak{H}_2}$ and $\text{Ran } A|_{\mathfrak{H}_2}$ are dense in \mathfrak{H} .

Then, (a') in Theorem 3.2 for $T = 0$ holds true, that is, the operator H_0 , defined by Eqs. (49)–(50) with $T = 0$, is self-adjoint. Furthermore, if some (possibly nonzero) $T : \text{Dom}(T) \subset \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$, symmetric is given, such that

(ii) T is H_0 -bounded,³

then, (a') in Theorem 3.2 holds true also for that T , that is, the operator H_T defined by Eqs. (49)–(50) is self-adjoint, and its resolvent is given by Eq. (51).

Finally, the question remains, if the renormalized Hamiltonian $H_T = H_{\text{free}} + A^* + A$ is equivalent to a Hamiltonian obtained by cutoff renormalization. That is: does there exist a sequence of regularized Hamiltonians $H_n := H_{\text{free}} + A_n^* + A_n + E_n$ such that $H_n \rightarrow H_T$ in a suitable sense? Here, [22, Theorem 3.10] provides us with conditions for an affirmative answer. The following result is an immediate consequence of [22, Theorem 3.10], using⁴ Theorem 3.3.

Theorem 3.4. *Let H_{free} a self-adjoint nonnegative operator, $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}_{+s}, \mathfrak{H})$ for some $s \in (0, 2)$, with $A^* \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}, \mathfrak{H}_{-s})$ its dual, and $T : \text{Dom}(T) \subset \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$ self-adjoint. Suppose that*

- (i) $\text{Ker } A|_{\mathfrak{H}_2}$ and $\text{Ran } A|_{\mathfrak{H}_2}$ are dense in \mathfrak{H} ;
- (ii) T is H_0 -bounded with relative bound smaller than one;

besides, suppose that there exists a sequence of closable operators $A_n : \text{Dom}(A_n) \subset \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$ (“regularized annihilation operators”), such that

- (iii) there exists some $s' \in [0, 1]$ such that $\text{Dom}(A_n) \supset \mathfrak{H}_{s'}$ and $A_n|_{\mathfrak{H}_{s'}} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}_{s'}, \mathfrak{H})$;
- (iv) $A_n^* + A_n$ is H_{free} -bounded with n -independent relative bound smaller than one;
- (v) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|A_n - A\|_{\mathfrak{H}_2 \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}} = 0$;
- (vi) there exists a sequence $\{E_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})$, E_n : symmetric, such that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $A_n R A_n^* + E_n$ is relatively bounded w.r.t $H_{\text{free}} + A_n^* + A_n + A_n R A_n^*$, with n -independent relative bound smaller than one, and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|A_n R A_n^* + E_n + T\|_{\text{Dom}(T) \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}} = 0. \quad (53)$$

Then, we have

- (b') $H_{\text{free}} + A_n^* + A_n - E_n$ converges to $H_{\text{free}} + A^* + A_T$ in the norm resolvent sense.

Remark 3.5 (On two different notions of adjoint). Note that we are requiring each A_n to be closable, thus admitting an adjoint $A_n^\dagger : \text{Dom}(A_n^\dagger) \subset \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$ with respect to the topology of \mathfrak{H} . This is different from the adjoint with respect to the pairing between $\mathfrak{H}_{s'}$ and $\mathfrak{H}_{-s'}$ (for some s' s.t. $\mathfrak{H}_{s'} \subset \text{Dom}(A_n)$), i.e., there are “two different adjoints”:

- an unbounded operator $A_n^\dagger : \text{Dom}(A_n^\dagger) \subset \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$ defined by

$$\langle \Psi, A_n \Phi \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}} = \langle A_n^\dagger \Psi, \Phi \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}} \quad \text{for all } \Phi \in \text{Dom}(A_n); \quad (54)$$

- a continuous operator $A_n^* : \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}_{-s'}$ defined by

$$\langle \Psi, A_n \Phi \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}} = \langle A_n^* \Psi, \Phi \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}_{-s'}, \mathfrak{H}_{s'}} \quad \text{for all } \Phi \in \mathfrak{H}_{s'}, \Psi \in \mathfrak{H}. \quad (55)$$

Clearly A_n^* is an extension of A_n^\dagger to all of \mathfrak{H} . With a slight abuse of notation, we will also write A_n^* for the restriction of this operator to $\text{Dom}(A_n^\dagger) \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$ (i.e., for A_n^\dagger). It then becomes clear from the context which domain is meant. \triangle

Remark 3.6 (Self-energy renormalization). Theorem 3.4 is valid for $s \in (0, 2)$, i.e., both in Case 1 and most situations of Case 2. The latter case is the one in which the terms E_n

³By X is Y -bounded or X is relatively bounded with respect to Y we mean $\exists a, b \geq 0$ s.t. $\|X\Psi\| \leq a\|Y\Psi\| + b\|\Psi\| \forall \Psi \in \text{Dom}(Y)$. The constant a is called *relative bound*. For $a < 1$, we call X *Kato-bounded w.r. to Y* . If for every $a > 0$, there exists some b such that the relative bound is true, we call X *infinitesimally Y -bounded*.

⁴Note that the consequences of Theorem 3.3 allow us to restrict to the case $\mu = 0$ in [22, Theorem 3.10].

become necessary, which can physically be interpreted as “self-energy counterterms”. As described above, to make the renormalized Hamiltonian H_T formally correspond to the physically desired Hamiltonian $H_{\text{free}} + A^* + A$, we would need to “manually add” the interaction $T = -ARA^* = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -A_n R A_n^*$. Now, the sequence of operators $A_n R A_n^*$:

- will converge to ARA^* , if $s \leq 1$ (Case 1);
- will generally not have a limit, if $s > 1$ (Case 2).

However, in the latter case, several QFT-type models admit a properly chosen family of (self-energy) counterterms $\{E_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, such that the operator

$$T = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -A_n R A_n^* - E_n \quad (56)$$

is well-defined, within a suitable sense of convergence. For example, for the Nelson model [26] in Case 2, $\{E_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ just amounts to a divergent sequence of real numbers. Since adding a constant to the Hamiltonian does not change the Heisenberg equations of motion, the operator T can heuristically be regarded as equivalent to the ill-defined expression $-ARA^*$. Likewise, H_T is heuristically equivalent to the desired model Hamiltonian $H_{\text{free}} + A^* + A$.

Of course, the choice of E_n is *not unique*: different choices of $\{E_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ may result in different operators T , and vice versa, various choices of T are reachable by selecting an appropriate sequence of counterterms, resulting in inequivalent quantum dynamics. It is thus important to make a heuristic reasoning, based on physical arguments, to justify which renormalized Hamiltonian shall be the correct one.

Instead, in our Case 1 ($s \in (0, 1]$), we can simply set $E_n = 0$ to obtain the limit $T = -ARA^*$ as required in Eq. (46). The situation in Case 2 will be analyzed elsewhere. \triangle

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

Our plan is to use Theorems 3.3 and 3.4 to establish (a) and (b). We start by collecting some mathematical tools that will turn out useful for the proof.

4.1. Preliminaries. Let $\{\mathcal{H}_s\}_{s \in \mathbb{R}}, \{\mathcal{F}_s\}_{s \in \mathbb{R}}$ be the scales of Hilbert spaces associated respectively with ω and $d\Gamma(\omega)$, cf. Eq. (11) and related discussion. Let us recall the following proposition.

Proposition 4.1 ([23, Props. 3.4, 3.5 and 3.7]). *Let $f \in \mathcal{H}_{-s}$ for some $s \geq 1$. Then the following statements are true:*

- (i) *the restriction of the annihilation operator to \mathcal{F}_{+s} defines a continuous operator $a(f) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}_{+s}, \mathcal{F})$;*
- (ii) *its adjoint $a^*(f) := a(f)^* \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_{-s})$ with respect to the duality pairing between \mathcal{F}_{+s} and \mathcal{F}_{-s} is a continuous operator whose action on $\Psi \in \mathcal{F}_{+1}$ agrees with the creation operator defined in Eq. (4);*
- (iii) *there exists a sequence $\{f^i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{H}$ such that*

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \left\| a(f) - a(f^i) \right\|_{\mathcal{F}_s \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} = 0, \quad \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \left\| a^*(f) - a^*(f^i) \right\|_{\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{-s}} = 0, \quad (57)$$

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

In words: If $f \in \mathcal{H}_{-s} \setminus \mathcal{H}$, then the annihilation operator $a(f)$, while still a legitimate densely defined operator on \mathcal{F} , fails to be closable and thus to have an adjoint with respect to the topology of \mathfrak{H} . However, its restriction to \mathcal{F}_{+s} , interpreted as an operator in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}_{+s}, \mathcal{F})$, always admits an adjoint $a^*(f) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_{-s})$ with respect to the pairing. If $f \in \mathcal{H}$, following the same line of reasoning as in Remark 3.5, the “singular” creation operator defined as the adjoint with respect to the pairing corresponds to an extension of the “regular” one for Eq. (4).

We shall need the following definitions (see, e.g., [35, Section 6.1]). Every single-particle vector $g \in \mathcal{H}$ is associated with a (*non-normalized*) coherent vector $\varepsilon(g) \in \mathcal{F}$ defined by

$$\varepsilon(g) := \left\{ \varepsilon(g)^{(n)} \right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, \quad \varepsilon(g)^{(n)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n!}} g^{\otimes n}. \quad (58)$$

In particular, if $g \in \mathcal{H}_{+s}$, then $\varepsilon(g) \in \mathcal{F}_{+s}$ and, given $f \in \mathcal{H}_{-s}$, $a(f)\varepsilon(g) = \langle f, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{-s}, \mathcal{H}_{+s}} \varepsilon(g)$. With this definition, given any subset $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{H}$, the *coherent domain over \mathcal{D}* is the subspace $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{D}) \subset \mathcal{F}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{D}) = \text{Span} \{ \varepsilon(g) : g \in \mathcal{D} \}, \quad (59)$$

and it can be proven that $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{D})$ is dense in \mathcal{F} whenever \mathcal{D} is dense in \mathcal{H} , and that $\varepsilon(g_n) \rightarrow \varepsilon(g)$ whenever $g_n \rightarrow g$.

4.2. Denseness of kernel and range. Statement (a) will follow from (a') in Theorem 3.3. As discussed above, in case $s \leq 1$, the operator $T = -ARA^*$ is bounded, and thus also H_0 -bounded with relative bound zero. It remains to establish the denseness of $\text{Ker } A|_{\mathfrak{H}_2}$ and $\text{Ran } A|_{\mathfrak{H}_2}$, which we do in this subsection.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $f \in \mathcal{H}_{-s} \setminus \mathcal{H}$ for $s \in [1, 2]$, and $a(f) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}_{+s}, \mathcal{F})$. Then*

- (i) $\text{Ker } a(f)|_{\mathcal{F}_{+2}}$ is dense in \mathcal{F} ;
- (ii) $\text{Ran } a(f)|_{\mathcal{F}_{+2}}$ is dense in \mathcal{F} .

Proof. It suffices to prove the claims in the case $s = 2$; the claims for $s < 2$ are then true *a fortiori*. To simplify the notation, in the following we will omit the subscript in the the duality pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}, \mathcal{H}_{+2}}$ between \mathcal{H}_{-2} and \mathcal{H}_{+2} .

(i) Since the functional $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_{+2} \mapsto \langle f, \varphi \rangle$ is unbounded, its kernel, i.e., the space $\mathcal{D}_0 = \{g \in \mathcal{H}_{+2} : \langle f, g \rangle = 0\}$, is dense in \mathcal{H} [69, Lemma 1.2.3], whence its associated coherent domain $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{D}_0)$ is dense in \mathcal{F} . But, given any $g \in \mathcal{D}_0$, its corresponding coherent vector $\varepsilon(g)$ satisfies $a(f)\varepsilon(g) = \langle f, g \rangle \varepsilon(g) = 0$, whence the same holds for all elements of $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{D}_0)$. This proves $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{D}_0) \subset \text{Ker } a(f)|_{\mathcal{F}_{+2}}$. Since the former is dense in \mathcal{F} , so is the latter.

(ii) Since $f \neq 0$, the set $\mathcal{D} = \{g \in \mathcal{H}_{+2} : \langle f, g \rangle \neq 0\}$ is also dense in \mathcal{H} , thus $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{D})$ is again dense in \mathcal{F} . Given $g \in \mathcal{D}$, we then have $a(f) \left(\langle f, g \rangle^{-1} \varepsilon(g) \right) = \varepsilon(g)$. This proves $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{D}) \subset \text{Ran } a(f)|_{\mathcal{F}_{+2}}$ and thus, again, the latter is dense in \mathcal{F} . \square

We remark that, while the denseness of the range of $a(f)$ holds under the only condition $f \neq 0$, the denseness of its kernel additionally requires $f \notin \mathcal{H}$.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $s \leq 2$, $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{H}_{-s} \setminus \mathcal{H}$ a family of \mathcal{H} -independent form factors (see Definition 1.2), and $B_1, \dots, B_N \in \mathbb{C}^{D \times D}$. Then, for A defined in Eq. (3), $\text{Ker } A|_{\mathfrak{H}_{+2}}$ is dense in \mathfrak{H} .*

Proof. Again, it suffices to prove the claim for $s = 2$. Since $\{f_j\}_{j=1}^N$ are \mathcal{H} -independent, the space of single-particle states that are in the kernel of *all* form factors,

$$\mathcal{D}_0 = \left\{ g \in \mathcal{H}_{+2} : \langle f_j, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{-2}, \mathcal{H}_{+2}} = 0 \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, N \right\} \quad (60)$$

is dense in \mathcal{H} , see [69, Lemma 3.1.1]. Then the coherent domain, $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{D}_0)$, is also dense in \mathcal{F} , and likewise $\mathfrak{h} \otimes \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{D}_0)$ is dense in \mathfrak{H} . Now, given any coherent vector $\varepsilon(g) \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{D}_0)$, one has $a(f_j)\varepsilon(g) = 0$, so for any $u \in \mathfrak{h}$,

$$A(u \otimes \varepsilon(g)) = \sum_{j=1}^N (B_j^* u) \otimes (a(f_j)\varepsilon(g)) = 0, \quad (61)$$

whence, by linearity, $\mathfrak{h} \otimes \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{D}_0) \subset \text{Ker } A|_{\mathfrak{H}_{+2}}$. Since the former is dense in \mathfrak{H} , so is the latter. \square

We remark that the denseness of $\text{Ker } A|_{\mathfrak{H}_{+2}}$ is irrespective of the choice of $B_1, \dots, B_N \in \mathbb{C}^{D \times D}$. No point of Assumption 1.1 enters here. However, the \mathcal{H} -independence of the form factors is crucial.

Proposition 4.4. *Let $s \leq 2$, $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{H}_{-s} \setminus \mathcal{H}$ be a family of \mathcal{H} -independent form factors (see Definition 1.2), and let $B_1, \dots, B_N \in \mathbb{C}^{D \times D}$ satisfy Assumption 1.1. Then, for A defined in Eq. (3), $\text{Ran } A|_{\mathfrak{H}_{+2}}$ is dense in \mathfrak{H} .*

Proof. Because of points (i) and (ii) in Assumption 1.1, the matrices B_1, \dots, B_N share a common orthonormal eigenbasis: there exists a set of orthonormal vectors $\{u^{(a)}\}_{a=1}^d \subset \mathfrak{h}$ such that

$$B_j u^{(a)} = b_j^{(a)} u^{(a)}, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, N, \quad a = 1, \dots, d, \quad (62)$$

with $b_j^{(a)} \in \mathbb{C}$. By normality, $\{u^{(a)}\}_{a=1}^d$ is also a common eigenbasis for their adjoints, with

$$B_j^* u^{(a)} = \overline{b_j^{(a)}} u^{(a)}, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, N, \quad a = 1, \dots, d. \quad (63)$$

We can thus conveniently decompose the Hilbert space as

$$\mathfrak{H} \simeq \bigoplus_{a=1}^d \mathfrak{H}^{(a)}, \quad \mathfrak{H}^{(a)} = \text{Span}\{u^{(a)}\} \otimes \mathcal{F} \simeq \mathcal{F}. \quad (64)$$

This decomposition is preserved by A , i.e., $A\mathfrak{H}^{(a)} \subset \mathfrak{H}^{(a)}$, since for any $\Psi \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$\begin{aligned} A(u^{(a)} \otimes \Psi) &= \sum_{j=1}^N B_j^* u^{(a)} \otimes a(f_j) \Psi \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^N \overline{b_j^{(a)}} u^{(a)} \otimes a(f_j) \Psi \\ &= u^{(a)} \otimes a\left(\sum_{j=1}^N b_j^{(a)} f_j\right) \Psi. \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

So we can also decompose

$$A = \bigoplus_{a=1}^d A^{(a)}, \quad A^{(a)} = a\left(\sum_{j=1}^N b_j^{(a)} f_j\right). \quad (66)$$

Obviously, $\text{Ran } A = \bigoplus_a \text{Ran } A^{(a)}$. So it suffices to prove that $\text{Ran } A^{(a)}$ is dense in $\mathfrak{H}^{(a)}$ for each a , in order to establish the proposition. Now, $A^{(a)}$ is just an annihilation operator on $\mathfrak{H}^{(a)} \simeq \mathcal{F}$, so Lemma 4.2 applies, provided that

$$\sum_{j=1}^N b_j^{(a)} f_j \in \mathcal{H}_{-2} \setminus \mathcal{H}. \quad (67)$$

This requirement is fulfilled because of the \mathcal{H} -independence of f_1, \dots, f_N , provided that there exists at least one $j = 1, \dots, N$ such that $b_j^{(a)} \neq 0$. The latter statement means that none of the vectors $u^{(a)}$ is such that $B_j u^{(a)} = 0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, N$ simultaneously, which is guaranteed by point (iii) of Assumption 1.1, viz. $\bigcap_{j=1}^N \text{Ker } B_j = \{0\}$. Therefore Proposition 4.2 indeed applies, rendering denseness of $\text{Ran } A^{(a)}|_{\mathcal{F}_{+2}} \subset \text{Ran } A^{(a)}$ in $\mathfrak{H}^{(a)}$, which establishes the proposition. \square

4.3. Finishing the proof.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. (a) We would like to apply Theorem 3.3. Since $f_j \in \mathcal{H}_{-s} \setminus \mathcal{H}$ for $s \leq 1$, we have $f_j \in \mathcal{H}_{-1} \setminus \mathcal{H}$. By Proposition 4.1, this implies $a(f_j) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F})$. In case of the spin-boson model (6) we are considering, it is then immediate to see that $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}_{+1}, \mathfrak{H})$, and by duality, $A^* \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}, \mathfrak{H}_{-1})$. The requirement that $\text{Ker } A|_{\mathfrak{H}_2}$ and $\text{Ran } A|_{\mathfrak{H}_2}$ be dense in \mathfrak{H} have been proven in Propositions 4.3 and 4.4, respectively.

Now, recall that, for $s \in (0, 1]$, the choice $T = -ARA^*$ is needed to make $H = H_{\text{free}} + A^* + A$ agree with H_T . This T is bounded, see Eq. (47), so it is in particular Kato-bounded with respect to H_0 . Thus, Theorem 3.3 applies, rendering statement (a).

(b) We would like to apply Theorem 3.4. Conditions (i) and (ii) have already been verified. Proposition 4.1 now provides us, for each form factor f_j , a sequence of regularized form factors $\{f_{j,n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{H}$ such that $\|f_{j,n} - f_j\|_{\mathcal{H}_{-s}} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and

$$\|a(f_{j,n}) - a(f_j)\|_{\mathcal{F}_s \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} \rightarrow 0, \quad \|a^*(f_{j,n}) - a^*(f_j)\|_{\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{-s}} \rightarrow 0. \quad (68)$$

Correspondingly, we define the regularized operators as in Eq. (14)

$$A_n := \sum_{j=1}^N B_j^* \otimes a(f_{j,n}), \quad A_n^* := \sum_{j=1}^N B_j \otimes a^*(f_{j,n}), \quad (69)$$

which are obviously closable as $f_{j,n} \in \mathcal{H}$. Furthermore, for $\Psi \in \mathfrak{H}_1$, introducing the number operator $\mathcal{N} := d\Gamma(1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_n^\sharp \Psi\| &\leq \sum_{j=1}^N \|B_j\| \| (I \otimes a^\sharp(f_{j,n})) \Psi \| \leq \sum_{j=1}^N \|B_j\| \|f_{j,n}\|_{\mathcal{H}} \|(\mathcal{N} + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Psi\| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^N \|B_j\| \|f_{j,n}\|_{\mathcal{H}} (\min\{m_0, 1\})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|(H_{\text{free}} + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Psi\| \leq c \|\Psi\|_{\mathfrak{H}_1} \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

for some $c > 0$, so $A_n|_{\mathfrak{H}_1} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}_1, \mathfrak{H})$ and $\text{Dom}(A_n) \supset \mathfrak{H}_1$, which establishes requirement (iii). Furthermore, Eq. (70) implies that there is some $C > 0$, such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$:

$$\|A_n \Psi\| \leq C \|(H_{\text{free}} + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Psi\| \leq C(\varepsilon \|(H_{\text{free}} + 1) \Psi\| + \varepsilon^{-1} \|\Psi\|). \quad (71)$$

So $A_n^* + A_n$ is infinitesimally Kato-bounded against $(H_{\text{free}} + 1)$ and thus also against H_{free} , which establishes requirement (iv). Concerning requirement (v), the convergence (68) implies

$$\|A_n - A\|_{\mathfrak{H}_s \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}} \leq \sum_{j=1}^N \|B_j\| \|a(f_{j,n}) - a(f_j)\|_{\mathcal{F}_s \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} \rightarrow 0, \quad (72)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. So in particular, $\|A_n - A\|_{\mathfrak{H}_2 \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}} \rightarrow 0$, which is requirement (v).

Finally, for (vi), we just choose $E_n = 0$. By the same mapping property argument as in Eq. (47), $A_n R A_n^*$ is bounded, so it is relatively bounded with respect to any symmetric operator with relative bound 0. Further, boundedness of T implies $\text{Dom}(T) = \mathfrak{H}$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_n R A_n^* + E_n + T\|_{\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}} &= \|A_n R A_n^* - A R A^*\|_{\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}} \\ &\leq \underbrace{\|A_n - A\|_{\mathfrak{H}_s \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}}}_{\rightarrow 0} \underbrace{\|R A_n^*\|_{\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}_s}}_{< \infty} + \underbrace{\|A R\|_{\mathfrak{H}_{-s} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}}}_{< \infty} \underbrace{\|A_n^* - A^*\|_{\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}_{-s}}}_{\rightarrow 0} \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

where $\|A_n^* - A^*\|_{\mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}_{-s}} \rightarrow 0$ follows from Eq. (68) by the same arguments as in (72). This also establishes (vi).

Consequently, Theorem 3.4 applies, and we obtain the desired convergence (15). \square

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this work, we have discussed the ultraviolet renormalization problem for generalized spin–boson models, exploiting the abstract framework provided by Posilicano in [22]. By this technique, under suitable requirements, we were able to provide an explicit expression for the self-adjointness domain of the Hamiltonian. The requirements include the choice of form factors $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{H}_{-1}$ (Case 1, see Eq. (11)), so they exhibit “mild” ultraviolet divergences, as well as Assumption 1.1 on the operators B_1, \dots, B_N modulating the interaction between the quantum system and the boson field. Furthermore, it was shown that such models can be obtained as the norm resolvent limit of their regularized versions (e.g., those in which an ultraviolet cut-off is imposed). This generalizes the results presented in [23, Section 4], where the existence of a self-adjoint realization of generalized spin–boson models was proven through perturbative methods.

The research initiated in this paper offers, among others, two clear routes of continuation. First, the conditions on the matrices B_1, \dots, B_N , while reasonably general and including many cases of physical interest, are likely prone to be relaxed. This is strongly suggested by the results in [23, Sections 5–6] and [25], where an explicit expression for the self-adjointness domain fully compatible with the one provided here (cf. [25, Remark 3.8]) was obtained for a class of models corresponding to a choice of B_1, \dots, B_N which *violates* Assumption 1.1. An extension of our results to the case of an infinite-dimensional quantum system interacting with the field is also foreseeable along the lines depicted in Remark 1.5.

Second, the abstract framework developed by Posilicano is naturally suited to treat the case of “strong” ultraviolet divergences belonging to Case 2. As already discussed (cf. Remark 3.6), additional care is required in this case in order to properly choose the operator T entering the statements of Theorem 3.2–3.4: while for mild divergences the “minimal” choice $T = -ARA^*$ is available (and bounded), novel mathematical intricacies appear when renormalization enters the game. Future research will be devoted to this topic.

Acknowledgments. This research was supported by the European Research Council (ERC) through the Starting Grant FERMIMATH, Grant Agreement No. 101040991 of Niels Benedikter, by “Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare” (INFN) through the project “QUANTUM”, by the Italian National Group of Mathematical Physics (GNFM–INdAM), and by European Union – NextGenerationEU (CN00000013 – “National Center for HPC, Big Data and Quantum Computing”). D.L. thanks the Department of Mathematics at “Università degli Studi di Milano” for its hospitality.

REFERENCES

- [1] 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.
- [2] 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.
- [3] M. Hübner and H. Spohn. “Spectral properties of the spin-boson Hamiltonian”. *Annales de l’I.H.P. Physique théorique* **62** (1995), 289–323.
- [4] M. Hirokawa. “An expression of the ground state energy of the Spin-Boson model”. *Journal of Functional Analysis* **162** (1999), 178–218.
- [5] 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.
- [6] A. Amann. “Ground states of a spin-boson model”. *Annals of Physics* **208** (1991), 414–448.
- [7] E. B. Davies. “Symmetry breaking for molecular open systems”. *Annales de l’I.H.P. Physique théorique* **35** (1981), 149–171.
- [8] M. Fannes, B. Nachtergaele, and A. Verbeure. “The equilibrium states of the spin-boson model”. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **114** (1988), 537–548.
- [9] M. Hübner and H. Spohn. “Radiative decay: nonperturbative approaches”. *Reviews in Mathematical Physics* **7** (1995), 363–387.
- [10] J. Reker. “Existence of resonances for the spin-boson model with critical coupling function”. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* **483** (2020), 123628.
- [11] 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.
- [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] J. Dereziński. “Van Hove Hamiltonians – Exactly Solvable Models of the Infrared and Ultraviolet Problem”. *Annales Henri Poincaré* **4** (2003), 713–738.
- [19] C. J. Fewster and K. Rejzner. “Algebraic Quantum Field Theory – an introduction”. *F. Finster, D. Giulini, J. Kleiner, & J. Tolksdorf (Eds.), Progress and Visions in Quantum Theory in View of Gravity: Bridging Foundations of Physics and Mathematics*. Birkhauser, 2020.
- [20] S. Lill. “Time Dynamics in Quantum Field Theory Systems”. PhD thesis. U. Tübingen, 2022.
- [21] S. Lill. “Extended State Space for describing renormalized Fock spaces in QFT”. arXiv:2012.12608 (2020).
- [22] A. Posilicano. “On the self-adjointness of $H+A^*+A$ ”. *Mathematical Physics, Analysis and Geometry* **23** (2020), 1–31.
- [23] D. Lonigro. “Generalized spin-boson models with non-normalizable form factors”. *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **63** (2022), 072105.
- [24] D. Lonigro. “Renormalization of spin–boson interactions mediated by singular form factors”. arXiv:2210.15267 (2022).
- [25] D. Lonigro. “Self-Adjointness of a Class of Multi-Spin–Boson Models with Ultraviolet Divergences”. *Mathematical Physics, Analysis and Geometry* **26** (2023), 15.
- [26] E. Nelson. “Interaction of nonrelativistic particles with a quantized scalar field”. *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **5** (1964), 1190–1197.
- [27] J. P. Eckmann. “A model with persistent vacuum”. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **18** (1970), 247–264.
- [28] J. Fröhlich. “On the infrared problem in a model of scalar electrons and massless, scalar bosons”. *Annales de l’institut Henri Poincaré. Section A, Physique Théorique* **19** (1973), 1–103.
- [29] A. D. Sloan. “The polaron without cutoffs in two space dimensions”. *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **15** (1974), 190–201.
- [30] M. Griesemer and A. Wünsch. “Self-adjointness and domain of the Fröhlich Hamiltonian”. *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **57** (2016), 021902.
- [31] M. Griesemer and A. Wünsch. “On the domain of the Nelson Hamiltonian”. *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **59** (2018), 042111.
- [32] L. Gross. “The relativistic polaron without cutoffs”. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **31** (1973), 25–73.
- [33] S. Teufel and R. Tumulka. “Hamiltonians without ultraviolet divergence for quantum field theories”. *Quantum Studies: Mathematics and Foundations* **8** (2021), 17–35.
- [34] 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.
- [35] 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.
- [36] J. Lampart and J. Schmidt. “On Nelson-type Hamiltonians and abstract boundary conditions”. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **367** (2019), 629–663.
- [37] J. Lampart. “A nonrelativistic quantum field theory with point interactions in three dimensions”. *Annales Henri Poincaré* **20** (2019), 3509–3541.
- [38] J. Schmidt. “The massless Nelson Hamiltonian and its domain”. *Mathematical Challenges of Zero-Range Physics: Models, Methods, Rigorous Results, Open Problems*. Springer. 2021, 57–80.
- [39] J. Lampart. “The renormalized Bogoliubov–Fröhlich Hamiltonian”. *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **61** (2020), 101902.
- [40] J. Glimm and A. Jaffe. “A $\lambda\phi^4$ Quantum Field Theory without Cutoffs. I”. *Physical Review* **176** (1968), 1945.
- [41] J. Glimm and A. Jaffe. “The $\lambda(\varphi^4)_2$ quantum field theory without cutoffs: II. The field operators and the approximate vacuum”. *Annals of Mathematics* (1970), 362–401.
- [42] J. Glimm and A. Jaffe. “The $\lambda(\varphi^4)_2$ quantum field theory without cutoffs: III. The physical vacuum”. *Acta Mathematica* **125** (1970), 203–267.

- [43] J. Glimm and A. Jaffe. “The Yukawa₂ quantum field theory without cutoffs”. *Journal of Functional Analysis* **7** (1971), 323–357.
- [44] J. Glimm and A. Jaffe. “Positivity of the φ Hamiltonian”. *Fortschritte der Physik* **21** (1973), 327–376.
- [45] R. Haag. “On quantum field theories”. *Danske Videnskabernes Selskab Matematisk-Fysiske Meddelelser* **29** (1955).
- [46] R. Haag. *Local Quantum Physics: Fields, particles, algebras*. Springer Science & Business Media, 1996.
- [47] I. Segal. “Notes toward the construction of nonlinear relativistic quantum fields, I. The Hamiltonian in two space-time dimensions as the generator of a C^* -automorphism group”. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **57** (1967), 1178–1183.
- [48] M. Dedushenko. “Snowmass white paper: The quest to define QFT”. *International Journal of Modern Physics A* **38** (2023), 2330002.
- [49] S. J. Summers. “A perspective on constructive quantum field theory”. arXiv:1203.3991 (2012).
- [50] 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.
- [51] H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione. *The theory of open quantum systems*. Oxford University Press on Demand, 2002.
- [52] U. Weiss. *Quantum dissipative systems*. Vol. 13. World Scientific, 2012.
- [53] R. H. Dicke. “Coherence in spontaneous radiation processes”. *Physical Review* **93** (1954), 99.
- [54] M. Gross and S. Haroche. “Superradiance: An essay on the theory of collective spontaneous emission”. *Physics Reports* **93** (1982), 301–396.
- [55] A. F. Van Loo, A. Fedorov, K. Lalumiere, B. C. Sanders, A. Blais, and A. Wallraff. “Photon-mediated interactions between distant artificial atoms”. *Science* **342** (2013), 1494–1496.
- [56] U Dorner and P Zoller. “Laser-driven atoms in half-cavities”. *Physical Review A* **66** (2002), 023816.
- [57] T. Tufarelli, F. Ciccarello, and M. Kim. “Dynamics of spontaneous emission in a single-end photonic waveguide”. *Physical Review A* **87** (2013), 013820.
- [58] 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.
- [59] A. González-Tudela, V. Paulisch, H. Kimble, and J. I. Cirac. “Efficient multiphoton generation in waveguide quantum electrodynamics”. *Physical Review Letters* **118** (2017), 213601.
- [60] 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.
- [61] 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.
- [62] D. Lonigro and D. Chruściński. “Quantum regression beyond the Born-Markov approximation for generalized spin-boson models”. *Physical Review A* **105** (2022), 052435.
- [63] D. Lonigro and D. Chruściński. “Quantum regression in dephasing phenomena”. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **55** (2022), 225308.
- [64] A. Arai, M. Hirokawa, and F. Hiroshima. “On the absence of eigenvectors of Hamiltonians in a class of massless quantum field models without infrared cutoff”. *Journal of Functional Analysis* **168** (1999), 470–497.
- [65] J. Dereziński and V. Jakšić. “Spectral theory of Pauli–Fierz operators”. *Journal of Functional Analysis* **180** (2001), 243–327.
- [66] V Jakšić, E. Kritchevski, and C.-A. Pillet. “Mathematical theory of the Wigner-Weisskopf atom”. *Large Coulomb Systems: Lecture Notes on Mathematical Aspects of QED* (2006), 145–215.
- [67] V. Bach, M. Ballesteros, M. Könenberg, and L. Menrath. “Existence of ground state eigenvalues for the spin–boson model with critical infrared divergence and multiscale analysis”. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* **453** (2017), 773–797.
- [68] T. N. Dam and J. S. Møller. “Asymptotics in Spin-Boson type models”. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **374** (2020), 1389–1415.
- [69] S. Albeverio and P. Kurasov. *Singular perturbations of differential operators: solvable Schrödinger-type operators*. Vol. 271. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [70] S. Albeverio, S. Kuzhel, and L. Nizhnik. “Singularly perturbed self-adjoint operators in scales of Hilbert spaces”. *Ukrainian Mathematical Journal* **59** (2007), 787–810.

- [71] B. Simon. “Spectral analysis of rank one perturbations and applications”. *CRM Lecture Notes*. Vol. 8. 1995, 109–149.
- [72] Q. Xie, H. Zhong, M. T. Batchelor, and C. Lee. “The quantum Rabi model: solution and dynamics”. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **50** (2017), 113001.
- [73] D. Braak. “Integrability of the Rabi model”. *Physical Review Letters* **107** (2011), 100401.
- [74] M.-J. Hwang, R. Puebla, and M. B. Plenio. “Quantum phase transition and universal dynamics in the Rabi model”. *Physical Review Letters* **115** (2015), 180404.
- [75] H. Zhong, Q. Xie, M. T. Batchelor, and C. Lee. “Analytical eigenstates for the quantum Rabi model”. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **46** (2013), 415302.
- [76] G. S. Agarwal. “Rotating-wave approximation and spontaneous emission”. *Physical Review A* **4** (1971), 1778.