

Boson Clustering and Low-Density Properties at High Temperatures

Xin-Hai Tong^{*},¹ Tomotaka Kuwahara^{†,2,3} and Zongping Gong^{‡4}

¹*Department of Physics, The University of Tokyo,*

5-1-5 Kashiwanoha, Kashiwa-shi, Chiba 277-8574, Japan^{}*

²*Analytical Quantum Complexity RIKEN Hakubi Research Team,*

RIKEN Center for Quantum Computing (RQC), 2-1 Hirosawa, Wako, Saitama 351-0198, Japan

³*PRESTO, Japan Science and Technology (JST), Kawaguchi, Saitama 332-0012, Japan[†]*

⁴*Department of Applied Physics, The University of Tokyo,*

7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-8656, Japan[‡]

(Dated: November 19, 2024)

In statistical and quantum many-body physics, the correlation function is a fundamental quantity, especially for lattice models described by local Hamiltonians. Away from the phase-transition point, correlation function typically satisfies the clustering property, meaning that the correlation concentrates at short ranges while decays rapidly (exponentially) at long distances. Though the clustering property has been extensively studied for spin and fermion systems, whether a similar result holds for boson systems remains a long-standing open problem. The essential difficulty lies in the infinite Hilbert-space dimension of a boson, in stark contrast to the finite dimension of a spin or fermion. This work is devoted to establishing the boson counterpart of the clustering of correlations at high temperatures, focusing primarily on the canonical Bose-Hubbard model. As a byproduct, we rigorously justify the low-boson-density assumption for the Gibbs state of the Bose-Hubbard model. This assumption is often invoked as a preliminary requirement for proving various rigorous results, including the boson Lieb-Robinson bound. Building on the results above, we show the specific heat density can be bounded above by a constant at high temperatures. Our achievement is based on the imaginary-time interaction picture, which is expected to have much broader applications to other open problems concerning bosons in statistical and quantum many-body physics.

I. INTRODUCTION

The correlation function quantifies how physical quantities are interrelated across different positions (and times). It has been proven crucial across diverse topics of statistical physics, ranging from critical phenomena and phase transitions [1–6], to nonequilibrium dynamics and irreversible processes [7–12]. There has been a long history of studies on correlation functions in lattice models in classical and quantum statistical physics described by local Hamiltonians, such as Ising model [13, 14], Potts model [15, 16], Hubbard model [17] and so on. By locality we refer to the property that the Hamiltonian can be expressed as a sum of terms, each acting only on a few geometrically adjacent sites within the lattice [18–20].

Remarkably, in a local system not at a critical point, the correlation function inherits the clustering theorem, which states that its magnitude adheres to an exponentially decaying upper bound concerning the distance [19–28]. The exponential clustering of the correlation, is widely used as a prerequisite to investigate various problems in statistical and quantum many-body physics. Examples include information propagation in quantum dynamics [23, 24, 29–35], entanglement area law [36–38] and complexity-theoretical analysis [18, 24, 39–42]. These results not only provide us with a deeper understanding of the fundamental properties arising from locality of quantum systems, but also serve as beneficial guiding prin-

ciples for practical applications in the fields of quantum information/computing [34, 43–47] and non-equilibrium physics [18, 48–52].

Historically, the topic of clustering property dates all the way back to Ising, whose solution of the model named after him in one dimension demonstrated the absence of thermal phase transitions [14, 53]. Then during the study on the quantum counterpart of Ising’s result, Araki [54] proved clustering property for any locally interacting 1D quantum spin chain at arbitrary temperatures, ruling out the possibility of thermal phase transition in general. A few decades later, Hastings and Koma [21] extended the clustering theorem to higher dimensional quantum spin (and fermion) lattices for gapped ground states by invoking the Lieb-Robinson bound [22, 55]. Parallel progress was made in finite temperature studies [28], leading to a completed proof for clustering property in the general quantum spin model at high temperatures [20].

All of the previous works focused on clustering theorem in fermionic/spin systems, characterized by finite-dimensional local Hilbert spaces. They failed to cover infinite-dimensional bosonic systems, which are equally ubiquitous and widely studied in the literature, especially in the context of ultracold atoms [56, 57], quantum computing [58–60] and condensed matter physics [61, 62]. The infinite dimensionality in the boson model, arising from the absence of the Pauli exclusion principle, can exhibit physics qualitatively different from fermions and spins. For example, the energy of bosons can be unbounded, so the specific heat (density) may remain finite in the infinite temperature limit. Instead, the specific heat necessarily tends to zero for a finite-level system of fermions or spins at infinite temperature, where the energy reaches its finite maximum. Moreover, many

^{*}xinhai@iis.u-tokyo.ac.jp

[†]tomotaka.kuwahara@riken.jp

[‡]gong@ap.t.u-tokyo.ac.jp

fermionic/spin systems with finite-dimensional Hilbert space are essentially idealized simplifications of physical setups. This is because the coupling between the system and environment is inevitable, where the latter is usually modeled as ensembles of harmonic oscillators, i.e., free bosons [63–65]. Therefore, it is urgent to develop analogous results for infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces and bosonic models, which would have profound implications for both theoretical research and practical applications.

In this work, for the first time, we prove the clustering property for correlation functions evaluated in the Gibbs state of locally interacting bosons at high temperatures. We focus primarily on the canonical Bose-Hubbard model, though the proof is applicable to much broader classes of bosonic models. The main idea is to perform cluster expansion around the Gibbs states with on-site interactions alone, as can be rigorously done in the imaginary-time interaction picture. On top of the exponential decay in distance, the bound shows unbounded growth in temperature for typical observables such as particle number and energy density, thus reflects both the bosonic nature of the system and its infinite dimensionality.

Another main contribution in this work is establishing an upper bound on the moment of the local particle number operator to arbitrary orders. This bound, sometimes called low-boson-density assumption if the growth in moment order is not too fast, has been frequently introduced as one of the preliminaries in many studies on rigorous results for bosons [32, 66–68], yet never justified unless the state is trivial (e.g., the product state). Following a similar proof for the clustering theorem, we prove this inequality for the high-temperature Gibbs state. Our result thus provides a rigorous justification for low-boson-density condition within the Bose-Hubbard class of models, which are of strong experimental relevance. Moreover, we point out that low density actually implies the (stretched) exponential decay of the particle number distribution.

As an application of our established clustering theorem and low-boson-density condition, we analyze the thermodynamics properties of the Bose-Hubbard model. In particular, we show that the specific heat density is upper bounded by a constant at high temperatures, which can be viewed as a weak version of the Dulong–Petit law. To the best of our knowledge, this claim, though well-known as a textbook-level statement in the context of Einstein or Debye theory of phonons, has never been rigorously proved for interacting bosons. This result immediately implies the temperature-linear upper bound for the energy.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we introduce the setup, notations and main conclusion of the present work. In Sec. III we discuss some useful techniques that will be frequently recalled later. In Sec. IV we establish the bound for thermal average of the local particle number, which serves as the basic lemma prepared for the proofs in subsequent sections. In Sec. V we first show the proof for low-boson-density assumption. Then the proof for clustering property is given in Sec. VI, by revisiting the previous techniques and re-

sults. In Sec. VII we derive a weak version of the Dulong–Petit law as the application of the established results. In Sec. VIII we list some further discussions. We summarize this paper in Sec. IX with a few future prospects. Throughout this paper, we set $\hbar = k_B = 1$ and $\beta = 1/T$, with k_B being the Boltzmann constant and T being the temperature if there is no special reminder. Besides, we call the constants that are independent of the system size and β as $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constants, which may nevertheless depend on other prescribed finite, intensive physical quantities.

II. SETUP AND MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we give a pedagogical review of the Bose-Hubbard model and then reformulate it with a more convenient and compact notation, which will be used throughout this study. Later, we give a comprehensive summary of the main results for readers’ convenience.

A. Model and Notations

1. Bose-Hubbard model

For generality, we consider the inhomogeneous Bose-Hubbard model defined on the lattice, i.e.,

$$H = - \sum_{x \sim y} J_{xy} (a_x^\dagger a_y + \text{H.c.}) + \sum_{x \in V} \left[\frac{U_x}{2} n_x (n_x - 1) - \mu_x n_x \right]. \quad (1)$$

Here, a_x (a_x^\dagger) is the boson annihilation (creation) operator satisfying $[a_x, a_y^\dagger] = \delta_{xy}$ and $n_x := a_x^\dagger a_x$ is the local particle number operator at site x . The first and second summations in Eq. (1) are taken over all the nearest neighbors $x \sim y$ and the entire set of sites V , respectively. All the random parameters in Eq. (1) are uniformly bounded:

$$|J_{xy}| \leq J, \quad |\mu_x| \leq \mu, \quad 0 < U_{\min} \leq U_x \leq U_{\max}, \quad (2)$$

where we set the interaction to be positive (repulsive) so that the energy is lower-bounded and the Gibbs state is well-defined. Usually, we recast Eq. (1) in the form of

$$H = -I + W, \quad (3a)$$

$$I := \sum_{x \sim y} J_{xy} (a_x^\dagger a_y + \text{H.c.}), \quad (3b)$$

$$W := \sum_{x \in V} \left(\frac{U_x}{2} n_x^2 - \mu_{0,x} n_x \right) \quad (3c)$$

with $\mu_{0,x} := \mu_x + U_x/2$ bounded by $|\mu_{0,x}| \leq \mu + U_{\max}/2 =: \mu_0$. We denote the Gibbs state with respect to (w.r.t) H at temperature β as $\rho_\beta := e^{-\beta H} / \text{Tr} e^{-\beta H}$. We also use the shorthand $\langle X \rangle_{\beta Y} := \text{Tr} X e^{-\beta Y} / \text{Tr} e^{-\beta Y}$ to denote the general thermal average of operator X over the Gibbs state of Y at temperature β .




Figure 1: A mindmap of the main results, methodological framework and manuscript structure of this work. We present a comprehensive study on the high-temperature Gibbs state of the Bose-Hubbard model from various angles.

For later convenience, we first introduce a new set of notations that emphasizes the local nature of the Bose-Hubbard model. First we observe that while the hopping term I in Eq. (3) acts on the total Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} := \otimes_{x \in V} \mathcal{H}_x$, each specific term denoted as h_λ in I only acts nontrivially on $\otimes_{x \in \lambda} \mathcal{H}_x$, where we also use $\lambda = \text{Supp } h_\lambda \subset V$ to denote the support of h_λ and call it as an edge. By denoting the edge set, which is the collection of all edges, as E , we can reformulate Eq. (3) as follows

$$I = \sum_{\lambda \in E} h_\lambda, \quad W = \sum_{x \in V} W_x \quad (4)$$

with $h_\lambda = J_{x_1 x_2} (a_{x_1}^\dagger a_{x_2} + a_{x_2}^\dagger a_{x_1})$ for $\lambda = \{x_1, x_2\}$ and $W_x := U_x n_x^2 / 2 - \mu_{0,x} n_x$. Correspondingly, we call V as the vertex set and the tuple (V, E) as the interaction graph [20].

2. Interaction Graph

Next, we investigate the local property of the interaction graph (V, E) . For any edge subset $G \subset E$, its complement $G^c := E \setminus G$, extension $\bar{G} := \{\lambda \in E \mid \exists \lambda' \in G : \lambda' \cap \lambda \neq \emptyset\}$ and boundary $\partial G := \bar{G} \setminus G$ are also well-defined edge subsets. Each given edge subset $G \subset E$ generates a vertex subset, denoted by $V_G := \{x \mid \exists \lambda \in G, x \in \lambda\}$. The truncated hopping and

on-site term for G can also be defined as $I_G := \sum_{\lambda \in G} h_\lambda$ and $W_{V_G} = \sum_{x \in V_G} W_x$, which further leads to the truncated Hamiltonian $H_G := -I_G + W_{V_G}$. Noting that the supports of V_G and G coincide, it's also reasonable to introduce the notations $I_{V_G} \equiv I_G$ and $H_{V_G} \equiv H_G$ whenever convenient. We should emphasize that the vertex




Figure 2: A 2D square lattice as an illustration of the relation $(V_G)^c = V_{G^c} = V_G^c$.

subsets V_G and $(V_G)^c := V_{G^c} \equiv V_G^c$ are sufficient for covering all sites $x \in V$. Therefore, there is no need to include additional subsets such as $V_{\partial G}$. Conversely, each given vertex subset $V' \subset V$ also generates two edge subsets, denoted by $G_{V'} := \{\lambda \mid \exists x \in V', x \in \lambda\}$ and $G_{V'}^{\text{inner}} := \{\lambda \mid \lambda \subset V'\}$ respectively. With these defini-

tions, we denote the boundary of an observable X as $\partial X := G_{\text{Supp } X} / G_{\text{Supp } X}^{\text{inner}}$, i.e., the edges across the boundary of $\text{Supp } X$. We also use the symbol V_X , G_X and G_X^{in} for a shorthand for its support $\text{Supp } X$, its corresponding edge subsets $G_{\text{Supp } X}$ and $G_{\text{Supp } X}^{\text{inner}}$ respectively when no potential confusion arises.

See Fig. 2 for an intuitive demonstration with many definitions included.

3. Norms

Throughout this paper, we recurrently use the Schatten p norm for $p \in [1, \infty]$ defined by

$$\|X\|_p := (\text{Tr}|X|^p)^{1/p} = \left[\sum_l s_l(X)^p \right]^{1/p} \quad (5)$$

with $|X| := \sqrt{X^\dagger X}$ and $\{s_l(X)\}_l$ denoting the singular values of X to measure the magnitude of the operator X . Here we have implicitly assumed X to be a trace class satisfying $\|X\|_1 = \text{Tr}|X| < \infty$, so that $\|X\|_p$ is well-defined, a point we will return to later. The arguably most commonly used Schatten norms are the ones corresponding to $p = 1, 2$ and ∞ , which are also called trace norm, Hilbert-Schmidt norm and operator norm, respectively [69]. Different norms can be linked by the Hölder's inequality [70]

$$\|X_1 X_2\|_p \leq \|X_1\|_{p_1} \|X_2\|_{p_2} \quad (6)$$

for $p^{-1} = p_1^{-1} + p_2^{-1}$. In later sections, we will use Eq. (6) by setting $(p, p_1, p_2) = (1, 1, \infty)$ or $(1, 2, 2)$. Usually, we use the shorthand $\|\bullet\| \equiv \|\bullet\|_\infty$ for the operator norm. For the tensor product of the operators, its norm can be obtained by

$$\|X_1 \otimes X_2\|_p = \|X_1\|_p \|X_2\|_p, \quad (7)$$

since the combination of singular values of the individual operators $\{s_{l_1}(X_1)s_{l_2}(X_2)\}_{(l_1, l_2)}$ coincides with the singular values of their tensor products [71].

It should be highlighted that we use the shorthand X rather than $\mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1} \dots \otimes X \otimes \dots \mathbb{1}$ to denote a local operator X with $V_X \subset V$. This fact warns us not to involve $\|\mathbb{1}\|_1$ or $\|\mathbb{1}\|_2$ when using Eqs. (6) and (7), for both of these two norms are unbounded. The reason is, now the local Hilbert space has infinite dimensions $\dim \mathcal{H}_x = \infty, \forall x \in V$, which formally results in $\|\mathbb{1}\|_1, \|\mathbb{1}\|_2 = \infty$ by definition [cf. Eq. (5)]. Nevertheless, the operator norm of the identity $\|\mathbb{1}\|_\infty = 1$ is well-defined.

B. Summary of Results

In this subsection, we summarize the main contributions of this study.

- (i) *Upper bound for thermal average of particle number n_x with optimal temperature scaling.*—We focus on the high temperature Gibbs state for the

Bose-Hubbard model. Then we show that the thermal average of the local particle number operator $\langle n_x \rangle_{\beta H}$ at any given site can be expressed as [cf. Lemma 1] is upper bounded by

$$\langle n_x \rangle_{\beta H} \leq \frac{C_2}{\sqrt{\beta}} \quad (8)$$

with $C_2 = \mathcal{O}(1)$. This bound exhibits the same scaling behavior with respect to β as observed in the on-site case ($J_{xy} = 0$) of Eq. (24), so the temperature scaling is indeed optimal. Interestingly, Eq. (8) suggests the existence of the hopping term does not affect the temperature scaling of the bound. As detailed below, we also observe this phenomenon for the upper bound of $\langle n_x^s \rangle_{\beta H}$ with $s = 2, 3, \dots$. Equation (8) serves as a fundamental lemma that helps us to derive all subsequent main results. More significantly, some techniques utilized for achieving Eq. (8), such as the interaction picture and cluster expansion, will be frequently recalled to treat later problems.

- (ii) *Proof for low-boson-density assumption.*—We generalized Lemma 1 and find this results essentially implies the following relation [cf. Corollary 1] for the high temperature Gibbs state of the Bose-Hubbard model:

$$\langle n_x^s \rangle_{\beta H} \leq \frac{1}{e} \left(\frac{\kappa_1}{e} s^{\kappa_2} \right)^s, \quad s \in \mathbb{N}^+ \quad (9)$$

where $\kappa_{1,2} = \mathcal{O}(1)$ are independent from system size and s . This inequality (9) is called the low-boson-density assumption and introduced as the basic prerequisite by many studies on rigorous results for bosons [32, 66–68]. Here, our result actually provides a physical justification for Eq. (9) within the thermal state of Bose-Hubbard class Hamiltonian. It is worth highlighting that to achieve Eq. (9), we first obtain a more general result in terms of local operator X [cf. Theorem 1] at high temperature:

$$|\langle X \rangle_{\beta H}| \leq C_6 \|X e^{-\mathcal{X}}\| + |\langle X \rangle_{\beta W_{V_X}}|. \quad (10)$$

with $C_6 = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and $\|\bullet\|$ denoting the operator norm. Here, $\mathcal{X} := \alpha \sum_{x \in V_X} n_x$ with $\alpha = c\sqrt{\beta}$ and $c = \mathcal{O}(1)$ can be chosen flexibly. Then by choosing $X = n_x^s$ we arrive at Eq. (9).

- (iii) *Proof for boson clustering at high temperatures.*—By considering the previously developed techniques in doubled Hilbert space [72], we manage to show (at high temperatures) the following inequality [cf. Theorem 2] for the correlation function [cf. Eq. (58)] defined for two spatially separated local operators:

$$|C_\beta(X, Y)| \leq C_7 \|X e^{-\mathcal{X}}\| \|Y e^{-\mathcal{Y}}\| e^{-\text{dist}(X, Y)/\xi(\beta)}. \quad (11)$$

with $\xi(\beta)$, $\text{dist}(X, Y)$ and C_7 being the correlation length [cf. Eq. (81)], distance [cf. Eq. (59)] and $\mathcal{O}(1)$

constant, respectively. Here, $\mathcal{X} := \alpha \sum_{x \in V_X} n_x$, $\mathcal{Y} := \alpha \sum_{x \in V_Y} n_x$ with $\alpha = c\sqrt{\beta}$ and $c = \mathcal{O}(1)$ can be chosen spatially separated. This bound (11) provides the bosonic version of the clustering property, which has long been discussed in fermionic/spin system. One of the fundamental challenges in establishing the boson clustering property lies in dealing with infinite dimensionality inherent to bosonic systems. This essential difficulty is resolved by combining the interaction picture with cluster expansion techniques.

- (iv) *Bounding specific heat by $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant.*—Applying the clustering property [cf. Eq. (11)], we obtain an $\mathcal{O}(1)$ upper bound for the heat capacity density [cf. Corollary 2] at high temperature, which further implies the linear-temperature upper bound for the energy density.

We refer the readers to Fig. 1 for the visualization capturing our main findings.

III. REVIEW OF CLUSTER EXPANSION AND WARM UP

In this section, we review the cluster expansion technique in detail and apply it to rewrite the imaginary time evolution operator in the interaction picture. Then, we introduce several lemmas to reformulated the thermal average of bosonic operators into a more compact form for later convenience. All the techniques discussed below will be frequently revisited in subsequent sections.

A. Interaction Picture

The operator norms of local Hamiltonians and observables are bounded in quantum spin/fermionic systems [18, 20, 69]. That is, we have $\|h_\lambda\| < \infty$ and $\|X\| < \infty$ for any edge $\lambda \in E$ and any observable X of interest. Due to the infinite dimensionality, one can readily verify from Eq. (4) that $\|h_\lambda\|$ with $\lambda \in E$ diverges for the Bose-Hubbard model. The norm $\|X\|$ is also unbounded for most physically relevant bosonic operators such as $X = n_x$ with $x \in V$. As mentioned previously, the divergence of the norms resulting from the boson nature is one of the essential difficulties in proving boson clustering property and many other related claims. As we will see in later sections, the interaction picture technique [28] introduced below helps to confront this challenging task. Also, the interaction picture enables one to separate the hopping and on-site terms apart, which makes further analysis much more convenient.

To demonstrate our motivation clearly, we start from the thermal average for operator X over the Gibbs state of the Bose-Hubbard model:

$$\langle X \rangle_{\beta H} := \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)} \text{Tr} X e^{-\beta H} \quad (12)$$

with $\mathcal{Z}(\beta) := \text{Tr} e^{-\beta H}$ being the partition function. The main idea of the interaction picture is to find the operator $S(\beta)$ satisfying

$$e^{-\beta H} = e^{-\beta W} S(\beta). \quad (13)$$

The solution to Eq. (13) can be expressed via the Dyson series

$$\begin{aligned} S(\beta) &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \int_0^\beta d\tau_1 \int_0^{\tau_1} d\tau_2 \dots \int_0^{\tau_{m-1}} d\tau_m \\ &\quad \times I(\tau_1) I(\tau_2) \dots I(\tau_m) \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \int_{\vec{\tau} \in \mathcal{T}_m} \mathcal{D}\vec{\tau} \prod_{i=1}^m I(\tau_i). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Here, we used the notation $\bullet(\tau) := e^{\tau W} \bullet e^{-\tau W}$ and the convention that the term with $m = 0$ corresponds to the identity $\mathbb{1}$. To obtain the second line of Eq. (14), we introduced $\mathcal{D}\vec{\tau} := d\tau_1 d\tau_2 \dots d\tau_m$ with $\vec{\tau} := (\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_m)$ and used $\mathcal{T}_m := \{\vec{\tau} | 0 \leq \tau_m \leq \dots \leq \tau_2 \leq \tau_1 \leq \beta\}$ to denote the hyper-triangle region. Note that we can expand the integrand of Eq. (14) explicitly in the form of

$$\prod_{i=1}^m I(\tau_i) = \prod_{i=1}^m \left[\sum_{\lambda \in E} h_\lambda(\tau_i) \right] = \sum_{\{\lambda_k \in E\}_{k=1}^m} \prod_{i=1}^m h_{\lambda_i}(\tau_i). \quad (15)$$

The summation on the right-hand side (RHS) of Eq. (15) motivates us to introduce a more compact notation customized for cluster expansion.

B. Cluster Expansion I: Alphabet and Words

Expansion of a certain quantity w.r.t a series of clusters, first proposed in Ref. [73], has now been proven to be a powerful tool for exploring various problems in statistical physics [69, 74]. To address this technique in a general form, we first give several new definitions.

Following the terminology of free Lie algebra [75, 76], we identify the edges as letters and the edge set E as the alphabet. A word w is defined as an ordered sequence of letters (repetition is allowed) and the total number of letters contained in w is called its length and denoted by $|w|$. Therefore, we can represent the word w by $w = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{|w|})$ or $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{|w|})$, possibly with $\lambda_i = \lambda_j$ for some $i \neq j$ ($i, j = 1, 2, \dots, |w|$). The product of local Hamiltonians w.r.t a word w can then be denoted by $h(w) := h_{\lambda_1} h_{\lambda_2} \dots h_{\lambda_{|w|}}$. With an auxiliary vector $\vec{\tau} \in \mathcal{T}_{|w|}$, we introduce $h(w, \vec{\tau}) := h_{\lambda_1}(\tau_1) h_{\lambda_2}(\tau_2) \dots h_{\lambda_{|w|}}(\tau_{|w|})$ as a product of local Hamiltonians in the interaction picture corresponding to a given word w . Using this notation in Eq. (15) and substituting the results into Eq. (14), we convert the Dyson series in terms of

$$S(\beta) = \sum_{w \in E^*} \int_{\vec{\tau} \in \mathcal{T}_{|w|}} \mathcal{D}\vec{\tau} h(w, \vec{\tau}) := \sum_{w \in E^*} f(w). \quad (16)$$

Here, E^* represents the set of all the words with arbitrary length. Likewise, by G^* we denote the set of words with

letters in the edge subset $G \subset E$ with arbitrary length, which means any edge subset G can be identified as the subalphabet.

For any subalphabet G^* we can actually consider a similar relation like Eq. (13)

$$e^{-\beta H_G} = e^{-\beta W_{V_G}} S[I_G](\beta), \quad (17)$$

where

$$S[I_G](\beta) = \sum_{w \in G^*} \int_{\vec{\tau} \in \mathcal{T}_{|w|}} \mathcal{D}\vec{\tau} h(w, \vec{\tau}) := \sum_{w \in G^*} f(w) \quad (18)$$

with $f(w)$ evaluated via only picking the edges in G .

Equations (13) and (16) enable us to bound Eq. (12) in the form of

$$\langle X \rangle_{\beta H} \leq \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{C}(G_X)} \text{Tr} X e^{-\beta W} f(w) + \langle X \rangle_{\beta W_{V_X}} \quad (19)$$


with $W_{V_X} := \sum_{x \in V_X} W_x$. To derive Eq. (19), we first expand the Boltzmann factor $e^{-\beta H}$ using Eqs. (13) and (14). In this expansion, the terms without words overlapping with G_X contribute to the second term on the RHS of Eq. (19), appearing as a modified thermal average. The remaining overlapping terms form the first term denoted by $C_\beta(X)$ for brevity. The detailed proof for Eq. (19) is presented in Appendix A 1. In Eq. (19), the set $\mathcal{C}(G)$ collects all the words that overlap with $G \subset E$, where the terminology ‘‘overlap’’ between a word w and an edge subset G means w contains at least one letter from G and is denoted by $G_w \cap G \neq \emptyset$. Here, the edge subset G_w is obtained by removing all the repeated edges in a word w . To deal with the first term of Eq. (19), we need to consider a refined structure of $\mathcal{C}(G)$, which is closely related to the connectivity property of the interaction graph (V, E) as will be detailed in the next subsection.

C. Cluster Expansion II: Thermal Average Reformulated

To begin, we say an edge subset is connected, if any pair of its edges are connected. The word w is called a cluster in case G_w is a connected edge subset. We say the word w' is contained by $w \in E^*$ (denoted as $w' \subset w$) if w' can be obtained by deleting a certain set of letters from w . For any edge subset $G \subset E$, we denote $\mathcal{C}_{\geq L}(G)$ as the set of words which contains at least one cluster c such that $c \cap G \neq \emptyset$ and $|c| \geq L$. Then we recognize the set $\mathcal{C}(G_X)$ defined in Eq. (19) is identical to $\mathcal{C}_{\geq 1}(G_X)$. By $\mathcal{C}_{\geq L}^k(G)$ we denote the set of words which contains exactly k such clusters (which are disjoint) as defined in $\mathcal{C}_{\geq L}(G)$ (see Fig. 3).

Noticing $\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}_{\geq L}^k(G) = \mathcal{C}_{\geq L}(G)$, we further convert the first term on RHS of Eq. (19) to

$$C_\beta(X) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{C}_{\geq 1}^k(G_X)} \text{Tr} X e^{-\beta W} f(w), \quad (20)$$



subalphabet G and elements in $\mathcal{C}_{\geq 2}^1(G)$, $\mathcal{C}_{\geq 2}^2(G)$ and $[\mathcal{C}(G)]^c$

Figure 3: A 2D square lattice as an illustration of $\mathcal{C}_{\geq L}^k(G)$ and $\mathcal{C}(G)$.

which can be recast in the form of

$$C_\beta(X) = -\frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (-1)^m \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq 1}^m(G_X)} \text{Tr} X e^{-\beta W} \rho(G). \quad (21)$$

Here, the detailed derivation and explanation for the new definitions can be found in Appendix A 2. This identity (21) refines the thermal average of a given operator X into a series of edge subsets resolved by sizes and connectivities, to which many useful conclusions from graph theory are applicable as we will see later. Equations (19) and (21) are the starting point of this study and will be recalled frequently.

D. Further Discussion

In this subsection, we focus on some additional properties of the words and the interaction graph.

Recall that letters may repeat multiple times within a word. To describe this property we introduce the concept of multiplicity. We use integer $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, |G_w|\}$ to label the edges in an given word w . Then by $\mu_i(w) \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote the number of times an edge labeled by i appears in the word w , which is also called the edge-wise multiplicity of the i -th edge in the word w . Obviously, the size of a word can also given by the sum of all the edge-wise multiplicities:

$$|w| = \sum_{i=1}^{|G_w|} \mu_i(w), \quad (22)$$

where the length of the corresponding edge subset $|G_w|$ also equals the number of different edges contained by the word w . Sometimes it may be more convenient to consider the multiplicities w.r.t sites. To that end, we first denote the maximum degree of the interaction graph (V, E) as \mathfrak{d} , the maximal number of edges that share a common site or the maximal ‘‘directions’’ for a site to be contained in edges. Note that \mathfrak{d} is an $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant for an interaction graph (V, E) of a locally interacting system. For example we have $\mathfrak{d} = 2d$ for d -dimensional cubic


lattice with nearest neighbor hopping. For each site x in some word $w \in E^*$, it is contained by at most \mathfrak{d} different edges selected from G_w . We denote the multiplicities of those edges as $\{\mu_{x,\theta}(w)\}$ with $\theta = 1, 2, \dots, \mathfrak{d}$ labelling the directions accessible to the site x and we simply set $\mu_{x,\theta_0} = 0$ if there is no edge in the direction θ_0 for x . By denoting $V_w := \{x \mid \exists \lambda \in w, \lambda \ni x\}$ as the support of w , we note that the graph (V_w, G_w) is always a subgraph of (V, E) . Therefore, the maximum degree of (V_w, G_w) is also bounded from above by \mathfrak{d} .

To conclude this subsection, we list the following useful relations between edge-wise and vertex-wise multiplicities (see Appendix A 3 for the proof)

$$\sum_{x \in V_w} \sum_{\theta=1}^{\mathfrak{d}} \frac{\mu_{x,\theta}(w)}{2} = \sum_{i=1}^{|G_w|} \mu_i(w) \equiv |w| \quad (23a)$$

$$\prod_{x \in V_w} \prod_{\theta=1}^{\mathfrak{d}} \mu_{x,\theta}(w)! = \prod_{i=1}^{|G_w|} [\mu_i(w)!]^2. \quad (23b)$$

See Fig. 4 for a demonstration of the definitions introduced in this subsection.



the word w and the vertex subset V_w in the graph with $\mathfrak{d} = 4$

Figure 4: A 2D square lattice as an illustration of “directions” of the edges surrounding a given site x . We have $\mu_{x,\theta}(w) = 0$ for the directions $\theta = 1, 2, 3$. Edge multiplicities are represented by the differential line widths, with thicker lines indicating higher multiplicity values.

IV. BOUNDING LOCAL PARTICLE NUMBER

For the on-site Hamiltonian W [cf. Eq. (3c)], the temperature scaling of the thermal averaged particle number is straightforward to be obtained. More precisely, for the local particle number operator n_x ($\forall x \in V$) we have (see Appendix B 1 for the proof)

$$\langle n_x \rangle_{\beta W} \leq \frac{C_1}{\sqrt{\beta}} \quad (24)$$

with $C_1 = C_1(U_{\max}, U_{\min}, \mu)$ being an $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant. Similar analysis for $\langle n_x \rangle_{\beta H}$ is much more challenging due to the hopping term I [cf. Eq. (3b)]. Here, we explicitly show that $\langle n_x \rangle_{\beta H}$ share the same scaling as Eq. (24):

Lemma 1. In the Bose-Hubbard model [cf. Eq. (3)], the thermal average of the local particle number operator $\langle n_x \rangle_{\beta H}$ ($\forall x \in V$) satisfies the follow inequality

$$\langle n_x \rangle_{\beta H} \leq \frac{C_2}{\sqrt{\beta}} \quad (25)$$

for high temperature $\beta < \beta_{L1}^* = \mathcal{O}(1)$ with $C_2 = C_2(U_{\max}, U_{\min}, \mu, \beta_{L1}^*)$ being an $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant.

Though looks simple, Lemma 1 is the building block for nearly all the other theorems presented in later sections. The proof of Lemma 1 can be summarized as three steps. First, we choose $X = n_{x_0}$ in Eq. (19) to prepare for the further cluster expansion technique. Then by several Lemmas, we obtain the bound for each term resulting from the interacting picture (see the key intermediate result Eq. (33)). Finally, with the result from graph theory Lemma 9 we complete the sum and achieve the desired bound.

Proof. — We choose $X = n_{x_0}$ with $x_0 \in V$ in Eq. (19) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle n_{x_0} \rangle_{\beta H} &\leq \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{C}(G_{x_0})} \text{Tr } n_{x_0} e^{-\beta W} f(w) + \langle n_{x_0} \rangle_{\beta W_{x_0}} \\ &:= C_\beta(n_{x_0}) + \langle n_{x_0} \rangle_{\beta W_{x_0}}, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where we simplify G_X as $G_{x_0} := \{\lambda \mid x_0 \ni \lambda\}$ and notice that $V_X = x_0$. The second term of Eq. (26) can be obtained from Eq. (24), therefore our main focus is to bound the first term. With the help of Eq. (21) we further have

$$\begin{aligned} C_\beta(n_{x_0}) &= - \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (-1)^m \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq 1}^m(G_{x_0})} \text{Tr } n_{x_0} e^{-\beta W} \rho(G). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

After a little arrangement, we can find (see Appendix B 2 for details)

$$\rho(G) = S[I_{\overline{G}^c}](\beta) \prod_{j=1}^m \eta(G_j) \quad (28)$$

with

$$\eta(G) := \sum_{w \in G^*: G_w = G} f(w). \quad (29)$$

Here, we have used the decomposition $G = \bigcup_{j=1}^m G_j$ since none of the elements in $\{G_j\}_{j=1}^m$ overlap with one another. Substituting Eq. (28) into Eq. (27) and by Eq. (61)

we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
C_\beta(n_{x_0}) &= -\frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (-1)^m \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq 1}^m(G_{x_0})} \\
&\quad \text{Tr } n_{x_0} e^{-\beta H_{\overline{G}^c}} e^{-\beta W_{V_G}} \prod_{j=1}^m [\eta(G_j)] \\
&= -\frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (-1)^m \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq 1}^m(G_{x_0})} \\
&\quad \text{Tr } n_{x_0} e^{-\beta H_{\overline{G}^c}} \prod_{j=1}^m \left[e^{-\beta W_{V_{G_j}}} \eta(G_j) \right], \quad (30)
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used $e^{-\beta W_{V_G}} = \prod_{j=1}^m e^{-\beta W_{V_{G_j}}}$. From the constraint $G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq 1}^m(G_{x_0})$ we know $x_0 \in V_G$, or equivalently $x_0 \notin V_{\overline{G}^c}$. Therefore, we first switch the order of n_{x_0} and $e^{-\beta H_{\overline{G}^c}}$ and then decompose $n_{x_0} = \prod_{j=1}^m n_{G_j}$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
C_\beta(n_{x_0}) &= -\frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (-1)^m \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq 1}^m(G_{x_0})} \\
&\quad \text{Tr } e^{-\beta H_{\overline{G}^c}} \prod_{j=1}^m \left[n_{G_j} e^{-\beta W_{V_{G_j}}} \eta(G_j) \right] \\
&= -\frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (-1)^m \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq 1}^m(G_{x_0})} \sum_{\left\{ \begin{array}{l} w^{(j)} \in G_j^* \\ G_{w^{(j)}} = G_j \end{array} \right\}_{j=1}^m} \\
&\quad \text{Tr } e^{-\beta H_{\overline{G}^c}} \prod_{j=1}^m \left[n_{G_j} e^{-\beta W_{V_{G_j}}} f(w^{(j)}) \right]. \quad (31)
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we should emphasize that for a specific $j' \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ we have $n_{G_{j'}} = n_{x_0}$ and otherwise $n_{G_j} = \mathbb{1}$. To bound $|C_\beta(n_{x_0})|$, we naturally turn to first achieve the upper bound for

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \text{Tr } e^{-\beta H_{\overline{G}^c}} \prod_{j=1}^m \left[n_{G_j} e^{-\beta W_{V_{G_j}}} f(w^{(j)}) \right] \right| \\
&\leq \left\| e^{-\beta H_{\overline{G}^c}} \prod_{j=1}^m \left[n_{G_j} e^{-\beta W_{V_{G_j}}} f(w^{(j)}) \right] \right\|_1 \\
&= \mathcal{Z}_{\overline{G}^c}(\beta) \prod_{j=1}^m \left\| n_{G_j} e^{-\beta W_{V_{G_j}}} f(w^{(j)}) \right\|_1, \quad (32)
\end{aligned}$$

where we used $|\text{Tr } A| \leq \|A\|_1 = \text{Tr } |A|$ and defined $\mathcal{Z}_{\overline{G}^c}(\beta) := \text{Tr } e^{-\beta H_{\overline{G}^c}}$. In the last line of Eq. (32) we also noticed that the operators $H_{\overline{G}^c}$ and $n_{G_j} e^{-\beta W_{V_{G_j}}} f(w^{(j)})$ have disjoint supports, which together with the property Eq. (7) gives us the final result.

For sake of shortening the notation, we consider bounding $\|n_G e^{-\beta W_{V_G}} f(w)\|_1$ from above for any connected subalphabet and the word w satisfying $w \in G^*$ and

$G_w = G$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|n_G e^{-\beta W_{V_G}} f(w)\|_1 \\
&\leq \left(\frac{C_3(q_G!)}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{|V_G|} \left(\frac{C_4}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{q_G/2} \frac{(C_5\sqrt{\beta})^{|w|}}{|w|!} \prod_{i=1}^{|G|} \mu_i(w)! \quad (33)
\end{aligned}$$

with C_3, C_4, C_5 being $C_{2,5}, C_{2,2}, C_{2,8} := \mathcal{O}(1)$ defined in Eq. (B28). The quantity q_G denotes the number of boson (creation and annihilation) operators offered by n_G , actually $q_G = 2$ if $n_G = n_{x_0}$ and otherwise $q_G = 0$. The detailed proof of Eq. (33) can be found in Appendix B 3.

By applying Eq. (33) to all the subalphabets in $\{G_j\}_{j=1}^m$ and putting the results into Eq. (32) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\prod_{j=1}^m \left\| n_{G_j} e^{-\beta W_{V_{G_j}}} f(w^{(j)}) \right\|_1 \leq \left(\frac{C_4}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{q_G/2} \\
&\quad \times \left(\frac{C_3(q_G!)}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{|V_G|} \prod_{j=1}^m \frac{(C_5\sqrt{\beta})^{|w^{(j)}|}}{|w^{(j)}|!} \prod_{i=1}^{|G_j|} \mu_i(w^{(j)}), \quad (34)
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used $|V_G| = \sum_{j=1}^m |V_{G_j}|$ and $q_G = \sum_{j=1}^m q_{G_j}$ since $G = \bigcup_{j=1}^m G_j$. Equation (34) can be further simplified if we notice $q_G \equiv 2$ since $x_0 \in V_G$, with this fact and Eqs. (31) and (32) we achieve the follow inequality for $C_\beta(n_{x_0})$ (see Appendix B 4 for the detailed calculations)

$$|C_\beta(n_{x_0})| \leq \left(\frac{C_4}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right) \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq 1}^m(G_{x_0})} \left(\frac{C_{5,1}\beta^{1/2}}{1 - C_5\beta^{1/2}} \right)^{|G|}. \quad (35)$$

with $C_{5,1} = \mathcal{O}(1)$. We choose $\beta_{L1}^* = 1/(C_5 + C_{5,1})^2$ to ensure $C_{5,1}\sqrt{\beta}/(1 - C_5\sqrt{\beta}) \leq 1$ and recall Lemma 8 from Ref. [20] to further obtain

$$\sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq 1}^m(G_{x_0})} y(\beta)^{|G|} \leq \frac{1}{m!} \left[\sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq 1}(G_{x_0})} y(\beta)^{|G|} \right]^m \quad (36)$$

where we have denoted $y(\beta) := C_{5,1}\sqrt{\beta}/(1 - C_5\sqrt{\beta})$. The from Lemma 9 we advance with Eq. (36) by

$$\sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq 1}(G_{x_0})} y(\beta)^{|G|} \leq \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} |G_{x_0}| \sigma^l y(\beta)^l. \quad (37)$$

We denote $b(\beta) := \sigma y(\beta)$ and substitute Eq. (37) into Eq. (35) to acquire the result

$$\begin{aligned}
|C_\beta(n_{x_0})| &\leq \frac{C_4}{\sqrt{\beta}} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m!} \left[\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} |G_{x_0}| b(\beta)^l \right]^m \\
&= \frac{C_4}{\sqrt{\beta}} \left[\exp \left(|G_{x_0}| \frac{b(\beta)}{1 - b(\beta)} \right) - 1 \right] \quad (38)
\end{aligned}$$

with choosing $\beta_{L1}^* < 1/(C_5 + \sigma C_{5,1})^2$ again to ensure $b(\beta) < 1$. By noticing that $\exp(|G_{x_0}| b(\beta)/(1 - b(\beta)))$ is monotonically increasing for $\beta \in (0, \beta_{L1}^*)$, we then finish the proof for Lemma 1 via

$$|C_\beta(n_{x_0})| \leq \frac{C_4}{\sqrt{\beta}} \left[\exp \left(|G_{x_0}| \frac{b(\beta_{L1}^*)}{1 - b(\beta_{L1}^*)} \right) - 1 \right] := \frac{C_2}{\sqrt{\beta}}, \quad (39)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C_2 &:= C_4 \left[\exp \left(\left| G_{x_0} \middle| \frac{b(\beta_{L1}^*)}{1 - b(\beta_{L1}^*)} \right) - 1 \right) \right] \\ &= C_2(U_{\max}, U_{\min}, \mu, \beta_{L1}^*) \\ &= \mathcal{O}(1). \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Discussion. — Unlike the bound for the local density in the on-site Hamiltonian case [cf. Eq. (24)], the inequality here only holds for high temperature $\beta < \beta_{L1}^* = \mathcal{O}(1)$. This restriction arises from the convergence requirements of several infinite series and lemma [cf. Eqs. (36)–(38)]. Actually, by choosing $X = n_x^s$ the proof here also works and we may straightforwardly justify the low-density assumption. However, in this study, we lean towards postponing the discussion for this to the end of the next section where we will derive a general bound for $\langle X \rangle_{\beta H}$ based on Lemma 1. In Sec. VIII, we present an alternative proof for Lemma 1 to show it is actually valid at arbitrary temperatures. However, this method is insufficient to establish the low-density assumption.

V. JUSTIFYING THE LOW-BOSON-DENSITY ASSUMPTION

In this section, we prove the low-boson-density assumption for the high-temperature Gibbs state of the Bose-Hubbard model. We are going to present the application for Lemma 1 to first establish an upper bound for the thermal average w.r.t a universal operator. Subsequently, we utilize this result to complete the proof for the low-boson-density assumption.

Note that the bound for $\langle X \rangle_{\beta H}$ is partly achieved by Eq. (19), then we present the subsequent theorem to complete this bound:

Theorem 1. In the Bose-Hubbard model [cf. Eq. (3)], the thermal average of any local operator X ($V_X \subset V$) with bounded $\|X e^{-\mu N}\| \forall \mu > 0$ (N : total particle number operator) satisfies the follow inequality

$$|\langle X \rangle_{\beta H}| \leq C_6 \|X e^{-\mathcal{X}}\| + |\langle X \rangle_{\beta W_{V_X}}|. \quad (41)$$

for high temperature $\beta < \beta_{T1}^* = \mathcal{O}(1)$ with $C_6 = C_6(U_{\max}, U_{\min}, \mu, \beta_{T1}^*, X) = \mathcal{O}(1)$ being an $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant. Here, $\mathcal{X} := \alpha \sum_{x \in V_X} n_x$ with $\alpha = c\sqrt{\beta}$ and $c = \mathcal{O}(1)$ can be chosen flexibly.

The proof for Theorem 1 will recall the similar techniques used for Lemma 1 i.e., the cluster expansion and interaction picture. However, some steps and lemmas are modified for the sake of brevity. The β -scaling of α defined below Eq. (41) needs to be particularly emphasized. Later we will see that the present $\beta^{1/2}$ scaling validates the modified lemmas.

Proof. — To begin with, we list the following result

$$\langle X \rangle_{\beta H} \leq C_\beta(X) + \langle X \rangle_{\beta W_{V_X}}. \quad (42)$$

Then we treat the first term in the same manner of Eq. (27), which leads us to Eq. (21). The essential difference from the proof for Lemma 1 is that now we introduce the subsequent transform:

$$\beta \tilde{W} := \beta W - \mathcal{X}, \quad (43a)$$

$$\mathcal{X} := \alpha \sum_{x \in V_X} n_x, \quad (43b)$$

$$\tilde{X} := X e^{-\mathcal{X}}, \quad (43c)$$

where $\alpha = c\sqrt{\beta}$ and $c = \mathcal{O}(1)$ can be chosen later. Equation (43) further helps us to reformulate Eq. (21) as

$$C_\beta(X) = -\frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (-1)^m \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq 1}^m(G_X)} \text{Tr} \tilde{X} e^{-\beta \tilde{W}} \rho(G), \quad (44)$$

which can be expanded as

$$\begin{aligned} C_\beta(X) &= -\frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (-1)^m \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq 1}^m(G_X)} \sum_{\left\{ \begin{array}{l} w^{(j)} \in G_j^* \\ G_{w^{(j)}} = G_j \end{array} \right\}_{j=1}^m} \text{Tr} \tilde{X} e^{-\beta \tilde{H}_{\tilde{G}^c}} \prod_{j=1}^m \left[e^{-\beta \tilde{W}_{V_{G_j}}} f(w^{(j)}) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

by noticing that $e^{-\beta \tilde{W}} S[I_{\tilde{G}^c}](\beta) = e^{-\beta \tilde{W}_{V_G}} e^{-\beta \tilde{H}_{\tilde{G}^c}}$ and switching the sequence of the latter two operators. Here, we should understand \tilde{W}_{V_G} as

$$\beta \tilde{W}_{V_G} = \beta \sum_{x \in V_G} W_x - \alpha \sum_{x \in V_X \cap V_G} n_x \quad (46)$$

and $\tilde{H}_{\tilde{G}^c} = \tilde{W}_{\tilde{G}^c} - I_{\tilde{G}^c}$. Then by Hölder's inequality, we can bound

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \text{Tr} \tilde{X} e^{-\beta \tilde{H}_{\tilde{G}^c}} \prod_{j=1}^m \left[e^{-\beta \tilde{W}_{V_{G_j}}} f(w^{(j)}) \right] \right| \\ &\leq \|\tilde{X}\| \|\tilde{Z}_{\tilde{G}^c}(\beta)\| \prod_{j=1}^m \left\| e^{-\beta \tilde{W}_{V_{G_j}}} f(w^{(j)}) \right\|_1. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Here, thanks to the newly introduced quantity $e^{-\mathcal{X}}$, the norm $\|\tilde{X}\|$ is bounded for many operators of physical interest, which is one of the most crucial motivations of the transform Eq. (43). Otherwise, the norm $\|X\|$ goes to infinity due to its bosonic nature. Similar to the proof for Lemma 1, we first establish the bound (see Appendix C 1 for details) for any connected subalphabet and word w satisfying $w \in G^*$ and $G_w = G$:

$$\left\| e^{-\beta \tilde{W}_{V_G}} f(w) \right\|_1 \leq \left(\frac{C_{3,r}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{|V_G|} \frac{(C_{5,r} \sqrt{\beta})^{|w|}}{|w|!} \prod_{i=1}^{|G|} \mu_i(w) \quad (48)$$

with $C_{3,r}$ and $C_{5,r}$ being $C_{2,5,r}, C_{2,8,r} = \mathcal{O}(1)$ defined in Eq. (C24). Similarly, we apply Eq. (48) to all the subal-

phabets in $\{G_j\}_{j=1}^m$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \prod_{j=1}^m \left\| e^{-\beta \tilde{W}_{V_{G_j}}} f(w^{(j)}) \right\|_1 \\ & \leq \left(\frac{C_{3,r}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{|G|} \prod_{j=1}^m \frac{(C_{5,r} \sqrt{\beta})^{|w^{(j)}|}}{|w^{(j)}|!} \prod_{i=1}^{|G_j|} \mu_i(w^{(j)})! \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

which together with Eq. (47) directs us to Eq. (45)

$$|C_\beta(X)| \leq C_{6,1}^{|V_X|} \|\tilde{X}\| \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq 1}^m(G_X)} \left(\frac{C_{6,2} \beta^{1/2}}{1 - C_{5,r} \beta^{1/2}} \right)^{|G|}, \quad (50)$$

where $C_{6,1}, C_{6,2}, C_{5,r} = \mathcal{O}(1)$. We direct the readers to Appendix C 2 for the derivation of Eq. (50). Then we follow the derivations from Eqs. (35)–(39) to finally achieve

$$|C_\beta(X)| \leq C_{6,1}^{|V_X|} \|\tilde{X}\| \left[\exp \left(|G_X| \frac{b_{T_1}(\beta)}{1 - b_{T_1}(\beta)} \right) - 1 \right], \quad (51)$$

where $b_{T_1}(\beta) := \sigma C_{6,2} \beta^{1/2} / (1 - C_{5,r} \beta^{1/2})$ and we should choose $\beta_{T_1}^* < 1 / (C_{5,r} + \sigma C_{6,2})^2$ to ensure $b_{T_1}(\beta) < 1$. In such a high-temperature regime, Eq. (51) implies

$$|C_\beta(X)| \leq C_6 \|X e^{-\mathcal{X}}\| \quad (52)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} C_6 &:= C_{6,1}^{|V_X|} \left[\exp \left(|G_X| \frac{b_{T_1}(\beta_{T_1}^*)}{1 - b_{T_1}(\beta_{T_1}^*)} \right) - 1 \right] \\ &= C_6(U_{\max}, U_{\min}, \mu, \beta_{T_1}^*, X). \\ &= \mathcal{O}(1) \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Equation (52) together with Eq. (B21) completes the proof for Theorem 1. \blacksquare

Discussion. — We emphasize again that the transform (43) is one of the key ideas throughout the proof, enabling us to convert the typically unbounded norm $\|X\|$ into a bounded one $\|\tilde{X}\|$. However, this operation will change the scaling of parameter b from β to $\beta^{1/2}$ as discussed in Appendix C 1 and C 2. Therefore, the Lemma 6 in conjunction with Lemma 3 and (5) need reexamination. Fortunately, after possible redefinition of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constants, all of the updated lemmas maintain their original forms. Additionally, to estimate the ratio of two different partition functions we also employed the method described in Ref [77], which is widely utilized to evaluate quantity variations during adiabatic processes. All these techniques enable us to obtain quite an elegant upper bound for $\langle X \rangle_{\beta W}$, in the sense that we are able to split the trace in Eq. (47) and use $\|\tilde{X}\|$ to encode the information from the observable X .

We here emphasize that the support of the observable X can even be disconnected. However, this bonus does not mean we can derive the clustering property of the correlation function by simply using Theorem 1 with $X = X_1 X_2$ and $V_{X_1} \cap V_{X_2} = \emptyset$. In fact, the correlation function should be considered in the doubled Hilbert space as we will see in the next section.

By Theorem 1, we can easily obtain the bound for $\langle n_x^s \rangle_{\beta H}$. This result immediately implies the so-called low-boson-density assumption [32, 66, 67]. Below, we present the proof of this assumption for the high-temperature Gibbs state of the Bose-Hubbard model.

Corollary 1 (low-boson-density assumption). For the Gibbs state of Bose-Hubbard model at high temperature $\beta \leq \beta_{C_1}^* = \mathcal{O}(1)$, the follow bound holds

$$\langle n_x^s \rangle_{\beta H} \leq \frac{1}{e} \left(\frac{\kappa_1}{e} s^{\kappa_2} \right)^s \quad (54)$$

for all $s \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Here $\kappa_1 = \mathcal{O}(\beta^{-1/2})$ and $\kappa_2 = \mathcal{O}(1)$ are independent from system size and s .

Proof. — Choosing $X = n_x^s$ in Theorem 1 we obtain

$$\langle n_x^s \rangle_{\beta H} \leq C_6 \|n_x^s e^{-c\sqrt{\beta} n_x}\| + \langle n_x^s \rangle_{\beta W_x}. \quad (55)$$

Here for the first we note that $\|n_x^s e^{-c\sqrt{\beta} n_x}\| \leq \max_x x^s e^{-c\sqrt{\beta} x} = e^{-s} (s/c\sqrt{\beta})^s$. For the second term of Eq. (55), we use Lemma 3 and Eq. (B2) to obtain $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n^s e^{-(an^2 - bn)} / \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-(an^2 - bn)} \leq 2^{-1} \sqrt{s!} \sqrt{\pi} C_{L3}^s a^{-s/2} (1 + |b|/a)^{1/2} \leq (C_{\kappa_1} \beta^{-1/2})^s \sqrt{s!}$, with $C_{\kappa_1} := 2^{-1} \sqrt{\pi} C_{L3} \sqrt{2/U_{\min}} (1 + 2\mu_0/U_{\min})^{1/2} = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and C_{L3} being the $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant defined in Lemma 3. The we proceed with Eq. (55):

$$\begin{aligned} \langle n_x^s \rangle_{\beta H} &\leq C_6 e^{-s} \left(\frac{s}{c\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^s + \left(\frac{C_{\kappa_1}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^s \sqrt{s!} \\ &\leq C_6 \left(\frac{s}{ce\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^s + \left(\frac{C_{\kappa_1}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^s s^s \\ &= \left(\frac{C_6 s}{ce\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^s + \left(\frac{C_{\kappa_1} s}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^s \\ &\leq 2(C_{\kappa_2} s)^s \leq \frac{1}{e} \left(\frac{2e^2 C_{\kappa_2}}{e} s \right)^s. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

where we defined $C_{\kappa_2} := \max\{C_6/ce\sqrt{\beta}, C_{\kappa_1}/\sqrt{\beta}\} = \mathcal{O}(1)$. By choosing $\kappa_1 = 2e^2 C_{\kappa_2} = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and $\kappa_2 = 1$ we complete the proof. \blacksquare

Discussion. — The low-boson-density condition provides a powerful constraint on $\langle n_x^s \rangle_{\beta H}$. Mathematically, it claims the moment of n_x can always be bounded to arbitrary orders. To have a more intuitive physical insight, for the distribution $\{p_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n^s p_n = \langle n_x^s \rangle_{\beta H}$ we have from Eq. (54) that $p_n \leq c_{\text{low},1} e^{-c_{\text{low},2} n^{\kappa_2}}$ (see Appendix C 3 for details). This bound points out that the low-boson-density condition ensures the (stretched) exponential decay of particle number distribution, especially for large n . In contrast, a power-law decay of p_n is insufficient to guarantee bounded moments of all orders for n_x . Specifically, for any power-law decay, there always exists a critical order s_0 beyond which the moment $\langle n_x^{s_0} \rangle_{\beta H}$ diverges to infinity.

By replacing n_x with n_x^s in Lemma 1 we can also derive Corollary 1 from a direct cluster expansion without any

transform (43). Furthermore, combining the bound for $\langle n_x^s \rangle_{\beta H}$ with the following decomposition condition

$$X = \sum_{\alpha} \prod_{x \in V_X} f_{\alpha, x} \quad (57)$$

we can still establish Theorem 1. Here, all the functions in $\{f_{\alpha, x}\}_{x \in V_X}$ are the polynomial function with argument to the local creation and annihilation operators. Then we collect the summand in Eq. (54) supported by V_G^c into $e^{-\beta \tilde{H}_G^c}$ and leave the others to $\prod_{j=1}^m e^{-\beta \tilde{W}_{V_G^c j}} f(w^{(j)})$. We may invoke the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality $\text{Tr} AB\rho \leq (\text{Tr} AA^\dagger \rho \cdot \text{Tr} BB^\dagger \rho)^{1/2}$ to decompose the thermal average of $\prod_{x \in V_X} f_{\alpha, x}$ into products of $\langle f_{\alpha, x} \rangle_{\beta H}$ evaluated w.r.t different sites. However, we did not adopt this strategy for it makes the derivation as well as the conclusion much more complex and needs additional assumption (57). Also, we mention that the temperature scaling in Corollary 1 is again optimal since it's easy to know from Lemma 3 and Eq. (B2) that for the on-site case $\langle n_x \rangle_{\beta W} \leq C_{\text{on}} \beta^{-s/2}$ with $C_{\text{on}} = \mathcal{O}(1)$.

VI. BOSON CLUSTERING PROPERTY

It has been well understood that the correlation exhibits an essentially exponential decay on distance above the critical temperature in several lattice models, such as the ferromagnetic spin system. In this section we will demonstrate the correlation clusters exponentially at high temperature for Bose-Hubbard model.

The correlation function for any two local operators X and Y ($V_X, V_Y \subset V$) is defined as

$$C_{\beta}(X, Y) := \text{Tr} \rho_{\beta} X Y - \text{Tr} \rho_{\beta} X \text{Tr} \rho_{\beta} Y. \quad (58)$$

We are particularly interested the scaling of the correlation function w.r.t the distant between X and Y . Here, the distant between two observables refers to the distant between their support, which can be defined as

$$\text{dist}(X, Y) = \min_{x_1 \in V_X, x_2 \in V_Y} \text{dist}(x_1, x_2). \quad (59)$$

In Eq. (59), the distant of two sites is the size of the smallest edge subset connecting them and naturally $\text{dist}(x, y) = 0$ for $x = y$. Then the subsequent theorem demonstrates that the correlation function [cf. Eq. (58)] exhibits exponential decay with respect to distance defined in Eq. (59):

Theorem 2 (boson clustering property at high temperatures). In the Bose-Hubbard model [cf. Eq. (3)], the correlation function of any two local operators X, Y ($V_X, V_Y \subset V$) satisfies the follow inequality

$$|C_{\beta}(X, Y)| \leq C_7 \|X e^{-\mathcal{X}}\| \|Y e^{-\mathcal{Y}}\| e^{-\text{dist}(X, Y)/\xi(\beta)}. \quad (60)$$

for high temperature $\beta \leq \beta_{T_2}^* = \mathcal{O}(1)$ with $C_7 = C_7(U_{\text{max}}, U_{\text{min}}, \mu, \beta_{T_2}^*, X, Y)$ being an $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant. Here, $\mathcal{X} := \alpha \sum_{x \in V_X} n_x$, $\mathcal{Y} := \alpha \sum_{x \in V_Y} n_x$ with $\alpha =$

$c\sqrt{\beta}$ and $c = \mathcal{O}(1)$ can be chosen according to the users' requirements. Here, the correlation length [cf. Eq. (81)] is given by $\xi^{-1}(\beta) := -\ln[\sigma C_{7,4} \beta^{1/2} / (1 - C_{7,2} \beta^{1/2})]$ with $C_{7,4}, C_{7,2} = \mathcal{O}(1)$.

To prove Theorem 2, we first need to recast some techniques such as interaction pictures and cluster expansion in the doubled Hilbert space. Then we truncate the cluster expansion for the correlation function to include the effect of the distance between (the support of) those two observables we are considering. After we obtain the upper bound for the the magnitude of the correlation function, several tricks are introduced to finally reformulate the result into the desired exponential form.

Proof. — For the sake of employing the techniques discussed previously, we first rewrite the correlation function [cf. Eq. (58)] into the form of a single trace. To that end, we need to formulate Eq. (58) in the doubled Hilbert space:

$$C_{\beta}(X, Y) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)^2} \text{Tr} e^{-\beta H^{(+)}} X^{(0)} Y^{(1)}, \quad (61)$$

where we introduced the notations $O^{(0)} := O \otimes \mathbb{1}$, $O^{(1)} := O \otimes \mathbb{1} - \mathbb{1} \otimes O$ and $O^{(+)} := O \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes O$ to have a more compact form. Similar to the proofs for Lemma 1 and Theorem 1, we still adopt the interaction picture but for the Boltzmann factor $e^{-\beta H^{(+)}}$ defined in the doubled Hilbert space i.e., we need to find the operator $\tilde{S}(\beta)$ satisfying

$$e^{-\beta H^{(+)}} = e^{-\beta W^{(+)}} \tilde{S}(\beta), \quad (62)$$

whose solution can also be represented via the Dyson series like Eq. (14)

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{S}(\beta) &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \int_0^{\beta} d\tau_1 \int_0^{\tau_1} d\tau_2 \dots \int_0^{\tau_{m-1}} d\tau_m \\ &\quad \times I(\tau_1)^{(+)} I(\tau_2)^{(+)} \dots I(\tau_m)^{(+)} \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \int_{\vec{\tau} \in \mathcal{T}_m} \mathcal{D}\vec{\tau} \prod_{i=1}^m I(\tau_i)^{(+)}. \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

Equation (63) can also be recast as a summation over the words [cf. Eq. (16)]

$$\tilde{S}(\beta) = \sum_{w \in E^*} \int_{\vec{\tau} \in \mathcal{T}_{|w|}} \mathcal{D}\vec{\tau} \tilde{h}(w, \vec{\tau}) := \sum_{w \in E^*} \tilde{f}(w), \quad (64)$$

where we have defined $\tilde{h}(w, \vec{\tau}) := h_{\lambda_1}(\tau_1)^{(+)} h_{\lambda_2}(\tau_2)^{(+)} \dots h_{\lambda_{|w|}}(\tau_{|w|})^{(+)}$. By substituting Eqs. (62) and (65) into Eq. (61) we can also express the correlation function $C_{\beta}(X, Y)$ as a series expansion. In contrast to Eq. (20), this series can be truncated and expressed represented as

$$C_{\beta}(X, Y) := \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{C}_{\geq L}(\partial X)} \text{Tr} e^{-\beta W^{(+)}} \tilde{f}(w) X^{(0)} Y^{(1)} \quad (65)$$

with $L := \text{dist}(X, Y)$ denoting the distance between X and Y . To justify Eq. (65), we show that for the word $w \in [\mathcal{C}_{\geq L}(\partial X)]^c$ with $L := d(X, Y)$, the trace

$$\text{Tr} e^{-\beta W^{(+)} \tilde{h}(w, \vec{\tau}) X^{(0)} Y^{(1)}} = 0. \quad (66)$$

To see this, we first note that all the words in $[\mathcal{G}_{\geq L}(\partial X)]^c$ do not connect V_X and V_Y . This observation enables us to rearrange a specific word w into a concatenation of two words $w = (w_1^X, w_2^X, \dots, w_{|w^X|}^X, w_1^Y, w_2^Y, \dots, w_{|w^Y|}^Y)$, where at least we can say w^X overlaps with ∂X and therefore V_X . The terminology ‘‘overlap’’ between a word w and a vertex subset U means w contains at least a letter λ such that $\lambda \cap U \neq \emptyset$. For any two letters $\lambda_I \in w^X$, $\lambda_{II} \in w^Y$ and corresponding τ_I, τ_{II} we always have $h_{\lambda_I}(\tau_I)^{(+)}$ commuting with $h_{\lambda_{II}}(\tau_{II})^{(+)}$ since their have disjoint supports and W is on-site. Therefore, we can always have $\tilde{h}(w, \vec{\tau}) = \tilde{h}(w^X, \vec{\tau}^X) \tilde{h}(w^Y, \vec{\tau}^Y)$ where the vector $\vec{\tau}$ has the same elements as in $\vec{\tau}^X \oplus \vec{\tau}^Y$. Then the trace in Eq. (66) can be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LHS of Eq. (66)} &= \text{Tr}_{V_X} e^{-\beta W_{V_X}^{(+)} \tilde{h}(w^X, \vec{\tau}^X) X^{(0)}} \\ &\times \text{Tr}_{V_X^c} e^{-\beta W_{V_X^c}^{(+)} \tilde{h}(w^Y, \vec{\tau}^Y) Y^{(1)}}, \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

The latter trace vanishes since $e^{-\beta W_{V_X^c}^{(+)} \tilde{h}(w^Y, \vec{\tau}^Y) Y^{(1)}}$ is symmetric when switching the sequence of the two Hilbert spaces while $Y^{(1)}$ is anti-symmetric. Thus we obtain Eq. (66) and the truncated expansion Eq. (65) is justified.

By utilizing the same tricks in Eqs. (20) and (21), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} C_\beta(X, Y) &= -\frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)^2} \\ &\times \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (-1)^m \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq L}^m(\partial X)} \text{Tr} e^{-\beta W^{(+)} \rho(G) X^{(0)} Y^{(1)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

To advance, we recall the transform Eq. (43) and use the revised form

$$\beta \tilde{W} := \beta W - \mathcal{X} - \mathcal{Y}, \quad (69a)$$

$$\mathcal{X} := \alpha \sum_{x \in V_X} n_x, \quad (69b)$$

$$\mathcal{Y} := \alpha \sum_{x \in V_Y} n_x, \quad (69c)$$

$$\check{X} := X^{(0)} e^{-\mathcal{X}^{(+)}} , \quad (69d)$$

$$\check{Y} := Y^{(1)} e^{-\mathcal{Y}^{(+)}} , \quad (69e)$$

where $\alpha = c\sqrt{\beta}$ and $c = \mathcal{O}(1)$ can be chosen later. Applying Eq. (69) we reformulate Eq. (68) as

$$\begin{aligned} C_\beta(X, Y) &= -\frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)^2} \\ &\times \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (-1)^m \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq L}^m(\partial X)} \text{Tr} e^{-\beta \tilde{W}^{(+)} \tilde{\rho}(G) \check{X} \check{Y}} \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

with the new quantity $\tilde{\rho}(G)$ defined by analogue to Eq. (A5)

$$\tilde{\rho}(G) := \sum_{w \in [(\partial G)^c]^*: G_w = G} \tilde{f}(w). \quad (71)$$

By repeating the derivations in Appendix B 2 again with substituting the relevant quantities such as $\rho(G), \eta(G)$ and $f(w)$ by tilded ones, we obtain a formula similar to Eq. (28) in the doubled Hilbert space,

$$\tilde{\rho}(G) = \tilde{S}[I_{\bar{G}^c}](\beta) \prod_{j=1}^m \tilde{\eta}(G_j) \quad (72)$$

with

$$\tilde{\eta}(G) := \sum_{w \in G^*: G_w = G} \tilde{f}(w). \quad (73)$$

Equations (72) and (73) with Eq. (70) lead us to

$$\begin{aligned} C_\beta(X, Y) &= -\frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)^2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (-1)^m \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq L}^m(\partial X)} \\ &\sum_{\left\{ \substack{w^{(j)} \in G_j^* \\ G_j \subset w^{(j)}} \right\}_{j=1}^m} \text{Tr} e^{-\beta \tilde{H}_{\bar{G}^c}^{(+)} \prod_{j=1}^m \left[e^{-\beta \tilde{W}_{V_{G_j}}^{(+)} \tilde{f}(w^{(j)})} \right] \check{X} \check{Y}}, \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

where we have used similar relation to Eq. (61) but for the doubled Hilbert space: $e^{-\beta \tilde{H}_{\bar{G}^c}^{(+)}} = e^{-\beta W_{V_{\bar{G}^c}}^{(+)}} \tilde{S}[I_{\bar{G}^c}](\beta)$. Here, we should understand $\tilde{W}_{V_{\bar{G}^c}}$ as $\beta \tilde{W}_{V_{\bar{G}^c}} = \beta \sum_{x \in V_{\bar{G}^c}} W_x - \alpha \sum_{x \in (V_X \cup V_Y) \cap V_{\bar{G}^c}} n_x$ and $\tilde{H}_{\bar{G}^c} = \tilde{W}_{V_{\bar{G}^c}} - I_{\bar{G}^c}$. Following a similar argument as in Eq. (47), we apply Hölder’s inequality to find

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \text{Tr} e^{-\beta \tilde{H}_{\bar{G}^c}^{(+)} \prod_{j=1}^m \left[e^{-\beta \tilde{W}_{V_{G_j}}^{(+)} \tilde{f}(w^{(j)})} \right] \check{X} \check{Y}} \right| \\ &= \check{Z}_{\bar{G}^c}(\beta)^2 \prod_{j=1}^m \left\| e^{-\beta \tilde{W}_{V_{G_j}}^{(+)} \tilde{f}(w^{(j)})} \right\|_1 \|\check{X}\| \|\check{Y}\| \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

with observing that $\text{Tr} e^{-\beta \tilde{H}_{\bar{G}^c}^{(+)}} = \check{Z}_{\bar{G}^c}(\beta)^2$. Then we deduce the subsequent inequality with the help of Eq. (47) in Appendix D 1

$$\left\| e^{-\beta \tilde{W}_{V_{G_j}}^{(+)} \tilde{f}(w)} \right\|_1 \leq \left(\frac{C_{7,1}}{\beta} \right)^{|V_{G_j}|} \frac{(C_{7,2} \sqrt{\beta})^{|w|}}{|w|!} \prod_{i=1}^{|G_j|} \mu_i(w)! \quad (76)$$

with $C_{7,1}, C_{7,2}$ being the $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constants $C_{2,5,r}^2$ and $2C_{2,7,r}$ defined in Eq. (D14). Applying Eq. (76) for all the subalphabets in $\{G_j\}_{j=1}^m$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} &\prod_{j=1}^m \left\| e^{-\beta \tilde{W}_{V_{G_j}}^{(+)} \tilde{f}(w^{(j)})} \right\|_1 \\ &\leq \left(\frac{C_{7,1}}{\beta} \right)^{|V_G|} \prod_{j=1}^m \frac{(C_{7,2} \sqrt{\beta})^{|w^{(j)}|}}{|w^{(j)}|!} \prod_{i=1}^{|G_j|} \mu_i(w^{(j)})! \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

and with Eq. (75) we further obtain (see Appendix D 2)

$$|C_\beta(X, Y)| \leq C_{7,3}^{|V_X|+|V_Y|} \times \|\tilde{X}\| \|\tilde{Y}\| \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq L}^m(\partial X)} \left(\frac{C_{7,4}\beta^{1/2}}{1 - C_{7,2}\beta^{1/2}} \right)^{|G|}, \quad (78)$$

with $C_{7,3}, C_{7,4} = \mathcal{O}(1)$. Then we follow the derivations from Eqs. (35)–(39) to achieve

$$|C_\beta(X, Y)| \leq C_{7,3}^{|V_X|+|V_Y|} \|\tilde{X}\| \|\tilde{Y}\| \left[\exp \left(|G_X| \frac{b_{T_2}(\beta)^L}{1 - b_{T_2}(\beta)} \right) - 1 \right], \quad (79)$$

where $b_{T_2}(\beta) := \sigma C_{7,4}\beta^{1/2}/(1 - C_{7,2}\beta^{1/2})$ and we should choose $\beta_{T_2}^* < 1/(C_{7,2} + \sigma C_{7,4})^2 = \mathcal{O}(1)$ to ensure $b_{T_2}(\beta) < 1$. Applying the same truncation scheme to the series in Eq. (65) but w.r.t to the words in $\mathcal{C}_{\geq L}(\partial Y)$, we arrive at an inequality identical to Eq. (79) differing only in that $|G_X|$ is substituted by $|G_Y|$. Therefore, we choose $g := \min\{|G_X|, |G_Y|\}$ to refine Eq. (79) as

$$|C_\beta(X, Y)| \leq C_{7,3}^{|V_X|+|V_Y|} \|\tilde{X}\| \|\tilde{Y}\| \left[\exp \left(g \frac{b_{T_2}(\beta)^L}{1 - b_{T_2}(\beta)} \right) - 1 \right]. \quad (80)$$

The final step is the convert RHS of Eq. (80) in the exponential form w.r.t L . To that end, we notice that $u(x) = (e^x - 1)/x$ is monotonically increasing, which means $e^x - 1 \leq xu(x_0)$ for $x \in [0, x_0]$. Then by further defining the thermal correlation length

$$\xi^{-1}(\beta) := -\ln b_{T_2}(\beta) \quad (81)$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \exp \left(g \frac{b_{T_2}(\beta)^L}{1 - b_{T_2}(\beta)} \right) - 1 &\leq g \frac{b_{T_2}(\beta)^L}{1 - b_{T_2}(\beta)} u(x_0) \\ &= gu(x_0) \frac{e^{-\text{dist}(X, Y)/\xi(\beta)}}{1 - e^{-1/\xi(\beta)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

The constraint $gb_{T_2}(\beta)^L/(1 - b_{T_2}(\beta)) \leq x_0$ or equally $L \geq \ln g^{-1}\{x_0(1 - b_{T_2}(\beta))\}/\ln b_{T_2}(\beta) := L_0(\beta)$ can be removed if we set $L_0(\beta) \leq 0$, which means one chooses $x_0 = g/(1 - b_{T_2}(\beta_{T_2}^*)) = \mathcal{O}(1)$. Then by noting that $\|\tilde{X}\| = \|Xe^{-\mathcal{X}}\|$ and $\|\tilde{Y}\| \leq 2\|Ye^{-\mathcal{Y}}\|$ from Eq. (69), we reformulate Eq. (80) as

$$|C_\beta(X, Y)| \leq 2gu(x_0)C_{7,3}^{|X|+|Y|} \times \|Xe^{-\mathcal{X}}\| \|Ye^{-\mathcal{Y}}\| \frac{e^{-\text{dist}(X, Y)/\xi(\beta)}}{1 - e^{-1/\xi(\beta)}}, \quad (83)$$

which can be further simplified to be

$$|C_\beta(X, Y)| \leq C_7 \|Xe^{-\mathcal{X}}\| \|Ye^{-\mathcal{Y}}\| e^{-\text{dist}(X, Y)/\xi(\beta)}, \quad (84)$$

as long as we use $1/(1 - e^{-1/\xi(\beta)}) \leq 1/(1 - e^{-1/\xi(\beta^*)}) = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and denote

$$\begin{aligned} C_7 &:= 2gu(x_0)C_{7,3}^{|X|+|Y|}/[1 - e^{-1/\xi(\beta^*)}] \\ &= C_7(U_{\max}, U_{\min}, \mu, \beta_{T_2}^*, X, Y) \\ &= \mathcal{O}(1). \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

Hereby, we finish the proof for Theorem 2. \blacksquare

Discussion. — In terms of Eq. (83), one of the key distinctions from Eq. (11) of Ref. [20] concerning clustering properties of quantum spins lies in the form of functions $b_{T_2}(\beta)$ and $b(\beta)$ as defined therein. The main reason is we use the interaction picture to extract Boltzmann(-like) factor such as $e^{\check{\mathcal{O}}_x(n_x)}$ and $e^{\check{\mathcal{O}}_x(n_x)}$ to “suppress” the divergence of boson operators. This operator leads to the factorial and $-1/2$ power scaling w.r.t p and β respectively in Lemma 6, which finally results in $C\sqrt{\beta}$ and $\prod_{k=1}^{|G|} \mu_k(w)!$ on LHS of Eq. (E45). In comparison to Ref. [20], the product $\prod_{k=1}^{|G|} \mu_k(w)!$ cancels the denominator of the multinomial coefficient and brings out the geometric series. Otherwise, the summation in Eq. (E46) over $\{\mu_k\}_{k=1}^n$ remains the partial Taylor expansion of exponential function. This is exactly the the fermionic/spin case, since norms of local Hamiltonians are uniformly bounded, eliminating the need for interaction picture technique.

We emphasize that the distance $\text{dist}(x, y)$ [cf. Eq. (59)] upper bounds the Euclidean distance $d(x, y)$ so we do have clustering in terms of the physical distance:

$$|C_\beta(X, Y)| \leq C_7 \|Xe^{-\mathcal{X}}\| \|Ye^{-\mathcal{Y}}\| e^{-d(X, Y)/\xi(\beta)} \quad (86)$$

with

$$d(X, Y) := \min_{x_1 \in V_X, x_2 \in V_Y} d(x_1, x_2) \quad (87)$$

denoting the Euclidean distance between two operators.

Finally, we conclude this discussion by noting a natural result: Using Lemma 1 as our foundation, we can reproduce the low-boson-density assumption through mathematical induction. This works when we choose (X, Y) to be (n_x^s, n_x) .

VII. TOWARDS THE DULONG-PETIT LAW

To present an application of the previous results especially Theorem 2, we show that in the high-temperature regime, the specific heat density of the Bose-Hubbard model is upper bounded by the order of $\mathcal{O}(1)$, which can be viewed as the weak version of the Dulong–Petit law. This thermodynamic law states that the molar specific heat capacity for solid crystalline substances is equal to a constant $3R$ with R being the gas constant [6]. Even though it looks quite simple [78], Dulong–Petit law holds with considerably high precision for many different kinds of materials at high temperatures.

We will see that the low-density property, due to its optimal temperature scaling, implies a linear upper bound on the energy. However, this result does not imply the specific heat density is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(1)$, though the converse is true. We use Theorem 2 to prove this $\mathcal{O}(1)$ bound on specific heat density, which we call the quasi Dulong–Petit law.

To begin, we first note that the energy per site or energy density is evaluated via

$$e(\beta) := |V|^{-1} \langle H \rangle_{\beta H}, \quad (88)$$

whose derivative w.r.t. temperature $T \equiv 1/\beta$ gives the specific heat density

$$c_p(\beta) := |V|^{-1} \beta^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \langle H \rangle_{\beta H}. \quad (89)$$

Then the following corollary provides an upper bound for the specific heat $c_p(\beta)$:

Corollary 2 (upper bound for specific heat). For high temperatures $\beta \leq \beta_{C_2}^*$, the specific heat density of the Bose-Hubbard model can be bounded by $C_8 = C_8(U_{\max}, U_{\min}, \mu, \beta_{C_2}^*) = \mathcal{O}(1)$.

Proof. — Carrying out the derivative with the help of Duhamel's formula, we obtain

$$c_p(\beta) = |V|^{-1} \beta^2 \langle (\Delta H)^2 \rangle_{\beta H} \quad (90)$$

with $\Delta H := H - \langle H \rangle_{\beta H}$. By recasting the Hamiltonian as $H = \sum_k h_k$ with $\{h_k\}$ being different terms (including both on-site and hopping terms) in the Hamiltonian, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_p(\beta) &= |V|^{-1} \beta^2 \sum_{k,k'} \langle (h_k - \langle h_k \rangle_{\beta H})(h_{k'} - \langle h_{k'} \rangle_{\beta H}) \rangle_{\beta H} \\ &= |V|^{-1} \beta^2 \sum_{k,k'} C_{\beta}(h_k, h_{k'}). \end{aligned} \quad (91)$$

Now we turn to deal with the correlation function in RHS of Eq. (91) under the help of Theorem 2.

$$\begin{aligned} c_p(\beta) &\leq |V|^{-1} \sum_{k,k'} C_{8,1}^{|h_k|+|h_{k'}|} \beta \|h_k e^{-c\sqrt{\beta}V_{h_k}}\| \\ &\quad \times \beta \|h_{k'} e^{-c\sqrt{\beta}V_{h_{k'}}}\| e^{-\text{dist}(h_k, h_{k'})/\xi(\beta)} \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

with $C_{8,1} := 2gu(x_0)C_{7,3}/[1 - e^{-1/\xi(\beta_{C_2}^*)}] = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and choosing $\beta_{C_2}^* = \beta_{T_2}^*$. First we note that for $\beta \leq \beta_{C_2}^*$

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k,k'} e^{-\text{dist}(h_k, h_{k'})/\xi(\beta)} \\ &\leq \sum_k \left[\mathfrak{d}_0 + 2^{d/2} \Gamma(d/2)^{-1} \int_0^\infty dr e^{-r/\xi(\beta)} \right] \\ &\leq N \left[\mathfrak{d}_0 + 2^{d/2} \Gamma(d/2)^{-1} \int_0^\infty dr e^{-r/\xi(\beta)} \right] \\ &= N [\mathfrak{d} + C_d \xi(\beta)^d] \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

Here, $N \leq |V| + \mathfrak{d}|V|/2$ being the number of the terms in the Hamiltonian and $\mathfrak{d}_0 = \mathcal{O}(1)$ denotes the maximum number of neighboring sites surrounding any given site, defined as $\mathfrak{d}_0 := \max_{x \in V} |\{x_0 \text{ dist}(x, x_0) = 1\}|$. Note that $\xi(\beta) \leq \xi(\beta^*)$, which together with Eq. (93) gives us $|V|^{-1} \sum_{k,k'} e^{-\text{dist}(h_k, h_{k'})/\xi(\beta)} \leq (1 + \mathfrak{d}/2) [\mathfrak{d}_0 + C_d \xi(\beta)^d] = \mathcal{O}(1)$. This motivates us to consider the norm $\beta \|h_k e^{-c\sqrt{\beta}V_{h_k}}\|$ case by case

- For $h_k = \mu_{0,x} n_x$, $\beta \|\mu_{0,x} n_x e^{-c\sqrt{\beta} n_x}\| \leq \beta \mu_0 e^{-1} c^{-1} \beta^{-1/2} \leq \mu_0 e^{-1} c^{-1} \sqrt{\beta_{C_2}^*} = \mathcal{O}(1)$
- For $h_k = U_x n_x^2/2$, $\beta \|U_x n_x^2 e^{-c\sqrt{\beta} n_x}/2\| \leq \beta U_{\max} e^{-2} c^{-2} \beta^{-1} = U_{\max} e^{-2} c^{-2} = \mathcal{O}(1)$
- For $h_k = J_{xy}(a_x^\dagger a_y + a_y^\dagger a_x)$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\beta \|J_{xy}(a_x^\dagger a_y + a_y^\dagger a_x) e^{-c\sqrt{\beta}(n_x+n_y)}\| \\ &\leq \beta J \left[\|a_x^\dagger e^{-c\sqrt{\beta} n_x}\| \|a_y e^{-c\sqrt{\beta} n_y}\| + (x \leftrightarrow y) \right] \\ &\leq 2J \beta \sqrt{C_{8,2} \beta^{-1/2} + 1} \sqrt{C_{8,2} \beta^{-1/2}} \\ &\leq 2J \sqrt{C_{8,2} (\beta_{C_2}^*)^{1/2} + \beta_{C_2}^*} \sqrt{C_{8,2} (\beta_{C_2}^*)^{1/2}} = \mathcal{O}(1). \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

Here, we used $\|X\| \equiv \sqrt{\|X^\dagger X\|}$ to obtain $\|a e^{-c\sqrt{\beta} n}\| = \sqrt{\|n e^{-2c\sqrt{\beta} n}\|}$ and $\|a^\dagger e^{-c\sqrt{\beta} n}\| = \sqrt{\|(n+1) e^{-2c\sqrt{\beta} n}\|} \leq \sqrt{\|n e^{-2c\sqrt{\beta} n}\|} + 1$. Then it's obvious $\|n e^{-2c\sqrt{\beta} n}\| \leq e^{-1} c^{-1} \beta^{-1/2} := C_{8,2} \beta^{-1}$.

From the discussion above we know that $\beta \|h_k e^{-c\sqrt{\beta} V_{h_k}}\|$ as well as $C_{8,1}^{|h_k|+|h_{k'}|} \leq \max\{C_{8,1}, 1\}^4$ is always bounded by $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constants, by which we finish the proof. ■

Discussion. — Now we briefly discuss how to obtain the linear upper bound for the energy. The low-boson-density condition Corollary 1 ensures the energy density $e(\beta)$ is finite for $0 < \beta \leq \beta_{C_2}^*$, where we choose $\beta_{C_2}^* \leq \beta_{C_1}^*$. To see this, we first note that for $h_k = \mu_{0,x} n_x$ or $U_x n_x^2/2$, the thermal average $\langle n_x^s \rangle_{\beta H}$ for $s = 1, 2$ can be bounded by Eq. (54). Then for $h_k = J_{xy}(a_x^\dagger a_y + a_y^\dagger a_x)$, we invoke the operator Cauchy-Schwarz inequality [79] $\pm(a_x^\dagger a_y + a_y^\dagger a_x) \leq n_x + n_y$ to bound $\langle h_k \rangle_{\beta H}$ by linear combination of $\{\langle n_x \rangle_{\beta H}\}_{x \in V}$. Therefore we conclude that $e(T) \leq e_0$ for $T_{C_2}^* \leq T < \infty$ with $T_{C_2}^* = (\beta_{C_2}^*)^{-1}$. This fact together with Corollary 2 gives us $e(T) \leq e_0 + c_{\max}(T - T_{C_2}^*)$, where c_{\max} is the $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant to bound $c_p(\beta)$ for high temperature.

VIII. MISCELLANEOUS

This section is devoted to other minor results of the present study. We first briefly present an alternative shortcut proof for Lemma 1 with which we claim Theorem 2 actually implies Corollary 1. Finally, we discuss the convergence of the series introduced for the interaction picture.

A. Shortcut Proof for Lemma 1

The main technique we utilize for the shortcut proof is the Peierls-Bogoliubov inequality in Ref. [79]:

$$\langle O \rangle_{\beta H} \leq \frac{\text{Tr} O e^{O-\beta H}}{\text{Tr} e^{O-\beta H}}, \quad (95)$$

which holds for any operator O commuting with the total particle number operator $N = \sum_{x \in V} n_x$ and making

$Oe^{-\beta H}$ and $e^{O-\beta H}$ trace class. To obtain the bound for $\langle n_x \rangle_{\beta H}$ we choose

$$O \rightarrow O_x = \beta \left[c_x n_x + \sum_{y: x \sim y} J_{xy} (a_x^\dagger a_y + a_y^\dagger a_x) \right] \quad (96)$$

such that the hopping terms involving site x disappear in $H^{(x)} := H - \beta^{-1} O_x$. In Eq. (96) $\{c_x\}_{x \in V}$ can be arbitrary positive constants being determined later. Naturally, the Gibbs state of $H^{(x)}$ adheres to the tensor product form $\rho_\beta^{(x)} = \rho_x \otimes \rho_{x^c}$, where the subscripts denote the supports. Noticing $\rho_x = e^{-\beta(U_x/2 + c_x)n_x} / \text{Tr}_x e^{-\beta(U_x/2 + c_x)n_x}$, we have $\text{Tr}[a_x \rho_x] = \text{Tr}[a_x^\dagger \rho_x] = 0$, which implies the expectation value of the hopping term in Eq. (96) vanishes for $\rho_\beta^{(x)}$. Then by putting Eq. (96) into Eq. (95) we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & (c_x - J_x) \langle n_x \rangle_{\beta H} - \sum_{y: x \sim y} |J_{xy}| \langle n_y \rangle_{\beta H} \\ & \leq c_x \frac{\text{Tr}_x n_x \exp\{-\beta[U_x n_x^2/2 - (\mu_{0,x} + c_x)n_x]\}}{\text{Tr}_x \exp\{-\beta[U_x n_x^2/2 - (\mu_{0,x} + c_x)n_x]\}} \\ & \leq \frac{C_{\text{cut}}}{\sqrt{\beta}}, \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

where we have also used operator Cauchy-Schwarz inequality [79] $\pm(a_x^\dagger a_y + a_y^\dagger a_x) \geq -(n_x + n_y)$ and denoted $J_x := \sum_{y: x \sim y} |J_{xy}|$. To obtain the last line of Eq. (97), we refer to the analysis in Eq. (B3) and choose $C_{\text{cut}} = C_{\text{cut}}(c_x, \mu, U_{\text{max}}, U_{\text{min}}) = \mathcal{O}(1)$. It's worth emphasizing that Eq. (97) holds for arbitrary temperature (not only high temperature) due to the nice property of Eq. (B3). Equation (97) can be reformulated into a more compact form

$$\mathbf{M} \mathbf{n}_\beta \leq \beta^{-1/2} \mathbf{C}. \quad (98)$$

Here, we introduce the $|V|$ dimensional square matrix \mathbf{M} with diagonal and off-diagonal elements given by $M_{xx} = c_x - J_x$ and $M_{xy} = -|J_{xy}|$ ($M_{xy} = 0$) if $x \sim y$ (otherwise), respectively. Also, we defined $|V|$ -dimensional vectors \mathbf{n}_β and \mathbf{C} via $(\mathbf{n}_\beta)_x := \langle n_x \rangle_{\beta H}$ and $C_x := C_{\text{cut}}(c_x, \mu, U_{\text{max}}, U_{\text{min}})$. We should choose $\{c_x\}$ large enough to ensure all the elements of \mathbf{M}^{-1} are non-negative, then Eq. (98) leads us to

$$\mathbf{n}_\beta \leq \beta^{-1/2} \mathbf{M}^{-1} \mathbf{C}. \quad (99)$$

Otherwise the direction of Eq. (99) may change. Let \mathbf{D} be the diagonal part of \mathbf{M} and denote $\mathbf{P} := \mathbf{D} - \mathbf{M}$. we utilize the following series to evaluate $\mathbf{M}^{-1} = (\mathbf{D} - \mathbf{P})^{-1}$:

$$\mathbf{M}^{-1} = \mathbf{D}^{-1} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (\mathbf{P} \mathbf{D}^{-1})^m. \quad (100)$$

The convergence condition $\|\mathbf{P} \mathbf{D}^{-1}\| \leq \|\mathbf{P}\| \|\mathbf{D}^{-1}\| < 1$ (here we used Hölder's inequality [cf. Eq. (6)] with $p = p_1 = p_2 = \infty$) for Eq. (100) is guaranteed by choosing sufficiently large $\{c_x\}_{x \in V}$. To see this, we just note that $\|\mathbf{D}^{-1}\| = \max_{x \in V} (c_x - J_x)^{-1}$ and $\|\mathbf{P}\| = \max_{x \in V} \sum_{y \in V} |P_{xy}| = \max_{x \in V} \sum_{y: x \sim y} |J_{xy}| =$

$\max_{x \in V} J_x$. Due to the nearest neighbor property of \mathbf{P} , for a specific element of \mathbf{M} we truncate the series Eq. (100) as follows

$$(\mathbf{M}^{-1})_{xy} = \left[\mathbf{D}^{-1} \sum_{m \geq \text{dist}(x,y)} (\mathbf{P} \mathbf{D}^{-1})^m \right]_{xy}. \quad (101)$$

By noticing $|M_{xy}| \leq \|\mathbf{M}\|$, Eq. (101) leads us to

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{M}^{-1})_{xy} & \leq \sum_{m \geq \text{dist}(x,y)} \|\mathbf{D}^{-1}\| (\|\mathbf{P}\| \|\mathbf{D}^{-1}\|)^m \\ & = \frac{\|\mathbf{D}^{-1}\|}{1 - \|\mathbf{P}\| \|\mathbf{D}^{-1}\|} (\|\mathbf{P}\| \|\mathbf{D}^{-1}\|)^{\text{dist}(x,y)} \\ & = C_M e^{-\text{dist}(x,y)/\xi}, \end{aligned} \quad (102)$$

where we defined $C_M := \|\mathbf{D}^{-1}\| / (1 - \|\mathbf{P}\| \|\mathbf{D}^{-1}\|) = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and denote $\xi^{-1} := -\ln(\|\mathbf{P}\| \|\mathbf{D}^{-1}\|)$ as the clustering length of the matrix \mathbf{M}^{-1} . Substituting Eq. (102) into Eq. (99) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle n_x \rangle_{\beta H} & \leq \beta^{-1/2} \sum_{y \in V} (\mathbf{M}^{-1})_{xy} C_y \\ & \leq \beta^{-1/2} \max_{x_1 \in V} C_{x_1} \sum_{y \in V} C_M e^{-\text{dist}(x,y)/\xi}. \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

Here, follow the similar calculations in Eq. (93) we know that the summation on RHS of Eq. (103) can be bounded by $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant, which together with $\max_{x_1 \in V} C_{x_1} = \max_{x_1 \in V} C_{\text{cut}}(c_x, \mu, U_{\text{max}}, U_{\text{min}}) = \mathcal{O}(1)$ finishes the proof. Actually, having Eq. (103) in hand and choosing

$$O \rightarrow O'_x = \beta \left[c'_x n_x^2 + \sum_{y: x \sim y} J_{xy} (a_x^\dagger a_y + a_y^\dagger a_x) \right] \quad (104)$$

in Eq. (95) enable us to derive $\langle n_x \rangle_{\beta H} \leq C' \beta^{-1}$ with $C' = C'_{\text{cut}}(c_x, \mu, U_{\text{max}}, U_{\text{min}}) = \mathcal{O}(1)$.

We conclude this subsection by a short discussion. Unlike Lemma 1, the present inequality Eq. (103) holds for arbitrary temperature. However, this approach is only limited to achieve the upper bound for $\langle n_x \rangle_{\beta H}$ and $\langle n_x^2 \rangle_{\beta H}$. We still need clustering expansion and interaction picture to prove the more general claim, i.e., the low-boson-density assumption Corollary 1.

B. Absolute Convergence of Interaction Picture

We show that for finite system (V, E) and high (but not infinite) temperatures, the series $e^{-\beta W_{V_\mathcal{E}}} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{E}} f(w)$ over any set of words $\mathcal{E} \subset E^*$ converges absolutely with $V_\mathcal{E} := \bigcup_{w \in \mathcal{E}} V_w$. This fact implies we can freely adjust the order of the $f(w)$ terms in the series.

To see this, we first denote $G_\mathcal{E} := \bigcup_{w \in \mathcal{E}} G_w$ to write

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| e^{-\beta W_{V_\mathcal{E}}} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{E}} f(w) \right\| & \leq \sum_{w \in \mathcal{E}} \|e^{-\beta W_{V_\mathcal{E}}} f(w)\| \\ & \leq \sum_{w \in [G_\mathcal{E}]^*} \|e^{-\beta W_{V_\mathcal{E}}} f(w)\|. \end{aligned} \quad (105)$$

Then for each word $w \in [G_\mathcal{E}]^*$, we have $\|e^{-\beta W_{V_\mathcal{E}}} f(w)\| = \|e^{-\beta W_{V_w^c}}\| \|e^{-\beta W_{V_w}} f(w)\| \leq e^{\beta \mu_0 |V_w^c|/2U_{\min}} \|e^{-\beta W_{V_w}} f(w)\|_1$, where we denote $V_w^c := V_\mathcal{E} \setminus V_w$ and use $\|\bullet\| \leq \|\bullet\|_1$. Then by setting $n_G = \mathbb{1}$ in Eq. (33) we obtain

$$\|e^{-\beta W_{V_w}} f(w)\|_1 \leq \left(\frac{C_3}{\sqrt{\beta}}\right)^{|V_w|} \frac{(C_5 \sqrt{\beta})^{|w|}}{|w|!} \prod_{i=1}^{|G_\mathcal{E}|} \mu_i(w)!, \quad (106)$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{w \in [G_\mathcal{E}]^*} \|e^{-\beta W_{V_\mathcal{E}}} f(w)\| \\ & \leq C_{\text{abs}}^{|V_\mathcal{E}|} \sum_{w \in [G_\mathcal{E}]^*} \frac{(C_5 \sqrt{\beta})^{|w|}}{|w|!} \prod_{i=1}^{|G_\mathcal{E}|} \mu_i(w)! \\ & \leq C_{\text{abs}}^{|V_\mathcal{E}|} \left(\frac{1}{1 - C_5 \beta^{1/2}}\right)^{|G_\mathcal{E}|} \end{aligned} \quad (107)$$

and therefore justifies the absolutely convergence of Eq. (105) for $0 < \beta \leq \beta_{\text{abs}} := 1/C_5^2 > \beta_{L1}^*$. Here, we have denoted $C_{\text{abs}} := \max\{C_3 \beta^{-1/2}, e^{\beta \mu_0/2U_{\min}}\}$ and used Lemma 8 with the constraint $\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n \geq 1$ in the second line of Eq. (E46) replaced by $\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n \geq 0$. We emphasize that the radius of convergence β_{abs} is greater than that in Lemma 1, which ensures there is no worry about the order of $f(w)$ in the series whenever Lemma 1 is applicable. In fact, we can also directly establish the bound for $\|e^{-\beta W_{V_w}} f(w)\|$ without using Eq. (33) to have a tighter bound on $\|e^{-\beta W_{V_\mathcal{E}}} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{E}} f(w)\|$. However, to prove convergence the analysis presented above is sufficient.

By similar approach we can also show the absolute convergence of $e^{-\beta \widetilde{W}_{V_\mathcal{E}}} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{E}} f(w)$ and $e^{-\beta \widetilde{W}_{V_\mathcal{E}}^{(+)}} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{E}} \widetilde{f}(w)$ over any set of words. Therefore, when accompanied by either $e^{-\beta W_{V_w}}$ or $e^{-\beta \widetilde{W}_{V_w}}$ ($e^{-\beta \widetilde{W}_{V_w}^{(+)}}$), we may freely interchange the order of $f(w)$ ($\widetilde{f}(w)$).

IX. CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

To summarize, by combining cluster expansion and interaction picture techniques we presented the proof of boson clustering theorem for the Bose-Hubbard model at high temperature. The techniques developed here also led us to bound the moment of local particle number to any order. This result can be viewed as a rigorous justification for the frequently invoked low-boson-density condition in the Bose-Hubbard class of Hamiltonians, which are of strong experimental relevance. We also demonstrated the application of clustering theorem by considering the specific heat density of the Bose-Hubbard model, which was shown to be bounded above by $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant. To the best of our knowledge, this work presents the first rigorous proof of the clustering property for bosonic systems, along with the associated thermodynamical relations.

The mathematical techniques, lemmas, and theorems developed in this work have broader applications to locality problems in quantum many-body systems. Particularly, the calculations in this work presents a systematical methodology to deal with the divergence emerging from the infinite dimensionality of the Hilbert spaces. Our theoretical framework including clustering expansion and interaction picture also shed light on other bosonic version of properties arising from locality, such as clustering of (conditional) mutual information [26, 80, 81], thermal area law [79, 82] and Lieb-Robinson bound [32, 67, 68].

Although not explicitly stated in this study, our derivations for clustering theorem and low-boson-density can be readily generalized to a broad class of Hubbard-type Hamiltonian [68]. Different forms of the on-site interaction and hopping term does not essentially spoil the application of clustering expansion, interaction picture and various combinatorics tricks.

We end this paper by outlining several possible research topics that emerge from this work below:

- (i) *Clustering of correlation at arbitrary temperatures in 1D boson system.*—While Araki's seminal work [54] only demonstrated the clustering property for one-dimensional quantum spin systems, this property holds at all temperatures, which consequently proves the absence of thermal phase transitions. Parallel result is also expected to obtain for 1D Bose-Hubbard class of models with our method.
- (ii) *Clustering of tripartite correlations at high temperature.*—In this work we mainly focus on the conventional two-point correlation function. However, tripartite or more general, multi-point correlation functions are also appearing in statistical physics [83–85]. It might be meaningful to generalize the present boson clustering theorem to cases where more operators are involved.
- (iii) *Further implications of clustering property in equilibrium thermodynamics.*—We showed that the clustering property is directly linked to the specific heat, due to the bipartite nature of the correlation function. The possibility of evaluating or establishing bounds for thermodynamic quantities, such as free energy and entropy, through clustering properties presents an intriguing area of investigation. Furthermore, examining the distinct correlation lengths between fermionic and bosonic systems offers valuable insights into how the Pauli exclusion principle influences thermodynamic quantities.
- (iv) *Dynamical aspect of low-boson-density condition.*—The definition for low-boson-density condition is state-wise, which does not depends on the system and any dynamical processes. A natural extension of this work to dynamical regime is to investigate whether this condition persists when the system, initially prepared in the high-temperature Gibbs state of the Bose-Hubbard model, evolves according to either the von Neumann [86, 87] or Lindblad equations [88]. We can even consider this problem

within the more general non-Markovian dynamics [65, 89].

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank Prof. Naomichi Hatano and Prof. Masahito Yamazaki for fruitful discussions. X.-H.T. was supported by the FoPM, WINGS Program, the University of Tokyo. Z.G. acknowledges support from the University of Tokyo Excellent Young Researcher Program and from JST ERATO Grant Number JPMJER2302, Japan. T. K. acknowledges the Hakubi projects of RIKEN. T. K. was supported by JST PRESTO (Grant No. JPMJPR2116), ERATO (Grant No. JPMJER2302), and JSPS Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research (No. JP23H01099, JP24H00071), Japan.

APPENDIX

Appendix A: Derivation of Calculations in Sec. III

1. Proof of Eq. (19)

Putting Eqs. (13) and (16) into Eq. (12), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)} \text{Tr} X e^{-\beta H} &= \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)} \text{Tr} X e^{-\beta W} S(\beta) \\
&= \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)} \sum_{w \in E^*} \text{Tr} X e^{-\beta W} f(w) \\
&= \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{C}(G_X)} \text{Tr} X e^{-\beta W} f(w) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)} \sum_{w \notin \mathcal{C}(G_X)} \text{Tr} X e^{-\beta W} f(w).
\end{aligned} \tag{A1}$$

As explained in the main text that $\mathcal{C}(G_X) = \{w | w \cap G_X \neq \emptyset\}$ collects all the words overlap with the edges contained by the support of X . Therefore, all the words in the complement of $\mathcal{C}(G_X)$ are generated by edges outside G_X . Namely, we have $[\mathcal{C}(G_X)]^c = [G_X^c]^*$, which gives us

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{w \notin \mathcal{C}(G_X)} \text{Tr} X e^{-\beta W} f(w) &= \sum_{w \in [G_X^c]^*} \text{Tr} X e^{-\beta W} f(w) \\
&= \text{Tr} X e^{-\beta W} S[I_{G_X^c}](\beta) \\
&= \text{Tr} X e^{-\beta W_{V_X}} e^{-\beta W_{V_X^c}} S[I_{G_X^c}](\beta) \\
&= \text{Tr} X e^{-\beta W_{V_X}} e^{-\beta H_{V_X^c}} \\
&= \text{Tr}_{V_X} X e^{-\beta W_{V_X}} \text{Tr}_{V_X^c} e^{-\beta H_{V_X^c}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A2}$$

Here, we used Eq. (18), (61) and the fact $V_X^c \equiv V_{G_X^c}$ (see Fig. 5 for an illustration) to obtain the second and the fourth line, respectively. In the last line of Eq. (B6), we explicitly write out Tr_U to denote the partial trace evaluated over the Hilbert space $\otimes_{x \in U} \mathcal{H}$ with $U \subset V$

being an arbitrary vertex subset. By Lemma 2 we further bound Eq. (B6):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)} \sum_{w \notin \mathcal{C}(G_X)} \text{Tr} X e^{-\beta W} f(w) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\text{Tr}_{V_X} e^{-\beta W_{V_X}} \text{Tr}_{V_X^c} e^{-\beta H_{V_X^c}}} \\
&\quad \times \text{Tr}_{V_X} X e^{-\beta W_{V_X}} \text{Tr}_{V_X^c} e^{-\beta H_{V_X^c}} = \langle X \rangle_{\beta W_{V_X}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A3}$$

Therefore we finish the proof for Eq. (19).




Figure 5: A 2D square lattice as an illustration of the relation $V_X^c \equiv V_{G_X^c}$.

2. Proof of Eq. (21)

Here we prove the general version of Eq. (21) with 1 replaced by L . First for any $G_0 \subset E$ and any function $f_0(w)$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{C}_{\geq L}^k(G_0)} \text{Tr} X e^{-\beta W} f_0(w) \\
&= - \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (-1)^m \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \binom{k}{m} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{C}_{\geq L}^k(G_0)} \text{Tr} X e^{-\beta W} f_0(w),
\end{aligned} \tag{A4}$$

where we have used Lemma 3 from Ref[20] and the derivation is similar to that of Eq. (A8) in the same reference. To proceed we define

$$\rho(G) := \sum_{w \in [(\partial G)^c]^* : G_w = G} f_0(w), \tag{A5}$$

with $G_w \subset G$ representing every letter in G occurs at least once in w . Then we denote by $\mathcal{A}_{\geq L}(G_0)$ the sets of connected edge subsets that overlap with G_0 and are of size equal to or greater than L . Here the terminology “overlap” between two edge subsets G and G' means $G \cap G' \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, we denote by $\mathcal{A}_{\geq L}^k(G_0)$ the corresponding sets of k -fold nonoverlapping connected edge subsets, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{A}_{\geq L}^k := \left\{ \bigcup_{j=1}^k G_j : G_j \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq L}(G_0) \text{ nonoverlapping} \right\}. \tag{A6}$$

The Lemma 10 (which is, independent of the concrete form of the function $f_0(w)$) from Ref [20] helps us to obtain

$$\sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq L}^m(G_0)} \rho(G) = \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \binom{k}{m} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{C}_{\geq L}^k(G_0)} f_0(w). \quad (\text{A7})$$

Putting Eq. (E16) into Eq. (A4) we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{C}_{\geq L}^k(G_0)} \text{Tr} X e^{-\beta W} f_0(w) \\ &= - \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (-1)^m \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq L}^m(G_0)} \text{Tr} X e^{-\beta W} \rho(G). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A8})$$

Then by choosing $L = 1$, $G_0 = G_X$ and $f_0 = f$ we finish the proof for Eq. (21).

3. Relations Between Edge- and Vertex-Wise Multiplicities

For Eq. (23a) we just note that in LHS we actually double sum over each edge, which always contain two vertices. Summing θ from 1 to \mathfrak{d} is reasonable, if there is actually no edges in certain “direction” $\theta_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots, \mathfrak{d}\}$ then we simply set $\mu_{x, \theta_0}(w) = 0$, which does not contribute to both sides of Eq. (23a). For Eq. (23b), the square in the RHS also comes from the double counting. By noting that $0! = 1$, the production with θ ranging from 1 to \mathfrak{d} is also reasonable, since we have set $\mu_{x, \theta_0}(w) = 0$ whenever there is no edge in the “direction” θ_0 .

In general, we have for any constant a that

$$\sum_{x \in V_w} \sum_{\theta=1}^{\mathfrak{d}} a \mu_{x, \theta}(w) = \sum_{i=1}^{|G_w|} 2a \mu_i(w) \equiv 2a|w| \quad (\text{A9a})$$

$$\prod_{x \in V_w} \prod_{\theta=1}^{\mathfrak{d}} [a \mu_{x, \theta}(w)]! = \prod_{i=1}^{|G_w|} [a \mu_i(w)]!. \quad (\text{A9b})$$

Appendix B: Derivation of Calculations in Sec. IV

1. Thermal Average of Local Particle Number: On-Site

It's not hard to know

$$\langle n_x \rangle_{\beta W} = \frac{\text{Tr}_x n_x e^{-\beta W_x}}{\text{Tr}_x e^{-\beta W_x}} = \frac{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n e^{-(an^2 - bn)}}{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-(an^2 - bn)}} \quad (\text{B1})$$

with $a = \beta U_x/2$ and $b = \beta \mu_{0,x}$. Here, the numerator can be bounded by Lemma 3 via $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n e^{-(an^2 - bn)} \leq C_{B1} a^{-1}$ with $C_{B1} = \mathcal{O}(1)$ being the constant defined in the last line of Eq. (E13). For the denominator, the treatment is little more tricky.

► If $b < 0$, by noticing that $bn \geq bn^2$ we obtain $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-an^2 + bn} \geq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-(a-b)n^2} \geq \sqrt{\pi}(a -$

$b)^{-1/2}/2 = \sqrt{\pi}(a + |b|)^{-1/2}/2$. Here we used inequality $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-a_0 n^2} \geq \int_0^{\infty} dx e^{-a_0 x^2} = \sqrt{\pi} a_0^{-1/2}/2$ for $a_0 > 0$.

► If $b \geq 0$, we still have $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-an^2 + bn} \geq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-an^2 - bn} \geq \sqrt{\pi}(a + |b|)^{-1/2}/2$.

Therefore, we conclude that for all $b \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-an^2 + bn} \right)^{-1} \leq 2(a + |b|)^{1/2}/\sqrt{\pi}, \quad (\text{B2})$$

which leads us to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n e^{-(an^2 - bn)}}{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-(an^2 - bn)}} \\ & \leq C_{B1} a^{-1} \cdot 2(a + |b|)^{1/2}/\sqrt{\pi} \\ & = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} C_{B1} (U_{\max}/2 + \mu_0)^{1/2} (U_{\min}/2)^{-1} \beta^{-1/2} \\ & := \frac{C_{B2}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B3})$$

with C_{B2} being an $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant, which finishes the proof. Note that Eq. (B3) does not require the high temperature condition.

2. Proof of Eq. (28)

To begin with, we give the definition for the equivalent relation between any two words $w_{\text{I}}, w_{\text{II}} \in \{w \in [\partial G]^* : G_w = G\}$ w.r.t $G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq L}^m(G_0)$:

$$w_{\text{I}} \sim w_{\text{II}} \iff \begin{cases} w_{\text{I}} \upharpoonright \overline{G}^c = w_{\text{II}} \upharpoonright \overline{G}^c \\ w_{\text{I}} \upharpoonright G_j = w_{\text{II}} \upharpoonright G_j \end{cases} \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, m. \quad (\text{B4})$$

Here, for any subalphabet $G' \subset E$, the restriction $w \upharpoonright G'$ of a word $w \in E^*$ is obtained from w by omitting all letters that are not in G' . For a fixed word $u \in \{w \in [\partial G]^* : G \subset u\}$ also served as a representative, the corresponding equivalent class $K(u) := \{w | w \sim u\}$ can also be labelled as $K(u) = K[w_0, w_1, w_2, \dots, w_m]$ with $w_0 = u \upharpoonright \overline{G}^c$ and $w_j = u \upharpoonright G_j$ ($j = 1, 2, \dots, m$). We introduce the shorthand

$$W^{=G_j} := \{w \in (G_j)^* : G_w = G_j\} \quad (\text{B5})$$

For this equivalent class K , we have from Lemma 4 that

$$\sum_{w \in K(u)} f(w) = f(w_0) f(w_1) f(w_2) \dots f(w_m). \quad (\text{B6})$$

then for any representative u

$$\begin{aligned}
& \rho(G) \\
&= \sum_{K(u)} \sum_{w \in K(u)} f(w) \\
&= \sum_{w_0 \in [G^c]^*} \sum_{w_1 \in \mathcal{W}^{=G_1}} \sum_{w_2 \in \mathcal{W}^{=G_2}} \dots \sum_{w_m \in \mathcal{W}^{=G_m}} \sum_{w \in K} f(w) \\
&= \sum_{w_0 \in [G^c]^*} f(w_0) \sum_{w_1 \in \mathcal{W}^{=G_1}} f(w_1) \sum_{w_2 \in \mathcal{W}^{=G_2}} f(w_2) \\
&\quad \dots \sum_{w_m \in \mathcal{W}^{=G_m}} f(w_m) \\
&= S[I_{G^c}](\beta) \prod_{j=1}^m \eta(G_j).
\end{aligned} \tag{B7}$$

Thus, we arrive at the desired result.

3. Trace Norm of $n_G e^{-\beta W_{V_G}} f(w)$

Here we bound $\|n_G e^{-\beta W_{V_G}} f(w)\|_1$ from above for any connected subalphabet and the word w satisfying $w \in G^*$ and $G_w = G$. This condition actually restricts the support of the word within V_G and implies it is inconsequential to refine the notation $\bullet(\tau) := e^{\tau W_{V_G}} \bullet e^{-\tau W_{V_G}}$. It will be convenient if we rewrite the Dyson series into the form of ‘‘durations’’, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{-\beta W_{V_G}} f(w) &= \int_{[0, \beta]^{|w|+1}} \mathcal{D}\Delta\vec{\tau} \\
&\delta \left(\sum_{i=1}^{|w|+1} \Delta\tau_i - \beta \right) \prod_{k=1}^{|w|} [e^{-\Delta\tau_k W_{V_G}} h_{\lambda_k}(w)] \cdot e^{-\Delta\tau_{|w|+1} W_{V_G}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{B8}$$

Here, we have defined durations $\Delta\tau_1 := \beta - \tau_1$, $\Delta\tau_{|w|+1} := \tau_{|w|}$ and $\Delta\tau_k = \tau_k - \tau_{k+1}$ for $k = 2, 3, \dots, |w|$. We know from the relation $\beta \geq \tau_1 \geq \tau_2 \geq \dots \geq \tau_{|w|} \geq 0$ (definition for $\mathcal{T}_{|w|}$) that $\Delta\tau_k \in [0, \beta]$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, |w|+1$. Also, by explicitly writing out $h_{\lambda_k}(w)$ we emphasize the operator h_{λ_k} under investigation is the one of the edges coming from the word w . We then have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|n_G e^{-\beta W_{V_G}} f(w)\|_1 &\leq \int_{[0, \beta]^{|w|+1}} \mathcal{D}\Delta\vec{\tau} \delta \left(\sum_{i=1}^{|w|+1} \Delta\tau_i \right. \\
&\left. - \beta \right) \left\| n_G \prod_{k=1}^{|w|} [e^{-\Delta\tau_k W_{V_G}} h_{\lambda_k}(w)] \cdot e^{-\Delta\tau_{|w|+1} W_{V_G}} \right\|_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{B9}$$

Note that each local term

To proceed, we tend to decompose $\prod_{k=1}^{|w|} [e^{-\Delta\tau_k W_{V_G}} h_{\lambda_k}(w)]$ w.r.t different sites. However, we note each local Hamiltonian in $\{h_{\lambda_k}(w)\}_{k=1}^{|w|}$ consists two terms, i.e., the forward and backward hoppings $h_{\lambda_k}(w) = J_{x_k y_k} (a_{x_k}^\dagger a_{y_k} + a_{y_k}^\dagger a_{x_k})$ for each $\lambda_k = \{x_k, y_k\}$. This fact motivates us to denote $h_{\lambda_k}(w) = \sum_{s=1,2} h_{\lambda_k}^{(s)}(w)$ with $s = 1$ and 2 corresponds

to the forward and backward hopping, respectively. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \prod_{k=1}^{|w|} [e^{-\Delta\tau_k W_{V_G}} h_{\lambda_k}(w)] \cdot e^{-\Delta\tau_{|w|+1} W_{V_G}} \\
&= \sum_{\{s_k=1,2\}_{k=1}^{|w|}} \prod_{k=1}^{|w|} [e^{-\Delta\tau_k W_{V_G}} h_{\lambda_k}^{(s_k)}(w)] \cdot e^{-\Delta\tau_{|w|+1} W_{V_G}}
\end{aligned} \tag{B10}$$

which leads us to

$$\begin{aligned}
\|n_G e^{-\beta W_{V_G}} f(w)\|_1 &\leq \int_{[0, \beta]^{|w|+1}} \mathcal{D}\Delta\vec{\tau} \delta \left(\sum_{i=1}^{|w|+1} \Delta\tau_i - \beta \right) \\
&\sum_{\{s_k=1,2\}_{k=1}^{|w|}} \left\| n_G \prod_{k=1}^{|w|} [e^{-\Delta\tau_k W_{V_G}} h_{\lambda_k}^{(s_k)}(w)] \cdot e^{-\Delta\tau_{|w|+1} W_{V_G}} \right\|_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{B11}$$

Later we move to bound RHS of Eq. (B11) for each sequence of $s_1 s_2 \dots s_{|w|} \in \{1, 2\}^{|w|}$ denoted by \vec{s} . By first noting that we have $\prod_{k=1}^{|w|} h_{\lambda_k}^{(s_k)}(w) = \prod_{x \in V_G} h_x(w, \vec{s})$, where each quantity in $\{h_x(w, \vec{s})\}_{x \in V_G}$ is the production of a set of creation (a_x^\dagger) or annihilation operators (a_x). Each edge $\lambda \in w$ contributes one of the operators in $\{a_x^\dagger, a_x, \mathbb{1}\}$ to each site $x \in V_G$, since all the terms in $\{h_{\lambda_k}^{(s_k)}\}_{k=1}^{|w|}$ take the form of $\sim a_\bullet^\dagger a_\circ$ (the symbol \sim means we omit the coefficient temporarily).

The analysis above enables us to decompose $h_x(w, \vec{s})$ can be decomposed as $h_x(w, \vec{s}) \sim \prod_{k=1}^{|w|} o_{x,k}(w, \vec{s})$ with each element in $\{o_{x,k}(w, \vec{s})\}_{k=1}^{|w|}$ picked from $\{a_x^\dagger, a_x, \mathbb{1}\}$. Then we can obtain the following useful formula

$$\begin{aligned}
& \prod_{k=1}^{|w|} [e^{-\Delta\tau_k W_{V_G}} h_{\lambda_k}^{(s_k)}(w)] \cdot e^{-\Delta\tau_{|w|+1} W_{V_G}} \\
&= \prod_{x \in V_G} \left\{ \prod_{k=1}^{|w|} [e^{-\Delta\tau_k W_x} o_{x,k}(w, \vec{s})] e^{-\Delta\tau_{|w|+1} W_x} \right\}
\end{aligned} \tag{B12}$$

Based on this, we equip $h_x(w, \vec{s})$ a $|w|$ -dimensional vector $\vec{b}_x(w, \vec{s})$ to describe the structure of $h_x(w, \vec{s})$ for each site $x \in V_G$, whose values can be read off from the following dictionary:

$$\begin{cases} o_{x,k}(w, \vec{s}) = a_x^\dagger & [\vec{b}_x(w, \vec{s})]_k = +1 \\ o_{x,k}(w, \vec{s}) = \mathbb{1} & [\vec{b}_x(w, \vec{s})]_k = 0 \\ o_{x,k}(w, \vec{s}) = a_x & [\vec{b}_x(w, \vec{s})]_k = -1, \end{cases} \tag{B13}$$

for $k = 1, 2, \dots, |w|$. Then, $h_x(w, \vec{s})$ can be decomposed as $h_x(w, \vec{s}) \sim \prod_{k=1}^{|w|} o_{x,k}(w, \vec{s})$. Here, we denote by $m_x(w) := \sum_{k=1}^{|w|} |[\vec{b}_x(w, \vec{s})]_k|$ as the number of the operators at site x offer by the word w , which is independent of the sequence \vec{s} . To move further, we first notice that for any smooth function f_1 with argument to particle number operator n , we have the relations $f_1(n)a = a f_1(n-1)$ and $f_1(n)a^\dagger = a^\dagger f_1(n+1)$ with creation (a^\dagger) and annihilation (a) operators. Since $W_{V_G} = \sum_{x \in V_G} W_x(n_x)$ with

$W_x(n) := U_x n^2/2 - \mu_{0,x} n$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \prod_{k=1}^{|w|} \left[e^{-\Delta\tau_k W_{V_G}} h_{\lambda_k}^{(s_k)}(w) \right] e^{-\Delta\tau_{|w|+1} W_{V_G}} \\ &= \prod_{x \in V_G} h_x(w, \vec{s}) e^{-\sum_{k=1}^{|w|} \Delta\tau_k W_x(n_x + B_{x,k}(w, \vec{s})) - \Delta\tau_{|w|+1} W_x(n_x)} \\ &:= \prod_{x \in V_G} h_x(w, \vec{s}) e^{O_x(n_x)}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B14})$$

where we defined $B_{x,k}(w, \vec{s}) := \sum_{i=k}^{|w|} [\vec{b}_x(w, \vec{s})]_i$ to denote the total number of the operators corresponding to the truncated vector of $\vec{b}_x(w, \vec{s})$. With Eq. (B14), we find the norm on RHS of Eq. (B11) can be splitted w.r.t different sites via

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| n_G \prod_{k=1}^{|w|} \left[e^{-\Delta\tau_k W_{V_G}} h_{\lambda_k}^{(s_k)}(w) \right] \cdot e^{-\Delta\tau_{|w|+1} W_{V_G}} \right\|_1 \\ &= \prod_{x \in V_G} \left\| n_{G,x} h_x(w, \vec{s}) e^{O_x(n_x)} \right\|_1, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B15})$$

where for convenience we used the decomposition

$$n_G = \prod_{x \in V_G} n_{G,x} \quad (\text{B16})$$

with $n_{G,x} = n_{x_0}$ or $\mathbb{1}$. To bound the norm for each site, we utilize the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality (i.e., setting $(p, p_1, p_2) = (1, 2, 2)$ in Eq. (13))

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| n_{G,x} h_x(w, \vec{s}) e^{O_x(n_x)} \right\|_1 \\ & \leq \left\| n_{G,x} h_x(w, \vec{s}) e^{O_x(n_x)/2} \right\|_2 \left\| e^{O_x(n_x)/2} \right\|_2 \\ &= \sqrt{\text{Tr}_x h_x(w, \vec{s})^\dagger n_{G,x}^\dagger n_{G,x} h_x(w, \vec{s}) e^{O_x(n_x)}} \sqrt{\text{Tr}_x e^{O_x(n_x)}} \\ &= \sqrt{\text{Tr}_x \bar{h}_{G,x}(w, \vec{s})^\dagger \bar{h}_{G,x}(w, \vec{s}) e^{O_x(n_x)}} \sqrt{\text{Tr}_x e^{O_x(n_x)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B17})$$

Note that the operator $\bar{h}_{G,x}(w, \vec{s}) := n_{G,x} h_x(w, \vec{s})$ is given by the production of $m_x(w) + q_{G,x} =: \bar{q}_{G,x}(w)$ creation and annihilation operators, with $q_{G,x}$ and $\bar{q}_{G,x}(w)$ denoting the number of the operators offered by $n_{G,x}$ and $\bar{h}_{G,x}(w, \vec{s})$, respectively. Actually, we set $q_{G,x} = 2$ if $n_{G,x} = n_{x_0} = a_{x_0}^\dagger a_{x_0}$ and $q_{G,x} = 0$ if $n_{G,x} = \mathbb{1}$. We omit the coefficients temporarily to have the decomposition result $\bar{h}_{G,x}(w, \vec{s}) \sim \prod_{k=1}^{\bar{q}_{G,x}(w)} \bar{o}_{x,k}(w, \vec{s})$. To describe the structure of $\bar{h}_{G,x}(w, \vec{s})$, we define the vector $\vec{c}_{\alpha,x}(w)$ with dimensions $\bar{q}_{\alpha,x}(w)$. Here for each operator $\bar{o}_{x,k}(w, \vec{s}) \in \{a_x^\dagger, a_x\}$ with $k = 1, 2, \dots, \bar{q}_{G,x}(w)$, the following dictionary relation gives value for $\vec{c}_{\alpha,x}(w)$:

$$\begin{cases} \bar{o}_{x,k}(w) = a_x^\dagger & [\vec{c}_x(w)]_k = +1 \\ \bar{o}_{x,k}(w) = a_x & [\vec{c}_x(w)]_k = -1. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B18})$$

Then we can obtain (we temporarily omit the argument

of $\{\bar{o}_{x,k}(w, \vec{s})\}_{k=1}^{|w|}$ for brevity)

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{h}_{G,x}(w, \vec{s})^\dagger \bar{h}_{G,x}(w, \vec{s}) \\ & \sim \bar{o}_{x,\bar{q}_{G,x}(w)}^\dagger \dots \bar{o}_{x,2}^\dagger \bar{o}_{x,1}^\dagger \bar{o}_{x,1} \bar{o}_{x,2} \dots \bar{o}_{x,\bar{q}_{G,x}(w)} \\ & = \bar{o}_{x,\bar{q}_{G,x}(w)}^\dagger \dots \bar{o}_{x,2}^\dagger [n_x + \theta([\vec{c}_x(w)]_1)] \bar{o}_{x,2} \dots \bar{o}_{x,\bar{q}_{G,x}(w)} \\ & = \bar{o}_{x,\bar{q}_{G,x}(w)}^\dagger \dots \bar{o}_{x,2}^\dagger \bar{o}_{x,2} \dots \bar{o}_{x,\bar{q}_{G,x}(w)} \\ & \quad \times \left[n_x + \theta([\vec{c}_x(w)]_1) + \sum_{i=2}^{\bar{q}_{G,x}(w)} [\vec{c}_x(w)]_i \right] \\ & \dots \\ & = \prod_{k=1}^{\bar{q}_{G,x}(w)} \left[n_x + \theta([\vec{c}_x(w)]_k) + \sum_{i=k+1}^{\bar{q}_{G,x}(w)} [\vec{c}_x(w)]_i \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B19})$$

Equation (B19) motivates us to obtain for integer n that $n - \bar{q}_{G,x}(w) \leq n + \theta([\vec{c}_x(w)]_k) + \sum_{i=k+1}^{\bar{q}_{G,x}(w)} [\vec{c}_x(w)]_i \leq n + \bar{q}_{G,x}(w)$ and $[n + \bar{q}_{G,x}(w)]^{\bar{q}_{G,x}(w)} \geq [n - \bar{q}_{G,x}(w)]^{\bar{q}_{G,x}(w)}$, which further gives us

$$\begin{aligned} & \prod_{k=1}^{\bar{q}_{G,x}(w)} \left[n + \theta([\vec{c}_x(w)]_k) + \sum_{i=k+1}^{\bar{q}_{G,x}(w)} [\vec{c}_x(w)]_i \right] \\ & \leq [n + \bar{q}_{G,x}(w)]^{\bar{q}_{G,x}(w)}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B20})$$

which will later play critical role to obtain the bound for Eq. (B11). To handle the factor $e^{O_x(n_x)}$, we note that for integer n

$$\begin{aligned} & O_x(n) \\ &= - \sum_{k=1}^{|w|} \Delta\tau_k W_x(n + B_{x,k}(w, \vec{s})) - \Delta\tau_{|w|+1} W_x(n) \\ & \leq - \sum_{k=1}^{|w|} \Delta\tau_k \cdot \min_k W(n + B_{x,k}(w, \vec{s})) - \Delta\tau_{|w|+1} W_x(n) \\ & \leq - \sum_{k=1}^{|w|+1} \Delta\tau_k \cdot \min_k \{ \min W_x(n + B_{x,k}(w, \vec{s})), W(n) \} \\ & \leq - \beta \min_{k \in [-m_x(w), m_x(w)]} W_x(n + k) \\ & \leq - \beta \min_{y \in [n - m_x(w), n + m_x(w)]} W_x(y), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B21})$$

where to obtain the last second line we used $|B_{x,k}(w, \vec{s})| \leq m_x(w)$ by the definition of $B_{x,k}(w, \vec{s})$. By restoring the coefficients $\{J_{xy}\}$ and the uniform bound

Eq. (2), Equations (B20) and (B21) lead us to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Tr}_x h_x(w, \vec{s})^\dagger n_{G,x}^\dagger n_{G,x} h_x(w, \vec{s}) e^{O_x(n_x)} \\
& \leq J^{2m_x(w)} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n + \bar{q}_{G,x}(w)) \bar{q}_{G,x}(w) \\
& \quad \times \exp \left[-\beta \min_{y \in [n-m_x(w), n+m_x(w)]} W_x(y) \right] \\
& \leq J^{2m_x(w)} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n + \bar{q}_{G,x}(w)) \bar{q}_{G,x}(w) \\
& \quad \times \exp \left[-\beta \min_{y \in [n-\bar{q}_{G,x}(w), n+\bar{q}_{G,x}(w)]} W_x(y) \right] \\
& \leq J^{2m_x(w)} \left(\frac{C_{2,1}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{m_x(w)+q_{G,x}+1} (m_x(w) + q_{G,x})! \\
& \leq J^{2m_x(w)} \left(\frac{C_{2,2}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{m_x(w)+q_{G,x}+1} m_x(w)! q_{G,x}! \quad (\text{B22})
\end{aligned}$$

Here, to obtain the last line we used Lemma 6 and $(m+n)! \leq 2^{m+n} m! n!$ for integers m and n . The latter inequality follows from the fact that $\binom{m+n}{n} \leq 2^{m+n}$. In Eq. (B22) we have defined $C_{2,1} := C_{L6} \sqrt{2/U_{\min}}$ with C_{L6} being the constant C defined in Lemma 6 (the last line of Eq. (E39)) and we choose $C_{2,2} := 2C_{2,1}$ in the last line. By Eq. (E37), we also obtain $\text{Tr}_x e^{O_x(n_x)} \leq C_{2,4} m_x(w) / \sqrt{\beta} \leq C_{2,4} e^{m_x(w)} / \sqrt{\beta}$ for $C_{2,4} := C_{L6,1} \sqrt{2/U_{\min}}$ with $C_{L6,1}$ being the constant defined in the last line of Eq. (E40). By putting this inequality and Eq. (B22) into Eq. (B17) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| n_{G,x} h_x(w, \vec{s}) e^{O_x(n_x)} \right\|_1 \\
& \leq \frac{C_{2,5}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \left(\frac{C_{2,2}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{q_{G,x}(w)/2} \left(\frac{C_{2,6}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{m_x(w)/2} [m_x(w)!]^{1/2} \\
& \quad \times (q_{G,x}!)^{1/2} \quad (\text{B23})
\end{aligned}$$

where we defined $C_{2,5} := \sqrt{C_{2,2} C_{2,4}}$ and $C_{2,6} := e J^2 C_{2,2}$. By substituting Eq. (B23) into Eq. (B15) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| n_G \prod_{k=1}^{|w|} \left[e^{-\Delta \tau_k W_{V_G}} h_{\lambda_k}^{(s_k)}(w) \right] \cdot e^{-\Delta \tau_{|w|+1} W_{V_G}} \right\|_1 \\
& = \prod_{x \in V_G} \frac{C_{2,5}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \left(\frac{C_{2,2}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{q_{G,x}/2} \left(\frac{C_{2,6}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{m_x(w)/2} [m_x(w)!]^{1/2} \\
& \quad \times (q_{G,x}!)^{1/2}. \quad (\text{B24})
\end{aligned}$$

Note that each term from I simply offers one operator to the sites it contains, which implies $m_x(w)$ equals the number of the edges coming from w which contain the site x . In a formal way, $m_x(w) = \#\{\lambda | x \ni \lambda, \lambda \in w\}$ which gives us the following relation between $m_x(w)$ and the vertice-wise multiplicities

$$m_x(w) = \sum_{\theta=1}^{\mathfrak{d}} \mu_{x,\theta}(w), \quad (\text{B25})$$

with which and Lemma 7 we further bound part of the

factors in Eq. (B24) via

$$\begin{aligned}
& \prod_{x \in V_G} \left(\frac{C_{2,6}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{m_x(w)/2} [m_x(w)!]^{1/2} \\
& = \left(\frac{C_{2,6}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{|w|} \prod_{x \in V_w} \left[\left(\sum_{\theta=1}^{\mathfrak{d}} \mu_{x,\theta}(w) \right)! \right]^{1/2} \\
& \leq \left(\frac{C_{2,6}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{|w|} \left\{ \prod_{x \in V_w} \left[\prod_{\theta=1}^{\mathfrak{d}} [\mu_{x,\theta}(w)!] \cdot \mathfrak{d}^{\sum_{\theta=1}^{\mathfrak{d}} \mu_{x,\theta}(w)} \right] \right\}^{1/2} \\
& = \left(\frac{C_{2,7}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{|w|} \prod_{i=1}^{|G|} \mu_i(w)!. \quad (\text{B26})
\end{aligned}$$

Here, in the second line we simply noticed that $V_G = V_w$ since $w \in G^*$ and $G_w = G$. In the third line of Eq. (B26) we used Lemma 8 and to obtain the last line we defined $C_{2,7} := \mathfrak{d} C_{2,6}$. Substituting Eq. (B26) into Eq. (B24), we arrive at the bounds

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| n_G \prod_{k=1}^{|w|} \left[e^{-\Delta \tau_k W_{V_G}} h_{\lambda_k}^{(s_k)}(w) \right] \cdot e^{-\Delta \tau_{|w|+1} W_{V_G}} \right\|_1 \\
& \leq \left(\frac{C_{2,5}(q_G!)^{1/2}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{|V_G|} \left(\frac{C_{2,2}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{q_G/2} \left(\frac{C_{2,7}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{|w|} \prod_{i=1}^{|G|} \mu_i(w), \quad (\text{B27})
\end{aligned}$$

where we defined $q_G := \sum_{x \in V_G} q_{G,x}$ [cf. Eq. (B16)] as the total number of operators offered by n_G and used $\prod_{x \in V_G} (q_{G,x}!)^{1/2} \leq ((q_G!)^{1/2})^{|V_G|}$. By putting Eq. (B27) into Eq. (B11) we obtain the desired bound

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| n_G e^{-\beta W_{V_G}} f(w) \right\|_1 \\
& \leq \int_{[0,\beta]^{|w|+1}} \mathcal{D} \Delta \bar{\tau} \delta \left(\sum_{i=1}^{|w|+1} \Delta \tau_i - \beta \right) \sum_{\{s_k=1,2\}_{k=1}^{|w|}} \\
& \quad \left(\frac{C_{2,5}(q_G!)^{1/2}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{|V_G|} \left(\frac{C_{2,2}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{q_G/2} \left(\frac{C_{2,7}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{|w|} \prod_{i=1}^{|G|} \mu_i(w)! \\
& = \frac{\beta^{|w|}}{|w|!} 2^{|w|} \left(\frac{C_{2,5}(q_G!)^{1/2}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{|V_G|} \left(\frac{C_{2,2}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{q_G/2} \left(\frac{C_{2,7}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{|w|} \\
& \quad \times \prod_{i=1}^{|G|} \mu_i(w)! \\
& := \left(\frac{C_{2,5}(q_G!)^{1/2}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{|V_G|} \left(\frac{C_{2,2}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{q_G/2} \frac{(C_{2,8} \sqrt{\beta})^{|w|}}{|w|!} \prod_{i=1}^{|G|} \mu_i(w)! \quad (\text{B28})
\end{aligned}$$

with the definition $C_{2,8} := 2C_{2,7}$. Thus, we finish the proof.

4. Proof of Eq. (35)

we first have

$$\begin{aligned}
|C_\beta(n_{x_0})| &\leq \left(\frac{C_4}{\sqrt{\beta}}\right) \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq 1}^m(G_{x_0})} \frac{Z_{\overline{G}^c}(\beta)}{Z(\beta)} \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}C_3}{\sqrt{\beta}}\right)^{|V_G|} \sum_{\left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} w^{(j)} \in G_j^* \\ G_{w^{(j)}} = G_j \end{smallmatrix} \right\}_{j=1}^m} \prod_{j=1}^m \frac{(C_5\sqrt{\beta})^{|w^{(j)}|}}{|w^{(j)}|!} \prod_{i=1}^{|G_j|} \mu_i(w^{(j)})! \\
&\leq \left(\frac{C_4}{\sqrt{\beta}}\right) \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq 1}^m(G_{x_0})} \left(\sqrt{2}C_3C_{L2}\right)^{|V_G|} \prod_{j=1}^m \sum_{w \in G: G_w = G} \frac{(C_5\sqrt{\beta})^{|w|}}{|w|!} \prod_{i=1}^{|G_j|} [\mu_i(w)] \\
&= \left(\frac{C_4}{\sqrt{\beta}}\right) \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq 1}^m(G_{x_0})} \left(\sqrt{2}C_3C_{L2}\right)^{|V_G|} \left(\frac{C_5\beta^{1/2}}{1 - C_5\beta^{1/2}}\right)^{|G|} \\
&\leq \left(\frac{C_4}{\sqrt{\beta}}\right) \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq 1}^m(G_{x_0})} \left(\frac{C_{5,1}\beta^{1/2}}{1 - C_5\beta^{1/2}}\right)^{|G|}. \tag{B29}
\end{aligned}$$

Here, in the second and the third line we used Lemma 1 and (8), respectively. To obtain the last line of Eq. (B29), we first notice that $|V_G| \leq 2|G|$ since all the edges are supported by two sites i.e., $|\lambda| = 2$ for $\lambda \in E$. Then we use $(\sqrt{2}C_3C_{L2})^{|V_G|} \leq (\max\{\sqrt{2}C_3C_{L2}, 1\})^{2|G|}$ and define $C_{5,1} := \max\{\sqrt{2}C_3C_{L2}, 1\}^2 = \mathcal{O}(1)$.

Appendix C: Derivation of Calculations in Sec. V

1. Trace Norm of $e^{-\beta\tilde{W}_{V_G}} f(w)$

The newly introduced quantity \tilde{W}_{V_G} affects the ‘‘duration’’ technique in Eq. (B19) and we should first write

$$e^{-\beta\tilde{W}_{V_G}} = e^{c\sqrt{\beta}\delta N_G} e^{-\beta W_{V_G}}, \tag{C1}$$

where we denote $\delta N_G := \sum_{x \in V_G} \delta_x n_x$ with $\delta_x = 1$ for $x \in V_X$ and otherwise $\delta_x = 0$. Equation (C1) motivates us to modify

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{-\beta\tilde{W}_{V_G}} f(w) &= \int_{[0, \beta]^{|w|+1}} \mathcal{D}\Delta\vec{\tau} e^{c\sqrt{\beta}\delta N_G} \\
\delta \left(\sum_{i=1}^{|w|+1} \Delta\tau_i - \beta \right) &\prod_{k=1}^{|w|} [e^{-\Delta\tau_k W_{V_G}} h_{\lambda_k}(w)] \cdot e^{-\Delta\tau_{|w|+1} W_{V_G}}. \tag{C2}
\end{aligned}$$

Then we advance by the wisdom of Eq. (B10)

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{c\sqrt{\beta}\delta N_G} \prod_{k=1}^{|w|} [e^{-\Delta\tau_k W_{V_G}} h_{\lambda_k}(w)] \cdot e^{-\Delta\tau_{|w|+1} W_{V_G}} &= \\
\sum_{\{s_k=1,2\}_{k=1}^{|w|}} e^{c\sqrt{\beta}\delta N_G} \prod_{k=1}^{|w|} [e^{-\Delta\tau_k W_{V_G}} h_{\lambda_k}^{(s_k)}(w)] \cdot e^{-\Delta\tau_{|w|+1} W_{V_G}}, \tag{C3}
\end{aligned}$$

whose summand can also be dealt in the similar manner of Eq. (B14)

$$\begin{aligned}
&e^{c\sqrt{\beta}\delta N_G} \prod_{k=1}^{|w|} [e^{-\Delta\tau_k W_{V_G}} h_{\lambda_k}^{(s_k)}(w)] e^{-\Delta\tau_{|w|+1} W_{V_G}} \\
&= e^{c\sqrt{\beta}\delta N_G} \prod_{x \in V_G} h_x(w, \vec{s}) e^{O_x(n_x)} \\
&= \prod_{x \in V_G} h_x(w, \vec{s}) \exp \left[O_x(n_x) + c\sqrt{\beta}\delta_x(n_x + B_{x,1}(w, \vec{s})) \right] \\
&:= \prod_{x \in V_G} h_x(w, \vec{s}) e^{\check{O}_x(n_x)}, \tag{C4}
\end{aligned}$$

We still need to establish the bound for $\|h_x(w, \vec{s}) e^{\check{O}_x(n_x)}\|_1$, which can be easily achieve by setting $n_{G,x} = \mathbb{1}$ and replacing $O_x(n_x)$ with $\check{O}_x(n_x)$ in Eq. (B17):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|h_x(w, \vec{s}) e^{\check{O}_x(n_x)}\|_1 \\
&\leq \sqrt{\text{Tr}_x h_x(w, \vec{s})^\dagger h_x(w, \vec{s}) e^{\check{O}_x(n_x)}} \sqrt{\text{Tr}_x e^{\check{O}_x(n_x)}}. \tag{C5}
\end{aligned}$$

The consequences are as follows. Firstly, Eq. (B19) can be simplified to

$$\begin{aligned}
&h_x(w, \vec{s})^\dagger h_x(w, \vec{s}) \\
&\sim \prod_{k=1}^{m_x(w)} \left[n_x + \theta([\vec{c}_x(w)]_k) + \sum_{i=k+1}^{m_x(w)} [\vec{c}_x(w)]_i \right] \tag{C6}
\end{aligned}$$

and the RHS of Eq. (B20) should also be revised as $[n + m_x(w)]^{m_x(w)}$. Secondly, the bound for $\check{O}_x(n)$ is obtained by adding an extra term to Eq. (B21) according to δN_G

$$\begin{aligned}
&\check{O}_x(n) \\
&\leq -\beta \min_{y \in [n - m_x(w), n + m_x(w)]} W_x(y) + c\sqrt{\beta}\delta_x(n + m_x(w)). \tag{C7}
\end{aligned}$$

Then Eqs. (C6) and (C7) naturally lead us to

$$\text{Tr}_x h_x(w, \vec{s})^\dagger h_x(w, \vec{s}) e^{\check{O}_x(n_x)}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq J^{2m_x(w)} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n + m_x(w))^{m_x(w)} \\ &\quad \times \exp \left[-\beta \min_{y \in [n - m_x(w), n + m_x(w)]} W_x(y) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + c\sqrt{\beta} \delta_x(n + m_x(w)) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C8})$$

for $x \in V_X \cap V_G$. Equation (C8) motivates us to consider the upper bound of

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+p)^p e^{\max_{x \in [n-p, n+p]} (-ax^2 + bx) + c\sqrt{\beta}(x+p)} \\ &= e^{c\sqrt{\beta}p} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+p)^p e^{\max_{x \in [n-p, n+p]} (-ax^2 + \check{b}x)} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C9})$$

with $\check{b} = b + c\sqrt{\beta}$. Fortunately, with minor adjustments to the constants in the conclusion, Lemma 6 can be directly applied to establish bounds for Eq. (C9). Here we will justify this claim.

Note that previously, the temperature scalings of a and b are always $\mathcal{O}(\beta)$, with which we fix the expressions for the constants in Lemma 3, (5) and (6). However, the present scaling of b becomes $\mathcal{O}(\beta^{1/2})$. Our goal is to show that even under this revised scalings of a and b , we can still keep the same form of Lemma 6 and bound the constant C there by subtly changing the expression of C . Before that, we shall first prove Lemma 3 and Lemma 5 again with the new scalings.

proof for Lemma 3 with $b \rightarrow \check{b}$. — We still have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n^p e^{-(an^2 - \check{b}n)} \leq \check{C}_1 a^{-(p+1)/2} \Gamma(p+1/2)^{1/2} \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{\check{b} + \sqrt{\check{b}^2 + 8ap}}{4a} \right)^p 2e^{\check{b}^2/4a} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C10})$$

with $\check{C}_1 := 2^{-1/2} \pi^{1/4} e^{\check{b}^2/2a}$. Then we have $(\check{b} + \sqrt{\check{b}^2 + 8ap})/(4a) \leq \sqrt{2p}(\check{b} + \sqrt{\check{b}^2 + 4a})/(4a) = a^{-1/2} p \sqrt{2}(\check{b} + \sqrt{\check{b}^2 + 4a})/(4a^{1/2}) := \check{C}_{2,1} p^{1/2} a^{-1/2}$ with $\check{C}_{2,1} := \sqrt{2}(\check{b} + \sqrt{\check{b}^2 + 4a})/(4a^{1/2})$. Then we have the second term of Eq. (C10) can be bounded by $\check{C}_2^p a^{-p/2} p^{p/2}$ with $\check{C}_2 := 4e^{\check{b}^2/2a} \check{C}_{2,1}$. Therefore we have similar to the discussion below Eq. (E34) we have

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n^p e^{-(an^2 - \check{b}n)} \leq \check{C}_{L3}^p a^{-(p+1)/2} (p!)^{1/2} \quad (\text{C11})$$

with $\check{C}_{L3} := 4 \max\{4C_1^2, 8aC_2\}$. However, it's straightforward to show that $\check{C}_{L3} = \mathcal{O}(1)$ for $\beta \leq \beta^*$. To see this, we only need to show \check{C}_1 and \check{C}_2 can be bounded by $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constants. Actually, $\check{C}_1 \leq 2^{-1/2} \pi^{1/4} \exp[(\beta^* \mu_0 + 2\mu_0 c\sqrt{\beta^*} + c^2)/U_{\min}] = \mathcal{O}(1)$ since

$$\begin{aligned} \check{b}^2/a &= \frac{2(\beta\mu_{0,x} + c\sqrt{\beta})^2}{\beta U_x} \\ &\leq 2 \frac{\beta^* \mu_0 + 2\mu_0 c\sqrt{\beta^*} + c^2}{U_{\min}} = \mathcal{O}(1) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C12})$$

can be bounded. Then we readily recognize

$$\begin{aligned} \check{C}_2 &= 4e^{\check{b}^2/2a} \sqrt{2} \left(\check{b} + \sqrt{\check{b}^2 + 4a} \right) / (4a^{1/2}) \\ &= \sqrt{2} e^{\check{b}^2/2a} \left[\frac{\check{b}}{a^{1/2}} + \sqrt{\frac{\check{b}^2}{a} + 4} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C13})$$

can also be bounded by $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant. Therefore we finish the proof. \blacksquare

Next, the Lemma 5 also need to be revisited.

proof for Lemma 5 with $b \rightarrow \check{b}$. — First from Eqs. (E27) and (E28) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+2p)^p e^{-an^2 + \check{b}n} \leq \check{C}_1^p p^{p+1} + \check{C}_2^p a^{-(p+1)/2} \\ &\quad \times \Gamma\left(p + \frac{1}{2}\right)^{1/2} + 2(x_0 + 2p)^p e^{\check{b}^2/4a} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C14})$$

with $\check{C}_1 := 8e^{2\check{b}}$ and $\check{C}_2 := 2^{1/2} \pi^{1/2} e^{\check{b}^2/2a}$. However,

$$\begin{aligned} x_0 + 2p &= \frac{\check{b} + 4ap + \sqrt{(\check{b} + 4ap)^2 + 8ap}}{4a} \\ &\leq p \frac{\check{b} + 4a + \sqrt{(\check{b} + 4a)^2 + 8a}}{4a} \\ &= a^{-1/2} p \frac{\check{b} + 4a + \sqrt{(\check{b} + 4a)^2 + 8a}}{4a^{1/2}} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C15})$$

which gives us

$$2(x_0 + 2p)^p e^{\check{b}^2/4a} \leq \check{C}_3^p a^{-p/2} p^p \quad (\text{C16})$$

with $\check{C}_3 := e^{\check{b}^2/4a} \left(\check{b} + 4a + \sqrt{(\check{b} + 4a)^2 + 8a} \right) a^{-1/2}$.

The follow the discussion below Eq. (E30) we finally have

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+2p)^p e^{-an^2 + \check{b}n} \leq \check{C}_{L5}^p p^{p+1} a^{-(p+1)/2} \quad (\text{C17})$$

with $\check{C}_{L5} := 3 \max\{\check{C}_4, a^{1/2} \check{C}_4 + a \check{C}_4\}$ and $\check{C}_4 := \max\{\check{C}_1, \check{C}_2, \check{C}_3\}$. It's also obviously that \check{C}_1, \check{C}_2 and \check{C}_3 can be bounded by $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant, which implies $\check{C}_{L5} \leq \mathcal{O}(1)$ for $\beta \leq \beta^*$ and finishes the proof. \blacksquare

Finally, equipped with the revised Lemma 3 and (5), we move on to revisit Lemma 6.

proof for Lemma 6 with $b \rightarrow \check{b}$. — First we have from Eq. (E34) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+p)^p \exp \left[\max_{x \in [n-p, n+p]} (-an^2 + \check{b}n) \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n^p e^{-an^2 + \check{b}n} + (2p+1)(n_0 + 2p)^p e^{\check{b}^2/4a} \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+2p)^p e^{-an^2 + \check{b}n}, \quad (\text{C18})$$

where the first and last term can be bounded by recalling Eqs. (C11) and (C17), respectively. Now we turn to deal with the second term in Eq. (C18), which can be bounded by $3p \left[\check{b}/(2a) + 1 + 2p \right]^p e^{\check{b}^2/2a} \leq \check{C}_2^p a^{-p/2} p^{p+1}$ with $\check{C}_2 := e^{\check{b}^2/2a} \left[3\check{b}/(2a^{1/2}) + 9a^{1/2} \right]$, which means

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+p)^p \exp \left[\max_{x \in [n-p, n+p]} (-an^2 + \check{b}n) \right] \\ & \leq \check{C}_{L3}^p a^{-(p+1)/2} (p!)^{1/2} + \check{C}_2^p a^{-p/2} p^{p+1} + \check{C}_{L5}^p p^{p+1} a^{-(p+1)/2} \\ & \leq \check{C}_4^p \left[p^{p+1} a^{-(p+1)/2} + a^{-(p+1)/2} (p!)^{1/2} + a^{-p/2} p^{p+1} \right] \\ & \leq C_4^p 16^p p! \left(a^{-(p+1)/2} + a^{-(p+1)/2} + a^{-p/2} \right) \\ & \leq C_4^p 16^p p! \left(2 + a^{1/2} \right) a^{-(p+1)/2} \\ & \leq \check{C}_{L6}^{p+1} a^{-(p+1)/2} p!. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C19})$$

with $\check{C}_{L6} := \max\{1, 16(2 + a^{1/2}) \max\{\check{C}_{L3}, \check{C}_2, \check{C}_{L5}\}\}$. Note that \check{C}_2 and further \check{C}_{L6} can be bounded by $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant at high temperatures, by which we finish the proof. \blacksquare

Discussion. — For the discussion part of Lemma 6, we find that the original constant C defined in Eq. (E40) can still be bounded by $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant even if $b \rightarrow \check{b}$. Therefore, no revision is necessary to apply Eq. (E40) within the new scalings.

We emphasize here that the lower bound of high temperature regime β^* in the three revisited lemmas above can be chosen as either $\beta_{L1}^*, \beta_{T1}^*$ or β_{T2}^* for different usages. Based on the analysis above, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+p)^p e^{\max_{x \in [n-p, n+p]} (-ax^2 + bx) + c\sqrt{\beta}(x+p)} \\ & \leq \check{C}_{L6,1}^{p+1} a^{-(p+1)/2} p! \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C20})$$

with $\check{C}_{L6,1} := e^{c\sqrt{\beta^*}} \check{C}_{L6}$. Actually, for convenience we further have

$$\begin{aligned} & \max \left\{ \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+p)^p e^{\max_{x \in [n-p, n+p]} (-ax^2 + bx) + c\sqrt{\beta}(x+p)}, \right. \\ & \left. \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+p)^p e^{\max_{x \in [n-p, n+p]} (-ax^2 + bx)} \right\} \leq C_{L6,r}^{p+1} a^{-(p+1)/2} p!, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C21})$$

where $C_{L6,r} := \max\{\check{C}_{L6,1}, C_{L6}\} = \mathcal{O}(1)$ with C_{L6} being the constant C defined in original Lemma 6. Therefore, we have for all $x \in V_G$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Tr}_x h_x(w, \vec{s})^\dagger h_x(w, \vec{s}) e^{\check{\mathcal{O}}_x(n_x)} \\ & \leq J^{2m_x(w)} \left(\frac{C_{2,2,r}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{m_x(w)+1} m_x(w)! \quad (\text{C22}) \\ \text{and } \text{Tr}_x e^{\check{\mathcal{O}}_x(n_x)} & \leq C_{2,4} e^{m_x(w)} / \sqrt{\beta} \text{ with } C_{2,2,r} := \\ & C_{L6,r} \sqrt{2/U_{\min}}. \text{ Then from Eq. (E5) we obtain} \end{aligned}$$

$$\|h_x(w, \vec{s}) e^{\check{\mathcal{O}}_x(n_x)}\|_1 \leq \frac{C_{2,5,r}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \left(\frac{C_{2,6,r}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{m_x(w)/2} [m_x(w)!]^{1/2} \quad (\text{C23})$$

which further gives us the desired result after we follow the same treatment from Eqs. (B22)–(B28):

$$\|e^{-\beta \check{W}_{V_G}} f(w)\|_1 \leq \left(\frac{C_{2,5,r}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{|V_G|} \frac{(C_{2,8,r} \sqrt{\beta})^{|w|}}{|w|!} \prod_{i=1}^{|G|} \mu_i(w) \quad (\text{C24})$$

Here we have already set $q_G = 0$ and the expressions for the $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constants are summarized as follows: $C_{2,4,r} := C_{2,4}$, $C_{2,5,r} = \sqrt{C_{2,2,r} C_{2,4,r}}$, $C_{2,6,r} := e J^2 C_{2,2,r}$, $C_{2,7,r} := \mathfrak{d} C_{2,6,r}$ and $C_{2,8,r} := 2C_{2,7,r}$.

2. Proof of Eq. (50)

The main part of the derivation for Eq. (50) is quite similar to that for Eq. (35). Following Eq. (B29), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |C_\beta(X)| & \leq \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq 1}^m(G_X)} \sum_{\left\{ \begin{array}{l} w^{(j)} \in G_j^* \\ G_{w^{(j)}} = G_j \end{array} \right\}_{j=1}^m} \|\check{X}\| \check{Z}_{G^c}(\beta) \left(\frac{C_{3,r}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{|V_G|} \frac{(C_{5,r} \sqrt{\beta})^{|w^{(j)}|}}{|w^{(j)}|!} \prod_{i=1}^{|G_j|} \mu_i(w^{(j)})! \\ & \leq C_{6,1}^{|V_X|} \|\check{X}\| \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq 1}^m(G_X)} \sum_{\left\{ \begin{array}{l} w^{(j)} \in G_j^* \\ G_{w^{(j)}} = G_j \end{array} \right\}_{j=1}^m} (C_{3,r} C_{L2,r})^{|V_G|} \frac{(C_{5,r} \sqrt{\beta})^{|w^{(j)}|}}{|w^{(j)}|!} \prod_{i=1}^{|G_j|} \mu_i(w^{(j)})! \\ & \leq C_{6,1}^{|V_X|} \|\check{X}\| \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq 1}^m(G_X)} (C_{3,r} C_{L2,r})^{|V_G|} \left(\frac{C_{5,r} \beta^{1/2}}{1 - C_{5,r} \beta^{1/2}} \right)^{|G|} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq C_{6,1}^{|V_X|} \|\check{X}\| \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq 1}^m(G_X)} \left(\frac{C_{6,2} \beta^{1/2}}{1 - C_{5,r} \beta^{1/2}} \right)^{|G|}. \quad (\text{C25})$$

Here, we used $(C_{3,r} C_{L2,r})^{|V_G|} \leq (\max\{C_{3,r} C_{L2,r}, 1\})^{2|G|}$ and define $C_{6,2} := \max\{C_{3,r} C_{L2,r}, 1\}^2 = \mathcal{O}(1)$ with $C_{L2,r}$ being the $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant defined later. To obtain the second line of Eq. (E26), we have used

$$\frac{\check{Z}_{G^c}(\beta)}{\check{Z}(\beta)} \leq C_{6,1}^{|V_X|} (C_{L2,r} \sqrt{\beta})^{|V_G|} \quad (\text{C26})$$

with $C_{6,1} = \mathcal{O}(1)$. To see this, we first write

$$\frac{\check{Z}_{G^c}(\beta)}{\check{Z}(\beta)} = \frac{\check{Z}(\beta)}{\check{Z}(\beta)} \cdot \frac{\check{Z}_{G^c}(\beta)}{\check{Z}(\beta)} \leq \frac{\check{Z}(\beta)}{\check{Z}(\beta)} \cdot \frac{1}{\text{Tr}_{V_G} e^{-\beta \check{W}_{V_G}}}, \quad (\text{C27})$$

where we have already used Lemma 2 for the Hamiltonian $\check{H} := \check{W} - I$. The subtle point is how to deal with the factor $(\text{Tr}_{V_G} e^{-\beta \check{W}_{V_G}})^{-1} = \prod_{x \in V_G} (\text{Tr} e^{-\beta \check{W}_x})^{-1}$ with $-\beta \check{W}_x = -\beta W_x + c\sqrt{\beta} \delta_x n_x$. For $x \notin V_X$, we can still bound $(\text{Tr} e^{-\beta \check{W}_x})^{-1}$ via $C_{L2} \sqrt{\beta}$ (see the discussion before Eq. (E7)). For $x \in V_X$, we first write $-\beta \check{W}_x = -a n_x^2 + \check{b} n_x$ with $a = -\beta U_x / 2$ and $\check{b} = c\sqrt{\beta} - \mu_{0,x} \beta$.

► If $\check{b} \geq 0$, we use $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-an^2 + \check{b}n} \geq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-an^2} \geq \int_0^{\infty} dx e^{-ax^2} = \sqrt{\pi} a^{-1/2} / 2$ to obtain $(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-an^2 + \check{b}n})^{-1} \leq 2a^{1/2} / \sqrt{\pi}$.

► If $\check{b} < 0$, we have $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-an^2 + \check{b}n} \geq \int_0^{\infty} dx e^{-ax^2 + bx} = e^{b^2/4a} \sqrt{\pi} a^{-1/2} \text{erfc}(|b|/2\sqrt{a})/2$. Then by using [90] $\text{erfc}(x) \geq 0.1e^{-2x^2}$, we obtain $(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-an^2 + \check{b}n})^{-1} \leq 10e^{\check{b}^2/4a} 2a^{1/2} / \sqrt{\pi}$

Therefore, we conclude that for all $\check{b} \in \mathbb{R}$ (note that $10e^{\check{b}^2/4a} > 1$)

$$\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-an^2 + \check{b}n} \right)^{-1} \leq 20e^{\check{b}^2/4a} a^{1/2} / \sqrt{\pi}, \quad (\text{C28})$$

which leads us to $(\text{Tr} e^{-\beta \check{W}_x})^{-1} \leq \check{C}_{L2} \sqrt{\beta}$ with $\check{C}_{L2} := 20\sqrt{U_{\max}/2} \exp(\beta^* \mu_0 + 2\mu_0 c\sqrt{\beta^*} + c^2/4U_{\min})$ at high temperatures $\beta \leq \beta^*$. Then by choosing $C_{L2,r} := \max\{C_{L2}, \check{C}_{L2}\} = \mathcal{O}(1)$ we obtain $(\text{Tr}_{V_G} e^{-\beta \check{W}_{V_G}})^{-1} \leq (C_{L2,r} \sqrt{\beta})^{|V_G|}$ and therefore the second factor of Eq. (C27).

Now we turn to deal with the first factor on RHS of Eq. (C27) via utilizing thermodynamics integration formalism. We directly set

$$\mathcal{Z}_\eta := \text{Tr} \exp \left(-\beta H + \eta \sqrt{\beta} \sum_{x \in V_X} n_x \right) \quad (\text{C29})$$

and evaluate

$$\ln \frac{\check{Z}(\beta)}{\check{Z}(\beta)} = \int_0^c d\eta \frac{d}{d\eta} \ln \mathcal{Z}_\eta = \sqrt{\beta} \int_0^c d\eta \sum_{x \in V_X} \langle n_x \rangle_\eta. \quad (\text{C30})$$

Here, we introduced the quantity

$$\langle n_x \rangle_\eta := \frac{\text{Tr} n_x e^{-\beta H + \eta \sqrt{\beta} \sum_{x \in V_X} n_x}}{\text{Tr} e^{-\beta H + \eta \sqrt{\beta} \sum_{x \in V_X} n_x}}. \quad (\text{C31})$$

To obtain the upper bound $\langle n_x \rangle_\eta \leq C_\eta \beta^{-1/2}$ with $C_\eta := C_\eta(U_{\max}, U_{\min}, \mu_0, \beta^*, \eta) = \mathcal{O}(1)$, we just need to repeat the proof for Lemma 1 again with the parameter b in Lemma 6 replaced by $\check{b}_\eta = b + \eta \sqrt{\beta}$. Thanks to the analysis from Eqs. (C10)–(C19), the Lemma 6 still works under this revision and we simply choose $\check{C}_{\text{th}} := \max_{\eta \in [0, c]} C_\eta = \mathcal{O}(1)$ to arrive at $\langle n_x \rangle_\eta \leq \check{C}_{\text{th}} \beta^{-1/2}$. Based on this inequality, Eq. (E33) gives us

$$\frac{\check{Z}(\beta)}{\check{Z}(\beta)} \leq e^{c\check{C}_{\text{th}}|V_X|} := C_{6,1}^{|V_X|} \quad (\text{C32})$$

with $C_{6,1} := e^{c\check{C}_{\text{th}}} = \mathcal{O}(1)$.

3. Implication of Low Boson Density

From low-boson-density condition, we have

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n^s p_n \leq \frac{1}{e} \left(\frac{\kappa_1}{e} s^{\kappa_2} \right)^s, \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{N}^+. \quad (\text{C33})$$

We are curious about what can we say about p_n under the constraint Eq. (C33) in analogue to Corollary 1. Actually, we have

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{cn^a} p_n = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{(cn^a)^m}{m!} p_n \leq \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{c^m}{m!} \frac{1}{e} \left[\frac{\kappa_1}{e} (am)^{\kappa_2} \right]^{am}. \quad (\text{C34})$$

Then we choose $a = \kappa_2^{-1}$ and show that there exists $\gamma = \gamma(\kappa_1, \kappa_2)$ to let $(\kappa_1 e^{-1})^{\kappa_2^{-1}m} (\kappa_2^{-1}m)^m \leq \gamma^m \Gamma(m+1)$. To see this we just note that $m \ln \gamma + \ln \Gamma(m+1) - \kappa_2^{-1}m \ln \kappa_1 e^{-1} - m \ln \kappa_2^{-1}m \geq 0$ as long as we choose $\gamma \geq 16(\kappa_1 e^{-1})^{\kappa_2^{-1}} \kappa_2^{-1}$ and notice $16^m \Gamma(m+1) \geq m^m$. Therefore we further bound RHS of Eq. (C34) by

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{cn^a} p_n \leq \frac{1}{e} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} c^m \gamma^m = \frac{1}{e(1-c\gamma)} \quad (\text{C35})$$

with choosing $0 < c < \gamma^{-1}$, which leads us to

$$p_n \leq \frac{1}{e(1-c\gamma)} e^{-cn^{\kappa_2^{-1}}}. \quad (\text{C36})$$

Appendix D: Derivation of Calculations in Sec. VI

1. Trace Norm of $e^{-\beta\tilde{W}_{V_G}^{(+)}} \tilde{f}(w)$

To obtain the bound for $\left\| e^{-\beta\tilde{W}_{V_G}^{(+)}} \tilde{f}(w) \right\|_1$, we first have the formula similar to Eq. (C2)

$$e^{-\beta\tilde{W}_{V_G}^{(+)}} \tilde{f}(w) = e^{c\sqrt{\beta\delta}\tilde{N}_G^{(+)}} \int_{[0,\beta]^{|w|+1}} \mathcal{D}\Delta\vec{\tau} \delta \left(\sum_{i=1}^{|w|+1} \Delta\tau_i - \beta \right) \prod_{k=1}^{|w|} \left[e^{-\Delta\tau_k W_{V_G}^{(+)}} h_{\lambda_k}(w)^{(+)} \right] e^{-\Delta\tau_{|w|+1} W_{V_G}^{(+)}} \quad (\text{D1})$$

where in comparison with Eq. (C2) we denote $\delta\tilde{N}_G := \sum_{x \in V_G} \tilde{\delta}_x n_x$ with $\tilde{\delta}_x = 1$ for $x \in V_X \cup V_Y$ and otherwise $\tilde{\delta}_x = 0$. Also, we can further decompose

$$\prod_{k=1}^{|w|} \left[e^{-\Delta\tau_k W_{V_G}^{(+)}} h_{\lambda_k}(w)^{(+)} \right] = \sum_{\{s_k=1,2\}_{k=1}^{|w|}} \prod_{k=1}^{|w|} \left[e^{-\Delta\tau_k W_{V_G}^{(+)}} h_{\lambda_k}^{(s_k)}(w)^{(+)} \right]. \quad (\text{D2})$$

The main idea is to split the integrand in Eq. (D1) into two Hilber spaces and bound them separately. For later convenience we first define the function \tilde{H} w.r.t the word w and the sequence (collected as a vector) \vec{s} :

$$\tilde{H}(w, \vec{s}) := \prod_{k=1}^{|w|} \left[e^{-\Delta\tau_k W_{V_G}^{(+)}} h_{\lambda_k}^{(s_k)}(w)^{(+)} \right]. \quad (\text{D3})$$

Then the primary technical task at present is to recast $\tilde{H}(w, \vec{s})$ in two single Hilbert spaces. To achieve this we first decompose the product $\prod_{k=1}^{|w|} h_{\lambda_k}^{(s_k)}(w)^{(+)}$ labelled by into the sum of bipartite tensor products:

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{k=1}^{|w|} h_{\lambda_k}^{(s_k)}(w)^{(+)} &= \prod_{k \in \mathcal{K}_w} h_{\lambda_k}^{(s_k)}(w)^{(+)} \\ &= \sum_{\mathcal{K}_w^I \cup \mathcal{K}_w^{\text{II}} = \mathcal{K}_w} \prod_{k \in \mathcal{K}_w^I} h_{\lambda_k}^{(s_k)}(w) \otimes \prod_{k \in \mathcal{K}_w^{\text{II}}} h_{\lambda_k}^{(s_k)}(w). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D4})$$

Here, we defined $\mathcal{K}_w := \{1, 2, \dots, |w|\}$ and denoted by $\mathcal{K}_w^{I/\text{II}}$ the subsets of \mathcal{K}_w such that $\mathcal{K}_w^I \cup \mathcal{K}_w^{\text{II}} = \mathcal{K}_w$. Then by introducing the notation $H^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s}) := \prod_{k \in \mathcal{K}_w} e^{-\Delta\tau_k W_{V_G}} F(h_{\lambda_k}^{(s_k)}(w), I/\text{II})$ with

$$F(h_{\lambda_k}^{(s_k)}(w), I/\text{II}) := \begin{cases} h_{\lambda_k}^{(s_k)}(w) & k \in \mathcal{K}_w^{I/\text{II}} \\ \mathbb{1} & k \notin \mathcal{K}_w^{I/\text{II}} \end{cases}, \quad (\text{D5})$$

we arrive at the decomposition formula for $\tilde{H}(w)$ in the form of

$$\tilde{H}(w, \vec{s}) = \sum_{\mathcal{K}_w^I \cup \mathcal{K}_w^{\text{II}} = \mathcal{K}_w} H^I(w, \vec{s}) \otimes H^{\text{II}}(w, \vec{s}). \quad (\text{D6})$$

To advance, we first note that the following decomposition $\prod_{k \in \mathcal{K}_w} F(h_{\lambda_k}^{(s_k)}(w), I/\text{II}) = \prod_{x \in V_G} h_x^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s})$ where each quantity in $\{h_x^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s})\}_{x \in V_G}$ can be expressed as the production of a set of creation (a_x^\dagger) or annihilation operators (a_x). More significantly, each term in $\{h_{\lambda_k}^{(s_k)}(w)\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}_w^{I/\text{II}}}$ only contributes exactly one operator (denoted by $o_{x,k}^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s})$ for $k \in \mathcal{K}_w^{I/\text{II}}$) picking from $\{a_x, a_x^\dagger, \mathbb{1}\}$ to the site x . Therefore, similar to the analysis below Eq. (B11), we further write out $h_x^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s}) \sim \prod_{k \in \mathcal{K}_w^{I/\text{II}}} o_{x,k}^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s})$. Then, by setting $o_{x,k}^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s}) = \mathbb{1}$ for $k \in [\mathcal{K}_w^{I/\text{II}}]^c$ we have $h_x^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s}) \sim \prod_{k \in \mathcal{K}_w} o_{x,k}^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s})$, which can be readily dealt with the techniques developed previously. Based on this, we equip $h_x^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s})$ a $|w|$ -dimensional vector $\vec{b}_x^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s})$ to describe the structure of $h_x^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s})$ for each site $x \in V_G$, whose values can be read off from the following dictionary:

$$\begin{cases} o_{x,k}^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s}) = a_x^\dagger & [\vec{b}_x^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s})]_k = +1, \\ o_{x,k}^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s}) = \mathbb{1} & [\vec{b}_x^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s})]_k = 0, \\ o_{x,k}^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s}) = a_x & [\vec{b}_x^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s})]_k = -1 \end{cases} \quad (\text{D7})$$

for $k = 1, 2, \dots, |w|$. It's worth remarking that $\vec{b}^I(w, \vec{s}) + \vec{b}^{\text{II}}(w, \vec{s}) = \vec{b}(w, \vec{s})$ for $x \in V_G$. Remember that the vector $\vec{b}(w, \vec{s})$ stands for the $|w|$ -dimensional vector describing the structure of $h_x(w, \vec{s})$ resulting from $\prod_{k=1}^{|w|} h_{\lambda_k}^{(s_k)}(w) = \prod_{x \in V_G} h_x(w, \vec{s})$ [cf. Appendix B 3].

Next, in analogue to Eq. (C4) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{c\sqrt{\beta\delta}\tilde{N}_G} H^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s}) e^{-\Delta\tau_{|w|+1} W_{V_G}} \\ &= \prod_{x \in V_G} h_x^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s}) \\ & \quad \times \exp \left[O_x^{I/\text{II}}(n_x) + c\sqrt{\beta\delta}\tilde{\delta}_x(n_x + B_{x,1}^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s})) \right] \\ &:= \prod_{x \in V_G} h_x^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s}) e^{\tilde{O}_x^{I/\text{II}}(n_x)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D8})$$

Here, we have denoted $O_x^{I/\text{II}}(n_x) := -\sum_{k=1}^{|w|} \Delta\tau_k W_x(n_x + B_{x,k}^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s})) - \Delta\tau_{|w|+1} W_x(n_x)$ with $B_{x,k}^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s}) := \sum_{i=k}^{|w|} [\vec{b}_x^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s})]_i$ denoting the total number of the operators corresponding to the truncated vector of $\vec{b}_x^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s})$. Denoting $m_x^{I/\text{II}}(w) := \sum_{k=1}^{|w|} |[\vec{b}_x^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s})]_k|$ as the number of the operators at site x offered by the subword $\{w_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}_w^{I/\text{II}}}$, we obtain [cf. Eq. (C23)]

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| h_x^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s}) e^{\tilde{O}_x^{I/\text{II}}(n_x)} \right\|_1 \\ & \leq \frac{C_{2,5,r}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \left(\frac{C_{2,6,r}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{m_x^{I/\text{II}}(w)/2} [m_x^{I/\text{II}}(w)]^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D9})$$

To move further, we revise Eq. (B25) to obtain the relation between $m_x^{I/\text{II}}(w)$ and the vertice-wise multiplicities of subwords

$$m_x^{I/\text{II}}(w) = \sum_{\theta=1}^{\circ} \mu_{x,\theta}^{I/\text{II}}(w) \quad (\text{D10})$$

with $\mu_{x,\theta}^{I/\text{II}}(w)$ only counts the number of the edges coming from the subword $w^{I/\text{II}} := \{w_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}_w^{I/\text{II}}}$ and laying at θ direction of x . By recognizing the analogue of Eq. (23) in the form of

$$\sum_{x \in V_w} \sum_{\theta=1}^{\mathfrak{d}} \frac{\mu_{x,\theta}^{I/\text{II}}(w)}{2} = \sum_{i=1}^{|G|} \mu_i(w^{I/\text{II}}) \quad (\text{D11a})$$

$$\prod_{x \in V_w} \prod_{\theta=1}^{\mathfrak{d}} \mu_{x,\theta}^{I/\text{II}}(w)! = \prod_{i=1}^{|G|} [\mu_i(w^{I/\text{II}})]^2, \quad (\text{D11b})$$

we obtain from Eq. (D8) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| e^{c\sqrt{\beta}\delta\tilde{N}_G} H^{I/\text{II}}(w, \vec{s}) e^{-\Delta\tau_{|w|+1} W_{V_G}} \right\|_1 \\ & \leq \left(\frac{C_{2,5,r}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{|V_G|} \left(\frac{C_{2,7,r}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{|w^{I/\text{II}}|} \prod_{i=1}^{|G|} \mu_i(w^{I/\text{II}}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D12})$$

With the relations $\mu_i(w^I) + \mu_i(w^{\text{II}}) = \mu_i(w)$ and (by summing over i from 1 to $|G|$ we obtain) $|w^I| + |w^{\text{II}}| = |w|$, Eq. (D12) leads us to

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| e^{c\sqrt{\beta}\delta\tilde{N}_G^{(+)} \prod_{k=1}^{|w|} \left[e^{-\Delta\tau_k W_{V_G}^{(+)}} h_{\lambda_k}^{(s_k)}(w)^{(+)} \right] e^{-\Delta\tau_{|w|+1} W_{V_G}^{(+)}} \right\|_1 \\ & \leq \sum_{\mathcal{K}_w^I \cup \mathcal{K}_w^{\text{II}} = \mathcal{K}_w} \left\| \left[e^{c\sqrt{\beta}\delta\tilde{N}_G} \otimes e^{c\sqrt{\beta}\delta\tilde{N}_G} \right] \left[H^I(w, \vec{s}) \otimes H^{\text{II}}(w, \vec{s}) \right] \left[e^{-\Delta\tau_{|w|+1} W_{V_G}} \otimes e^{-\Delta\tau_{|w|+1} W_{V_G}} \right] \right\|_1 \\ & = \sum_{\mathcal{K}_w^I \cup \mathcal{K}_w^{\text{II}} = \mathcal{K}_w} \left\| e^{c\sqrt{\beta}\delta\tilde{N}_G} H^I(w, \vec{s}) e^{-\Delta\tau_{|w|+1} W_{V_G}} \right\|_1 \cdot \left\| e^{c\sqrt{\beta}\delta\tilde{N}_G} H^{\text{II}}(w, \vec{s}) e^{-\Delta\tau_{|w|+1} W_{V_G}} \right\|_1 \\ & \leq \left(\frac{C_{2,5,r}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{|V_G|} \left(\frac{C_{2,7,r}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{|w^I|} \left(\frac{C_{2,5,r}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{|V_G|} \left(\frac{C_{2,7,r}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{|w^{\text{II}}|} \sum_{\mathcal{K}_w^I \cup \mathcal{K}_w^{\text{II}} = \mathcal{K}_w} \prod_{i=1}^{|G|} [\mu_i(w^I)] [\mu_i(w^{\text{II}})] \\ & \leq \left(\frac{C_{2,5,r}^2}{\beta} \right)^{|V_G|} \left(\frac{C_{2,7,r}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{|w|} \sum_{\mathcal{K}_w^I \cup \mathcal{K}_w^{\text{II}} = \mathcal{K}_w} \prod_{i=1}^{|G|} \mu_i(w)! \\ & = \left(\frac{C_{2,5,r}^2}{\beta} \right)^{|V_G|} \left(\frac{C_{2,7,r}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{|w|} 2^{|w|} \prod_{i=1}^{|G|} \mu_i(w)! = \left(\frac{C_{2,5,r}^2}{\beta} \right)^{|V_G|} \left(\frac{2C_{2,7,r}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{|w|} \prod_{i=1}^{|G|} \mu_i(w)!, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D13})$$

which gives us the final result

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| e^{-\beta\tilde{W}_{V_G}^{(+)}} \tilde{f}(w) \right\|_1 \\ & \leq \frac{\beta^{|w|}}{|w|!} \left(\frac{C_{2,5,r}^2}{\beta} \right)^{|V_G|} \left(\frac{2C_{2,7,r}}{\sqrt{\beta}} \right)^{|w|} \prod_{i=1}^{|G|} \mu_i(w)! \\ & = \left(\frac{C_{2,5,r}^2}{\beta} \right)^{|V_G|} \frac{(2C_{2,7,r}\sqrt{\beta})^{|w|}}{|w|!} \prod_{i=1}^{|G|} \mu_i(w)! \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D14})$$

and concludes the proof of Eq. (76).

2. Proof of Eq. (78)

The derivations for Eq. (78) is quite similar to those for Eq. (50):

$$\begin{aligned} |C_\beta(X, Y)| & \leq \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)^2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq 1}^m(G_X)} \sum_{\left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} w^{(j)} \in G_j^* \\ G_{w^{(j)}} = G_j \end{smallmatrix} \right\}_{j=1}^m} \|\check{X}\| \|\check{Y}\| \check{Z}_{\overline{G}^c}(\beta)^2 \left(\frac{C_{7,1}}{\beta} \right)^{|V_G|} \frac{(C_{7,2}\sqrt{\beta})^{|w^{(j)}|}}{|w^{(j)}|!} \prod_{i=1}^{|G_j|} \mu_i(w^{(j)})! \\ & \leq C_{7,3}^{|V_X|+|V_Y|} \|\check{X}\| \|\check{Y}\| \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq L}^m(\partial X)} \sum_{\left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} w^{(j)} \in G_j^* \\ G_{w^{(j)}} = G_j \end{smallmatrix} \right\}_{j=1}^m} (C_{7,1} C_{L2,r}^2)^{|V_G|} \frac{(C_{7,2}\sqrt{\beta})^{|w^{(j)}|}}{|w^{(j)}|!} \prod_{i=1}^{|G_j|} \mu_i(w^{(j)})! \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C_{7,3}^{|V_X|+|V_Y|} \|\check{X}\| \|\check{Y}\| \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq L}^m(\partial X)} (C_{7,1} C_{L2,r}^2)^{|V_G|} \left(\frac{C_{7,2} \beta^{1/2}}{1 - C_{7,2} \beta^{1/2}} \right)^{|G|} \\
&\leq C_{7,3}^{|V_X|+|V_Y|} \|\check{X}\| \|\check{Y}\| \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_{\geq L}^m(\partial X)} \left(\frac{C_{7,4} \beta^{1/2}}{1 - C_{7,2} \beta^{1/2}} \right)^{|G|}. \tag{D15}
\end{aligned}$$

Here we used Eq. (C27) but with [cf. Eq. (E33)] $\mathcal{Z}_\eta := \text{Tr} \exp\left(-\beta H + \eta \sqrt{\beta} \sum_{x \in V_X \cup V_Y} n_x\right)$:

$$\frac{\check{\mathcal{Z}}_{\bar{G}^c}(\beta)}{\check{\mathcal{Z}}(\beta)} \leq C_{6,1}^{|V_X|+|V_Y|} (C_{L2,r} \sqrt{\beta})^{|V_G|}. \tag{D16}$$

We also denote $C_{7,3} := C_{6,1}^2 = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and $C_{7,4} := C_{7,1} C_{L2,r}^2 C_{7,2} = \mathcal{O}(1)$ in the second and last line of Eq. (D15), respectively.

Appendix E: Other Technical Lemmas

Lemma 2. Let (V, E) be the interaction graph for the Bose-Hubbard model defined as in Eq. (3), then for any edge subset $G \subset E$

$$\frac{1}{\text{Tr} e^{-\beta H}} \leq \frac{1}{\text{Tr}_{V_G^c} e^{-\beta H_{V_G^c}}} \frac{1}{\text{Tr}_{V_G} e^{-\beta W_{V_G}}}. \tag{E1}$$

Proof. — We introduced free energy functional

$$F(\bullet) := \text{Tr} H \bullet - \beta^{-1} S(\bullet) \tag{E2}$$

with $\rho_1 := \rho_{W_{V_G}} \otimes \rho_{H_{V_G^c}} := e^{-\beta W_{V_G}} / \text{Tr} e^{-\beta W_{V_G}} \otimes e^{-\beta H_{V_G^c}} / \text{Tr} e^{-\beta H_{V_G^c}}$ and $\rho_H := e^{-\beta H} / \text{Tr} e^{-\beta H}$. Here, we replace the notation $H_{\bar{G}^c}$ with $H_{V_G^c}$ to emphasize the support of this operator (they are equivalent, see Fig. 2). From the Gibbs variational principle we have

$$F(\rho_1) \geq F(\rho_H). \tag{E3}$$

To proceed, we first note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{Tr} H \rho_1 \\
&= \text{Tr} (H_{V_G} + H_{V_G^c} + H_I) \rho_1 \\
&= \frac{\text{Tr}_{V_G} H_{V_G} e^{-\beta W_{V_G}}}{\text{Tr}_{V_G} e^{-\beta W_{V_G}}} + \frac{\text{Tr}_{V_G^c} H_{V_G^c} e^{-\beta H_{V_G^c}}}{\text{Tr}_{V_G^c} e^{-\beta H_{V_G^c}}} + \text{Tr} H_I \rho_1 \\
&= \frac{\text{Tr}_{V_G} H_{V_G} e^{-\beta W_{V_G}}}{\text{Tr}_{V_G} e^{-\beta W_{V_G}}} + E(\rho_{H_{V_G^c}}) \tag{E4}
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the operator $H_I = - \sum_{x,y \in V_{\partial G}} J_{xy} (a_x^\dagger a_y + a_y^\dagger a_x)$ denotes the terms acting on both region V_G and V_G^c , i.e. part of the hopping term I supported by $V_{\partial G} := \{x \in V_G : \exists y \in V_G^c : x \sim y\} \cup \{y \in V_G^c : \exists x \in V_G : x \sim y\}$. This structure results in $\text{Tr} H_I \rho_1 = 0$ in the second line of Eq. (E4) since H_I does not preserve the numbers of the particles in region V_G , which makes the trace

$\text{Tr}_x a_x^\dagger e^{-\beta W_x} = \text{Tr}_x a_x e^{-\beta W_x} = 0$ for $x \in V_G \cap V_{\partial G}$. On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\beta^{-1} S(\rho_1) \\
&= \beta^{-1} S(\rho_{W_{V_G}}) + \beta^{-1} S(\rho_{H_{V_G^c}}) \\
&= E(\rho_{W_{V_G}}) + E(\rho_{H_{V_G^c}}) + \beta^{-1} \ln \text{Tr}_{V_G} e^{-\beta W_{V_G}} \\
&\quad + \beta^{-1} \ln \text{Tr}_{V_G^c} e^{-\beta H_{V_G^c}}. \tag{E5}
\end{aligned}$$

By substituting Eqs. (E4) and (E5) into Eq. (E3) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{Tr} H \rho_1 - \beta^{-1} S(\rho_1) \geq -\beta^{-1} \ln \text{Tr} e^{-\beta H} \\
&\Rightarrow - \frac{\text{Tr}_{V_G} I_{V_G} e^{-\beta W_G}}{\text{Tr}_{V_G} e^{-\beta W_{V_G}}} + \beta^{-1} \ln \text{Tr}_{V_G} e^{-\beta W_{V_G}} \\
&\quad + \beta^{-1} \ln \text{Tr}_{V_G^c} e^{-\beta H_{V_G^c}} \geq -\beta^{-1} \ln \text{Tr} e^{-\beta H} \\
&\Rightarrow \ln \frac{\text{Tr}_{V_G} e^{-\beta W_{V_G}} \text{Tr}_{V_G^c} e^{-\beta H_{V_G^c}}}{\text{Tr} e^{-\beta H}} \leq -\beta \frac{\text{Tr}_{V_G} I_{V_G} e^{-\beta W_{V_G}}}{\text{Tr}_{V_G} e^{-\beta W_{V_G}}} \\
&\Rightarrow \frac{1}{\text{Tr} e^{-\beta H}} \leq \frac{1}{\text{Tr}_{V_G^c} e^{-\beta H_{V_G^c}}} \frac{1}{\text{Tr}_{V_G} e^{-\beta W_{V_G}}}, \tag{E6}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used $I_{V_G} = H_{V_G} - W_{V_G}$ and in the last second line we used $\text{Tr}_{V_G} I_{V_G} e^{-\beta W_{V_G}} = 0$ since I_{V_G} does not preserve the number of the particles in the region V_G . Therefore we finish the proof. \blacksquare

Discussion. — By Eq. (B2) we have $(\text{Tr}_x e^{-\beta W_x})^{-1} \leq 2(a + |b|)^{1/2} / \sqrt{\pi} \leq 2(U_{\max}/2 + \mu_0)^{1/2} \sqrt{\beta} / \sqrt{\pi}$ and further

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\text{Tr} e^{-\beta H}} \leq \frac{1}{\text{Tr}_{V_G^c} e^{-\beta H_{V_G^c}}} (C_{L2} \sqrt{\beta})^{|V_G|} \\
&\Rightarrow \frac{\check{\mathcal{Z}}_{\bar{G}^c}(\beta)}{\check{\mathcal{Z}}(\beta)} \leq (C_{L2} \sqrt{\beta})^{|V_G|} \tag{E7}
\end{aligned}$$

with $C_{L2} := 2(U_{\max}/2 + \mu_0)^{1/2} / \sqrt{\pi} = \mathcal{O}(1)$

Lemma 3. For $a, b > 0$ and $p \geq 1/2$, we have

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n^p e^{-(an^2 - bn)} \leq C^p a^{-(p+1)/2} (p!)^{1/2}. \tag{E8}$$

Actually, $C := 4C_3$, $C_3 := \max\{4C_1^2, 8aC_2\}$, $C_2 := \sqrt{2}e^{-b^2/2a}(ba^{-1/2} + \sqrt{b^2a^{-3/2} + 4})$ and $C_1 := 2^{-1/2}\pi^{1/4}e^{b^2/2a}$. For $b \leq 0$, we can also obtain the bound in the same form of Eq. (E8) by replacing $b \rightarrow -b + \epsilon$ with $\epsilon > 0$. Here we abuse the notations C, C_1, C_2, \dots to avoid introducing too many symbols.

Proof. — First we denote $f(x) := x^p e^{-ax^2+bx}$ and find that $f(x)$ is increasing in $[0, x_0]$ and decreasing in $[x_0, \infty)$ with $x_0 = (b + \sqrt{b^2 + 8ap})/(4a)$. The maximum point x_0 should always fall between other two integers, i.e., $x_0 \in [x_1, x_2]$ with $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f(n) &= \sum_{n=0}^{x_1-1} f(n) + f(x_1) + f(x_2) + \sum_{n=x_2+1}^{\infty} f(n) \\ &\leq \int_0^{\infty} dx f(x) + 2f(x_0) \\ &= \int_0^{\infty} dx f(x) + 2x_0^p e^{-(ax_0^2-bx_0)} \\ &\leq \int_0^{\infty} dx f(x) + \left(\frac{b + \sqrt{b^2 + 8ap}}{4a} \right)^p 2e^{b^2/4a}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E9})$$

Then by Cauchy–Schwarz inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\infty} dx f(x) &\leq \sqrt{\int_0^{\infty} dx x^{2p} e^{-ax^2} \cdot \int_0^{\infty} dx e^{-ax^2+2bx}} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} a^{-(p+\frac{1}{2})} \Gamma\left(p + \frac{1}{2}\right) \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{a}} e^{\frac{b^2}{a}} \left(1 + \operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{b}{\sqrt{a}}\right)\right)} \\ &\leq C_1 a^{-(p+1)/2} \Gamma\left(p + \frac{1}{2}\right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E10})$$

where we used $\operatorname{erf}(x) \leq 1$ and defined $C_1 := 2^{-1/2} \pi^{1/4} e^{b^2/2a}$. Later we should turn to deal with Eq. (E9). By using $\sqrt{b^2 + 8ap} \leq \sqrt{b^2 + 4a} \sqrt{2p}$ for $p \geq 1/2$, we find $(b + \sqrt{b^2 + 8ap})/(4a) \leq \sqrt{2}(ba^{-1/2} + \sqrt{b^2 a^{-3/2} + 4})a^{-1/2} p^{1/2}/4$, which means we can bound $2f(x_0) \leq C_2^p a^{-p/2} p^{p/2}$ with $C_2 := \sqrt{2} e^{b^2/2a} (ba^{-1/2} + \sqrt{b^2 a^{-3/2} + 4})$. By noticing $\Gamma(p + 1/2)^{1/2} \geq 2^{-2p} p^{p/2}$ for $p \geq 1/2$ we can reorganize Eq. (E9) in the form of

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f(n) &\leq C_1 a^{-(p+1)/2} \Gamma\left(p + \frac{1}{2}\right)^{1/2} + C_2^p a^{-p/2} p^{p/2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2} \left[C_1 + (4C_2)^p a^{1/2} \right] a^{-(p+1)/2} (p!)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C^p a^{-(p+1)/2} (p!)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E11})$$

Here, to obtain the second line we used $\Gamma(p + 1/2) \leq 2\Gamma(p + 1) = 2p!$ and in the last line we used for $p \geq 1/2$ that $\sqrt{2}C_1 + \sqrt{2}(4C_2)^p a^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{2}C_1 + (2a \cdot 4C_2)^p \leq (4C_1^2)^p + (8aC_2)^p \leq 2C_3^p := C^p$, where we have defined $C_3 := \max\{4C_1^2, 8aC_2\}$ and $C := 4C_3$. Therefore, we finished the proof. ■

Discussion. — Now we show that for the setup demonstrated in the main text, where $a = \beta U_x/2$, $b = \beta \mu_{0,x}$ and $\beta \leq \beta^*$, the quantity C can be bounded above by constant of order $\mathcal{O}(1)$. Here the lower bound of high temperature regime β^* can be chosen as either $\beta_{L1}^*, \beta_{T1}^*$ or β_{T2}^* for different usages. Actually, we can bound C as

follows

$$\begin{aligned} C &= 4C_3 \\ &= 4 \max\{4C_1^2, 8aC_2\} \\ &\leq 4(4C_1^2 + 8aC_2) \\ &= 16 \frac{\pi^{1/2}}{2} e^{b^2/a} + 32\sqrt{2} e^{b^2/2a} (ba^{-1/2} + \sqrt{b^2 a^{-3/2} + 4}) \\ &\leq 64 \left[e^{b^2/a} + \sqrt{2} e^{b^2/2a} (ba^{-1/2} + \sqrt{b^2 a^{-3/2} + 4}) \right] \\ &\leq 64 e^{b^2/a} \left(1 + ba^{-1/2} + \sqrt{b^2 a^{-3/2} + 4} \right) \\ &\leq 64 e^{b^2/a} \left(1 + ba^{-1/2} + ba^{-3/4} + 2 \right) \\ &= 64 e^{b^2/a} \left(3 + ba^{-1/2} + ba^{-3/4} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E12})$$

Then we use

$$\begin{aligned} C &\leq 64 e^{b^2/a} \left(3 + ba^{-1/2} + ba^{-3/4} \right) \\ &= 64 e^{\beta \mu_{0,x}^2 / U_x} \left(3 + \beta^{1/2} \mu_{0,x} U_x^{-1/2} + \beta^{1/4} \mu_{0,x} U_x^{-3/4} \right) \\ &\leq 64 e^{2\beta^* \mu_{0,x}^2 / U_{\min}} \left(3 + 2^{1/2} \beta^{*1/2} \mu_{0,x} U_{\min}^{-1/2} + 2^{3/4} \beta^{*1/4} \mu_{0,x} U_{\min}^{-3/4} \right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}(1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E13})$$

Therefore, one may rewrite Lemma 3 as

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n^p e^{-(U_x n^2/2 - \mu_{0,x} n)} \leq C^p (U_x \beta/2)^{-(p+1)/2} (p!)^{1/2} \quad (\text{E14})$$

with C redefined as the $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant on RHS of Eq. (E13).

Lemma 4. For any fixed equivalent class defined in Eq. (B9) and labelled by $K[u] = K[w_0, w_1, w_2, \dots, w_m]$ with $w_0 = u \uparrow \overline{G}^c$ and $w_j = u \uparrow G_j$ ($j = 1, 2, \dots, m$), we have

$$\sum_{w \in K(u)} f(w) = f(w_0) f(w_1) f(w_2) \dots f(w_m). \quad (\text{E15})$$

with $f(w)$ defined in Eq. (16). The same relation also holds for $\tilde{f}(w)$ defined in Eq. (65).

Proof. — To shorten the notation we just use $f(w)$ defined in Eq. (16) as an example to present the proof since for $\tilde{f}(w)$ the derivations are essentially the same. We first formally prove this formula and then give a simple example for readers' convenience to conclude this subsection. Throughout the proof, we used $f(w)$ as an example and the proof for $\tilde{f}(w)$ is the same.

Given the structure of the equivalent class and the fact that operators supported by different regions commute with each other, the elements of a specific equivalent class $K(u)$ can be generated by a set of ordered permutations denoted by $\text{OP}[K(u)]$, which contains all the permutations w.r.t elements in K but get the orders of elements in each subsequence w_0, w_1, \dots, w_m fixed. The numbers of the ordered permutations corresponding to $K(u)$ is given by $\#\text{OP}[K(u)] = |w|! / (|w_0|! |w_1|! \dots |w_m|!)$, where recall that we denote $|w| = \sum_{k=0}^m |w_k|$.

With this notation, we expand LHS of Eq. (B6) as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{w \in K(u)} f(w) \\
&= \sum_{\sigma \in \text{OP}[K(u)]} \int_0^\beta d\tau_{\sigma(1)} \int_0^{\tau_{\sigma(1)}} d\tau_{\sigma(2)} \dots \int_0^{\tau_{\sigma(|w|-1)}} d\tau_{\sigma(|w|)} \\
&\quad \times h_{\sigma(1)}(\tau_{\sigma(1)}) h_{\sigma(2)}(\tau_{\sigma(2)}) \dots h_{\sigma(|w|)}(\tau_{\sigma(|w|)}) \\
&= \sum_{\sigma \in \text{OP}[K]} \int_0^\beta d\tau_{\sigma(1)} \int_0^{\tau_{\sigma(1)}} d\tau_{\sigma(2)} \dots \int_0^{\tau_{\sigma(|w|-1)}} d\tau_{\sigma(|w|)} \\
&\quad \times h(w_0, \vec{\tau}_{w_0}) h(w_1, \vec{\tau}_{w_1}) \dots h(w_m, \vec{\tau}_{w_m}). \tag{E16}
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we actually note that for each elements $w \in K(u)$, the subsequences w_k ($k \in 0, 1, \dots, m$) are fixed. Therefore, we can always adjust the product of the first line of Eq. (E16) into the form of the second line of Eq. (E16). To proceed, we first defined the map \mathcal{I} which maps a word $a_1 a_2 \dots a_m$ into a subset of \mathbb{R}^m in the form of

$$\mathcal{I}(a_1 a_2 \dots a_m) := \beta \geq a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_m \geq 0. \tag{E17}$$

We denote $A := a_1 a_2 \dots a_m$ and $B = b_1 b_2 \dots b_n$ for later convenience and define the addition

$$\mathcal{I}(A + B) := \mathcal{I}(A) \cup \mathcal{I}(B). \tag{E18}$$

Next, we show

$$\mathcal{I}(A \sqcup B) = \mathcal{I}(A) \cup \mathcal{I}(B), \tag{E19}$$

with $A \sqcup B$ denoting the shuffle product [75] of the words, the sum of all ways of interlacing them. It's easy to see the connection of the structure between $A \sqcup B$ and $\text{OP}[(A, B)]$, where we use $\text{OP}[(A, B)]$ to denote the set of all the ordered permutations over the sequence $A \circ B$ but with the inner orders of A and B fixed. There is an one-to-one map between each summand of $A \sqcup B$ and each element in $\text{OP}[(A, B)]$. With this fact, we can also denote

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}(A \sqcup B) &:= \bigcup_{\sigma \in \text{OP}[(A, B)]} \mathcal{I}_\sigma \\
&= \bigcup_{\sigma \in \text{OP}[(A, B)]} \mathcal{I}(\sigma(1)\sigma(2)\dots\sigma(m+n)). \tag{E20}
\end{aligned}$$

The proof of Eq. (E19) is as follows: we consider the point $x = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$. If $x \in \mathcal{I}(A \sqcup B)$, then there exist $\sigma_0 \in \text{OP}[(A, B)]$ to let $x \in \mathcal{I}_{\sigma_0}$, which implies

$$\left. \begin{aligned}
& \beta \geq a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_m \geq 0 \\
& \beta \geq b_1 \geq b_2 \geq \dots \geq b_n \geq 0
\end{aligned} \right\} = \mathcal{I}(A) \cup \mathcal{I}(B) \tag{E21}$$

Then we know $x \in \mathcal{I}(A) \cup \mathcal{I}(B)$. Conversely, if we have $x \in \mathcal{I}(A) \cup \mathcal{I}(B)$, we also have Eq. (E21). Depending on the order of $\{a_k\}_{k=1}^m$ and $\{b_k\}_{k=1}^n$ there always exist $\sigma_1 \in \text{OP}[(A, B)]$ such that $x \in \mathcal{I}_{\sigma_1}$, which is a subset of $\mathcal{I}(A \sqcup B)$. Therefore we have $x \in \mathcal{I}(A \sqcup B)$ and prove Eq. (E21).

By the associative property of the shuffle product and iteration we have

$$\mathcal{I}(A_1 \sqcup A_2 \sqcup \dots \sqcup A_m) = \bigcup_{k=1}^m \mathcal{I}(A_k). \tag{E22}$$

Using Eq. (E22) we can recast Eq. (E16) as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{w \in K} f(w) \\
&= \sum_{\sigma \in \text{OP}[K]} \int_{\vec{\tau} \in \mathcal{I}(\sigma(\tau_1)\sigma(\tau_2)\dots\sigma(\tau_{|w|}))} \mathcal{D}\vec{\tau} \\
&\quad \times h(w_0, \vec{\tau}_{w_0}) h(w_1, \vec{\tau}_{w_1}) \dots h(w_m, \vec{\tau}_{w_m}) \\
&= \int_{\vec{\tau} \in \mathcal{I}(\vec{\tau}_{w_0} \sqcup \vec{\tau}_{w_1} \sqcup \dots \sqcup \vec{\tau}_{w_m})} \mathcal{D}\vec{\tau} \\
&\quad \times h(w_0, \vec{\tau}_{w_0}) h(w_1, \vec{\tau}_{w_1}) \dots h(w_m, \vec{\tau}_{w_m}) \\
&= \int_{\vec{\tau} \in \bigcup_{k=0}^m \mathcal{I}(\vec{\tau}_k)} \mathcal{D}\vec{\tau} h(w_0, \vec{\tau}_{w_0}) h(w_1, \vec{\tau}_{w_1}) \dots h(w_m, \vec{\tau}_{w_m}) \\
&= \prod_{k=0}^m \int_{\vec{\tau} \in \mathcal{I}(\vec{\tau}_k)} \mathcal{D}\vec{\tau} h(w_k, \vec{\tau}) \\
&= \prod_{k=0}^m \int_{\vec{\tau} \in \mathcal{I}_{w_k}} \mathcal{D}\vec{\tau} h(w_k, \vec{\tau}) = \prod_{k=0}^m f(w_k). \tag{E23}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we finish the proof. \blacksquare

Discussion. —Here, we provide a simple example to intuitively demonstrate the idea behind the proof. Consider the conneted subalphabet G with $m = 1$ and the equivalent class $K[(12, 3)]$ generated by $u = (12, 3)$, where we use 1, 2, 3 rather than $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \overline{G}^c$ and $\lambda_3 \in G$ for brevity. Then Eq. (E16) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{w \in K[(12, 3)]} f(w) \\
&= f(123) + f(132) + f(312) \\
&= \int_0^\beta d\tau_1 \int_0^{\tau_1} d\tau_2 \int_0^{\tau_2} d\tau_3 h(1, \tau_1) h(2, \tau_2) h(3, \tau_3) \\
&\quad + \int_0^\beta d\tau_1 \int_0^{\tau_1} d\tau_3 \int_0^{\tau_3} d\tau_2 h(1, \tau_1) h(3, \tau_3) h(2, \tau_2) \\
&\quad + \int_0^\beta d\tau_3 \int_0^{\tau_3} d\tau_1 \int_0^{\tau_1} d\tau_2 h(3, \tau_3) h(1, \tau_1) h(2, \tau_2) \\
&= \left(\int_0^\beta d\tau_1 \int_0^{\tau_1} d\tau_2 \int_0^{\tau_2} d\tau_3 + \int_0^\beta d\tau_1 \int_0^{\tau_1} d\tau_3 \int_0^{\tau_3} d\tau_2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_0^\beta d\tau_3 \int_0^{\tau_3} d\tau_1 \int_0^{\tau_1} d\tau_2 \right) h(1, \tau_1) h(2, \tau_2) h(3, \tau_3) \\
&= \int_0^\beta d\tau_1 \int_0^{\tau_1} d\tau_2 \int_0^{\tau_2} d\tau_3 h(1, \tau_1) h(2, \tau_2) h(3, \tau_3) \\
&= \int_0^\beta d\tau_1 \int_0^{\tau_1} d\tau_2 h(1, \tau_1) h(2, \tau_2) \int_0^\beta d\tau_3 h(3, \tau_3) \\
&= f(12)f(3). \tag{E24}
\end{aligned}$$

Here in the third line of Eq. (E24), the three regions of the integral can be organized into the region in the integral

of the fourth line, since

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \beta \geq \tau_1 \geq \tau_2 \geq \tau_3 \geq 0 \\ \beta \geq \tau_1 \geq \tau_3 \geq \tau_2 \geq 0 \\ \beta \geq \tau_3 \geq \tau_1 \geq \tau_2 \geq 0 \end{array} \right\} \Rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \beta \geq \tau_1 \geq \tau_2 \geq 0 \\ \beta \geq \tau_3 \geq 0 \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{E25})$$

The main idea is that for each word in the equivalent class, the inner sequences of edges and τ are fixed.

Lemma 5. For $a, b > 0$ and $p \geq 1$, we have

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+2p)^p e^{-an^2+bn} \leq C^p p^{p+1} a^{-(p+1)/2}. \quad (\text{E26})$$

Actually, $C := 3 \max\{C_4, a^{1/2}C_4 + aC_4\}$. Here we also defined $C_4 := \max\{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$, $C_3 := e^{-b^2/4a} [ba^{-1/2} + a^{1/2} + \sqrt{(b+4a)^2 a^{-3/2} + 8}]$, $C_2 := 2^{1/2} \pi^{1/4} e^{b^2/2a}$ and $C_1 := 8e^{2b}$. For $b \leq 0$, we can also obtain the bound in the same form of Eq. (E26) by replacing $b \rightarrow -b + \epsilon$ with $\epsilon > 0$. Here we abuse the notations C, C_1, C_2, \dots to avoid introducing too many symbols.

Proof. — We denote $f(x) := (x+2p)^p e^{-ax^2+bx}$. It's easy to see that this function is increasing in $[0, x_0]$ and decreasing in $[x_0, \infty)$ with $x_0 = (b - 4ap + \sqrt{b^2 + 8ap(b+1) + (4ap)^2})/4a$. Similar to the proof of Lemma 4, we obtain

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f(n) \leq \int_0^{\infty} dx f(x) + 2f(x_0). \quad (\text{E27})$$

The first term of Eq. (E27) can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{\infty} dx f(x) \\ &= \int_0^{2p} dx (x+2p)^p e^{-ax^2+bx} + \int_{2p}^{\infty} dx (x+2p)^p e^{-ax^2+bx} \\ &\leq \int_0^{2p} dx (2p+2p)^p e^{2bp} + \int_{2p}^{\infty} dx (2x)^p e^{-ax^2+bx} \\ &\leq 2p(2p+2p)^p e^{2bp} + \int_0^{\infty} dx (2x)^p e^{-ax^2+bx} \\ &\leq C_1^p p^{p+1} + C_2^p a^{-(p+1)/2} \Gamma\left(p + \frac{1}{2}\right)^{1/2} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E28})$$

with $C_1 := 8e^{2b}$ and $C_2 := 2^{1/2} \pi^{1/2} e^{b^2/2a}$. Then by noticing that for $p \geq 1$, $\sqrt{(b+4ap)^2 + 8ap} \leq p\sqrt{(b+4a)^2 + 8a}$ we can obtain

$$2f(x_0) \leq C_3^p a^{-p/2} p^p \quad (\text{E29})$$

with $C_3 := e^{b^2/4a} [ba^{-1/2} + a^{1/2} + \sqrt{(b+4a)^2 a^{-3/2} + 8}]$. Putting Eqs. (E28) and (E29) into Eq. (E27) we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f(n) &\leq C_4^p [p^{p+1} + a^{-(p+1)/2} \Gamma(p+1/2)^{1/2} + a^{-p/2} p^p] \\ &\leq C_4^p 2p^{p+1} a^{-(p+1)/2} (a^{(p+1)/2} + 1 + a^{1/2}) \\ &\leq C^p p^{p+1} a^{-(p+1)/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E30})$$

Here, in the first line we denoted $C_4 := \max\{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$ and in the second line we used $2p^{p+1} \geq \max\{p^{p+1}, p^p, \Gamma(p+1/2)^{1/2}\}$. In the last line of Eq. (E30) we used $C_4^p [1 + a^{1/2} + a^{(p+1)/2}] \leq 3C_4^p \leq C^p$ with $C_4^p := \max\{C_4, a^{1/2}C_4 + aC_4\}$ and $C := 3C_4^p$ to obtain the finish the proof. ■

Discussion. — Now we show that for the setup demonstrated in the main text, where $a = \beta U_x/2$, $b = \beta \mu_{0,x}$ and $\beta \leq \beta^*$, the quantity C can be bounded above by constant of order $\mathcal{O}(1)$. Actually, We can bound C as follows

$$\begin{aligned} C &= 3 \max\{C_4, a^{1/2}C_4 + aC_4\} \\ &\leq 3(1 + a^{1/2} + a)(C_1 + C_2 + C_3) \\ &\leq 3(1 + a^{1/2} + a) \left\{ 8e^{2b} + 2^{1/2} \pi^{1/4} e^{b^2/2a} + e^{b^2/4a} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \left[ba^{-1/2} + a^{1/2} + \sqrt{(b+4a)^2 a^{-3/2} + 8} \right] \right\} \\ &\leq 3(1 + a^{1/2} + a) 8e^{2b+b^2/2a} \left\{ 1 + 1 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left[ba^{-1/2} + a^{1/2} + \sqrt{(b+4a)^2 a^{-3/2} + 8} \right] \right\} \\ &\leq 24(1 + a^{1/2} + a) e^{2b+b^2/2a} \{ 2 + ba^{-1/2} + a^{1/2} \\ &\quad + (b+4a)a^{-3/4} + \sqrt{8} \} \\ &\leq 24[1 + (\beta^* U_{\max}/2)^{1/2} + \beta^* U_{\max}/2] e^{2\beta^* \mu_0 + \beta^* \mu_0^2/U_{\min}} \\ &\quad \times (5 + \sqrt{\beta^* \mu_0} (U_{\min}/2)^{-1/2} + \sqrt{\beta^*} (U_{\max}/2)^{1/2} \\ &\quad + \sqrt[4]{\beta^* \mu_0} (U_{\min}/2)^{-3/4} + 4\sqrt[4]{\beta^*} (U_{\max}/2)^{1/4}) \\ &= \mathcal{O}(1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E31})$$

Therefore, one may rewrite Lemma 5 as

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+2p)^p e^{-(U_x n^2/2 - \mu_{0,x} n)} \leq C^p (U_x \beta/2)^{-(p+1)/2} p^{p+1} \quad (\text{E32})$$

with C redefined as the $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant on RHS of Eq. (E31).

Lemma 6. For $a, b > 0$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+p)^p \exp \left[\max_{x \in [n-p, n+p]} (-ax^2 + bx) \right] \\ & \leq C^{p+1} a^{-(p+1)/2} p! \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E33})$$

If $p \geq 1$, then

$C := \max\{3 \max\{16C_4, 16C_4 a^{1/2}, 16C_4 a\}, 1\}$. Here we also defined $C_4 := \max\{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$, where C_1 is the constant C defined in Lemma 3 while $C_2 := e^{b^2/2a} [3b/(2a) + 9]$ and C_3 is the constant C defined in Lemma 5. If $p = 0$, the lemma still holds but with $C := e^{b^2/4a} (2a^{1/2} + \pi^{1/2})$ and RHS of Eq. (E33) should be replaced with $C a^{-1/2}$. Actually, we just take the larger one between the two constants C discussed above to avoid the dependence on p . For $b \leq 0$, we can also obtain the bound in the same form of Eq. (E33) by replacing $b \rightarrow -b + \epsilon$ with $\epsilon > 0$. Here we abuse the notations C, C_1, C_2, \dots to avoid introducing too many symbols.

Proof. — First we consider the case $p \geq 1$, we denote $n_0 = \lfloor b/2a \rfloor$ and $V(x) := -ax^2 + bx$ to consider different cases.

► For $n \in [0, n_0 - 1 - p]$, $x \in [n - p, n + p] \subset [-p, n_0 - 1]$ so that in this case $\max_{x \in [n - p, n + p]}(-an^2 + bn) = V(n + p)$.

► For $n \in [n_0 - p, n_0 + p]$, $x \in [n - p, n + p] \subset [n_0 - 2p, n_0 + 2p]$, we have $\max_{x \in [n - p, n + p]}(-an^2 + bn) =$

$$\max\{V(n_0), V(n_0 - 1), V(n_0 + 1)\} \leq V(b/2a).$$

► For $n \in [n_0 + 1 + p, \infty]$, we have $x \in [n - p, n + p] \subset [n_0 + 1, \infty]$ so that $\max_{x \in [n - p, n + p]}(-an^2 + bn) = V(n - p)$.

Based on the analysis above, we can bound the quantity in LHS of Eq. (E33) by splitting it into five terms as follows

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+p)^p \exp \left[\max_{x \in [n-p, n+p]} (-an^2 + bn) \right] \\ &= \theta(n_0 - 1 - p) \sum_{n=0}^{n_0 - 1 - p} (n+p)^p e^{V(n+p)} + \theta(n_0 - p) \sum_{n=n_0 - p}^{n_0 + p} (n+p)^p e^{V(b/2a)} + \theta(-n_0 + p) \sum_{n=0}^{n_0 + p} (n+p)^p e^{V(b/2a)} \\ & \quad + \delta_{p, n_0} \sum_{n=0}^{n_0 + p} (n+p)^p e^{V(b/2a)} + \sum_{n=n_0 + p + 1}^{\infty} (n+p)^p e^{V(n-p)} \\ &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{n_0 - 1 - p} (n+p)^p e^{V(n+p)} + \sum_{n=n_0 - p}^{n_0 + p} (n+p)^p e^{V(b/2a)} + \sum_{n=n_0 + p + 1}^{\infty} (n+p)^p e^{V(n-p)} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=p}^{n_0 - 1} k^p e^{V(k)} + \sum_{n=n_0 - p}^{n_0 + p} (n+p)^p e^{V(b/2a)} + \sum_{k=n_0 + 1}^{\infty} (k+2p)^p e^{V(k)} \\ &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n^p e^{-an^2 + bn} + (2p+1)(n_0+2p)^p e^{b^2/4a} + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+2p)^p e^{-an^2 + bn} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E34})$$

with $\theta(\bullet)$ and $\delta_{\bullet, \circ}$ being the Heaviside step function and Kronecker delta, respectively.

The first and last term of RHS in Eq. (E34) can be bounded by directly using Lemma 3 and Lemma 5, respectively. So now we turn to deal with the second term in Eq. (E34), which can be bounded by $3p[b/(2a) + 1 + 2p]^p e^{b^2/2a} \leq C_2^p p^{p+1}$ with $C_2 := e^{b^2/2a} [3b/(2a) + 9]$. Then we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+p)^p \exp \left[\max_{x \in [n-p, n+p]} (-ax^2 + bx) \right] \\ &\leq C_1^p a^{-(p+1)/2} (p!)^{1/2} + C_2^p p^{p+1} + C_3^p p^{p+1} a^{-(p+1)/2} \\ &\leq C_4^p \left[p^{p+1} a^{-(p+1)/2} + a^{-(p+1)/2} (p!)^{1/2} + p^{p+1} \right] \\ &\leq C_4^p 16^p p! \left(a^{-(p+1)/2} + a^{-(p+1)/2} + 1 \right) \\ &\leq C_4^p 16^p p! \left(1 + 1 + a^{(p+1)/2} \right) a^{-(p+1)/2} \\ &\leq C_5^p a^{-(p+1)/2} p!. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E35})$$

Here, in the third line we denoted $C_4 := \max\{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$ with C_1 and C_3 being the constants C in Lemma 3 and Lemma 5, respectively. In the fourth line of Eq. (E35) we used $16^p p! \geq p^{p+1} \geq p^p \geq p! \geq (p!)^{1/2}$. To see this, we first show that $p^p \leq 4^p \Gamma(p)$, which is equivalent to $p \ln p \leq p \ln 4 + \ln \Gamma(p)$. To prove this we denote $g(x) := \ln \Gamma(x) + x \ln 4 - x \ln x$ and find $g(1) = 1.38629... > 0$. Then the derivative reads $g'(x) := \phi^{(0)}(x) + \ln 4 + \ln x + 1 \geq g'(1) = 1.80908... > 0$, which im-

plies $g(x) \geq 0$ for $x \geq 1$. Here we have used the digamma function, which is strictly increasing on $(0, \infty)$. In the last line of Eq. (E35), we used $C_4^p 16^p [2 + a^{(p+1)/2}] \leq (16C_4)^p + (16C_4)^p + (16C_4a)^p \leq 3C_4'^p \leq C''^p$ with $C_4' := \max\{16C_4, 16C_4a\}$ and $C'' := 3C_4'$. Then we use $C''^p \leq C^{p+1}$ with $C := \max\{1, C''\}$ to obtain the desired result.

For $p = 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-an^2 + bn} \leq \int_0^{\infty} dx e^{-ax^2 + bx} + 2e^{b^2/4a} \\ &\leq e^{b^2/4a} \sqrt{\pi} a^{-1/2} + 2e^{b^2/4a} := Ca^{-1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E36})$$

Thus we finish the proof. \blacksquare

Discussion. — We can also obtain the following bound:

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \exp \left[\max_{x \in [n-p, n+p]} (-ax^2 + bx) \right] \leq Cpa^{-1/2}, \quad (\text{E37})$$

whose proof is simple:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \exp \left[\max_{x \in [n-p, n+p]} (-ax^2 + bx) \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{n_0 - 1 - p} e^{V(n+p)} + \sum_{n=n_0 - p}^{n_0 + p} e^{V(b/2a)} + \sum_{n=n_0 + p + 1}^{\infty} e^{V(n-p)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{k=p}^{n_0-1} e^{V(k)} + \sum_{n=n_0-p}^{n_0+p} e^{V(b/2a)} + \sum_{k=n_0+1}^{\infty} e^{V(k)} \\
&\leq 2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-an^2+bn} + (2p+1)e^{b^2/4a}. \\
&\leq 3p \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-an^2+bn} + e^{b^2/4a} \right) \\
&\leq 3p \left(C'a^{-1/2} + e^{b^2/4a} \right) \\
&\leq Cpa^{-1/2} \tag{E38}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last second line we used Eq. (E36) and in the last line we defined $C := 3(C' + e^{b^2/4a}a^{1/2})$.

We can bound C as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
C &= \max\{3 \max\{16C_4, 16C_4a^{1/2}, 16C_4a\}, 1\} \\
&\leq 3 \max\{16C_4, 16C_4a^{1/2}, 16C_4a\} + 1 \\
&\leq 48(1 + a^{1/2} + a)C_4 + 1 \\
&\leq 48(1 + a^{1/2} + a)(C_1 + C_2 + C_3) + 1 \\
&\leq 48(1 + a^{1/2} + a) \left[C_1 + e^{b^2/2a} \left(\frac{3b}{2a} + 9 \right) + C_3 \right] + 1 \\
&\leq 48[1 + (\beta^*U_{\max}/2)^{1/2} + \beta^*U_{\max}/2] \\
&\quad \times \left[C_1 + e^{\beta^*\mu_0^2/U_{\min}} \left(\frac{3\mu_0}{U_{\min}} + 9 \right) + C_3 \right] + 1 \\
&= \mathcal{O}(1) \tag{E39}
\end{aligned}$$

For the constant C introduced in the discussion part, we can bound it via

$$\begin{aligned}
C &= 3(C' + e^{b^2/4a}a^{1/2}) \\
&= 3(e^{b^2/4a}\sqrt{\pi} + 2e^{b^2/4a}a^{1/2} + e^{b^2/4a}a^{1/2}) \\
&\leq 3e^{\beta^*\mu_0/2U_{\min}}(\sqrt{\pi} + 3\sqrt{\beta^*U_{\max}/2}) \\
&= \mathcal{O}(1) \tag{E40}
\end{aligned}$$

To can choose the larger one between the constants in Eqs. (E39) and (E40) to construct the bound.

Therefore, one may rewrite Lemma 6 as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+p)^p \exp \left[\max_{y \in [n-p, n+p]} (-U_x y^2/2 + \mu_{0,xy}) \right] \\
&\leq C^p (U_x \beta/2)^{-(p+1)/2} p^{p+1} \tag{E41}
\end{aligned}$$

with C redefined as the $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant on RHS of Eq. (E39). Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \exp \left[\max_{y \in [n-p, n+p]} (-U_x y^2/2 + \mu_{0,xy}) \right] \\
&\leq C (U_x \beta/2)^{-1/2} p \tag{E42}
\end{aligned}$$

with C redefined as the $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant on RHS of Eq. (E40).

Lemma 7. For non-negative integer m_1, m_2, \dots, m_s we have

$$\frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^s m_i \right)!}{\prod_{i=1}^s m_i!} \leq s^{\sum_{i=1}^s m_i} \tag{E43}$$

Proof. — Note that from the multinomial theorem

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\substack{m_1+m_2+\dots+m_s=M \\ m_1, m_2, \dots, m_s \geq 0}} x_1^{m_1} x_2^{m_2} \dots x_s^{m_s} \frac{M!}{m_1! m_2! \dots m_s!} \\
&= (x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_s)^M. \tag{E44}
\end{aligned}$$

By putting $x_1 = x_2 = \dots = x_s = 1$, we find the RHS of Eqs. (E43) and (E44) coincide while LHS of Eq. (E43) is only one of terms in the LHS of Eq. (E44), which completes the proof. ■

Lemma 8. Let $\{\mu_k(w)\}_{k=1}^{|w|}$ be the edge-wise multiplicities of the word w a certain constant $C > 0$, then we have

$$\sum_{w \in G^*: G_w = G} \left[\frac{(C\sqrt{\beta})^{|w|}}{|w|!} \prod_{k=1}^{|G|} \mu_k(w)! \right] = \left(\frac{C\beta^{1/2}}{1 - C\beta^{1/2}} \right)^{|G|} \tag{E45}$$

for $C\sqrt{\beta} < 1$.

Proof. — First we denote $n := |G|$ and omit the argument of $\{\mu_k(w)\}_{k=1}^{|G|}$ for brevity and start from

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{w \in G^*: G_C w} \left[\frac{(C\sqrt{\beta})^{|w|}}{|w|!} \prod_{k=1}^{|G|} \mu_k! \right] \\
&= \sum_{l=n}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n \geq 1 \\ \mu_1 + \mu_2 + \dots + \mu_n = l}} \binom{l}{\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n} \frac{(C\sqrt{\beta})^l}{l!} \prod_{k=1}^n \mu_k! \\
&= \sum_{l=n}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n \geq 1 \\ \mu_1 + \mu_2 + \dots + \mu_n = l}} \frac{l!}{\prod_{k=1}^n \mu_k!} \frac{(C\sqrt{\beta})^l}{l!} \prod_{k=1}^n \mu_k! \\
&\leq \sum_{l=n}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n \geq 1 \\ \mu_1 + \mu_2 + \dots + \mu_n = l}} (C\sqrt{\beta})^l \\
&= \sum_{l=n}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n \geq 1 \\ \mu_1 + \mu_2 + \dots + \mu_n = l}} (C\sqrt{\beta})^{\mu_1} (C_1\sqrt{\beta})^{\mu_2} \dots (C_1\sqrt{\beta})^{\mu_n} \\
&= \sum_{\mu_1=1}^{\infty} (C_1\sqrt{\beta})^{\mu_1} \sum_{\mu_2=1}^{\infty} (C_1\sqrt{\beta})^{\mu_2} \dots \sum_{\mu_n=1}^{\infty} (C_1\sqrt{\beta})^{\mu_n} \\
&= \left(\frac{C\beta^{1/2}}{1 - C\beta^{1/2}} \right)^{|G|}. \tag{E46}
\end{aligned}$$

Actually, this is an analogue of Lemma 5 of Ref. [20] but with simplified derivations. In the last line of Eq. (E46), we need to set $C\sqrt{\beta} < 1$ to ensure the summation converges. ■

Lemma 9. Let $G_0 \subset E$ be some edge subset, we denote $\mathcal{G}_m = \{G | G \cap F \neq \emptyset, |G| = m\}$ be the set of all the connected edge subsets that overlap with F and are of the size $|G| = m$. The the number of the elements in \mathcal{G}_m can be bounded by

$$|\mathcal{G}_m| \leq \sigma^m \tag{E47}$$

with $\sigma = \mathcal{O}(1)$.

Proof. — We simply list the lemma here for convenience and refer the readers to the discussion below Eq. (A11) of Ref. [20], proposition 3.6 of Ref. [91] and Ref [18] for details. ■

-
- [1] Malte Henkel. *Conformal invariance and critical phenomena*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [2] John Cardy. *Scaling and renormalization in statistical physics*, volume 5. Cambridge university press, 1996.
- [3] Michael E Fisher. The renormalization group in the theory of critical behavior. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 46(4):597, 1974.
- [4] H Eugene Stanley. *Phase transitions and critical phenomena*, volume 7. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1971.
- [5] Cyril Domb. *Phase transitions and critical phenomena*. Elsevier, 2000.
- [6] Lev Davidovich Landau and Evgenii Mikhailovich Lifshitz. *Statistical physics: theory of the condensed state*.
- [7] Robert Zwanzig. Time-correlation functions and transport coefficients in statistical mechanics. *Annual Review of Physical Chemistry*, 16(1):67–102, 1965.
- [8] Ryogo Kubo. The fluctuation-dissipation theorem. *Reports on progress in physics*, 29(1):255, 1966.
- [9] Ryogo Kubo. Statistical-mechanical theory of irreversible processes. i. general theory and simple applications to magnetic and conduction problems. *Journal of the physical society of Japan*, 12(6):570–586, 1957.
- [10] Herbert B Callen and Theodore A Welton. Irreversibility and generalized noise. *Physical Review*, 83(1):34, 1951.
- [11] Robert Zwanzig. *Nonequilibrium statistical mechanics*. Oxford university press, 2001.
- [12] Kyozi Kawasaki. Kinetic equations and time correlations of critical fluctuations. *Annals of Physics*, 61(1):1–56, 1970.
- [13] Kerson Huang. *Statistical mechanics*. John Wiley & Sons, 2008.
- [14] Stephen G Brush. History of the lenz-ising model. *Reviews of modern physics*, 39(4):883, 1967.
- [15] Fa-Yueh Wu. The potts model. *Reviews of modern physics*, 54(1):235, 1982.
- [16] Rodney J Baxter. Potts model at the critical temperature. *Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics*, 6(23):L445, 1973.
- [17] John Hubbard. Electron correlations in narrow energy bands. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 276(1365):238–257, 1963.
- [18] Dominik S Wild and Álvaro M Alhambra. Classical simulation of short-time quantum dynamics. *PRX Quantum*, 4(2):020340, 2023.
- [19] Matthew B Hastings. Locality in quantum systems. *Quantum Theory from Small to Large Scales*, 95:171–212, 2010.
- [20] Martin Kliesch, Christian Gogolin, Micahel J Kastoryano, Arnau Riera, and Jens Eisert. Locality of temperature. *Physical review x*, 4(3):031019, 2014.
- [21] Matthew B Hastings and Tohru Koma. Spectral gap and exponential decay of correlations. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 265:781–804, 2006.
- [22] Bruno Nachtergaele and Robert Sims. Lieb-robinson bounds and the exponential clustering theorem. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 265:119–130, 2006.
- [23] Chi-Fang Anthony Chen, Andrew Lucas, and Chao Yin. Speed limits and locality in many-body quantum dynamics. *Reports on Progress in Physics*, 86(11):116001, 2023.
- [24] Álvaro M Alhambra and J Ignacio Cirac. Locally accurate tensor networks for thermal states and time evolution. *PRX Quantum*, 2(4):040331, 2021.
- [25] Christian Gogolin and Jens Eisert. Equilibration, thermalisation, and the emergence of statistical mechanics in closed quantum systems. *Reports on Progress in Physics*, 79(5):056001, 2016.
- [26] Tomotaka Kuwahara and Keiji Saito. Exponential clustering of bipartite quantum entanglement at arbitrary temperatures. *Physical Review X*, 12(2):021022, 2022.
- [27] Jürg Fröhlich and Daniel Ueltschi. Some properties of correlations of quantum lattice systems in thermal equilibrium. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 56(5), 2015.
- [28] Matthew B Hastings. Solving gapped hamiltonians locally. *Physical Review B—Condensed Matter and Materials Physics*, 73(8):085115, 2006.
- [29] Nicolò Defenu, Alessio Lerose, and Silvia Pappalardi. Out-of-equilibrium dynamics of quantum many-body systems with long-range interactions. *Physics Reports*, 1074:1–92, 2024.
- [30] Zongping Gong and Ryusuke Hamazaki. Bounds in nonequilibrium quantum dynamics. *International Journal of Modern Physics B*, 36(31):2230007, 2022.
- [31] Berislav Buča. Unified theory of local quantum many-body dynamics: Eigenoperator thermalization theorems. *Physical Review X*, 13(3):031013, 2023.
- [32] Tomotaka Kuwahara, Tan Van Vu, and Keiji Saito. Effective light cone and digital quantum simulation of interacting bosons. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):2520, 2024.
- [33] Zongping Gong, Tommaso Guaita, and J. Ignacio Cirac. Long-range free fermions: Lieb-robinson bound, clustering properties, and topological phases. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 130:070401, Feb 2023.
- [34] Marc Cheneau, Peter Barmettler, Dario Poletti, Manuel Endres, Peter Schauß, Takeshi Fukuhara, Christian Gross, Immanuel Bloch, Corinna Kollath, and Stefan Kuhr. Light-cone-like spreading of correlations in a quantum many-body system. *Nature*, 481(7382):484–487, 2012.
- [35] Zhiyuan Wang and Kaden RA Hazzard. Tightening the lieb-robinson bound in locally interacting systems. *PRX Quantum*, 1(1):010303, 2020.
- [36] Jens Eisert, Marcus Cramer, and Martin B Plenio. Colloquium: Area laws for the entanglement entropy. *Reviews of modern physics*, 82(1):277–306, 2010.
- [37] Matthew B Hastings. An area law for one-dimensional quantum systems. *Journal of statistical mechanics: theory and experiment*, 2007(08):P08024, 2007.
- [38] Jens Eisert, Marcus Cramer, and Martin B Plenio. Area laws for the entanglement entropy—a review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0808.3773*, 2008.
- [39] J Ignacio Cirac, David Perez-Garcia, Norbert Schuch, and Frank Verstraete. Matrix product states and projected entangled pair states: Concepts, symmetries, theorems. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 93(4):045003, 2021.
- [40] David Perez-Garcia, Frank Verstraete, Michael M Wolf, and J Ignacio Cirac. Matrix product state representations. *arXiv preprint quant-ph/0608197*, 2006.
- [41] Michael J Kastoryano and Fernando GSL Brandao. Quantum gibbs samplers: The commuting case. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 344:915–957, 2016.
- [42] Kohtaro Kato and Fernando GSL Brandao. Quantum approximate markov chains are thermal. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 370:117–149, 2019.
- [43] Petar Jurcevic, Ben P Lanyon, Philipp Hauke, Cor-

- nelius Hempel, Peter Zoller, Rainer Blatt, and Christian F Roos. Quasiparticle engineering and entanglement propagation in a quantum many-body system. *Nature*, 511(7508):202–205, 2014.
- [44] Philip Richerme, Zhe-Xuan Gong, Aaron Lee, Crystal Senko, Jacob Smith, Michael Foss-Feig, Spyridon Michalakis, Alexey V Gorshkov, and Christopher Monroe. Non-local propagation of correlations in quantum systems with long-range interactions. *Nature*, 511(7508):198–201, 2014.
- [45] Tobias J Osborne. Efficient approximation of the dynamics of one-dimensional quantum spin systems. *Physical review letters*, 97(15):157202, 2006.
- [46] Jeongwan Haah, Matthew B Hastings, Robin Kothari, and Guang Hao Low. Quantum algorithm for simulating real time evolution of lattice hamiltonians. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 52(6):FOCS18–250, 2021.
- [47] Anurag Anshu, Srinivasan Arunachalam, Tomotaka Kuwahara, and Mehdi Soleimanifar. Sample-efficient learning of interacting quantum systems. *Nature Physics*, 17(8):931–935, 2021.
- [48] Tan Van Vu, Tomotaka Kuwahara, and Keiji Saito. Optimal light cone for macroscopic particle transport in long-range systems: A quantum speed limit approach. *Quantum*, 8:1483, 2024.
- [49] David Poulin. Lieb-robinson bound and locality for general markovian quantum dynamics. *Physical review letters*, 104(19):190401, 2010.
- [50] Pasquale Calabrese, Fabian HL Essler, and Maurizio Fagotti. Quantum quench in the transverse-field ising chain. *Physical review letters*, 106(22):227203, 2011.
- [51] Salvatore R Manmana, Stefan Wessel, Reinhard M Noack, and Alejandro Muramatsu. Strongly correlated fermions after a quantum quench. *Physical review letters*, 98(21):210405, 2007.
- [52] Florian Meinert, Manfred J Mark, Emil Kirilov, Katharina Lauber, Philipp Weinmann, Andrew J Daley, and H-C Nägerl. Quantum quench in an atomic one-dimensional ising chain. *Physical review letters*, 111(5):053003, 2013.
- [53] Thomas Ising, Reinhard Folk, Ralph Kenna, Bertrand Berche, and Yuri Holovatch. The fate of ernst ising and the fate of his model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.01764*, 2017.
- [54] Huzihiro Araki. Gibbs states of a one dimensional quantum lattice. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 14:120–157, 1969.
- [55] Elliott H Lieb and Derek W Robinson. The finite group velocity of quantum spin systems. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 28(3):251–257, 1972.
- [56] Allan Griffin, David W Snoke, and Sandro Stringari. *Bose-einstein condensation*. Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- [57] Franco Dalfovo, Stefano Giorgini, Lev P Pitaevskii, and Sandro Stringari. Theory of bose-einstein condensation in trapped gases. *Reviews of modern physics*, 71(3):463, 1999.
- [58] Max Tillmann, Borivoje Dakić, René Heilmann, Stefan Nolte, Alexander Szameit, and Philip Walther. Experimental boson sampling. *Nature photonics*, 7(7):540–544, 2013.
- [59] Justin B Spring, Benjamin J Metcalf, Peter C Humphreys, W Steven Kolthammer, Xian-Min Jin, Marco Barbieri, Animesh Datta, Nicholas Thomas-Peter, Nathan K Langford, Dmytro Kundys, et al. Boson sampling on a photonic chip. *Science*, 339(6121):798–801, 2013.
- [60] Craig S Hamilton, Regina Kruse, Linda Sansoni, Sonja Barkhofen, Christine Silberhorn, and Igor Jex. Gaussian boson sampling. *Physical review letters*, 119(17):170501, 2017.
- [61] Miguel Angel Cazalilla, Roberta Citro, Thierry Giamarchi, Edmond Orignac, and Marcos Rigol. One dimensional bosons: From condensed matter systems to ultracold gases. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 83(4):1405–1466, 2011.
- [62] John Dirk Walecka. A theory of highly condensed matter. *Annals of Physics*, 83(2):491–529, 1974.
- [63] Amir O Caldeira and Anthony J Leggett. Influence of dissipation on quantum tunneling in macroscopic systems. *Physical review letters*, 46(4):211, 1981.
- [64] Heinz-Peter Breuer and Francesco Petruccione. *The theory of open quantum systems*. Oxford University Press, USA, 2002.
- [65] Heinz-Peter Breuer, Elsi-Mari Laine, Jyrki Piilo, and Bassano Vacchini. Colloquium: Non-markovian dynamics in open quantum systems. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 88(2):021002, 2016.
- [66] Chao Yin and Andrew Lucas. Finite speed of quantum information in models of interacting bosons at finite density. *Physical Review X*, 12(2):021039, 2022.
- [67] Tomotaka Kuwahara and Keiji Saito. Lieb-robinson bound and almost-linear light cone in interacting boson systems. *Physical review letters*, 127(7):070403, 2021.
- [68] Tomotaka Kuwahara and Marius Lemm. Enhanced lieb-robinson bounds for a class of bose-hubbard type hamiltonians. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.04672*, 2024.
- [69] Álvaro M Alhambra. Quantum many-body systems in thermal equilibrium. *PRX Quantum*, 4(4):040201, 2023.
- [70] Barry Simon. *Operator theory*, volume 4. American Mathematical Soc., 2015.
- [71] Arlen Brown and Carl Pearcy. Spectra of tensor products of operators. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 17(1):162–166, 1966.
- [72] Hiroomi Umezawa, Hiroshi Matsumoto, and Masashi Tachiki. Thermo field dynamics and condensed states. 1982.
- [73] Joseph E Mayer and Elliott Montroll. Molecular distribution. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 9(1):2–16, 1941.
- [74] David Ruelle. *Statistical mechanics: Rigorous results*. World Scientific, 1969.
- [75] Hadleigh Frost, Carlos R Mafra, and Lionel Mason. A lie bracket for the momentum kernel. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 402(2):1307–1343, 2023.
- [76] Christophe Reutenauer. Free lie algebras. In *Handbook of algebra*, volume 3, pages 887–903. Elsevier, 2003.
- [77] John G Kirkwood. Statistical mechanics of fluid mixtures. *The Journal of chemical physics*, 3(5):300–313, 1935.
- [78] Robert K Fitzgerald and Frank H Verhoek. The law of dulong and petit, 1960.
- [79] Marius Lemm and Oliver Siebert. Thermal area law for lattice bosons. *Quantum*, 7:1083, 2023.
- [80] Andreas Bluhm, Ángela Capel, and Antonio Pérez-Hernández. Exponential decay of mutual information for gibbs states of local hamiltonians. *Quantum*, 6:650, 2022.
- [81] Tomotaka Kuwahara. Clustering of conditional mutual information and quantum markov structure at arbitrary temperatures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.05835*, 2024.
- [82] Fernando GSL Brandao and Michał Horodecki. Exponential decay of correlations implies area law. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 333:761–798, 2015.
- [83] Giorgio Parisi and Ramamurti Shankar. Statistical field

- theory. 1988.
- [84] Mehran Kardar. *Statistical physics of fields*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.
 - [85] Joseph I Kapusta and Charles Gale. *Finite-temperature field theory: Principles and applications*. Cambridge university press, 2007.
 - [86] David J Griffiths and Darrell F Schroeter. *Introduction to quantum mechanics*. Cambridge university press, 2018.
 - [87] Jun John Sakurai and Jim Napolitano. *Modern quantum mechanics*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
 - [88] Daniel Manzano. A short introduction to the lindblad master equation. *Aip advances*, 10(2), 2020.
 - [89] Li Li, Michael JW Hall, and Howard M Wiseman. Concepts of quantum non-markovianity: A hierarchy. *Physics Reports*, 759:1–51, 2018.
 - [90] Seok-Ho Chang, Pamela C Cosman, and Laurence B Milstein. Chernoff-type bounds for the gaussian error function. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 59(11):2939–2944, 2011.
 - [91] Jeongwan Haah, Robin Kothari, and Ewin Tang. Optimal learning of quantum hamiltonians from high-temperature gibbs states. In *2022 IEEE 63rd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 135–146. IEEE, 2022.