

EMERGENCE OF FERMION-MEDIATED INTERACTIONS IN BOSE-FERMI MIXTURES

ESTEBAN CÁRDENAS, JOSEPH K. MILLER, DAVID MITROUSKAS, AND NATAŠA PAVLOVIĆ

ABSTRACT. This work is inspired by recent experimental observations in ultracold atomic Bose-Fermi mixtures [DeSalvo et al., Nature 568 (2019)]. These experiments reveal the emergence of an attractive fermion-mediated interaction between bosons, as well as a stability-instability transition. We give the first mathematical demonstration of this transition by studying the low-energy spectrum of a many-body interspecies Hamiltonian. More precisely, we show the convergence of its eigenvalues towards those of an effective Bose Hamiltonian, which includes fermion-mediated effects. Applying this result to a model with short-range potentials, we derive a stability-instability transition in the bosonic subsystem, driven by the Bose–Fermi coupling strength g . For small $|g|$, the bosons form a stable Bose–Einstein condensate with the energy per particle uniformly bounded from below. For large $|g|$, the energy per particle is no longer uniformly bounded from below, signaling the collapse of the condensate.

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 2. Second quantization | 11 |
| 3. Proof of Theorem 1 and 2 | 14 |
| 4. Auxiliary estimates | 18 |
| 5. Upper and lower bounds | 22 |
| 6. Lattice sums | 30 |
| Appendix A. The bosonic quadratic form | 32 |
| Appendix B. Proof of Corollary 1.1 | 33 |
| References | 34 |

1. INTRODUCTION

In both high-energy and condensed matter physics, particle exchange processes play a central role in understanding the emergence of effective forces. Notable examples include the Yukawa potential arising from the exchange of massive bosons, and phonon-mediated Cooper pairing in superconductors. Ultracold atomic systems, particularly Bose-Fermi mixtures, offer a versatile and controllable platform for investigating analogous phenomena in novel regimes. With recent advancements in atomic physics—such as sympathetic laser cooling and magneto-optical trapping—it has become possible to simultaneously cool down and trap bosonic and fermionic gases [45, 46], paving the way for a better understanding of

the interplay between mediated interactions and collective behaviour in interesting physical systems.

The experimental realization of Bose-Fermi mixtures has revealed a remarkably rich phase diagram, involving polaron formation [36, 44] mediated interactions [21, 27, 30, 48, 58], novel pairing mechanisms [31, 55] and states of dual superfluidity [42, 56]. Our interest in this topic was motivated by recent experiments by DeSalvo et al. [21] on mixtures of light fermionic Li^6 atoms and heavy bosonic Cs^{133} atoms. In this mixture, the Cs atoms form a Bose-Einstein condensate (BEC) which is completely immersed in a much larger degenerate Fermi gas of Li atoms. A key observation—anticipated also by theoretical predictions [19, 43, 54]—is the emergence of an attractive fermion-mediated interaction between the bosons. As confirmed by the experimental data in [21], this effective interaction creates a dichotomy in the behavior of the bosonic subsystem. For weak interspecies coupling, the bosons form a stable BEC with a shifted energy, coexisting with the degenerate Fermi gas. However, as the coupling strength increases, the mediated attraction surpasses the intrinsic boson-boson repulsion, eventually destabilizing the BEC and leading to a collapse of the condensate cloud.

The aim of this paper is to give a rigorous derivation of fermion-mediated interactions—starting from an interspecies many-body Hamiltonian—and to prove the associated stability-instability transition.

1.1. The model

We consider N bosons and M fermions moving in the three-dimensional torus $\mathbf{T}^3 = (\mathbf{R}/2\pi\mathbf{Z})^3$. The Hilbert space of the system is the tensor product

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_F \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{H}_B = \bigotimes_{\text{sym}}^N L^2(\mathbf{T}^3, dx) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H}_F = \bigwedge^M L^2(\mathbf{T}^3, dy), \quad (1.1)$$

which account for bosonic and fermionic statistics, respectively. For simplicity, we assume both species are spinless, and of equal mass. The microscopic Hamiltonian in appropriate units then takes the form

$$H = h \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes \sum_{1 \leq j \leq M} (-\Delta_{y_j}) + \lambda \sum_{1 \leq i \leq N} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq M} V(x_i - y_j) \quad (1.2)$$

with Bose Hamiltonian

$$h = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq N} (-\Delta_{x_i}) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} W(x_i - x_j). \quad (1.3)$$

Here, W and V are sufficiently regular, even functions describing Bose-Bose and Bose-Fermi interactions, respectively. To capture different physical situations—particularly short-range interactions in dilute atomic gases—we allow the potentials to depend on the number of bosons N . We also adopt the common and well-justified approximation of neglecting short-range interactions between fermions [24]. The coupling λ is specified in (1.8) below.

We are interested in describing the low-energy spectrum of the operator H in a regime where the fermionic energy is much larger than the energy of the bosons. In order to make

this limit precise, we introduce on the momentum lattice $(\mathbf{T}^3)^* = \mathbf{Z}^3$ the *Fermi ball*

$$B_F = \{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3 : |k| \leq k_F\} \quad (1.4)$$

where $k_F \geq 1$ is the *Fermi momentum*. We follow the convention that k_F is a given number, and we set the fermionic particle number as

$$M = |B_F|. \quad (1.5)$$

In particular, thanks to simple geometric asymptotics, we know that $M \sim \frac{4\pi}{3}k_F^3$ for large k_F . We further introduce the Fermi energy

$$E_F = \sum_{k \in B_F} k^2 \quad (1.6)$$

that satisfies $E_F \sim \frac{4\pi}{5}k_F^5$ for large k_F . The Fermi energy is the ground state energy of the non-interacting fermionic subsystem, and the ground state is given by the Slater determinant of plane waves

$$\Omega_F = \bigwedge_{k \in B_F} e_k \quad \text{where} \quad e_k(x) = (2\pi)^{-\frac{3}{2}} e^{ik \cdot x}, \quad k \in \mathbf{Z}^3. \quad (1.7)$$

We will be interested in the regime for which the fermionic energy E_F is much larger than the bosonic energy.

The coupling λ of the Bose-Fermi potential in (1.2) is fixed throughout the article as

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi N k_F}}. \quad (1.8)$$

This choice leads to an effective Bose-Bose interaction which competes with W . Let us explain the heuristics (as described, for instance, in [21]). For low-energy states, we expect most fermions to occupy the Fermi ball B_F . Moreover, as $k_F \rightarrow \infty$, there is a separation of energy scales between fermions and bosons, which causes an effective (adiabatic) decoupling of the two subsystems. However, bosons can still interact with fermions through coherent three-particle processes: one boson excites a fermion with momentum change k , while another boson interacts with the same fermion with momentum change $-k$. These processes do not establish fermion-boson correlations (see e.g. Corollary 1.1 below), but they induce an effective interaction between boson pairs (see Figure 1 for a visualization). The amplitude of this process scales with the number of fermions a boson can interact with. Due to the Pauli exclusion principle, only fermions near the surface of the Fermi ball can participate. Thus, the number of contributing fermions scales like k_F^2 . Energy conservation (which appears in the form of a free fermionic resolvent) reduces this number further to k_F . Finally, we note that as a second order process, the amplitude is proportional to λ^2 . Consequently, the strength of the effective potential between two bosons scales like $\lambda^2 k_F$. To ensure this interaction is comparable to $\frac{1}{N}W$ in (1.3), we set λ as in (1.8). The factor $1/\sqrt{4\pi}$ is introduced only for convenience.

Despite significant interest in the physics community, the mathematical analysis of Bose-Fermi mixtures remains largely unexplored. While purely bosonic (e.g. [5–8, 10, 22, 23, 33–35, 39, 47, 57]) and purely fermionic (e.g. [2–4, 15, 16, 18, 25]) many-body systems have been extensively studied, the literature on combined mixtures is scarce. Before presenting




FIGURE 1. Visualization of the effective interaction: (a) illustrates a coherent three-particle process (in blue) involving two bosons and one fermion, which generates the effective interaction (in red). (b) and (c) show the same process in momentum space, where the first boson excites a fermion from the Fermi ball and the second boson subsequently annihilates this excitation.

our results, we briefly mention two works on the dynamics of Bose-Fermi mixtures: In [13], the first, second and last author of this paper focus on a semi-classical regime where bosons and fermions remain effectively coupled through mean-field potentials. Starting from an interspecies many-body Hamiltonian with an appropriate mean-field scaling, a system of coupled Hartree-Vlasov type equations is derived, describing the evolution of boson and fermion densities. In [38], P. Pickl and the third author of this paper consider a scaling similar to (1.8), but the focus lies on the dynamics of a fixed number of bosons (called impurities) interacting with a dense Fermi gas. While in [38] the impurities experience an effective interaction akin to the one felt by the bosons in our model, the effective potential is not computed explicitly, nor is a connection established to large Bose-Fermi mixtures. Since the present work focuses on spectral properties rather than dynamics, both the problem and our approach differ substantially from those in [38].

To our best knowledge, this is the first work to investigate the low-energy spectrum of large Bose-Fermi mixtures. Our purpose is two-fold. First, in Theorem 1 we rigorously justify the previously described picture by proving the emergence of an *effective* bosonic Hamiltonian that incorporates fermion-mediated interactions. Second, as an application, in Theorem 2 we consider short-range interactions and prove the existence of a stability-instability transition as detected experimentally in [21].

1.2. Main results

In our first result, we describe the asymptotics of the low-energy eigenvalues of H as $k_F \rightarrow \infty$. In this limit, we prove the emergence of an effective Hamiltonian acting on the bosonic subsystem \mathcal{H}_B given by

$$h^{\text{eff}} = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq N} (-\Delta_{x_i}) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} W^{\text{eff}}(x_i - x_j) \quad (1.9)$$

where the effective two-body potential takes the form

$$W^{\text{eff}} = W - V * V. \quad (1.10)$$

Here, $(f * g)(x) = \int_{\mathbf{T}^3} f(y)g(x-y)dy$ denotes the convolution on \mathbf{T}^3 . We let the Fourier series be $\hat{V}(k) = (2\pi)^{-3/2} \int_{\mathbf{T}^3} V(x)e^{-ik \cdot x} dx$ for any $k \in \mathbf{Z}^3$ and for convenience we put $\hat{V}_0 \equiv \hat{V}(0)$. For $s \in \mathbf{R}$ we denote by $H^s(\mathbf{T}^3)$ the Sobolev space on the torus.

In order to state our results, we introduce the precise condition for the potentials. Throughout this work, we shall always assume:

Condition 1. $W \in L^p(\mathbf{T}^3)$ for some $p \in (\frac{3}{2}, \infty]$ and $V \in H^4(\mathbf{T}^3)$.

Under these conditions, the Hamiltonian H can be defined as a self-adjoint operator, understood as a sum of quadratic forms with form domain $H^1(\mathbf{T}^{3N}) \otimes H^1(\mathbf{T}^{3M}) \cap \mathcal{H}$. While this is well-known, we include a proof of relative form boundedness of the potentials in Lemma A.1 for completeness. Notably, the Coulomb potential $\hat{W}(k) \sim |k|^{-2}$ is included.

Finally, for a lower bounded, self-adjoint operator A we denote by $(\mu_n(A))_{n \geq 1}$ its sequence of eigenvalues counting multiplicities, in non-decreasing order. Our first main result now reads as follows.

Theorem 1. *Let H be the Bose-Fermi Hamiltonian on $\mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_F$ given by (1.2), with scaling (1.8), and let h_{eff} be the effective bosonic Hamiltonian on \mathcal{H}_B defined in (1.9). Assume (W, V) satisfy Condition 1 for some $p \in (\frac{3}{2}, \infty]$. Then, there is a constant $C > 0$ (depending only on the value of p) such that for any $k_F \geq 1$, $N \geq 1$ and $1 \leq n \leq N$*

$$\mu_n(H) = E_F + \lambda N M \hat{V}_0 - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbf{T}^3} |V|^2 dx - \frac{1}{2} (N-2) |\hat{V}_0|^2 + \mu_n(h^{\text{eff}}) + \varepsilon_{N, k_F}$$

where the error satisfies

$$|\varepsilon_{N, k_F}| \leq C \left(1 + \|W\|_{L^p}^{2p/(2p-3)} + \|V\|_{H^4}^2 \right)^2 N^2 (\ln k_F)^{5/3} k_F^{-1/3} \quad (1.11)$$

provided $k_F (\ln k_F)^{-5} \geq C(nN \|V\|_{H^4}^2)^3$.

The statement involves three parameters: n , N and k_F . To approximate the eigenvalues of H using those of h^{eff} , the error must be smaller than $\mu_n(h^{\text{eff}})$. In particular, note that for fixed n and N , we have $|\varepsilon_{N, k_F}| \rightarrow 0$ as $k_F \rightarrow \infty$. For example, for the ground state energy ($n = 1$), we obtain:

$$\lim_{k_F \rightarrow \infty} \left(\inf \sigma(H) - E_F - \lambda N M \hat{V}_0 \right) = \inf \sigma(h^{\text{eff}}) - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbf{T}^3} |V|^2 dx - \frac{1}{2} (N-2) |\hat{V}_0|^2 \quad (1.12)$$

for all $N \geq 1$.

Remarks 1.1.

- The term $-\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbf{T}^3} |V|^2 dx$ represents the self-energy of the bosons, arising from a coherent two-particle process where a single boson excites and subsequently annihilates the same fermion from the Fermi ball. On the other hand, the term $\frac{1}{2} (N-2) |\hat{V}_0|^2$ must be subtracted in order to extract the explicit $V * V$ potential in the effective Hamiltonian. Both

of these contributions are physically irrelevant, as they correspond to constant energy shifts in the effective Hamiltonian.

- Thanks to the explicit error bound in Theorem 1, both potentials V and W can depend on the number of bosons N . This becomes relevant in Theorem 2, where we consider rescaled, N -dependent interactions. While, in principle, they can also depend mildly on k_F , we exclude this possibility since it is not relevant for our analysis.

Before discussing our main application, we state a corollary on the convergence of the ground state eigenfunction of H . For simplicity, we focus on the ground state, though the result extends to other non-degenerate eigenfunctions. The corollary shows that the ground state is approximately of the form $\phi^{\text{eff}} \otimes \Omega_F$, where ϕ^{eff} is the ground state of the effective Bose Hamiltonian h^{eff} . This supports the heuristics discussed above on the effective decoupling between the Fermi and Bose subsystems. The proof is postponed to Appendix B.

Corollary 1.1. *Let $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\phi^{\text{eff}} \in \mathcal{H}_B$ be the normalized ground state eigenfunctions of H and h^{eff} , and fix their relative phase so that $\langle \Phi, \phi^{\text{eff}} \otimes \Omega_F \rangle \geq 0$. Then, for all (W, V) satisfying Condition 1 and $N \geq 1$, we have*

$$\lim_{k_F \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \Phi - \phi^{\text{eff}} \otimes \Omega_F \right\| = 0$$

Our main application of Theorem 1 addresses the stability-instability transition in large Bose-Fermi mixtures, as mentioned in the introduction. The physical picture is that the bosons form a BEC immersed in a large fermionic environment [21]. For sufficiently weak coupling, the condensate remains stable under the interaction with the Fermi gas, and the energy per particle of the bosonic subsystem stays finite in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$. In contrast, when the Bose-Fermi coupling becomes strong enough, the effective boson-boson potential turns sufficiently attractive, driving the bosonic subsystem into an unstable phase. In this regime, the bosonic energy per particle is no longer uniformly bounded below, which indicates a collapse of the condensate.

To state a precise version of this transition, we consider the Gross-Pitaevskii (GP) regime that describes a dilute gas of ultracold atoms interacting via short-range potentials. Our precise assumptions are as follows.

Condition 2. *There exist $w \in C(\mathbf{R}^3)$ and non-zero $v \in H^4(\mathbf{R}^3)$, both non-negative, radial and compactly supported, such that*

$$W(x) = N^3 w(Nx) \quad \text{and} \quad V(x) = g N^3 v(Nx), \quad N \geq 1 \quad (1.13)$$

with coupling constant $g \in \mathbf{R}$.

Under this condition, the Hamiltonian H describes a Bose-Fermi mixture with repulsive Bose-Bose potential and repulsive ($g \geq 0$) or attractive ($g \leq 0$) Bose-Fermi interaction, with both W and V approximating delta distributions as $N \rightarrow \infty$. We note that $(V * V)(x) = g^2 N^3 (v * v)(Nx)$ and thus the effective re-scaled two-body potential is

$$w_g \equiv w - g^2 (v * v). \quad (1.14)$$

The effective Hamiltonian (1.9) on \mathcal{H}_B becomes

$$h^{\text{eff}} = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq N} (-\Delta_{x_i}) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} N^3 w_g(N(x_i - x_j)) , \quad (1.15)$$

which is commonly referred to as GP-scaling for N bosons. In Theorem 2 below, we prove the existence of a *critical coupling* $g_c \geq 0$ from which we can distinguish two regimes: First, the *stable regime*, given by $0 \leq |g| < g_c$. Here, the ground state energy per particle of the effective Hamiltonian h^{eff} is uniformly bounded in N . Second, the *unstable regime*, given by $|g| > g_c$, where the pair potential w_g becomes sufficiently attractive. Here, the ground state energy per particle diverges to $-\infty$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Within the stable regime, it would be desirable to calculate the energy per particle. To this end, we identify yet another parameter region. Namely, where $|g|$ is small enough so that $w_g \geq 0$. In this case, it is well known that bosons form a BEC with ground state energy

$$\inf \sigma(h^{\text{eff}}) = 4\pi \mathfrak{a}(g)N + O(1) \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty , \quad (1.16)$$

where $\mathfrak{a}(g)$ denotes the scattering length associated with the potential w_g . That is,

$$\mathfrak{a}(g) = \frac{1}{8\pi} \int_{\mathbf{R}^3} w_g(x) f_g(x) dx \quad \text{where} \quad \begin{cases} (-\Delta + \frac{1}{2}w_g)f_g = 0 \\ \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} |f_g(x)| = 1 \end{cases} . \quad (1.17)$$

We refer to [35] and [7, Theorem 1.1] for precise formulations and proofs of (1.16). Additionally, let us note that the analysis of dilute Bose gases has been a very active area of research in mathematical physics—for instance [5–7, 10, 22, 23, 34, 39]—with many results extending beyond (1.16). While the condition $w_g \geq 0$ is likely not necessary for Bose-Einstein condensation, the exact necessary and sufficient conditions are, to our knowledge, still unknown; see [1, 57] for partial results. Lastly, let us mention that it is also an open question whether alternative stable phases exist besides BEC. These problems are of interest beyond the context of Bose-Fermi mixtures and outside the scope of this work.

The stability-instability transition is summarized in the following theorem. A heuristic illustration of the statement is shown in Figure 2.

Theorem 2. *Assume that Condition 2 holds with coupling $g \in \mathbf{R}$, and define the shifted total energy-per-boson $\mathcal{E} : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ as*

$$\mathcal{E}(g) \equiv \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k_F \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \left(\inf \sigma(H) - E_F - \lambda N M \hat{V}_0 + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbf{T}^3} |V(x)|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} (N - 2) |\hat{V}_0|^2 \right) . \quad (1.18)$$

Then, the following statements hold

- (1) $\mathcal{E}(g) = \mathcal{E}(-g)$ for all $g \in \mathbf{R}$ and $g \in [0, \infty) \mapsto \mathcal{E}(g)$ is a monotone decreasing map.
- (2) There exists a critical coupling $0 \leq g_c < \infty$ such that

$$\mathcal{E}(g) > -\infty \quad \forall g \in \{0\} \cup (0, g_c) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}(g) = -\infty \quad \forall g > g_c . \quad (1.19)$$




FIGURE 2. Sketch of the phase diagram: For $w_g \geq 0$, the energy satisfies $\mathcal{E}(g) = 4\pi\mathfrak{a}(g)$. In the intermediate stable regime $g_0 \leq g \leq g_c$, only monotonicity of $\mathcal{E}(g)$ is known. In the unstable regime, $\mathcal{E}(g) = -\infty$.

- (3) Let $g_0 \equiv \sup\{g \geq 0 : w - g^2(v * v) \geq 0\}$ and $g_* \equiv w(0)/\|v\|_{L^2}^2$. Then, $g_0 \leq g_c \leq g_*$. In addition, for all $0 \leq g \leq g_0$ the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ in (1.18) exists, and

$$\mathcal{E}(g) = 4\pi\mathfrak{a}(g) , \quad (1.20)$$

where the right hand side is defined in terms of the scattering length (1.17).

Remarks 1.2. The following points are worth noting.

- The contribution due to self-energy scales like $\|V\|_{L^2}^2 = g^2 N^3 \|v\|_{L^2}^2$, and thus it must be subtracted from $\inf \sigma(H)$ in order to detect the stability-instability transition.
- In general, we cannot rule out the case $g_c = 0$, meaning the transition might occur as soon as $|g| > 0$. However, if $w_g \geq 0$ for small g —for example, by requiring $\text{supp}(v * v) \subset \text{supp}(w)$ —then $g_c \geq g_0 > 0$. This ensures a non-trivial stable regime.
- It is possible that $g_c = g_0 = g_*$, i.e., the intermediate phase is empty. From our proof, this follows for instance if $w_{g_0}(0) = 0$. *Example:* Choose $w = \alpha(v * v)$ for some $\alpha > 0$, so that $g_c = g_0 = g_* = \alpha$. Additionally, in this case $\mathcal{E}(g)$ is left-continuous at g_c , and $\mathcal{E}(g_c) = 0$.
- In addition to the GP-scaling, one may also consider less singular re-scaled potentials

$$W(x) = N^{3\beta} w(N^\beta x) \quad \text{and} \quad V(x) = g N^{3\beta} v(N^\beta x) \quad (1.21)$$

for $0 \leq \beta < 1$. The Bose gas energy for such models has been studied in [5, 8, 33, 47]. With these scalings, the analogous formula to (1.20) for $g \in \{0\} \cup [0, g_0]$ is

$$\mathcal{E}(g) = 4\pi \left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^3} w(x) dx - g^2 \left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^3} v(x) dx \right)^2 \right), \quad (1.22)$$

which comes from replacing the scattering length $\mathfrak{a}(g)$ with $\int_{\mathbf{R}^3} w_g(x) dx$. Let us emphasize that similar formulas to (1.22) have been derived in the physics literature; see [19, 21, 54].

1.3. Emergence of the effective theory

In this section, we sketch the proof of Theorem 1 and place the main ideas in a broader context. The key observation is that the bosons form a *slow* subsystem, while the fermions act as the *fast* subsystem. Here, the typical kinetic energy of a fermion is much larger than that of a boson, and one speaks of a separation of energy scales. From this perspective, our model belongs to a larger class of physical systems exhibiting an adiabatic decoupling between two coupled subsystems. The analysis of such systems has a long-standing history, dating back to the work of Born and Oppenheimer [9]. A fundamental consequence of the separation of energy scales is that the two subsystems effectively decouple, with the fast subsystem inducing an effective interaction in the slow subsystem. This phenomenon has been rigorously established in various contexts, including Born–Oppenheimer theory for heavy nuclei [40, 50, 52], the strongly coupled Fröhlich polaron [11, 12, 32, 37], and different Nelson-type quantum field theory models [14, 20, 26, 51, 53].

In Theorem 1, we verify this effect for large Bose–Fermi mixtures, where the ratio of energy scales is quantified by the Fermi momentum $k_F \gg 1$. While in our Hamiltonian the dependence of various terms with respect to k_F is not explicit, the underlying scaling can be understood in terms of a simplified *abstract* model, presented below. Here, we sketch the proof for this abstract model, as we believe that our ideas apply not only to Bose–Fermi mixtures, but to a wide range of physical systems. As we explain below, one of the key estimates in our proof is an operator inequality based on the completion of the square in the operator sense. It allows us to obtain the lower bound for the ground state energy, as well as the higher order eigenvalues. The abstract model that we present includes an explicit scaling parameter $\mu \gg 1$ to quantify the separation of energy scales; this choice of scaling is reminiscent of the one in the models studied in [11, 14, 20, 26]. We then discuss the modifications required to apply the argument to the Bose–Fermi model.

1.3.1. The abstract model

Consider a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, where \mathcal{H}_A and \mathcal{H}_B represent a fast and a slow subsystem, respectively. We assume a Hamiltonian of the form

$$\mathbb{H} = \mu T_A \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes T_B + \mu^{1/2} F, \quad (1.23)$$

where $T_A \geq 0$ and $T_B \geq 0$ are the Hamiltonians of the fast and slow subsystems, respectively, and F models their interaction. The parameter $\mu \gg 1$ controls the ratio of energy scales. We assume that T_A has a unique ground state Φ_A with eigenvalue $\inf \sigma(T_A) = 0$, a spectral gap of order one, and that $PFP = 0$ with spectral projection $P = |\Phi_A\rangle\langle\Phi_A| \otimes \mathbb{1}$.

We divide the analysis into upper and lower bounds, and sketch it only for the ground state energy. For the upper bound, we use a trial state of the form

$$\Psi = (\mathbb{1} - \mu^{-1/2} T_A^{-1} F) \Phi_A \otimes \Phi_B^{\text{eff}}, \quad \Phi_B^{\text{eff}} \in \mathcal{H}_B. \quad (1.24)$$

Under appropriate assumptions on the interaction (e.g. if F is bounded), one proves that

$$\langle \Psi, \mathbb{H} \Psi \rangle = \langle \Phi_B^{\text{eff}}, h_B^{\text{eff}} \Phi_B^{\text{eff}} \rangle + O(\mu^{-1/2}) \quad \text{with} \quad h_B^{\text{eff}} = T_B - \langle \Phi_A, F T_A^{-1} F \Phi_A \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_A}. \quad (1.25)$$

The effective Hamiltonian h_B^{eff} contains a non-positive operator on \mathcal{H}_B , representing a partial expectation value with respect to $\Phi_A \in \mathcal{H}_A$. More precisely, for an operator S on $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ and fixed $\Phi_A \in \mathcal{H}_A$, the sesquilinear form

$$\langle \Phi'_B, \langle \Phi_A, S\Phi_A \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_A} \Phi_B \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_B} \equiv \langle \Phi_A \otimes \Phi'_B, S\Phi_A \otimes \Phi_B \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B} \quad (1.26)$$

defines an operator $\Phi_B \mapsto \langle \Phi_A, S\Phi_A \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_A} \Phi_B$, which we call the partial expectation value of S with respect to the state $\Phi_A \in \mathcal{H}_A$. In our analysis, we take $S = FT_A^{-1}F$. We then choose Φ_B^{eff} as the ground state of h_B^{eff} and apply the variational principle to obtain $\inf \sigma(\mathbb{H}) \leq \inf \sigma(h_B^{\text{eff}}) + O(\mu^{-1/2})$. For our specific model, this analysis is carried out in Section 5.1.

To see how the effective Hamiltonian emerges as a lower bound, we *complete the square* in the following form (we omit the tensor product with the identity)

$$\mathbb{H} = \mu(T_A^{1/2} + \mu^{-1}T_A^{-1/2}F)^*(T_A^{1/2} + \mu^{-1}T_A^{-1/2}F) + T_B - FT_A^{-1}F. \quad (1.27)$$

This leads to the operator inequality $\mathbb{H} \geq T_B - FT_A^{-1}F$. Assuming we can show for suitable low-energy states $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}$ (e.g. the ground state of \mathbb{H}) that

$$\langle \Psi, FT_A^{-1}F\Psi \rangle \leq \langle \Psi, \mathbb{1} \otimes \langle \Phi_A, FT_A^{-1}F\Phi_A \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_A} \Psi \rangle + o(1) \quad \text{as } \mu \rightarrow \infty, \quad (1.28)$$

we obtain the matching lower bound $\inf \sigma(\mathbb{H}) \geq \inf \sigma(h_B^{\text{eff}}) + o(1)$. This bound is non-trivial and depends on specific model properties—in our setting, Φ_A corresponds to the Fermi sea and (1.28) emerges from normal ordering of creation and annihilation operators in combination with suitable operator inequalities. We refer to Section 5.2 for the details.

1.3.2. Application to Bose-Fermi mixtures

To apply the outlined arguments to the Bose-Fermi model, we first note that bosons mostly interact with fermions by creating or annihilating particle-hole pairs in the Fermi ball. Therefore, we introduce the so-called particle-hole transformation, which implements this directly at the level of the Hamiltonian. Up to unitary equivalence, we then study a new Hamiltonian \mathbb{H} —defined in Eq. (2.15)—that describes the interaction between bosons and *excitations* of the Fermi ball. Since most particle-hole excitations have large momentum $|p| \sim k_F$, we identify them as the fast subsystem relative to the slow bosons with energies of order one. While the excitation Hamiltonian \mathbb{H} retains the key assumptions of the abstract model discussed above, it introduces additional difficulties:

1. The Fermi momentum k_F plays the role of μ , but it does not appear as simple prefactors in the Hamiltonian. Thus, the scaling of the different terms must be carefully extracted.
2. All operators are unbounded and require careful estimates to control error terms.
3. The explicit form of the effective Hamiltonian requires analyzing the partial expectation value $\langle \Phi_A, FT_A^{-1}F\Phi_A \rangle$. In the Bose-Fermi model this operator still depends on k_F , and to obtain its explicit form—given by $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} (V * V)(x_i - x_j)$ —requires the analysis of its large k_F limit.

1.4. The small mass limit

As explained in the introduction, the present work is largely motivated by the experimental findings in [21] on Bose–Fermi mixtures consisting of light fermionic ${}^6\text{Li}$ atoms and heavier bosonic ${}^{133}\text{Cs}$ atoms. We denote the respective masses by m_F and m_B . In these experiments, the separation of energy scales arises due to the small mass ratio $m \equiv \frac{m_F}{m_B} \ll 1$. While in our analysis we set $m = 1$ and take the limit $k_F \rightarrow \infty$, it is also possible to consider a vanishing mass ratio $m \rightarrow 0$ at *fixed* k_F . The analysis of this limit is well within the scope of our methods—let us briefly sketch the necessary adjustments.

First, let H describe such a mixture in units where $m_B = 1$ and $m = m_F \ll 1$. The Fermi energy is now given by $E_F = m^{-1} \sum_{k \in B_F} k^2 = O(m^{-1})$ and we modify the coupling to $\lambda = 1/\sqrt{4\pi N m k_F}$. Following the proof of Theorem 1, we would then obtain the following result, analogous to (1.12):

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow 0} \left(\inf \sigma(H) - E_F - \lambda N M \hat{V}_0 \right) = \inf \sigma(h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}}) - \frac{1}{2} W_{k_F}(0), \quad (1.29)$$

where the effective Hamiltonian $h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}}$ and potential W_{k_F} are defined as in (3.3) and (3.4), respectively. Notably, the effective potential now depends on k_F , and it agrees with $V * V$ only in the limit $k_F \rightarrow \infty$.

Organization of the proof. In Section 2 we introduce the second quantization formalism and reduce the analysis to the excitation Hamiltonian \mathbb{H} on Fock space. In Section 3 we prove Theorem 1 and 2. The proof is based on corresponding upper and lower bounds for the eigenvalues of \mathbb{H} . In Section 4 we collect helpful estimates for its analysis; these involve sum over relevant geometric sets, and various operator inequalities. In Section 5 we prove these bounds and show the emergence of the effective Hamiltonian. Finally in Section 6 we prove an inequality first stated in Section 4.

Convention. We say that $C > 0$ is a *constant* if it is a positive number, independent of all the physical parameters N, M, λ and also of the potentials V and W . Its value may change from line to line.

2. SECOND QUANTIZATION

As we have mentioned earlier, the effective Bose-Bose interaction that is induced by the Fermi subsystem can be understood as exchanging (virtual) excitations of the Fermi ball. In order to make this idea precise, it is convenient to work in the formalism of second quantization, where we allow the number of fermions to fluctuate.

To this end, we embed the fermionic Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_F into the larger Fock space

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathbb{C} \oplus \bigoplus_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}^{(n)} \quad \text{with} \quad \mathcal{F}^{(n)} = \bigwedge_{j=1}^n L^2(\mathbf{T}^3), \quad n \geq 1 \quad (2.1)$$

so that $\mathcal{H}_F = \mathcal{F}^{(M)}$. As usual, \mathcal{F} is naturally endowed with an inner product

$$\langle \Psi, \Phi \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \langle \Psi^{(n)}, \Phi^{(n)} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}^{(n)}}, \quad \Psi, \Phi \in \mathcal{F} \quad (2.2)$$

and we denote the Fock vacuum by $\Omega = (1, \mathbf{0})$. Additionally, we equip \mathcal{F} with creation and annihilation operators, defined for $f \in L^2(\mathbf{T}^3)$ and $\Psi \in \mathcal{F}$

$$[a(f)\Psi]^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sqrt{n+1} \int_{\mathbf{T}^3} \overline{f(x)} \Psi^{(n+1)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) dx \quad (2.3)$$

$$[a^*(f)\Psi]^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^i f(x_i) \Psi^{(n-1)}(x_1, \dots, \hat{x}_i, \dots, x_n) . \quad (2.4)$$

where \hat{x}_i is omitted, and $n \geq 0$. In particular, denoting by $\{A, B\} = AB + BA$ the anticommutator, they satisfy the Canonical Anticommutation Relations (CAR)

$$\{a(f), a^*(g)\} = \langle f, g \rangle_{L^2(\mathbf{T}^3)} , \quad \{a^\flat(f), a^\flat(g)\} = 0 , \quad (2.5)$$

where $f, g \in L^2(\mathbf{T}^3)$, and $a^\flat(f)$ stands for either $a(f)$ or $a^*(f)$. It is well-known that from these relations both operators become bounded and satisfy

$$\|a(f)\| = \|a^*(f)\| = \|f\|_{L^2} . \quad (2.6)$$

We now pass from the position to the momentum representation. To this end, we recall $e_k(x)$ corresponds to the plane-wave basis (see (1.7)), and we define for any $k \in \mathbf{Z}^3$

$$a_k = a(e_k) , \quad a_k^* = a^*(e_k) . \quad (2.7)$$

The CAR takes now reads $\{a_k, a_\ell^*\} = \delta_{k,\ell}$ and $\{a_k^\flat, a_\ell^\flat\} = 0$. Note also $\|a_k\| = \|a_k^*\| = 1$. We let $\mathcal{N} = \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} a_k^* a_k$ denote the standard number operator.

The original Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_F$ is then naturally embedded into $\mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{F}$ via the inclusion map. The many-body operator (1.2) can now be expressed as the restriction $H = \mathcal{H} \upharpoonright \mathcal{H}$ of the Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H} = h \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} k^2 a_k^* a_k + \lambda \sum_{1 \leq i \leq N} \sum_{k, \ell \in \mathbf{Z}^3} \hat{V}(\ell - k) e^{-i(\ell - k)x_i} \otimes a_\ell^* a_k \quad (2.8)$$

defined on $\mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{F}$.

2.1. The particle-hole transformation

In order to extract the relevant terms for the eigenvalues $\mu_n(H)$ we introduce a change of variables which is referred to as the particle-hole transformation. This correspond to the unitary map

$$\mathcal{R} : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \quad (2.9)$$

defined via its action on creation and annihilation operators as

$$\mathcal{R}^* a_k \mathcal{R} = \chi^\perp(k) a_k + \chi(k) a_k^* \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}^* a_k^* \mathcal{R} = \chi^\perp(k) a_k^* + \chi(k) a_k \quad (2.10)$$

and set the image of the Fermi ball as the new vacuum $\mathcal{R}\Omega_F \equiv \Omega$. Here and in the sequel we use the notation for the characteristic functions for $k \in \mathbf{Z}^3$

$$\chi(k) \equiv \mathbb{1}(|k| \leq k_F) \quad \text{and} \quad \chi^\perp(k) \equiv \mathbb{1}(|k| > k_F) . \quad (2.11)$$

The map \mathcal{R} is trivially extended to $\mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{F}$ by tensoring with the identity. Finally, we introduce the following new set of creation and annihilation operators for *particles* and *holes*, respectively

$$b_k \equiv \chi^\perp(k) a_k \quad \text{and} \quad c_k \equiv \chi(k) a_k. \quad (2.12)$$

They satisfy the following version of the CAR

$$\{b_k, b_\ell^*\} = \chi^\perp(k) \delta_{k,\ell}, \quad \{c_k, c_\ell^*\} = \chi(k) \delta_{k,\ell} \quad \text{and} \quad \{b_k^\flat, c_\ell^\flat\} = 0 \quad (2.13)$$

for all $k, \ell \in \mathbf{Z}^3$. The main advantage of introducing the new set of operators $\{b_k\}$ and $\{c_\ell\}$ is that they carry all the information regarding momentum restrictions.

Let us now apply the particle-hole transformation to the Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} . A straightforward calculation yields

$$\mathcal{R}^* \mathcal{H} \mathcal{R} = E_F + \lambda N M \hat{V}_0 + \mathbb{H}. \quad (2.14)$$

Here the first term corresponds to the kinetic energy of the Fermi ball, whereas the second term corresponds to an additional energy shift due to its interaction with the bosons (a constant term due to translation invariance). On the other hand, the operator \mathbb{H} corresponds to the Hamiltonian describing the Bose gas and its interactions with the *excitations* of the Fermi ball. It takes the form

$$\mathbb{H} = h \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{T} + \lambda \mathbb{V}. \quad (2.15)$$

The first term is the Bose Hamiltonian (1.3). The second term describes the kinetic energy of the excitations, and is given by

$$\mathbb{T} = \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} \left(k^2 b_k^* b_k - k^2 c_k^* c_k \right). \quad (2.16)$$

The third term describes interspecies interactions and admits the decomposition

$$\mathbb{V} = \mathbb{V}_+ + \mathbb{V}_- + \mathbb{V}^{\text{diag}}, \quad (2.17)$$

where each contribution is given by

$$\mathbb{V}_+ = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{p, k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} \hat{V}(k) e^{-ik \cdot x_i} \otimes b_p^* c_{p+k}^* \quad (2.18)$$

$$\mathbb{V}_- = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{p, k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} \hat{V}(k) e^{+ik \cdot x_i} \otimes c_{p+k} b_p \quad (2.19)$$

$$\mathbb{V}^{\text{diag}} = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{\ell, k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} \hat{V}(\ell - k) e^{-i(\ell - k) \cdot x_i} \otimes \left(b_\ell^* b_k - c_k^* c_\ell \right). \quad (2.20)$$

Note $\mathbb{V}_- = (\mathbb{V}_+)^*$. Here, the notation is suggestive: Namely, \mathbb{V}_+ creates a collective excitation of particle-hole pairs due to interactions with the Bose system. On the other hand \mathbb{V}_- destroys such excitations. The diagonal term \mathbb{V}^{diag} does not create new particle-hole pairs, and in our analysis, it turns out as a lower order term. We note the operators b_p, c_ℓ carry all of the notation regarding summation regions, see (2.12).

After application of the particle-hole transformation, we can relate the original eigenvalues $\mu_n(H)$ with those of the excitation Hamiltonian \mathbb{H} . To this end, we first introduce the number operators on $\mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{F}$

$$\mathcal{N}_+ \equiv \mathbb{1} \otimes \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} (b_k^* b_k + c_k^* c_k) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{N}_- \equiv \mathbb{1} \otimes \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} (b_k^* b_k - c_k^* c_k) . \quad (2.21)$$

We refer to \mathcal{N}_- as the *charge operator* and its kernel plays a major role in our analysis. It represents the subspace of states with equal number of particles and holes. Throughout this article, we will write

$$\mathcal{K} \equiv \ker(\mathcal{N}_-) \subset \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{F} . \quad (2.22)$$

We then observe that $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{R}^* \mathcal{H}$, that is, it is the image of the original Hilbert space under the particle-hole transformation. This follows from $\mathcal{R}^* \mathcal{N} \mathcal{R} = M + 2\mathcal{N}_-$ and the fact that $\mathcal{N} \upharpoonright \mathcal{H} = M$. Thus, we now have that

$$\mu_n(H) = E_F + \lambda N M \hat{V}_0 + \mu_n(\mathbb{H} \upharpoonright \mathcal{K}) , \quad (2.23)$$

for all $n \geq 1$. We observe that the restriction to \mathcal{K} has the effect of making the energy \mathbb{T} non-negative. Namely, on \mathcal{K} we can add a term proportional to \mathcal{N}_- and write

$$\mathbb{T} = \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} |k^2 - k_F^2| b_k^* b_k + \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} |k^2 - k_F^2| c_k^* c_k . \quad (2.24)$$

Unless confusion arises, we ease the notation and write $\mathbb{H} = \mathbb{H} \upharpoonright \mathcal{K}$.

As a concluding remark, let us recall that an advantage of working with creation and annihilation operators is the use of *pull-through formulas*. In this article, we will mostly use the following version, in which we use the b and c operators, and the kinetic energy \mathbb{T}

$$f(\mathbb{T}) b_k^* = b_k^* f(\mathbb{T} + k^2) , \quad b_k f(\mathbb{T}) = f(\mathbb{T} + k^2) b_k , \quad (2.25)$$

$$f(\mathbb{T}) c_k^* = c_k^* f(\mathbb{T} - k^2) , \quad c_k f(\mathbb{T}) = f(\mathbb{T} - k^2) c_k , \quad (2.26)$$

for any $k \in \mathbf{Z}^3$, and any measurable function $f : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. They follow directly from the CAR and the functional calculus for \mathbb{T} .

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1 AND 2

3.1. Proof of Theorem 1

First, let us turn to the proof of Theorem 1. As discussed in Section 2.1, up to subtraction of constant terms, the eigenvalues of H are determined by those of a Hamiltonian on Fock space, denoted by \mathbb{H} . The operator \mathbb{H} describes the interactions between the (slow) bosonic subsystem and the (fast) excitations of the Fermi ball. In particular, the asymptotics of its spectrum can be analyzed in the framework of the theory described in Subsection 1.3. This argument is made rigorous in Section 5. It turns out that the resulting effective theory is described by a k_F -dependent Hamiltonian $h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}}$ on the bosonic space \mathcal{H}_B .

In order to state its definition, we must introduce the following *lune sets*

$$L(k) \equiv \{p \in \mathbf{Z}^3 : |p| > k_F \text{ and } |p - k| \leq k_F\} , \quad k \in \mathbf{Z}^3 . \quad (3.1)$$

In particular, throughout this article we will consider various sums supported on these sets. These sums give rise to important coefficients, which enter the effective Hamiltonian. Here, the relevant one is given by

$$D(k, k_F) \equiv \sum_{p \in L(k)} \frac{1}{p^2 - (p - k)^2}, \quad k \in \mathbf{Z}^3. \quad (3.2)$$

Let us comment that the same resolvent sums appear in the analysis of the ground state energy of interacting Fermi gases on the torus \mathbf{T}^3 in the mean-field limit; see [2–4, 15–18, 25]. In particular, we shall borrow certain estimates (and, prove new ones) which we state in Section 4. Now, the effective Hamiltonian takes the form

$$h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N (-\Delta_i) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} (W - W_{k_F})(x_i - x_j) \quad (3.3)$$

which is defined in terms of the effective potential defined on \mathbf{T}^3 via the inverse Fourier formula

$$W_{k_F}(x) \equiv \frac{1}{2\pi k_F} \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} e^{ikx} |\hat{V}(k)|^2 D(k, k_F). \quad (3.4)$$

In a second step, we compare the eigenvalues of $h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}}$ with those of h^{eff} introduced in (1.9). For this we use the asymptotics for the coefficients as $k_F \rightarrow \infty$

$$D(k, k_F) = 2\pi k_F + o(k_F), \quad \forall k \in \mathbf{Z}^3 / \{0\}. \quad (3.5)$$

In fact, we use a more precise version stated in Section 4. Note that, combined with (3.4), this will give rise to the convolution structure $V * V$ of the effective potential. It is, however, necessary to isolate the zero-Fourier modes which give rise to additional constant terms in the energy expansion for $\mu_n(H)$.

Before we turn to the proof let us introduce the following quantity

$$\mathcal{Q}_p \equiv 1 + \|W\|_{L^p}^{2p/(2p-3)} + \|V\|_{H^4}^2. \quad (3.6)$$

We also recall $\mathcal{K} = \ker(\mathcal{N}_-)$.

Proof of Theorem 1. Throughout this proof we fix $k_F \geq 1$ and $N \geq 1$.

First step. Recall that the effect of the conjugation with the particle-hole transformation (2.23) is that we have

$$\mu_n(H) = E_F + \lambda N M \hat{V}_0 + \mu_n(\mathbb{H}), \quad n \geq 1, \quad (3.7)$$

where $\mathbb{H} = \mathbb{H} \upharpoonright \mathcal{K}$ denotes the operator (2.15) restricted to the subspace \mathcal{K} .

In Proposition 5.1, we provide an upper bound for the eigenvalues of \mathbb{H} , while a corresponding lower bound is established in Proposition 5.2.

These estimates imply that we can find a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $1 \leq n \leq N$

$$\left| \mu_n(\mathbb{H}) - \mu_n(h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}}) + \frac{1}{2} W_{k_F}(0) \right| \leq C \mathcal{Q}_p^2 N^2 (\ln k_F)^{5/3} k_F^{-1/3} \quad (3.8)$$

provided $k_F(\ln k_F)^{-5} \geq C(nN\|V\|_{H^4}^2)^3$. Here $h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}}$ is the effective Hamiltonian introduced in (3.3). Thus, thanks to (3.8) it is sufficient to analyze the difference between $h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}}$ and h^{eff} , as well as the leading order term of $\frac{1}{2}W_{k_F}(0)$.

Second step. Let us now compare the eigenvalues of $h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}}$ and h^{eff} . To this end, we will consider the Fourier representation for $x \in \mathbf{T}^3$

$$(V * V)(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} e^{ikx} |\widehat{V}(k)|^2. \quad (3.9)$$

Observe that $L(0) = \emptyset$ and thus $D(0, k_F) = 0$. Hence, we can write for $x \in \mathbf{T}^3$

$$\begin{aligned} W_{k_F}(x) &= \sum_{k \neq 0} e^{ikx} |\widehat{V}(k)|^2 \frac{D(k, k_F)}{2\pi k_F} \\ &= \sum_{k \neq 0} e^{ikx} |\widehat{V}(k)|^2 + \sum_{k \neq 0} e^{ikx} |\widehat{V}(k)|^2 \left(\frac{D(k, k_F)}{2\pi k_F} - 1 \right) \\ &= (V * V)(x) - |\widehat{V}(0)|^2 + \sum_{k \neq 0} e^{ikx} |\widehat{V}(k)|^2 \left(\frac{D(k, k_F)}{2\pi k_F} - 1 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

The very last sum over $k \in \mathbf{Z}^3 \setminus \{0\}$ constitutes the main error term. The summation may be split into two regions $0 < |k| < 2k_F$ and $|k| \geq 2k_F$. For the first region, we use (4.2) from Lemma 4.1, whereas for the second region we can use (4.5) from Lemma 4.1. We obtain the inequalities

$$\left| \sum_{0 < |k| < 2k_F} e^{ikx} |\widehat{V}(k)|^2 \left(\frac{D(k, k_F)}{2\pi k_F} - 1 \right) \right| \leq C \sum_{0 < |k| < 2k_F} |\widehat{V}(k)|^2 |k|^4 (\ln k_F)^{5/3} k_F^{-1/3} \quad (3.11)$$

$$\left| \sum_{|k| \geq 2k_F} e^{ikx} |\widehat{V}(k)|^2 \left(\frac{D(k, k_F)}{2\pi k_F} - 1 \right) \right| \leq C \sum_{|k| \geq 2k_F} |\widehat{V}(k)|^2 \leq \frac{C}{k_F^4} \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} |\widehat{V}(k)|^2 |k|^4. \quad (3.12)$$

These two estimates combined with (3.10) imply the L^∞ estimate

$$\|W_{k_F} - (V * V) + |\widehat{V}_0|^2\|_{L^\infty(\mathbf{T}^d)} \leq C(\ln k_F)^{5/3} k_F^{-1/3} \|V\|_{H^2}^2. \quad (3.13)$$

As a consequence, summing over all particle possibilities $x_i - x_j$, we have in the sense of quadratic forms on \mathcal{H}_B that

$$\pm(h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}} - h^{\text{eff}} + \frac{1}{2}(N-1)|\widehat{V}_0|^2) \leq CN(\ln k_F)^{5/3} k_F^{-1/3} \|V\|_{H^2}^2 \quad (3.14)$$

and thus, via the min-max principle [49, Theorem 4.14], we obtain

$$\left| \mu_n(h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}}) - \mu_n(h^{\text{eff}}) + \frac{1}{2}(N-1)|\widehat{V}_0|^2 \right| \leq CN(\ln k_F)^{5/3} k_F^{-1/3} \|V\|_{H^2}^2 \quad \forall n \geq 1. \quad (3.15)$$

This controls the difference between the eigenvalues of $h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}}$ and h^{eff} .

Finally the bound (3.13) at $x = 0$ also implies

$$W_{k_F}(0) = \int_{\mathbf{T}^3} |V(x)|^2 dx - |\widehat{V}_0|^2 + O((\ln k_F)^{5/3} k_F^{-1/3} \|V\|_{H^2}^2). \quad (3.16)$$

Thus, we combine (3.7), (3.8) and (3.15) to finish the proof. \square

The remainder of the article is essentially devoted to establishing the upper and lower bounds for $\mu_n(\mathbb{H})$ given in Propositions 5.1 and 5.2, respectively. The proofs of these results rely on a number of technical lemmas, including suitable sum estimates and operator bounds. These auxiliary results are stated in Section 4. Before proceeding with this program, however, we provide the proof of Theorem 2.

3.2. Proof of Theorem 2

We note that by Theorem 1 and (1.12), the energy-per-boson is given by

$$\mathcal{E}(g) = \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \inf \sigma(h^{\text{eff}}|_g), \quad (3.17)$$

and thus the analysis can be reduced to studying the spectral properties of the bosonic Hamiltonian h^{eff} and its dependence on $g \in \mathbf{R}$; recall its definition in (1.15). Let us immediately note that $\mathcal{E}(g) \leq \mathcal{E}(0) < \infty$ thanks to (1.16).

For the proof, we show that whenever $w_g = w - g^2(v * v)$ is negative at $x = 0$, the energy-per-particle collapses to $-\infty$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Using a monotonicity argument, we prove the existence of the *smallest* $g_c \geq 0$ for which this collapse occurs.

Proof of Theorem 2. Thanks to (3.17), it suffices to look at $\inf \sigma(h^{\text{eff}}|_g)$ and its dependence on g .

(1) Since $h^{\text{eff}}|_g$ depends only on g^2 , we immediately obtain $\mathcal{E}(g) = \mathcal{E}(-g)$. Next, observe that the map $[0, \infty) \ni g \mapsto \mathcal{E}(g) = \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \inf \sigma(h^{\text{eff}}|_g)$ is monotone decreasing. To see this, let $g_2 > g_1 > 0$ and use $v * v \geq 0$:

$$(g_2^2 - g_1^2) \langle \Psi, \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} v * v(N(x_i - x_j)) \Psi \rangle \geq 0 \quad (3.18)$$

for all $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_B$. Thus, $h^{\text{eff}}|_{g=g_1} \geq h^{\text{eff}}|_{g=g_2}$ and we conclude that $\mathcal{E}(g_1) \geq \mathcal{E}(g_2)$ for $g_2 \geq g_1 \geq 0$.

(2) Now, for the proof of the main statement within Theorem 2, we set

$$g_c \equiv \inf \{g \geq 0 : \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} N^{-1} \inf \sigma(h^{\text{eff}}|_g) = -\infty\} \in [0, \infty]. \quad (3.19)$$

Let us first show that $g_c < \infty$. Indeed, since $(v * v)(0) = \|v\|_{L^2}^2 > 0$ we have $w_g(0) < 0$ for all $g > g_* \equiv \frac{w(0)}{(v * v)(0)}$. We now claim that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N^{-1} \inf \sigma(h^{\text{eff}}|_g) = -\infty \quad \text{for } g > g_* . \quad (3.20)$$

Fix $g > g_*$, and note that by continuity of w_g , there exist $c_0, r_0 > 0$ so that $w_g(x) \leq -c_0 < 0$ on the ball $B_0 \equiv B(0, r_0)$. We now construct an appropriate trial state. Take a radial symmetric function $\psi \in C_0^2(\mathbf{R}^3)$ so that $\text{supp}(\psi) \subset B(0, \frac{r_0}{2})$ and $\|\psi\|_{L^2} = 1$. In particular, $\text{supp}(|\psi|^2 * |\psi|^2) \subset B_0$. We define $\psi_N(x) = N^{3/2} \psi(Nx)$ and set $\Psi_N = \psi_N^{\otimes N}$ so that

$$\langle \Psi_N, \sum_{1 \leq i \leq N} (-\Delta_i) \Psi_N \rangle = N^3 \|\nabla \psi\|_{L^2}^2 . \quad (3.21)$$

On the other hand, using radial symmetry, we find for the potential energy

$$\left\langle \Psi_N, \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} N^3 w_g(N(x_i - x_j)) \Psi_N \right\rangle = N^4 \int_{B_0} (|\psi|^2 * |\psi|^2) w_g dx \leq -c_0 N^4. \quad (3.22)$$

Thus $\langle \Psi_N, h^{\text{eff}} \Psi_N \rangle \leq -N^4(c_0 - N^{-1} \|\nabla \psi\|^2)$ from which we conclude (3.20) for $g > g_*$. Therefore, $g_c \leq g_* < \infty$.

(3) From the previous argument we already conclude $g_* \geq g_c$. On the other hand, for $g \in \{0\} \cup (0, g_0)$ with $g_0 = \inf\{g \geq 0 : w_g \geq 0\} \geq 0$, the statement $\mathcal{E}(g) = 4\pi \mathfrak{a}(g)$ is a direct consequence of (3.17) and (1.16). \square

4. AUXILIARY ESTIMATES

In this section we prove some necessary estimates for the proof of the upper and lower bounds. First, we state estimates for sums involving the free resolvent for particle-hole excitations. Second, we prove some relevant operator inequalities.

4.1. Sum estimates

Here and in the sequel, we will consider various asymptotics of sums which are supported on the lune sets $L(k)$, defined in (3.1). The coefficients $D(k, k_F)$ introduced in (3.2) are the main example. However, for our analysis it will be necessary to generalize these sums. Namely, for any $\alpha \geq 0$ we let

$$\mathcal{D}_\alpha(k, k_F) \equiv \sum_{p \in L(k)} \frac{1}{(p^2 - (p - k)^2)^\alpha}, \quad k \in \mathbf{Z}^3. \quad (4.1)$$

Let us note that, by definition, $L(0)$ is the empty set and thus $\mathcal{D}_\alpha(0, k_F) = 0$.

Before we turn to these estimates, we observe the following useful fact: for all non-zero $k \in \mathbf{Z}^3$, we have $p^2 - (p - k)^2 \geq 1$ for all $p \in L(k)$. In particular, thanks to the crude geometric estimate $|L(k)| \leq C k_F^3$ one has the bound $\mathcal{D}_\alpha(k, k_F) \leq C k_F^3$.

The following lemma contains the main estimates that we use to analyze the coefficients \mathcal{D}_α . The inequalities for $\mathcal{D}_1 = D$ will be borrowed from [17]. The ones for \mathcal{D}_2 are—to our knowledge—new, but can be obtained from the methods developed in [17].

Lemma 4.1. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that the following holds for all $k_F \geq 1$.*

(1) *For all $0 < |k| < 2k_F$*

$$\left| \mathcal{D}_1(k, k_F) - 2\pi k_F \right| \leq C |k|^4 (\ln k_F)^{5/3} k_F^{2/3} \quad (4.2)$$

(2) *For all $0 < |k| < 2k_F$*

$$\mathcal{D}_1(k, k_F) \leq C k_F \left(1 + (\ln k_F)^{\frac{5}{3}} k_F^{-\frac{1}{3}} |k|^4 \right) \quad (4.3)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_2(k, k_F) \leq C k_F^{\frac{2}{3}} (\ln k_F)^{\frac{2}{3}} |k|^4. \quad (4.4)$$

(3) *For all $|k| \geq 2k_F$*

$$\mathcal{D}_1(k, k_F) \leq C k_F^3 |k|^{-2}. \quad (4.5)$$

Proof. The inequality in (1) is taken from [17, Proposition B.21]. The first inequality in (2) follows directly from the previous one. The proof of the second inequality in (2) is more involved and postponed to Section 6. The inequality in (3) is taken from [17, Proposition B.9]. \square

Our next goal is to combine the previous sum estimates with decay properties of the Fourier coefficients $\widehat{V}(k)$. To this end, let us introduce the following notation

$$\mathcal{S}_{\alpha,\beta}(k_F) \equiv \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} |\widehat{V}(k)|^2 \langle k \rangle^{2\beta} \mathcal{D}_\alpha(k, k_F) \quad (4.6)$$

for $k_F \geq 1$ and $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$. Here, $\langle k \rangle \equiv (1 + |k|^2)^{1/2}$.

Lemma 4.2. *There is $C > 0$ such that for all $k_F \geq 1$ and $\beta \geq 0$*

$$\mathcal{S}_{1,\beta}(k_F) \leq C \|V\|_{H^{2+\beta}}^2 k_F \quad (4.7)$$

$$\mathcal{S}_{2,\beta}(k_F) \leq C \|V\|_{H^{2+\beta}}^2 k_F^{2/3} (\ln k_F)^{5/3}. \quad (4.8)$$

Proof. Fix $\beta \geq 0$ and $k_F \geq 1$, and write for short $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha,\beta} = \mathcal{S}_{\alpha,\beta}(k_F)$, $\mathcal{D}_\alpha(k) = \mathcal{D}_\alpha(k, k_F)$. Denote $f(k) = |\widehat{V}(k)|^2 \langle k \rangle^{2\beta}$. We split the region of summation as

$$\mathcal{S}_1 = \sum_{|k| < 2k_F} f(k) \mathcal{D}_1(k) + \sum_{|k| \geq 2k_F} f(k) \mathcal{D}_1(k)$$

For the first region, we find with (4.3)

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|k| < 2k_F} f(k) \mathcal{D}_1(k) \\ & \leq C k_F \sum_{|k| < 2k_F} f(k) \left(1 + \frac{(\ln k_F)^{5/3}}{k_F^{1/3}} |k|^4 \right) \leq C k_F \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} f(k) (1 + |k|^4) \leq C k_F \|V\|_{H^{\beta+2}}. \end{aligned}$$

For the second region, we find thanks to (4.5)

$$\sum_{|k| \geq 2k_F} f(k) \mathcal{D}_1(k) \leq C \sum_{|k| \geq 2k_F} f(k) k_F^3 |k|^{-2} \leq C k_F \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} f(k) = C k_F \|V\|_{H^{2\beta}}.$$

This finishes the proof for \mathcal{S}_1 .

For the estimates regarding \mathcal{S}_2 we split the sum into the same two regions. For the small region $|k| < 2k_F$ we use the bound (4.4) from Lemma 4.1. For the large region $|k| \geq 2k_F$ we use the crude bound $\mathcal{D}_2(k) \leq C k_F^3$ instead. Thus, we find that for all $\gamma > 0$ there is $C > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_2 &= \sum_{|k| < 2k_F} f(k) \mathcal{D}_2(k) + \sum_{|k| \geq 2k_F} f(k) \mathcal{D}_2(k) \\ &\leq C k_F^{2/3} (\ln k_F)^{5/3} \sum_{|k| < 2k_F} f(k) |k|^4 + C k_F^{3-\gamma} \sum_{|k| \geq 2k_F} f(k) |k|^\gamma \\ &\leq C k_F^{2/3} (\ln k_F)^{5/3} \|V\|_{H^{\beta+2}} + C k_F^{3-\gamma} \|V\|_{H^{\beta+\gamma/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Setting $\gamma = 7/3$ completes the proof of the second bound. \square

Remark 4.1. As a useful corollary of Lemma 4.1 with $(\alpha, \beta) = (1, 0)$ we obtain the following L^∞ estimate for the effective potential W_{k_F} given by (3.4)

$$\|W_{k_F}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbf{T}^3)} \leq C \|V\|_{H^2}^2. \quad (4.9)$$

4.2. Operator estimates

First, we prove that the number of excitations above the Fermi sea can be controlled by their kinetic energy. Recall $\mathcal{K} = \ker(\mathcal{N}_-) \subset \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{F}$.

Lemma 4.3. *For all $\Psi \in \mathcal{K}$, the following inequality holds*

$$\langle \Psi, \mathcal{N}_+ \Psi \rangle \leq \langle \Psi, \mathbb{T} \Psi \rangle. \quad (4.10)$$

Proof. Let $n \in \mathbf{Z}$ be the greatest integer such that $n \leq k_F^2$. Then, for all $p \in B^c$ and $h \in B$ it holds that: $p^2 \geq n + 1$ and $h^2 \leq n$. Thus, from (2.16) we have the lower bound

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Psi, \mathbb{T} \Psi \rangle &= \sum_{p \in B^c} p^2 \|b_p \Psi\|^2 - \sum_{h \in B} h^2 \|c_h \Psi\|^2 \\ &\geq (n + 1) \sum_{p \in B^c} \|b_p \Psi\|^2 - n \sum_{h \in B} \|c_h \Psi\|^2 \\ &= \sum_{p \in B^c} \|b_p \Psi\|^2 + n \left(\sum_{p \in B^c} \|b_p \Psi\|^2 - \sum_{h \in B} \|c_h \Psi\|^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

Observe now that the term with n is proportional to $\langle \Psi, \mathcal{N}_- \Psi \rangle = 0$. On the other hand $\langle \Psi, \sum_{p \in B^c} b_p^* b_p \Psi \rangle = \langle \Psi, (\mathcal{N}_+ + \mathcal{N}_-) \Psi \rangle$. This finishes the proof. \square

Next, we will need an estimate for the diagonal operator \mathbb{V}^{diag} . In most cases, it can be safely regarded as a lower order term.

Lemma 4.4. *For all $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{F}$*

$$|\langle \Psi, \mathbb{V}^{\text{diag}} \Psi \rangle| \leq 2N \|\widehat{V}\|_{\ell^1} \langle \Psi, \mathcal{N}_+ \Psi \rangle. \quad (4.12)$$

Proof. The statement follows from

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \Psi, \mathbb{V}^{\text{diag}} \Psi \rangle| &\leq \frac{1}{2} N \sum_{\ell, k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} |\widehat{V}(\ell - k)| \left(\|b_\ell \Psi\|^2 + \|b_k \Psi\|^2 + \|c_\ell \Psi\|^2 + \|c_k \Psi\|^2 \right) \\ &\leq 2N \|\widehat{V}\|_{\ell^1} \|\mathcal{N}_+^{1/2} \Psi\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

Here, we used that $\sup_k \sum_\ell |\widehat{V}(\ell - k)| = \|\widehat{V}\|_{\ell^1}$ in the last line. \square

The next lemma is a small modification of [25, Lemma 4.7]. It will be useful to bound the off-diagonal terms \mathbb{V}_- .

Lemma 4.5. *There is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $\alpha \geq 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\Psi \in \mathcal{K}$*

$$\lambda \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} |\widehat{V}(k)| \sum_{p \in L(k)} \frac{\|c_{p-k} b_p \Psi\|}{(p^2 - (p-k)^2)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}}} \leq \varepsilon \langle \Psi, \mathbb{T} \Psi \rangle + \frac{C \lambda^2}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{S}_{\alpha, 2}(k_F).$$

Proof. Let $F(k) \equiv \sum_{p \in L(k)} (p^2 - (p-k)^2) \|c_{p-k} b_p \Psi\|^2$ and recall $\mathcal{D}_\alpha(k) \equiv \mathcal{D}_\alpha(k, k_F)$ was defined in (4.1). First, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality over $p \in L(k)$ shows that

$$\sum_{p \in L(k)} \frac{\|c_{p-k} b_p \Psi\|}{(p^2 - (p-k)^2)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}}} \leq F(k)^{1/2} \mathcal{D}_\alpha(k)^{1/2}. \quad (4.14)$$

Multiplying with $\lambda |\hat{V}(k)|$, summing over $k \in \mathbf{Z}^3$, and applying the Cauchy-Schwarz again, we see that for all $\varepsilon' > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} |\hat{V}(k)| \sum_{p \in L(k)} \frac{\|c_{p-k} b_p \Psi\|}{(p^2 - (p-k)^2)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}}} &\leq \lambda \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} |\hat{V}(k)| F(k)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{D}_\alpha(k)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \lambda \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} \langle k \rangle^{-4} F(k) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} |\hat{V}(k)|^2 \langle k \rangle^4 \mathcal{D}_\alpha(k) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon'}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} \langle k \rangle^{-4} F(k) + \frac{\lambda^2}{2\varepsilon'} \mathcal{S}_{\alpha,2}(k_F). \end{aligned}$$

We now estimate $\sup_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} F(k)$ in terms of the kinetic energy. Indeed, we obtain, thanks to the operator norm bounds $\|b\| = \|c\| = 1$

$$\begin{aligned} F(k) &= \sum_{p \in L(k)} (p^2 - k_F^2) \|c_{p-k} b_p \Psi\|^2 + \sum_{p \in L(k)} (k_F^2 - (p-k)^2) \|c_{p-k} b_p \Psi\|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{p \in B^c} (p^2 - k_F^2) \|b_p \Psi\|^2 + \sum_{h \in B} (k_F^2 - (p-k)^2) \|c_h \Psi\|^2 \\ &\leq \|\mathbb{T}^{1/2} \Psi\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

thanks to the representation (2.24) in the zero charge subspace. This finishes the proof by setting $\varepsilon' = 2\varepsilon/C$ for $C = \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} \langle k \rangle^{-4}$. \square

Finally, we establish the following bound on the kinetic energy of the particle-hole excitations. By Lemma 4.3, this immediately implies a bound for $\langle \Psi, \mathcal{N}_+ \Psi \rangle$ as well.

Lemma 4.6. *There is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $\delta > 0$ and all $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}$*

$$\langle \Psi, \mathbb{T} \Psi \rangle \leq (1 + \delta) \langle \Psi, \mathbb{H} \Psi \rangle + CN \left(\delta^{-1} \|V\|_{H^4}^2 + \|W\|_{L^p}^{\frac{2p}{2p-3}} \right) \|\Psi\|^2. \quad (4.16)$$

provided $k_F \geq C\delta^{-2}N\|\hat{V}\|_{\ell^1}^2$.

Proof. Let $\delta > 0$. Without loss of generality, we assume through the proof that $\|\Psi\| = 1$. From the definition of \mathbb{H} we find

$$\langle \Psi, \mathbb{T} \Psi \rangle = \langle \Psi, \mathbb{H} \Psi \rangle - \lambda \langle \Psi, \mathbb{V}^{\text{diag}} \Psi \rangle - 2\lambda \text{Re} \langle \Psi, \mathbb{V}^- \Psi \rangle - \langle \Psi, h \otimes \mathbb{1} \Psi \rangle. \quad (4.17)$$

We analyze each term separately. First, for the diagonal part, we use Lemmas 4.4 and 4.3 to bound

$$\lambda |\langle \Psi, \mathbb{V}^{\text{diag}} \Psi \rangle| \leq 2N^{1/2} k_F^{-1/2} \|\hat{V}\|_{\ell^1} \langle \Psi, \mathbb{T} \Psi \rangle \leq \delta \langle \Psi, \mathbb{T} \Psi \rangle \quad (4.18)$$

where the last inequality holds for $k_F \geq 4N\|\widehat{V}\|_{\ell^1}^2\delta^{-2}$. Secondly, for the off-diagonal part, starting from the definition of \mathbb{V}^- in (2.19) we use the triangle inequality, Lemma 4.5 for $\alpha = 1$, $\beta = 2$ and $\varepsilon = \frac{\delta}{N}$, and then (4.7) from Lemma 4.2 to find

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda |\langle \Psi, \mathbb{V}^- \Psi \rangle| &\leq \lambda N \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} |\widehat{V}(k)| \sum_{p \in L(k)} \|c_{p-k} b_p \Psi\| \\ &\leq N\varepsilon \langle \Psi, \mathbb{T} \Psi \rangle + C\lambda^2 N\varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{S}_{1,2}(k_F) \\ &\leq N\varepsilon \langle \Psi, \mathbb{T} \Psi \rangle + C\lambda^2 N k_F \varepsilon^{-1} \|V\|_{H^4} = \delta \langle \Psi, \mathbb{T} \Psi \rangle + C\delta^{-1} N \|V\|_{H^4} . \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

Recall $\lambda^2 N k_F = 4\pi$ is our choice of scaling. Finally, for the bosonic Hamiltonian we can easily deduce from Lemma A.1 that

$$\langle \Psi, h \otimes \mathbb{1} \Psi \rangle \geq -CN \|W\|_{L^p}^{\frac{2p}{2p-3}} \quad (4.20)$$

thanks to the non-negativity of the free kinetic energy. We combine the last four inequalities and re-define $\delta \mapsto \delta/10$ if necessary to finish the proof. \square

5. UPPER AND LOWER BOUNDS

In this section, we complete the proof of the expansion for the eigenvalues of \mathbb{H} . Let us recall that (W, V) satisfy Condition 1 with power $p \in (\frac{3}{2}, \infty]$. Throughout this section we will refer to the factor $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}_p$ given by

$$\mathcal{Q} = 1 + \|W\|_{L^p}^q + \|V\|_{H^4}^2, \quad q \equiv \frac{2p}{2p-3}. \quad (5.1)$$

5.1. Estimates for the upper bound

In this section, we prove the following proposition containing the upper bounds.

Proposition 5.1. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $k_F \geq 1$, $N \geq 1$ and $1 \leq n \leq N$*

$$\mu_n(\mathbb{H}) \leq \mu_n(h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}}) - \frac{1}{2} \|V\|_{L^2}^2 + C\mathcal{Q}^2 N^2 (\ln k_F)^{5/3} k_F^{-1/3}$$

provided $k_F^{1/3} \geq CnN\|V\|_{H^2}^2 (\ln k_F)^{5/3}$.

We will be using the following notation for the free fermionic resolvent

$$\mathbb{R} \equiv \mathbb{Q}_\Omega \mathbb{T}^{-1} \mathbb{Q}_\Omega \quad (5.2)$$

with orthogonal projections $\mathbb{Q}_\Omega = \mathbb{1} - \mathbb{P}_\Omega$ and $\mathbb{P}_\Omega = |\Omega\rangle\langle\Omega|$. Note that thanks to Lemma 4.3, we have $\mathbb{Q}_\Omega \mathbb{T} \mathbb{Q}_\Omega \geq \mathbb{Q}_\Omega$. Thus, \mathbb{R} is well-defined, and $0 \leq \mathbb{R} \leq \mathbb{1}$.

The following lemma will be useful to compute the norm of relevant trial states. Essentially, we gain a factor $k_F^{-1/3}$ relative to the leading order terms k_F thanks to the *double* resolvent in the inner product. The latter can then be expressed a sum over lune sets of the form analyzed in Section 6 with $\alpha = 2$.

Lemma 5.1. *There is $C > 0$ such that for all $k_F \geq 1$, $N \geq 1$ and $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_B$*

$$\|\mathbb{R} \mathbb{V}_+ \Phi \otimes \Omega\|^2 \leq CN^2 \|V\|_{H^2}^2 \|\Phi\|^2 k_F^{2/3} (\ln k_F)^{5/3} . \quad (5.3)$$

Proof. From the definition (2.18) and the pull-through formula one obtains

$$\|\mathbb{R}\mathbb{V}_+\Phi \otimes \Omega\|^2 = \langle \Phi \otimes \Omega, \mathbb{V}_-\mathbb{R}^2\mathbb{V}_+\Phi \otimes \Omega \rangle = \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} |\hat{V}(k)|^2 \sum_{p \in L(k)} \frac{\langle \Phi, e^{ik \cdot (x_i - x_j)} \Phi \rangle_{L^2}}{(p^2 - (p - k)^2)^2}.$$

Therefore, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality readily implies

$$\|\mathbb{R}\mathbb{V}_+\Phi \otimes \Omega\|^2 \leq N^2 \|\Phi\|^2 \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} \frac{|\hat{V}(k)|^2}{(p^2 - (p - k)^2)^2}. \quad (5.4)$$

The sum over $p \in L(k)$ coincides with $\mathcal{S}_{2,0}(k_F)$ and can be estimated with Lemma 4.2. This estimate gives the desired inequality. \square

In the upcoming proof, we let $h_0 \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N (-\Delta_i)$ be the bosonic kinetic energy on \mathcal{H}_B . We will use the following elementary bound

$$\mu_n(h_0) \leq n \quad (5.5)$$

for $1 \leq n \leq N$, which follows from testing the kinetic energy operator on the n -dimensional subspace $\text{Span}(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n) \subset \mathcal{H}_B$ with $\phi_j = S_N(e_0^{\otimes N-j} \otimes e_k^{\otimes j})$, where $k = (1, 0, 0)$ and S_N denotes the orthogonal projection on the symmetric subspace in $L^2(\mathbf{T}^{3N})$.

Proof of Proposition 5.1. For $n \in \mathbf{N}$ we denote by $\Phi_n \in \mathcal{H}_B$ the (normalized) eigenfunction associated to $\mu_n(h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}})$. The proof is based on a suitable estimate of the quadratic form of \mathbb{H} with the trial state

$$\Psi = (1 - \lambda \mathbb{R}\mathbb{V}_+)\Psi_0, \quad \Psi_0 \equiv \Phi \otimes \Omega \quad (5.6)$$

where $\Phi \in \text{Span}(\Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_n) \subset \mathcal{H}_B$, and we note that $\Psi \in \mathcal{K}$. Using

$$\langle \Psi, \mathbb{H}\Psi \rangle = \langle \Psi, h\Psi \rangle + \langle \Psi, \mathbb{T}\Psi \rangle + \lambda \langle \Psi, \mathbb{V}\Psi \rangle, \quad (5.7)$$

we will expand each energy term with respect to λ in (5.6). We will then identify the effective potential $W_{k_F}(x - y)$ as an $O(\lambda^2)$ contribution, and identify the error terms—to be estimated in the next step. A straightforward calculation shows

$$\langle \Psi, h\Psi \rangle = \langle \Psi_0, h\Psi_0 \rangle + \lambda^2 \langle \Psi_0, \mathbb{V}_-(h \otimes \mathbb{R}^2)\mathbb{V}_+\Psi_0 \rangle \quad (5.8)$$

$$\langle \Psi, \mathbb{T}\Psi \rangle = \lambda^2 \langle \Psi_0, \mathbb{V}_-\mathbb{R}\mathbb{V}_+\Psi_0 \rangle \quad (5.9)$$

$$\lambda \langle \Psi, \mathbb{V}\Psi \rangle = -2\lambda^2 \langle \Psi_0, \mathbb{V}_-\mathbb{R}\mathbb{V}_+\Psi_0 \rangle + \lambda^3 \langle \Psi_0, \mathbb{V}_-\mathbb{R}\mathbb{V}^{\text{diag}}\mathbb{R}\mathbb{V}_+\Psi_0 \rangle. \quad (5.10)$$

The following observation is crucial. Namely, from the partial trace over $\text{Span}(\Omega) \subset \mathcal{H}_F$ (i.e. the partial expectation value w.r.t to the Ω) we obtain the effective potential (3.4)

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^2 \langle \Phi \otimes \Omega, \mathbb{V}_- \mathbb{R} \mathbb{V}_+ \Phi \otimes \Omega \rangle &= \left\langle \Phi \otimes \Omega, \frac{1}{4\pi N k_F} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} \sum_{p \in L(k)} \frac{|\widehat{V}(k)|^2}{p^2 - (p - k)^2} \Phi \otimes \Omega \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \Phi, \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} W_{k_F}(x_i - x_j) \Phi \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \Phi, \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} W_{k_F}(x_i - x_j) \Phi \right\rangle + \frac{1}{2} W_{k_F}(0) \|\Phi\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

Combined with (5.8)–(5.10) and the definition of $h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}}$ in (3.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Psi, \mathbb{H} \Psi \rangle &= \langle \Phi, h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}} \Phi \rangle - \frac{1}{2} W_{k_F}(0) \|\Phi\|^2 \\ &\quad + \lambda^2 \langle \Psi_0, \mathbb{V}_-(h \otimes \mathbb{R}^2) \mathbb{V}_+ \Psi_0 \rangle + \lambda^3 \langle \Psi_0, \mathbb{V}_- \mathbb{R} \mathbb{V}^{\text{diag}} \mathbb{R} \mathbb{V}_+ \Psi_0 \rangle \\ &\equiv \langle \Phi, h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}} \Phi \rangle - \frac{1}{2} W_{k_F}(0) \|\Phi\|^2 + E_1 + E_2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

We now turn to the estimates of the two terms in (5.12), to be denoted by E_1 and E_2 .

Estimates for E_1 . Thanks to $W \in L^p(\mathbf{T}^3)$, the operator h can be bounded in terms of the kinetic energy h_0 . That is, from Lemma A.1 with $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ we obtain for $q \equiv \frac{2p}{2p-3}$

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &= \lambda^2 \langle \mathbb{R} \mathbb{V}_+ \Psi_0, h \mathbb{R} \mathbb{V}_+ \Psi_0 \rangle \\ &\leq C \lambda^2 (\langle \mathbb{R} \mathbb{V}_+ \Psi_0, h_0 \mathbb{R} \mathbb{V}_+ \Psi_0 \rangle + N \|W\|_{L^p}^q \|\mathbb{R} \mathbb{V}_+ \Psi_0\|^2) \\ &= C \lambda^2 N (\|\nabla_1 \mathbb{R} \mathbb{V}_+ \Psi_0\|^2 + \|W\|_{L^p}^q \|\mathbb{R} \mathbb{V}_+ \Psi_0\|^2). \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

where we used permutational symmetry $\langle \Psi, h_0 \Psi \rangle = N \|\nabla_1 \Psi\|^2$ in the second line. The second term of (5.13) can be readily estimated with Lemma 5.1

$$\|\mathbb{R} \mathbb{V}_+ \Psi_0\|^2 \leq C N^2 (\ln k_F)^{5/3} k_F^{2/3} \|V\|_{H^2}^2 \|\Phi\|^2. \quad (5.14)$$

On the other hand, the first term of (5.13) can be estimated using one commutator, and the triangle inequality

$$\|\nabla_1 \mathbb{R} \mathbb{V}_+ \Psi_0\|^2 \leq 2 \|\mathbb{R} \mathbb{V}_+ \nabla_1 \Psi_0\|^2 + 2 \|\mathbb{R} [\nabla_1, \mathbb{V}_+] \Psi_0\|^2. \quad (5.15)$$

These two terms must be analyzed separately. Essentially, thanks to the presence of the two resolvents, we will gain a factor $\sim k_F^{-1/3}$ relative to the leading order terms.

- The first term in (5.15) can be estimated with Lemma 5.1 and gives rise to

$$\|\mathbb{R} \mathbb{V}_+ (\nabla_1 \Phi \otimes \Omega)\|^2 \leq C N^2 (\ln k_F)^{5/3} k_F^{2/3} \|V\|_{H^2}^2 \|\nabla_1 \Phi\|^2.$$

We estimate the gradient using one more time Lemma A.1 with $\varepsilon = 1$ and $W_{k_F} \in L^\infty$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_1 \Phi\|^2 &= \frac{1}{N} \langle \Phi, h_0 \Phi \rangle \leq \frac{2}{N} \langle \Phi, h \Phi \rangle + C \|W\|_{L^p}^q \|\Phi\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{C}{N} \langle \Phi, h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}} \Phi \rangle + C \left(\|W_{k_F}\|_{L^\infty} + \|W\|_{L^p}^q \right) \|\Phi\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.16)$$

Next, we use the fact that $\Phi \in \text{Span}(\Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_n)$ with Φ_i the eigenfunction associated with the eigenvalue $\mu_i(h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}})$ to find

$$\frac{\langle \Phi, h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}} \Phi \rangle}{\langle \Phi, \Phi \rangle} \leq \mu_n(h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}}) \leq C \mu_n(h_0) + CN \left(\|W\|_{L^p}^q + \|W_{k_F}\|_{L^\infty} \right) \quad (5.17)$$

where we employed Lemma A.1 and the min-max principle in the second inequality. Thanks to (5.5) we find for $1 \leq n \leq N$ that $\mu_n(h_0) \leq N$. In addition, we recall that $W_{k_F} \in L^\infty$ is controlled in (4.9) by $V \in H^2$. Thus, we get

$$\mu_n(h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}}) \leq CN \left(1 + \|W\|_{L^p}^q + \|V\|_{H^2}^2 \right) \quad (5.18)$$

which then controls the gradient term $\|\nabla_1 \Phi\|^2$.

- The second term in (5.15) contains a commutator that can be computed explicitly

$$[\nabla_1, \mathbb{V}_+] = \sum_{p, k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \hat{V}(k) (-ik) e^{-ikx_1} \otimes b_p^* c_{p+k}^*. \quad (5.19)$$

Doing the same calculation as in Lemma 5.1, we find thanks to Lemma 4.2 for $\alpha = 2$ and $\beta = 1$ that

$$\|\mathbb{R}[\nabla_1, \mathbb{V}_+] \Phi \otimes \Omega\|^2 = \left\langle \Phi, \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} |\hat{V}(k)|^2 k^2 \mathcal{D}_2(k, k_F) \Phi \right\rangle \leq C (\ln k_F)^{5/3} k_F^{2/3} \|V\|_{H^3}^2 \|\Phi\|^2.$$

We put everything back in (5.13) and use $\lambda^2 N \sim k_F^{-1}$ to find that there is a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that for all $k_F \geq 1$ and $1 \leq n \leq N$

$$E_1 \leq CN^2 (\ln k_F)^{5/3} k_F^{-1/3} \left(\|V\|_{H^2}^2 (1 + \|W\|_{L^p}^q + \|V\|_{H^2}^2) + N^{-2} \|V\|_{H^3}^2 \right) \|\Phi\|^2. \quad (5.20)$$

We note that the term in brackets (\dots) is majorized by \mathcal{Q}^2 .

Estimates for E_2 . First, in view of Lemma 4.4 we control \mathbb{V}^{diag} in terms of \mathcal{N}_+ . Additionally, note that $\mathbb{R}\mathbb{V}_+(\Phi \otimes \Omega)$ is an eigenvector of \mathcal{N}_+ with eigenvalue 1. Thus, we find that for a constant $C > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} E_2 &= \lambda^3 \langle \Psi_0, \mathbb{V}_- \mathbb{R}\mathbb{V}^{\text{diag}} \mathbb{R}\mathbb{V}_+ \Psi_0 \rangle \\ &\leq C \lambda^3 N \|\hat{V}\|_{\ell^1} \|\mathbb{R}\mathbb{V}_+ \Psi_0\|^2 \\ &\leq CN^{3/2} (\ln k_F)^{5/3} k_F^{-5/6} \|\hat{V}\|_{\ell^1} \|V\|_{H^2}^2 \|\Phi\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.21)$$

where for the second inequality we used Lemma 5.1 to evaluate $\|\mathbb{R}\mathbb{V}_+ \Psi_0\|^2$, as well as $\lambda^3 \sim N^{-3/2} k_F^{-3/2}$. Observe also that $\|\hat{V}\|_{\ell^1} \leq C(1 + \|V\|_{H^2}^2)$ and thus, for $k_F \geq 1$ and $N \geq 1$, the right hand side of (5.21) is bounded above by the right hand side of (5.20)

Conclusion. Going back to (5.12), we obtain thanks to (5.20) and (5.21) that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $k_F \geq 1$ and $N \geq n \geq 1$

$$\langle \Psi, \mathbb{H}\Psi \rangle \leq (\mu_n(h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}}) - \tfrac{1}{2}W_{k_F}(0))\|\Phi\|^2 + CQ^2N^2(\ln k_F)^{5/3}k_F^{-1/3}\|\Phi\|^2, \quad (5.22)$$

With this result in place, we now employ the min-max principle to find that

$$\mu_n(\mathbb{H}) \leq \sup_{\Psi \in \mathcal{V}_n} \frac{\langle \Psi, \mathbb{H}\Psi \rangle}{\langle \Psi, \Psi \rangle},$$

where the supremum is taken over all states within the subspace

$$\mathcal{V}_n \equiv \text{Span}(\Psi_1, \dots, \Psi_n), \quad \Psi_j = (1 - \lambda \mathbb{R}\mathbb{V}_+)(\Phi_j \otimes \Omega).$$

Below, we show that $\dim(\mathcal{V}_n) = n$ for sufficiently large $k_F \geq 1$. Using (5.22) and the inequality $\|\Psi\| \geq \|\Phi\|$ for $\Psi = (1 - \lambda \mathbb{R}\mathbb{V}_+)(\Phi \otimes \Omega)$ with $\Phi \in \text{Span}(\Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_n)$, we derive the bound

$$\mu_n(\mathbb{H}) \leq \mu_n(h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}}) - \tfrac{1}{2}W_{k_F}(0) + CQ^2N^2(\ln k_F)^{5/3}k_F^{-1/3}.$$

So far, we have not made any further restrictions on $k_F \geq 1$ and $N \geq 1$. For the next argument, consider a large enough constant $R > 0$ and take $k_F \geq 1$ large enough so that

$$k_F^{1/3} \geq RnN\|V\|_{H^2}^2(\ln k_F)^{5/3}. \quad (5.23)$$

Let us now establish that \mathcal{V}_n has dimension n . Indeed, observe that $\langle \Phi_i, \Phi_j \rangle = \delta_{i,j}$ by assumption. Moreover, using Lemma 5.1, we find for $i \neq j$:

$$|\langle \Psi_i, \Psi_j \rangle| \leq \lambda^2 \|\mathbb{R}\mathbb{V}^+ \Phi_i \otimes \Omega\| \|\mathbb{R}\mathbb{V}^+ \Phi_j \otimes \Omega\| \leq C_0 N \|V\|_{H^2}^2 (\ln k_F)^{5/3} k_F^{-1/3}, \quad (5.24)$$

for some constant C_0 . If $\dim(\mathcal{V}_n) < n$, it would imply that the set $\{\Psi_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is linearly dependent. Consequently there would exist an integer $m \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that

$$\Psi_m = \sum_{j=1: j \neq m}^n \alpha_j \Psi_j \quad \text{with} \quad \alpha_j \in \mathbf{C}, \quad |\alpha_j| \leq 1.$$

Taking the inner product with Ψ_m and applying (5.24), we find

$$\|\Psi_m\|^2 \leq C_0(n-1)N\|V\|_{H^2}^2(\ln k_F)^{5/3}k_F^{-1/3} < C_0/R < 1$$

provided $R > C_0$. However, this contradicts $\|\Psi_m\| \geq 1$, and thus, we conclude that $\dim(\mathcal{V}_n) = n$. This completes the proof of Proposition 5.1. \square

5.2. Estimates for the lower bound

The purpose of this section is to prove the following operator inequality, which implies the lower bound in Theorem 1. Let us recall that (W, V) satisfy Condition 1 with power $p \in (\frac{3}{2}, \infty]$. For the next statement, we denote

$$\epsilon_0 = N(\ln k_F)^{5/3}k_F^{-1/3}. \quad (5.25)$$

We also recall $Q = 1 + \|W\|_{L^p}^q + \|V\|_{H^4}^2$ with $q \equiv \frac{2p}{2p-3}$.

Proposition 5.2. *There is $C > 0$ such that for all $k_F \geq 1$ and $N \geq 1$ the following holds*

(1) In the sense of quadratic forms on $\mathcal{K} = \ker \mathcal{N}_-$

$$\mathbb{H} \geq (1 - C\mathcal{Q}\epsilon_0) \left(h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}} - \frac{1}{2} W_{k_F}(0) \right) - C\mathcal{Q}N^2 (\ln k_F)^{5/3} k_F^{-1/3} \quad (5.26)$$

provided $k_F (\ln k_F)^{-5} \geq C\|V\|_{H^4}^6 N^3$.

(2) Let $1 \leq n \leq N$. Then, it holds that

$$\mu_n(\mathbb{H}) \geq \mu_n(h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}}) - \frac{1}{2} W_{k_F}(0) - C\mathcal{Q}^2 N^2 (\ln k_F)^{5/3} k_F^{-1/3} \quad (5.27)$$

provided $k_F (\ln k_F)^{-5} \geq C\|V\|_{H^4}^6 N^3$.

Proof. Throughout this proof, all operator inequalities are to be understood in the sense of quadratic forms on $\mathcal{K} = \ker \mathcal{N}_-$.

(1) First, we remove the diagonal term \mathbb{V}^{diag} by utilizing Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4

$$\mathbb{H} \geq h + \mathbb{T} + \lambda \mathbb{V}^+ + \lambda \mathbb{V}^- - CN^{1/2} k_F^{-1/2} \|\widehat{V}\|_{\ell^1} \mathbb{T}. \quad (5.28)$$

Thus, it is sufficient to analyze the first three terms on the right hand side. By completing the square, we find the operator inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{T} + \lambda \mathbb{V}^- + \lambda \mathbb{V}^+ &= \left(\mathbb{T}^{1/2} + \lambda \mathbb{T}^{-1/2} \mathbb{V}^+ \right)^* \left(\mathbb{T}^{1/2} + \lambda \mathbb{T}^{-1/2} \mathbb{V}^+ \right) - \lambda^2 \mathbb{V}^- \mathbb{T}^{-1} \mathbb{V}^+ \\ &\geq -\lambda^2 \mathbb{V}^- \mathbb{T}^{-1} \mathbb{V}^+. \end{aligned} \quad (5.29)$$

Note the above expressions are well-defined. This follows from $\mathbb{V}_+ \mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{N}_+ \geq 1) \mathcal{K}$ and the lower bound $\mathbb{T} \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{N}_+ \geq 1) \geq \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{N}_+ \geq 1)$.

Next, we compute

$$\mathbb{V}^- \mathbb{T}^{-1} \mathbb{V}^+ = \sum_{i,j=1}^N \sum_{k,\ell \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \overline{v_i(k)} v_j(\ell) \sum_{p,q \in \mathbb{Z}^3} b_p c_{p-k} \mathbb{T}^{-1} c_{q-\ell}^* b_q^*, \quad (5.30)$$

where we introduced $v_i(k) = e^{-ikx_i} \widehat{V}(k)$ and we keep in mind the implicit restrictions $p, q \in B^c$ and $p-k, q-\ell \in B$ coming from $\{c_p\}$ and $\{b_p\}$. In particular, we can always assume k and ℓ are non-zero. Let us denote $E_p \equiv p^2$. We then use the pull-through formula

$$b_p c_{p-k} \mathbb{T}^{-1} c_{q-\ell}^* b_q^* = (\mathbb{T} + E_p - E_{p-k})^{-1/2} b_p c_{p-k} c_{q-\ell}^* b_q^* (\mathbb{T} + E_q - E_{q-\ell})^{-1/2} \quad (5.31)$$

and apply the CAR to find

$$\begin{aligned} b_p c_{p-k} c_{q-\ell}^* b_q^* &= \delta_{p,q} \delta_{k,\ell} \chi^\perp(p) \chi(p+k) - \delta_{p,q} \chi^\perp(p) c_{q-\ell}^* c_{p-k} - \delta_{p-k,q-\ell} \chi(p-k) b_q^* b_p + b_q^* c_{q-\ell}^* c_{p-k} b_p. \end{aligned} \quad (5.32)$$

Upon combining (5.30)–(5.32) we obtain $\mathbb{V}^{-}\mathbb{T}^{-1}\mathbb{V}^{+} \equiv \sum_{n=1}^4 A_n$, where:

$$A_1 = \sum_{i,j} \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} \overline{v_i(k)} v_j(k) \sum_{p \in L(k)} (\mathbb{T} + E_p - E_{p-k})^{-1} \quad (5.33)$$

$$A_2 = - \sum_{i,j} \sum_{k,\ell} \overline{v_i(k)} v_j(\ell) \sum_{p \in B^c} (\mathbb{T} + E_p - E_{p-k})^{-\frac{1}{2}} c_{p-\ell}^* c_{p-k} (\mathbb{T} + E_p - E_{p-\ell})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad (5.34)$$

$$A_3 = - \sum_{i,j} \sum_{k,\ell} \overline{v_i(k)} v_j(\ell) \sum_{p-k \in B} (\mathbb{T} + E_p - E_{p-k})^{-\frac{1}{2}} b_{p-k+\ell}^* b_p (\mathbb{T} + E_{p-k+\ell} - E_{p-k})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad (5.35)$$

$$A_4 = \sum_{i,j} \sum_{k,\ell} \overline{v_i(k)} v_j(\ell) \sum_{p,q \in \mathbf{Z}^3} (\mathbb{T} + E_p - E_{p-k})^{-\frac{1}{2}} b_q^* c_{q-\ell}^* c_{p-k} b_p (\mathbb{T} + E_q - E_{q-\ell})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad (5.36)$$

where $\sum_{i,j} \equiv \sum_{i,j=1}^N$ and $\sum_{k,\ell} \equiv \sum_{k,\ell \in \mathbf{Z}^3}$ and we recall $L(k) = \{p : |p| > k_F, |p-k| \leq k_F\}$. We now study each term separately.

- The first term A_1 gives the effective potential (3.4). Namely, using $\mathbb{T} \geq 0$ on \mathcal{K} we find

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^2 A_1 &\leq \lambda^2 \sum_{i,j=1}^N \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} |\widehat{V}(k)|^2 e^{ik(x_i - x_j)} \sum_{p \in L(k)} \frac{1}{p^2 - (p-k)^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{1 \leq i,j \leq N} W_{k_F}(x_i - x_j) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} W_{k_F}(x_i - x_j) + \frac{1}{2} W_{k_F}(0). \end{aligned} \quad (5.37)$$

- The second and third terms are non-positive. To see this, we use the representation

$$(\mathbb{T} + E_p + E_q - E_{p'} - E_{q'})^{-1} = \int_0^\infty e^{-s(E_q - E_{q'})} e^{-s\mathbb{T}} e^{-s(E_p - E_{p'})} ds \quad (5.38)$$

for any $p, p', q, q' \in \mathbf{Z}^3$. Indeed, using the pull-through formula we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} A_2 &= - \sum_{i,j=1}^N \sum_{k,\ell \in \mathbf{Z}^3} \overline{v_i(k)} v_j(\ell) \sum_{p \in B^c} c_{p-\ell}^* (\mathbb{T} + E_p - E_{p-\ell} - E_{p-k})^{-1} c_{p-k} \\ &= - \sum_{p \in B^c} \int_0^\infty ds \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{\ell \in \mathbf{Z}^3} \overline{v_j(\ell)} e^{sE_{p-\ell}} c_{p-\ell} \right)^* e^{-s(\mathbb{T} + E_p)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} \overline{v_i(k)} e^{sE_{p-k}} c_{p-k} \right) \\ &\leq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.39)$$

Note the first line is well-defined, since $\mathbb{T} - E_{p-k}$ takes only non-negative values on states of the form $c_{p-k}\Psi$ with $\Psi \in \mathcal{K}$, while $E_p - E_{p-\ell}$ is strictly positive. As for the third term, we use the CAR and a change of variables $p \mapsto p+k$

$$\begin{aligned} A_3 &= - \sum_{i,j=1}^N \sum_{k,\ell \in \mathbf{Z}^3} \overline{v_i(k)} v_j(\ell) \sum_{p-k \in B} b_{p-k+\ell}^* (\mathbb{T} + E_{p-k+\ell} + E_p - E_{p-k})^{-1} b_p \\ &= - \sum_{i,j=1}^N \sum_{k,\ell \in \mathbf{Z}^3} \overline{v_i(k)} v_j(\ell) \sum_{p \in B} b_{p+\ell}^* (\mathbb{T} + E_{p+\ell} + E_{p+k} - E_p)^{-1} b_{p+k} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= - \sum_{p \in B} \int_0^\infty ds \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{\ell \in \mathbf{Z}^3} e^{-sE_{p-\ell}} \overline{v_j(\ell)} b_{p+\ell} \right)^* e^{-s(\mathbb{T}-E_p)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} e^{-sE_{p+k}} \overline{v_i(k)} b_{p+k} \right) \\
&\leq 0 .
\end{aligned} \tag{5.40}$$

Similarly, the first line is well-defined as $\mathbb{T} + E_{p+k}$ is non-zero on states $b_{p+k}\Psi$ with $\Psi \in \mathcal{K}$, while $E_{p+\ell} - E_p$ is strictly positive.

- For the fourth term, we proceed as follows. We use the CAR to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
A_4 &= \sum_{i,j=1}^N \sum_{k,\ell \in \mathbf{Z}^3} \overline{v_i(k)} v_j(\ell) \sum_{p,q \in \mathbf{Z}^3} b_q^* c_{q-\ell}^* (\mathbb{T} + E_p + E_q - E_{p-k} - E_{q-\ell})^{-1} c_{p-k} b_p \\
&\leq \sum_{i,j=1}^N \sum_{k,\ell \in \mathbf{Z}^3} \overline{v_i(k)} v_j(\ell) \sum_{p,q \in \mathbf{Z}^3} b_q^* c_{q-\ell}^* (E_p + E_q - E_{p-k} - E_{q-\ell})^{-1} c_{p-k} b_p
\end{aligned} \tag{5.41}$$

where the last inequality follows from (5.38) and $e^{-s\mathbb{T}} \leq 1$ on \mathcal{K} . For the next step, let us note that

$$(E_p + E_q - E_{p-k} - E_{q-\ell})^{-1} \leq (E_p - E_{p-k})^{-1/2} (E_q - E_{q-\ell})^{-1/2}.$$

Let us now evaluate A_4 in a normalized state $\Psi \in \mathcal{K}$. We use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, Lemma 4.5 for $\alpha = 2$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and Lemma 4.2 for $\mathcal{S}_{2,2}(k_F)$ to find

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda^2 \langle \Psi, A_4 \Psi \rangle &\leq N^2 \left(\lambda \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^3} |\widehat{V}(k)| \sum_{p \in L(k)} (E_p - E_{p-k})^{-1/2} \|c_{p-k} b_p \Psi\| \right)^2 \\
&\leq N^2 \left(\varepsilon \langle \Psi, \mathbb{T} \Psi \rangle + C \varepsilon^{-1} N^{-1} k_F^{-1/3} (\ln k_F)^{5/3} \|V\|_{H^4}^2 \right)^2 .
\end{aligned} \tag{5.42}$$

Finally, we minimize with respect to $\varepsilon > 0$ to find the estimate

$$\lambda^2 \langle \Psi, A_4 \Psi \rangle \leq CN \|V\|_{H^4}^2 k_F^{-1/3} (\ln k_F)^{5/3} \langle \Psi, \mathbb{T} \Psi \rangle . \tag{5.43}$$

Putting everything together. We deduce from (5.28), the completion of the square (5.29), and the estimates (5.37), (5.39), (5.40) and (5.43) that there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $N \geq 1$ and $k_F \geq 1$

$$\mathbb{H} \geq h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}} - \frac{1}{2} W_{k_F}(0) - C_0 \|V\|_{H^4}^2 \epsilon_0 \mathbb{T} \quad \text{with} \quad \epsilon_0 = N (\ln k_F)^{5/3} k_F^{-1/3} . \tag{5.44}$$

Finally, it suffices to bound the kinetic energy. To this end, we apply Lemma 4.6 with $\delta = 1$ to see that there is $C > 0$ such that for all $N \geq 1$ and $k_F \geq CN \|\widehat{V}\|_{\ell^1}^2$

$$\mathbb{T} \leq 2\mathbb{H} + CN\mathcal{Q} . \tag{5.45}$$

We combine the last two inequalities to obtain

$$(1 + C_0 \|V\|_{H^4}^2 \epsilon_0) \mathbb{H} \geq h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}} - \frac{1}{2} W_{k_F}(0) - C\mathcal{Q} N \epsilon_0 \tag{5.46}$$

for some distinguished constant C_0 . Assume now $k_F \geq 1$ is large enough so that

$$0 < 1 - C_0 \|V\|_{H^4}^2 \epsilon_0 < (1 + C_0 \|V\|_{H^4}^2 \epsilon_0)^{-1} < 1 .$$

Thus we get from (5.44), (5.45) and bootstrapping

$$\mathbb{H} \geq (1 - C_0 \|V\|_{H^4}^2 \epsilon_0) (h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}} - \tfrac{1}{2} W_{k_F}(0)) - C \mathcal{Q} N \epsilon_0 \quad (5.47)$$

which finishes the proof of the first statement.

(2) Recall that from (4.9) we have $\|W_{k_F}\|_{L^\infty} \leq C \|V\|_{H^2}^2 \leq C \mathcal{Q}$. In addition, from (5.18) we have the bound $\mu_n(h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}}) \leq C N \mathcal{Q}$ for any $1 \leq n \leq N$. Thus, we can now employ the min-max principle to find for all $1 \leq n \leq N$ (and all k_F sufficiently large)

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_n(\mathbb{H}) &\geq (1 - C_0 \mathcal{Q} \epsilon_0) (\mu_n(h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}}) - \tfrac{1}{2} W_{k_F}(0)) - C \mathcal{Q} N \epsilon_0 \\ &\geq \mu_n(h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}}) - \tfrac{1}{2} W_{k_F}(0) - C \mathcal{Q}^2 N \epsilon_0 . \end{aligned} \quad (5.48)$$

This completes the proof of the proposition. \square

6. LATTICE SUMS

The main purpose of this section is to complete the proof of Lemma 4.1. In order to prove the statement, we shall borrow some results from [17]. We start by recalling the definition of the lune set

$$L(k) = \{p \in \mathbf{Z}^3 : |p| > k_F \text{ and } |p - k| \leq k_F\} , \quad k \in \mathbf{Z}^3, \quad (6.1)$$

as well as the relevant singular denominators

$$\lambda_{p,k} \equiv \frac{1}{2} (|p|^2 - |p - k|^2) , \quad p, k \in \mathbf{Z}^3 . \quad (6.2)$$

Then, for any function $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ the following *summation formula* holds.

Proposition 6.1 ([17] Proposition B.20). *For all $k = (k_1, k_2, k_3) \in \mathbf{Z}^3$ with $|k| < 2k_F$ let us denote:*

- $\ell \in (0, \infty)$ as the positive number $\ell = |k|^{-1} \gcd(k_1, k_2, k_3)$.
- $m_* \in \mathbf{Z}$ as the least integer such that: $\frac{|k|}{2} < \ell m_*$
- $M \in \mathbf{Z}$ as the greatest integer such that: $\ell M \leq k_F$
- $M_* \in \mathbf{Z}$ as the greatest integer such that: $\ell M_* \leq k_F + |k|$

Then, as $k_F \rightarrow \infty$

$$\sum_{p \in L(k)} f(\lambda_{p,k}) = 2\pi |k| \sum_{m_* \leq m \leq M} f\left(|k| \left(\ell m - \frac{|k|}{2}\right)\right) \left(\ell m - \frac{|k|}{2}\right) \ell \quad (6.3)$$

$$+ \pi \sum_{M+1 \leq m \leq M_*} f\left(|k| \left(\ell m - \frac{|k|}{2}\right)\right) \left(k_F^2 - (\ell m - k)^2\right) \ell \quad (6.4)$$

$$+ O\left(|k|^{11/3} \ln(k_F) k_F^{\frac{2}{3}} \sum_{m_* \leq m \leq M_*} f\left(|k| \left(\ell m - \frac{|k|}{2}\right)\right)\right) \quad (6.5)$$

Remark 6.1. The following observations follow from the definition of the parameters ℓ , m_* , M and M_* and will become helpful in the upcoming calculations:

$$\ell \leq 1, \quad \ell m_* \leq \frac{|k|}{2} + \ell \quad \ell m_* - \frac{|k|}{2} \geq \frac{1}{2|k|}, \quad k_F - \ell \leq \ell M, \quad k_F + |k| - \ell \leq \ell M_*. \quad (6.6)$$

All are easy to obtain except the third one. It follows from $2\gcd(k_1, k_2, k_3)m_* \geq |k|^2 + 1$.

The next proof follows closely that of [17, Proposition B.21].

Proof of Lemma 4.1. (Inequality (4.4)) First, we observe that after a change of variables $p \mapsto p - k$

$$\sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \frac{\chi^\perp(p) \chi(p+k)}{(E_p - E_{p+k})^2} = C \sum_{p \in L(k)} \lambda_{p,k}^{-2} \quad (6.7)$$

where the Fermi momentum on the right is given by $k'_F = 2\pi k_F$. As in the final estimate the 2π factors will play no role we shall ignore it and estimate the right hand side as for a given k_F . We now use the Proposition with $f(\lambda) = \lambda^{-2}$.

The first term in (6.3) can be estimated as follows using the integral estimate $\sum_{n=a}^b f(n) \leq f(b) + \int_a^b f(x)dx$ for decreasing functions

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &\equiv 2\pi|k| \sum_{m_* \leq m \leq M} \frac{(\ell m - \frac{|k|}{2})\ell}{|k|^2(\ell m - \frac{|k|}{2})^2} \\ &= \frac{2\pi\ell}{|k|} \sum_{m_* \leq m \leq M} \frac{1}{(\ell m - \frac{|k|}{2})} \\ &\leq \frac{2\pi\ell}{|k|} \left(\frac{1}{(\ell M - \frac{|k|}{2})} + \int_{m_*}^M \frac{dm}{(\ell m - \frac{|k|}{2})} \right) \\ &= \frac{2\pi\ell}{|k|} \left(\frac{1}{(\ell M - \frac{|k|}{2})} + \ln(\ell M - \frac{|k|}{2}) - \ln(\ell m_* - \frac{|k|}{2}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (6.8)$$

Next, we use the various inequalities from Remark 6.1 and obtain

$$T_1 \leq \frac{2\pi\ell}{|k|} \left(\frac{1}{(k_F - 1 - \frac{|k|}{2})} + \ln(k_F - \frac{|k|}{2}) - \ln(\ell) \right) \leq \frac{C}{|k|} \left(k_F^{-1} + \ln k_F + C_* \right)$$

where in the last inequality we used $\ell \leq 1$ and $-\ell \ln \ell \leq C_*$. Thus $T_1 \leq \frac{C}{|k|} (1 + \ln k_F)$.

Arguing similarly, we now estimate the second error term in (6.4) as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
T_2 &\equiv \pi |k| \sum_{M+1 \leq m \leq M_*} \frac{(k_F^2 - (\ell m - k)^2) \ell}{|k|^2 (\ell m - \frac{|k|}{2})^2} \\
&\leq \pi |k| \sum_{M+1 \leq m \leq M_*} \frac{2|k| (\ell m - \frac{|k|}{2})}{|k|^2 (\ell m - \frac{|k|}{2})^2} \\
&= 2\pi \sum_{M+1 \leq m \leq M_*} \frac{1}{(\ell m - \frac{|k|}{2})} \\
&\leq 2\pi \left(\frac{1}{\ell M_* - |k|/2} + \ln \left(\ell M_* - |k|/2 \right) - \ln \left(\ell(M+1) - |k|/2 \right) \right) \\
&\leq C \left(k_F^{-1} + \ln k_F \right). \tag{6.9}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that in the first line we used $k_F^2 \leq (\ell m)^2$ for $m \geq M+1$. Thus $T_2 \leq C(1 + \ln k_F)$

Let us now turn to the third error term in (6.5). To this end, we estimate the sum using the same methods as before. We obtain thanks to the bounds in Remark 6.1

$$\begin{aligned}
T_3 &\equiv \sum_{m_* \leq m \leq M} \frac{1}{(|k|(\ell m - \frac{|k|}{2}))^2} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{|k|^2} \left(\frac{1}{(\ell M_* - \frac{|k|}{2})^2} + \frac{1}{\ell} \left(\frac{1}{\ell m_* - \frac{|k|}{2}} - \frac{1}{\ell M - \frac{|k|}{2}} \right) \right) \\
&\leq \frac{C}{|k|^2} \left(k_F^{-2} + \frac{|k|}{\ell} \right) \leq \frac{C}{|k|^2} \left(k_F^{-2} + |k|^2 \right) \tag{6.10}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we used $\ell|k| = \gcd(k_1, k_2, k_3) \geq 1$. Thus, $T_3 \leq C$. It suffices now to combine the estimates together. \square

APPENDIX A. THE BOSONIC QUADRATIC FORM

Let $h_0 \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N (-\Delta_{x_i})$ be the free operator with form domain $Q(h_0) = H^1(\mathbf{T}^{3N}) \cap \mathcal{H}_B$, and let $h = h_0 + N^{-1} \sum_{i < j} w(x_i - x_j)$ be the bosonic Hamiltonian, defined initially on $C^\infty(\mathbf{T}^3) \cap \mathcal{H}_B$.

Lemma A.1. *Assume $w \in L^p(\mathbf{T}^3)$ for some $3/2 < p \leq \infty$. Then, there are $a, c, q > 0$ (depending only on p) such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\Psi \in C^\infty(\mathbf{T}^3) \cap \mathcal{H}_B$*

$$(1 - \varepsilon) \langle \Psi, h_0 \Psi \rangle - \frac{cN}{\varepsilon^a} \|w\|_{L^p}^q \|\Psi\|^2 \leq \langle \Psi, h \Psi \rangle \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \langle \Psi, h_0 \Psi \rangle + \frac{cN}{\varepsilon^a} \|w\|_{L^p}^q \|\Psi\|^2. \tag{A.1}$$

In particular, h has a unique self-adjoint extension on \mathcal{H}_B with form domain $Q(h_0)$ and (A.1) holds for all $\Psi \in Q(h_0)$.

Remark A.1. From the proof, one may compute $q = \frac{2p}{2p-3}$.

Proof. Consider first $\varphi \in H^1(\mathbf{T}_x^3 \times \mathbf{T}_y^3)$. For $\frac{3}{2} < p \leq \infty$ let $p' = \frac{p}{p-1}$ be the dual exponent, with $1 \leq p' < 3$. Thanks to Hölder's inequality, L^p interpolation and the Sobolev embedding $H^1(\mathbf{T}^3) \hookrightarrow L^6(\mathbf{T}^3)$, we have for $\varphi_x(y) = \varphi(x, y)$

$$\begin{aligned} \iint w(x-y)|\varphi(x, y)|^2 dy dx &\leq \int \|w\|_{L^p} \|\varphi_x\|_{L^{2p'}}^2 dx \\ &\leq C \|w\|_{L^p} \int \|\varphi_x\|_{L^2}^{2\theta_1} \|\varphi_x\|_{L^6}^{2\theta_2} dx \leq C \|w\|_{L^p} \int \|\varphi_x\|_{L^2}^{2\theta_1} \|\nabla \varphi_x\|_{L^2}^{2\theta_2} dx . \end{aligned}$$

Here $\theta_1 = \frac{2}{2p'} \frac{6-2p'}{6-2} = \frac{2p-3}{2p}$ and $\theta_2 = \frac{6}{2p'} \frac{2p'-2}{6-2} = \frac{3}{2p}$ are found by interpolation. Thus, we may apply Young's inequality to find there is $C = C(p) > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\iint w(x-y)|\varphi(x, y)|^2 dy dx \leq \varepsilon \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2}^2 + C \varepsilon^{-\theta_2/\theta_1} \|w\|_{L^p}^{1/\theta_1} \|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Next, we turn to the proof of the lemma. Thanks to permutational symmetry, it suffices to estimate the quadratic form

$$\left\langle \Psi, \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i < j} w(x_i - x_j) \Psi \right\rangle = \frac{N-1}{2} \int dx_3 \cdots dx_N \int dx_1 dx_2 w(x_1 - x_2) |\psi(x_1, x_2)|^2 dx_1 dx_2 \quad (\text{A.3})$$

with $\psi(x_1, x_2) \equiv \Psi(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_N)$. We may now use (A.2) for $\varphi = \psi$ and then integrate over the remaining variables. Thus, we conclude the potential energy is relative form bounded with respect to h_0 , with constant $\varepsilon < 1$. Thus, thanks to the KLMN theorem the operator h has a unique self-adjoint extension, and the desired inequality follows by a standard approximation argument. \square

APPENDIX B. PROOF OF COROLLARY 1.1

Before we turn to the proof of Corollary 1.1 we argue that h^{eff} has a non-degenerate ground state. Indeed, consider on the whole Hilbert space $L^2(\mathbf{T}^{3N})$ the Schrödinger operator

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{i=1}^N (-\Delta_{x_i}) + N^{-1} \sum_{i < j} W^{\text{eff}}(x_i - x_j) .$$

One may adapt the proof of [34, Theorem 11.8] to the torus case \mathbf{T}^{3N} and show that \mathcal{H} has a ground state $\phi^{\text{eff}} \in L^2(\mathbf{T}^{3N})$ which is strictly positive and unique up to a constant phase (for this, we adapt the convexity inequality for gradients in [34, Theorem 7.8] to the torus). By standard arguments, the ground state is also permutationally symmetric, i.e. $\phi^{\text{eff}} \in \mathcal{H}_B$. As a consequence, we conclude that for each $N \geq 1$ we have the spectral gap

$$\mu_2(h^{\text{eff}}) - \mu_1(h^{\text{eff}}) > 0 . \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Proof of Corollary 1.1. Fix $N \geq 1$ throughout the proof. We prove the statement in the particle-hole picture. First, recall $\Omega = \mathcal{R}^* \Omega_F$ and consider the trial state $\Psi = (1 - \lambda \mathbb{R} \mathbb{V}^+) \Psi_0$, $\Psi_0 = \phi^{\text{eff}} \otimes \Omega$. Note that this state is analogous to the trial state introduced in

(5.6) (for $n = 1$) with $\Phi \equiv \phi^{\text{eff}}$. Second, following the exact same steps leading to (5.22), and using (3.13) and (3.14) to relate $h_{k_F}^{\text{eff}}$ and h^{eff} one verifies that

$$\langle \Psi, \mathbb{H}\Psi \rangle \leq \mu_1(\tilde{h}) + o(1) \quad k_F \rightarrow \infty \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where $\tilde{h} \equiv h^{\text{eff}} - \frac{1}{2}V * V(0)$ for notational convenience. Third, we introduce the orthogonal projections $P = |\mathcal{R}^*\Phi\rangle\langle\mathcal{R}^*\Phi|$ and $Q = 1 - P$, and let $\Delta \equiv \mu_2(h^{\text{eff}}) - \mu_1(h^{\text{eff}})$. We estimate

$$\langle \Psi, (\mathbb{H} - \mu_1(\tilde{h}))\Psi \rangle \geq \|P\Psi\|^2(\mu_1(\mathbb{H}) - \mu_1(\tilde{h})) + \|Q\Psi\|^2(\mu_2(\mathbb{H}) - \mu_1(\tilde{h}))$$

where we used $\mathbb{H}P = \mu_1(\mathbb{H})P$, $Q\mathbb{H}P = 0 = QP$, and $Q\mathbb{H}Q \geq \mu_2(\mathbb{H})Q$. Applying Propositions 5.1 and 5.2 for $n = 1$ and $n = 2$, respectively, together with (3.14), we find

$$\langle \Psi, (\mathbb{H} - \mu_1(\tilde{h}))\Psi \rangle \geq \|Q\Psi\|^2(\mu_2(\tilde{h}) - \mu_1(\tilde{h})) - o(1) \quad k_F \rightarrow \infty .$$

Combining this with (B.2) we obtain

$$\Delta\|Q\Psi\|^2 \leq \langle \Psi, (\mathbb{H} - \mu_1(\tilde{h}))\Psi \rangle + o(1) = o(1) \quad k_F \rightarrow \infty .$$

Using Lemma 5.1 and the definition of Ψ , we further estimate

$$\|Q(\phi^{\text{eff}} \otimes \Omega)\| \leq \|Q\Psi\| + \|\lambda\mathbb{R}\mathbb{V}^+(\phi^{\text{eff}} \otimes \Omega)\| \leq \|Q\Psi\| + o(1) , \quad k_F \rightarrow \infty$$

and thus

$$\|Q(\phi^{\text{eff}} \otimes \Omega)\|^2 = o(1) , \quad k_F \rightarrow \infty .$$

This implies $|\langle \mathcal{R}^*\Phi, \phi^{\text{eff}} \otimes \Omega \rangle| = |\langle \Phi, \phi^{\text{eff}} \otimes \Omega_F \rangle| \rightarrow 1$. This gives

$$\|\mathcal{R}^*\Phi - \alpha\phi^{\text{eff}} \otimes \Omega\|^2 = 2(1 - |\langle \Phi, \phi^{\text{eff}} \otimes \Omega_F \rangle|) \rightarrow 0 \quad k_F \rightarrow \infty$$

for $\alpha = |\langle \Phi, \phi^{\text{eff}} \otimes \Omega_F \rangle| |\langle \Phi, \phi^{\text{eff}} \otimes \Omega_F \rangle|^{-1}$. Choosing the relative phase so that $\langle \Phi, \phi^{\text{eff}} \otimes \Omega_F \rangle \geq 0$, we obtain $\alpha = 1$, which completes the proof of the corollary. \square

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank Robert Seiringer for valuable comments. E.C. gratefully acknowledges support from NSF under grant DMS-2052789 through Nataša Pavlović. N.P. gratefully acknowledges support from the NSF under grants No. DMS-1840314 and DMS-2052789

Data availability. This manuscript has no associated data.

Conflict of interest. The authors state that there is no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Baumgartner. *The existence of many-particle bound states despite a pair interaction with positive scattering length.* J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **30**, L741. (1997)
- [2] N. Benedikter, P.T. Nam, M. Porta, B. Schlein, and R. Seiringer. *Optimal Upper Bound for the Correlation Energy of a Fermi Gas in the Mean-Field Regime.* Commun. Math. Phys. Benedikter, 2097–2150 (2020).
- [3] N. Benedikter, P.T. Nam, M. Porta, B. Schlein, and R. Seiringer. *Correlation energy of a weakly interacting Fermi gas.* Invent. Math. **225**, 885–979 (2021).

- [4] N. Benedikter, M. Porta, B. Schlein, and R. Seiringer. *Correlation Energy of a Weakly Interacting Fermi Gas with Large Interaction Potential*. *Arch Rational Mech Anal* **247**, 65 (2023).
- [5] C. Boccato, C Brennecke, S. Cenatiempo and B. Schlein. *The excitation spectrum of Bose gases interacting through singular potentials*. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* 22, 7, 2331–2403. (2020)
- [6] C. Boccato, C Brennecke, S. Cenatiempo and B. Schlein. *Optimal rate for Bose–Einstein condensation in the Gross–Pitaevskii regime*. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 376, 1311–1395. (2020)
- [7] C. Boccato, C Brennecke, S. Cenatiempo and B. Schlein. *Bogoliubov theory in the Gross–Pitaevskii limit*. *Acta Math.* 222, 219–335. (2019)
- [8] L. Boßmann, N. Leopold, S. Petrat and S. Rademacher. *Ground state of Bose gases interacting through singular potentials*. arxiv.org/2309.12233
- [9] M. Born, and R. Oppenheimer. *Zur Quantentheorie der Molekeln*. *Ann. Phys.*, 389: 457–484.
- [10] M. Brooks. *Diagonalizing Bose gases in the Gross–Pitaevskii regime and beyond*. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 406, 17. (2025)
- [11] M. Brooks, and D. Mitrouskas. *Asymptotic series for low-energy excitations of the Fröhlich Polaron at strong coupling*. *Prob. Math. Phys.* 6, 281–325. (2025)
- [12] M. Brooks, and R. Seiringer. *The Fröhlich polaron at strong coupling: Part I–The quantum correction to the classical energy*. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 404, 287–337. (2023)
- [13] E. Cárdenas, J.K. Miller and N. Pavlović. *On the effective dynamics of Bose-Fermi mixtures*. [arXiv.org/2309.04638](https://arxiv.org/2309.04638). (2023)
- [14] E. Cárdenas and D. Mitrouskas. *The renormalized Nelson model in the weak coupling limit*. *Journal of Physics A*, 58, 17. (2025)
- [15] M.R. Christiansen, C. Hainzl, P.T. Nam. *The Gell-Mann–Brueckner Formula for the Correlation Energy of the Electron Gas: A Rigorous Upper Bound in the Mean-Field Regime*. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **401**, 1469–1529 (2023).
- [16] M.R. Christiansen, C. Hainzl, P.T. Nam. *The Random Phase Approximation for Interacting Fermi Gases in the Mean-Field Regime*. *Forum of Mathematics, Pi*. 2023;11:e32. doi:10.1017/fmp.2023.31 (2023).
- [17] M.R. Christiansen. *Emergent quasi-bosonicity in interacting Fermi gases*. PhD Thesis, LMU Munich. (2023) [arXiv:2301.12817v1](https://arxiv.org/2301.12817v1)
- [18] M.R. Christiansen, C. Hainzl, P.T. Nam. *The Correlation Energy of the Electron Gas in the Mean-Field Regime* (2024). [arXiv:2404.01386](https://arxiv.org/2404.01386).
- [19] S.T. Chui and V.N. Ryzhov. *Collapse transition in mixtures of bosons and fermions*. *Phys. Rev. A*. 69, 043607. (2004)
- [20] E.B. Davies. *Particle-boson interactions and the weak coupling limit*. *J. Math. Phys.* 1, 20 (3): 345–351. (1979)
- [21] B.J. DeSalvo, K. Patel, G. Cai and C. Chin. *Observation of fermion-mediated interactions between bosonic atoms*. *Nature* 568, 61–64. (2019)
- [22] S. Fournais and J.P. Solovej. *The energy of dilute Bose gases*. *Ann. of Math.* (2) 192 (3), 893–976. (2020)
- [23] S. Fournais and J.P. Solovej. *The energy of dilute Bose gases II: the general case*. *Invent. Math.* 232, 863–994. (2023)
- [24] M. Griesemer and M. Hofacker. *On the weakness of short-range interactions in Fermi gases*. *Lett. Math. Phys.* 113, 1. (2022)
- [25] C. Hainzl, M. Porta and F. Rexze. *On the correlation energy of interacting fermionic Systems in the mean-field regime*. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 374, 485–524. (2020)
- [26] F. Hiroshima. *Weak coupling limit and removing an ultraviolet cutoff for a Hamiltonian of*

- particles interacting with a quantized scalar field.* *J. Math. Phys.* 40(3), 1215–1236. (1999)
- [27] B. Huan. *Bose-Einstein condensate immersed in a Fermi sea: Theory of static and dynamic behavior across phase separation.* *Phys. Rev. A* 101, 063618. (2020)
 - [28] M. Jeblick, D. Mitrouskas, S. Petrat and P. Pickl. *Free time evolution of a tracer particle coupled to a Fermi gas in the high-density limit.* *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 356, 143–187, (2017).
 - [29] M. Jeblick, D. Mitrouskas and P. Pickl. *Effective dynamics of two tracer particles coupled to a Fermi gas in the high-density limit.* In *Macroscopic limits of quantum systems*, Springer Proceedings in Mathematics & Statistics, (2018).
 - [30] J.J. Kinnunen and G.M. Bruun. *Induced interactions in a superfluid bose-fermi mixture.* *Phys. Rev. A* 91, 041605. (2015)
 - [31] J.J. Kinnunen, Z. Wu and G. M. Bruun. *Induced p-wave pairing in Bose-Fermi mixtures.* *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 121, 253402. (2018)
 - [32] N. Leopold, D. Mitrouskas, S. Rademacher, B. Schlein and R. Seiringer. *Landau–Pekar equations and quantum fluctuations for the dynamics of a strongly coupled polaron.* *Pure Appl. Anal.*, 3, 4, 653–676, (2021).
 - [33] M. Lewin, P.T. Nam and N. Rougerie. *Derivation of Hartree’s theory for generic mean-field Bose systems.* *Adv. Math.* 254, 570–621. (2014)
 - [34] E.H. Lieb, R. Seiringer, J.P. Solovej and J. Yngvason. *The mathematics of the Bose gas and its condensation.* Oberwolfach Seminars 34. Birkhäuser. (2005)
 - [35] E.H. Lieb, R. Seiringer and J. Yngvason. *Bosons in a trap: A rigorous derivation of the Gross–Pitaevskii energy functional.* *Phys. Rev. A* 61, 043602. (2000)
 - [36] P. Massignan, M. Zaccanti and G.M. Bruun. *Polarons, dressed molecules and itinerant ferromagnetism in ultracold Fermi gases.* *Rep. Prog. Phys.* 77, 034401. (2014)
 - [37] D. Mitrouskas. *A note on the Fröhlich dynamics in the strong coupling limit.* *Lett. Math. Phys.* 111, 45. (2021)
 - [38] D. Mitrouskas and P. Pickl. *Effective pair interaction between impurity particles induced by a dense Fermi gas.* [arxiv.org/2105.02841](https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.02841)
 - [39] P.T. Nam, N. Rougerie and R. Seiringer. *Ground states of large bosonic systems: the Gross–Pitaevskii limit revisited.* *Anal. PDE* 9, 459–485. (2016)
 - [40] G. Panati S. Teufel, and H. Spohn. *The time-dependent Born-Oppenheimer approximation.* *ESAIM: Math. Model. Numer. Anal.* 41, 2, 297–314, 297–314. (2007)
 - [41] M. Reed, and B. Simon. *Fourier Analysis, Self-Adjointness. Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics*, Vol. 2, London: Academic Press 1975.
 - [42] R. Roy, A. Green, R. Bowler and S. Gupta. *Two-element mixture of Bose and Fermi superfluids.* *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 118, 055301. (2017)
 - [43] D.H. Santamore and E. Timmermans. *Fermion-mediated interactions in a dilute Bose-Einstein condensate.* *Phys. Rev. A* 78, 013619. (2008)
 - [44] F. Scazza, M. Zaccanti, P. Massignan, M.M. Parish and J. Levinsen. *Repulsive Fermi and Bose polarons in quantum gases.* *Atoms* 10(2), 55. (2022)
 - [45] F. Schreck, G. Ferrari, K.L. Corwin, J. Cubizolles, L. Khaykovich, M.-O. Mewes and C. Salomon. *Sympathetic cooling of bosonic and fermionic lithium gases towards quantum degeneracy.* *Phys. Rev. A* 64, 011402. (2001)
 - [46] F. Schreck, L. Khaykovich, K. L. Corwin, G. Ferrari, T. Bourdel, J. Cubizolles and C. Salomon. *Quasipure Bose-Einstein condensate immersed in a Fermi sea.* *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 87, 080403. (2001)
 - [47] R. Seiringer. *The excitation spectrum for weakly interacting Bosons.* *Comm. Math. Phys.*

- 306, 565–578. (2011)
- [48] X. Shen, N. Davidson, G.M. Bruun, M. Sun and Z. Wu. *Strongly interacting Bose-Fermi mixtures: mediated interaction, phase diagram, and sound propagation*. Phys. Rev. Lett. 132, 033401. (2024)
 - [49] G. Teschl. *Mathematical methods in quantum mechanics*, volume 157 of Graduate Studies in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, second edition, 2014.
 - [50] S. Teufel. *Adiabatic perturbation theory in quantum dynamics*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2003.
 - [51] S. Teufel *Effective N-body dynamics for the massless Nelson model and adiabatic decoupling without spectral gap*. Ann. Henri Poincaré 3, 939-965. (2002)
 - [52] S. Teufel, and H. Spohn. *Adiabatic Decoupling and Time-Dependent Born–Oppenheimer Theory*. Commun. Math. Phys. 224, 113–132. (2001)
 - [53] Tenuta, and S. Teufel *Effective dynamics for particles coupled to a quantized scalar field*. Commun. Math. Phys. 280, 751–805. (2008)
 - [54] T. Tsurumi and M. Wadati. *Dynamics of magnetically trapped Boson-Fermion mixtures*. Journal of the Physical Society of Japan 69, 1, 97–103. (2000)
 - [55] Z. Wu and G.M. Bruun. *Topological superfluid in a Fermi-Bose mixture with a high critical temperature*. Phys. Rev. Lett. 117, 245302. (2016)
 - [56] X.-C. Yao, H.-Z. Chen, Y.-P. Wu, X.-P. Liu, X.-Q. Wang, X. Jiang, Y. Deng, Y.-A. Chen and J.-W. Pan. *Observation of coupled vortex lattices in a mass-imbalance Bose and Fermi superfluid mixture*. Phys. Rev. Lett. 117, 145301. (2016)
 - [57] J. Yin. *The ground state energy of dilute Bose gas in potentials with positive scattering length*. Comm. Math. Phys. 295, 1–27. (2010)
 - [58] D.-C. Zheng, C.-R. Ye, L. Wen and R. Liao. *Polarizing the medium: Fermion-mediated interactions between bosons*. Phys. Rev. A 103, L021301. (2021)

(Esteban Cárdenas) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN, 2515 SPEEDWAY, AUSTIN TX, 78712, USA

Email address: eacardenas@utexas.edu

(Joseph K. Miller) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, STANFORD UNIVERSITY, 450 JANE STANFORD WAY, STANFORD, 94305, USA

Email address: : jkm314@stanford.edu

(David Mitrouskas) INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AUSTRIA (ISTA), AM CAMPUS 1, 3400 KLOSTERNEUBURG, AUSTRIA

Email address: mitrouskas@ist.ac.at

(Nataša Pavlović) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN, 2515 SPEEDWAY, AUSTIN TX, 78712, USA

Email address: natasa@math.utexas.edu