Journal of Mathematical Physics

RESEARCH ARTICLE | FEBRUARY 19 2026

Entropic fluctuation theorems for the spin–fermion model

Special Collection: XXI International Congress on Mathematical Physics 2024

T. Benoist ; L. Bruneau ; V. Jakšić ; A. Panati; C.-A. Pillet

Check for updates

J. Math. Phys. 67, 022101 (2026)
https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0311182

View Online
Export Citation

19 March 2026 15:06:40

AIP Publishing

Journal of
Mathematical Physics

ARTICLE

pubs.aip.org/aip/jmp

Entropic fluctuation theorems for the spin–fermion model

Cite as: J. Math. Phys. 67, 022101 (2026); doi: 10.1063/5.0311182
Submitted: 7 November 2025 • Accepted: 23 January 2026 •
Published Online: 19 February 2026 • Corrected: 20 February 2026

View Online Export Citation CrossMark

T. Benoist,[1] L. Bruneau,[2] V. Jakšić,[3,a)] A. Panati,[4,5] and C.-A. Pillet[4,5]

AFFILIATIONS

[1] Institut de Mathématiques de Toulouse, UMR5219, Université de Toulouse, CNRS, UPS IMT, F-31062 Toulouse Cedex 9, France
[2] Département de Mathématiques, CNRS UMR 8088, Cergy Paris Université, 95000 Cergy-Pontoise, France
[3] Dipartimento di Matematica, Politecnico di Milano, Piazza Leonardo da Vinci, 32 20133 Milano, Italy
[4] Université de Toulon, CNRS, CPT, UMR 7332, 83957 La Garde, France
[5] Aix-Marseille Univ, CNRS, CPT, UMR 7332, Case 907, 13288 Marseille, France

Note: This paper is part of the Special Topic on the XXI International Congress on Mathematical Physics 2024.
[a)] **Author to whom correspondence should be addressed:** vojkan.jaksic@polimi.it

ABSTRACT

We study entropic fluctuations in the Spin–Fermion model describing an N-level quantum system coupled to several independent thermal free Fermi gas reservoirs. We establish the quantum Evans–Searles and Gallavotti–Cohen fluctuation theorems and identify their link with entropic ancilla state tomography and quantum phase space contraction of non-equilibrium steady state. The method of proof involves the spectral resonance theory of quantum transfer operators developed by the authors in previous works.

© *2026 Author(s). All article content, except where otherwise noted, is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).* https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0311182

19 March 2026 15:06:40

I. INTRODUCTION

This is the fourth and final paper in a series[1,5,6] dealing with entropic fluctuations in quantum statistical mechanics, and in particular with the quantum Evans–Searles and Gallavotti–Cohen fluctuation theorems. Its goal is to illustrate, on the example of the open spin–fermion model, the general theory developed in Refs. 1 and 5. The work, Ref. 6, was devoted to the justification of the key formulas of Ref. 1 by thermodynamic limit arguments.

We assume the reader to be familiar with the framework and results of Refs. 1, 5, and 6. In particular, we will use the notation and conventions regarding open quantum systems and modular theory introduced in these works.

In the context of open quantum systems, the spin–fermion model goes back to the works, Refs. 4 and 7, and with time has become one of the paradigmatic models of quantum statistical mechanics. The closely related spin–boson model, in which each thermal reservoir is a free Bose gas, has a much longer history in the physics literature due to its connection with non-relativistic QED; see e.g., Ref. 8, Sec. 1.6. The description and analysis of the spin–boson model is technically more involved, and the model does not fit directly in the C^*-algebraic formalism of Refs. 1 and 5.

The revival of interest in the spin–fermion/boson model started with, Refs. 9–11 that have generated a large body of literature; an incomplete list of references is 8 and 12–27. We will comment on some of these works as we proceed. The techniques we will use draw on Refs. 10, 11, 24, and 28.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we introduce the spin–fermion model, briefly recall the main objects of study and state our results. In Sec. III, for the convenience of the reader, we recall the modular structure of the model, as well as the α-Liouvilleans introduced in Refs. 5 and 28 and their connection with the various entropic functionals. Section IV is devoted to the study of these α-Liouvilleans and closely follows the analysis in Refs. 10, 11, and 24. The proof of the main theorem is given in Sec. V.

© Author(s) 2026

II. THE SPIN–FERMION MODEL

A. Description of the model

The spin–fermion model is a concrete example of open quantum system with the structure described in Ref. 1, Sec. 1.1, where several independent reservoirs are coupled through a small system S. The model has a non-trivial small system part, described by a finite dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}_{\mathsf{S}}$ and Hamiltonian H_{S}. Its C^*-algebra of observables is $\mathcal{O}_{\mathsf{S}} = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathsf{S}})$, where $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ denotes the C^*-algebra of all bounded operators on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Its dynamics $\tau_{\mathsf{S}}^t = \mathrm{e}^{t\delta_{\mathsf{S}}}$ is generated by $\delta_{\mathsf{S}} = \mathrm{i}[H_{\mathsf{S}}, \cdot\,]$. Its reference state is $\omega_{\mathsf{S}}(A) = \mathrm{tr}(A)/\dim \mathcal{K}_{\mathsf{S}}$. This choice is made for convenience. None of our results depend on the choice of ω_{S} as long as $\omega_{\mathsf{S}} > 0$. Each reservoir subsystem R_j, $1 \le j \le M$, is a free Fermi gas with single particle Hilbert space $\mathfrak{h}_j$ and single particle Hamiltonian h_j. The algebra of observables of R_j is the CAR-algebra $\mathcal{O}_j = \mathrm{CAR}(\mathfrak{h}_j)$, the C^*-algebra generated by creation/annihilation operators $a_j^*(f)/a_j(f)$, $f \in \mathfrak{h}_j$, satisfying the canonical anti-commutation relations

$$\{a_j(f), a_j^*(g)\} = \langle f, g\rangle \mathbb{1}, \qquad \{a_j(f), a_j(g)\} = 0.$$

The Heisenberg dynamics on $\mathcal{O}_j$ is the group of Bogoliubov $*$-automorphisms associated to h_j, i.e., the C^*-dynamics defined by $\tau_j^t(a_j(f)) = a_j(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}th_j} f)$. We denote by δ_j its generator, $\tau_j^t = \mathrm{e}^{t\delta_j}$. The reference state ω_j on $\mathcal{O}_j$ is the gauge-invariant quasi-free state generated by the Fermi-Dirac density operator

$$T_j = \left(\mathbb{1} + \mathrm{e}^{\beta_j h_j}\right)^{-1},$$

where $\beta_j > 0$ is the inverse temperature. ω_j is the unique (τ_j, β_j)-KMS state on $\mathcal{O}_j$. The full reservoir system $\mathsf{R} = \mathsf{R}_1 + \cdots + \mathsf{R}_M$ is described by the quantum dynamical system $(\mathcal{O}_{\mathsf{R}}, \tau_{\mathsf{R}}, \omega_{\mathsf{R}})$ where

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathsf{R}} = \mathcal{O}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{O}_M,$$
$$\tau_{\mathsf{R}} = \tau_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \tau_M,$$
$$\omega_{\mathsf{R}} = \omega_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \omega_M.$$

The C^*-algebra and reference state of the joint system $\mathsf{S} + \mathsf{R}$ are $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathsf{S}} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathsf{R}}$ and $\omega = \omega_{\mathsf{S}} \otimes \omega_{\mathsf{R}}$. In the absence of interaction between S and R, its dynamics is $\tau_{\mathrm{fr}} = \tau_{\mathsf{S}} \otimes \tau_{\mathsf{R}}$. This free dynamics is generated by $\delta_{\mathrm{fr}} = \delta_{\mathsf{S}} + \delta_1 + \cdots + \delta_M$. Whenever the meaning is clear within the context, we write A for $A \otimes \mathbb{1}$ and $\mathbb{1} \otimes A$, δ_j for $\delta_j \otimes \mathrm{Id}$, $\mathrm{Id} \otimes \delta_j$, etc.

For each j, the interaction of S with R_j is described by

$$V_j = \sum_{k=1}^{m_j} Q_{j,k} \otimes R_{j,k} \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathsf{S}} \otimes \mathcal{O}_j, \tag{2.1}$$

where $Q_{j,k} \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathsf{S}}$ is self-adjoint and

$$R_{j,k} = \mathrm{i}^{n_{j,k}(n_{j,k}-1)/2} \varphi_j(f_{j,k,1}) \cdots \varphi_j(f_{j,k,n_{j,k}}), \tag{2.2}$$

with form factors $f_{j,k,m} \in \mathfrak{h}_j$, and where $\varphi_j(f) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(a_j(f) + a_j^*(f))$ are the Segal field operators. Following Ref. 4, we assume that:

(SFM0) For all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $j \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$ and $(k, m) \neq (k', m')$,

$$\langle f_{j,k,m}, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}th_j} f_{j,k',m'}\rangle = 0.$$

In particular, taking $t = 0$ in **(SFM0)** ensures that the $R_{j,k}$ are self-adjoint elements of $\mathcal{O}_j$.

Without further mentioning we will assume **(SFM0)** throughout the paper. The complete interaction is $V = \sum_j V_j$, and the interacting dynamics τ_λ is generated by

$$\delta = \delta_{\mathrm{fr}} + \lambda \mathrm{i}[V, \cdot\,],$$

where $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ is a coupling constant. The coupled system $\mathsf{S} + \mathsf{R}$ is described by the C^*-quantum dynamical system $(\mathcal{O}, \tau_\lambda, \omega)$. We denote by $\omega_t = \omega \circ \tau_\lambda^t$ the evolution of the state ω at time t.

Remark 2.1. In the simplest and most studied example of spin–fermion model one has $\mathcal{K}_{\mathsf{S}} = \mathbb{C}^2$, $H_{\mathsf{S}} = \sigma_z$ and for each reservoir R_j the interaction is of the form $V_j = \sigma_x \otimes \varphi(f_j)$, where σ_z and σ_x denote the usual Pauli matrices, see the example at the end of Sec. II D.

19 March 2026 15:06:40

© Author(s) 2026

As already mentioned, we are interested in the quantum versions of both Evans–Searles and Gallavotti–Cohen fluctuation theorems, a convenient reference in the spirit of the present work is the review, Ref. 29. The former refers to entropic fluctuations with respect to the initial (reference) state ω of the system while the latter refers to these fluctuations with respect to the Non-Equilibrium Steady State (NESS) ω_+ of the system. The next assumption postulates the existence of such an NESS of $(\mathcal{O}, \tau_\lambda, \omega)$.

(SFM1) For all $A \in \mathcal{O}$ the limit

$$\omega_+(A) = \lim_{t\uparrow\infty} \omega_t(A)$$

exists, and the restriction $\omega_{+\mathrm{S}}$ of the state ω_+ to $\mathcal{O}_\mathrm{S}$ is faithful, $\omega_{+\mathrm{S}} > 0$.

In Sec. II D we will describe sufficient conditions that guarantee the validity of **(SFM1)**.

A time reversal of the C^*-dynamics τ_λ is an anti-linear involutive $*$-automorphism Θ of $\mathcal{O}$ such that $\Theta \circ \tau_\lambda^t = \tau_\lambda^{-t} \circ \Theta$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. A state ν on $(\mathcal{O}, \tau_\lambda)$ is time-reversal invariant if τ_λ admits a time reversal Θ such that $\nu \circ \Theta(A) = \nu(A^*)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{O}$. In this case, we will say that the quantum dynamical system $(\mathcal{O}, \tau_\lambda, \nu)$ is time-reversal invariant (TRI).

If $(\mathcal{O}, \tau_\lambda, \omega)$ is TRI, then **(SFM1)** implies that for all $A \in \mathcal{O}$ the limit

$$\omega_-(A) = \lim_{t\to-\infty} \omega_t(A)$$

exists, and is given by $\omega_-(A) = \omega_+ \circ \Theta(A^*)$.

B. Entropy production and entropic functionals

Before introducing the three entropic functionals which are the main objects of our study, we briefly recall the mathematical framework needed to define these objects. The purpose here is to fix our notation, and we must refer the reader to Refs. 1 and 5 for a more detailed introduction and discussions.

Let $(\mathcal{H}, \pi, \Omega)$ be the GNS-representation of $\mathcal{O}$ induced by ω. The *enveloping algebra* $\mathfrak{M}$ is the smallest von Neumann subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ containing $\pi(\mathcal{O})$. A state on $\mathfrak{M}$ is *normal* whenever it is described by a density matrix on $\mathcal{H}$. The states on $\mathcal{O}$ obtained as restrictions of these normal states are called *ω-normal* and form the *folium* $\mathcal{N}$ of ω.

The dynamical system $(\mathcal{O}, \tau_\lambda, \omega)$ is *modular:* ω is a $(\varsigma_\omega, -1)$-KMS state where $\varsigma_\omega^t = \mathrm{e}^{t\delta_\omega}$, the *modular group* of ω, is the C^*-dynamics generated by

$$\delta_\omega = -\sum_{j=1}^{M} \beta_j \delta_j.$$

Since $\delta_j(\varphi_j(f)) = \varphi_j(\mathrm{i}h_j f)$, our next assumption ensures that $V_j \in \mathrm{Dom}(\delta_j)$, and hence $V \in \mathrm{Dom}(\delta_\omega)$.

(SFM2) $f_{j,k,m} \in \mathrm{Dom}(h_j)$ for all j, k, m.

The observable $\Phi_j = -\lambda\delta_j(V_j)$ is then well-defined, and describes the *energy flux* out of the jth reservoir. This brings us to the notion of *entropy production rate*, given by the observable[30,31]

$$\sigma = \lambda\delta_\omega(V) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} \beta_j \Phi_j,$$

satisfying the *entropy balance relation*, see e.g., Ref. 30,

$$\mathrm{Ent}(\omega_t|\omega) = -\int_0^t \omega_s(\sigma)\mathrm{d}s. \tag{2.3}$$

The left-hand side of this relation is Araki's *relative entropy*,[32,33] with the sign and ordering convention of Ref. 30. Since this quantity is non-positive, one has $\int_0^t \omega_s(\sigma)\mathrm{d}s \geq 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and hence $\omega_+(\sigma) \geq 0$.

Remark 2.2. Whenever Θ is a time reversal for τ_λ, irrespective of the coupling $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\Theta(V) = V$ and $\Theta(\sigma) = -\sigma$, so that $\omega_-(\sigma) \leq 0$. In particular, $\omega_+(\sigma) = 0$ if $\omega_- = \omega_+$.

For $\alpha \in \mathrm{i}\mathbb{R}$, the *Connes cocycle* of a pair (μ, ν) of faithful ω-normal states is

$$[D\mu : D\nu]_\alpha = \Delta_{\mu|\nu}^{\alpha} \Delta_\nu^{-\alpha},$$

19 March 2026 15:06:40

© Author(s) 2026

where Δ_ν, the *modular operator* of the state ν, and $\Delta_{\mu|\nu}$, the *relative modular operator* of the pair (μ,ν), are both non-negative operators on $\mathscr{H}$. Thus, $([D\mu : D\nu]_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathrm{i}\mathbb{R}}$ is a family of unitaries on $\mathscr{H}$ which, in fact, belong to $\mathfrak{M}$, see e.g., Ref. 34, Appendix B. We further have.

Proposition 2.3. Suppose **(SFM2)** *holds. Then, for all* $t\in\mathbb{R}$, $([D\omega_t : D\omega]_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathrm{i}\mathbb{R}}\subset\pi(\mathscr{O})$.

In what follows we write $[D\omega_t : D\omega]_\alpha$ for $\pi^{-1}([D\omega_t : D\omega]_\alpha)$. Similarly, whenever the meaning is clear within the context, we write A for $\pi(A)$. The proof of the above proposition relies on the identity

$$\log\Delta_{\omega_t|\omega} = \log\Delta_\omega + Q_t, \qquad Q_t = \int_0^t \tau_\lambda^{-s}(\sigma)\mathrm{d}s, \tag{2.4}$$

and the subsequent norm convergent expansion

$$[D\omega_t : D\omega]_\alpha = \mathbb{1} + \sum_{n\geq 1}\alpha^n \int_{0\leq\theta_1\leq\cdots\leq\theta_n\leq 1} \varsigma_\omega^{-\mathrm{i}\theta_1\alpha}(Q_t)\cdots\varsigma_\omega^{-\mathrm{i}\theta_n\alpha}(Q_t)\mathrm{d}\theta_1\cdots\mathrm{d}\theta_n. \tag{2.5}$$

For more details about Relations (2.4) and (2.5), we refer the reader to Ref. 6, Sec. 2, and in particular Lemma 2.4 and Eq. (2.13) in this reference.

We can now introduce the three entropic functionals considered in Ref. 5. We only briefly recall their definition and refer the reader to Refs. 1 and 5 for an in depth discussion.

1. Two-time measurement entropy production (2TMEP)

The following result was established in Ref. 1, Theorem 1.3. Note that Assumption (**Reg2**) of Ref. 1 is guaranteed by Proposition 2.3. For any $\nu\in\mathscr{N}$, $t\in\mathbb{R}$, and $\alpha\in\mathrm{i}\mathbb{R}$, the limit

$$\mathfrak{F}_{\nu,t}^{\mathrm{2tm}}(\alpha) = \lim_{R\to\infty}\frac{1}{R}\int_0^R \nu\circ\varsigma_\omega^\theta([D\omega_{-t} : D\omega]_\alpha)\mathrm{d}\theta$$

exists, and there is a unique Borel probability measure $Q_{\nu,t}^{\mathrm{2tm}}$ on $\mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\mathfrak{F}_{\nu,t}^{\mathrm{2tm}}(\alpha) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha s}\mathrm{d}Q_{\nu,t}^{\mathrm{2tm}}(s). \tag{2.6}$$

Moreover, one also has that

$$\mathfrak{F}_{\nu,t}^{\mathrm{2tm}}(\alpha) = \lim_{R\to\infty}\frac{1}{R}\int_0^R \nu\circ\varsigma_\omega^\theta\Big([D\omega_{-t} : D\omega]_{\frac{\bar\alpha}{2}}^*[D\omega_{-t} : D\omega]_{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\Big)\mathrm{d}\theta.$$

As discussed in Refs. 1 and 5, the family $\big(Q_{\nu,t}^{\mathrm{2tm}}\big)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ describes the statistics of a two-time measurement of the entropy produced during a time period of length t in the system $(\mathscr{O},\tau_\lambda,\omega)$, when the latter is in the state ν at the time of the first measurement. In Ref. 1 it was also shown that, if each reservoir system $(\mathscr{O}_j,\tau_j,\omega_j)$ is ergodic, (this holds if the one-particle Hamiltonian h_j has purely absolutely continuous spectrum, see Ref. 2 for a pedagogical discussion of this topic) then the map

$$\mathscr{N}\ni\nu\mapsto Q_{\nu,t}\in\mathscr{P}(\mathbb{R}),$$

where $\mathscr{P}(\mathbb{R})$ denotes the set of all Borel probability measures on $\mathbb{R}$ equipped with the weak topology, extends by continuity to the set $\mathscr{S}_{\mathscr{O}}$ of all states on $\mathscr{O}$, equipped with the weak* topology. This defines $Q_{\nu,t}$, hence $\mathfrak{F}_{\nu,t}^{\mathrm{2tm}}$ by (2.6), for all $\nu\in\mathscr{S}_{\mathscr{O}}$. We will be particularly interested in the case $\nu=\omega_+$.

2. Entropic ancilla state tomography (EAST)

For $\nu\in\mathscr{S}_{\mathscr{O}}$, $t\in\mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha\in\mathrm{i}\mathbb{R}$, we set

$$\mathfrak{F}_{\nu,t}^{\mathrm{ancilla}}(\alpha) = \nu\Big([D\omega_{-t} : D\omega]_{\frac{\bar\alpha}{2}}^*[D\omega_{-t} : D\omega]_{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\Big).$$

EAST is described by the family of functionals $\big(\mathfrak{F}_{\nu,t}^{\mathrm{ancilla}}\big)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$. When $\nu=\omega$, and up to an irrelevant prefactor, $\mathfrak{F}_{\omega,t}^{\mathrm{ancilla}}(\alpha)$ provides an experimental implementation of $\mathfrak{F}_{\omega,t}^{\mathrm{2tm}}(\alpha)$ through coupling and specific indirect projective measurements on an ancilla, a procedure called ancilla state tomography, see Ref. 5, Sec. 2.4 and references therein.

19 March 2026 15:06:40

© Author(s) 2026

3. Quantum phase space contraction (QPSC)

For $\nu \in \mathscr{S}_{\mathcal{O}}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha \in \mathrm{i}\mathbb{R}$, we set

$$\mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{qpsc}}_{\nu,t}(\alpha) = \nu([D\omega_{-t} : D\omega]_\alpha).$$

QPSC is described by the family of functionals $\left(\mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{qpsc}}_{\nu,t}\right)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ and provides another natural route to the quantization of the classical entropic functionals (Ref. 5, Sec. 2.7).

Note that when $\nu = \omega$ the three families of functionals coincide,

$$\mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{2tm}}_{\omega,t} = \mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{ancilla}}_{\omega,t} = \mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{qpsc}}_{\omega,t}, \tag{2.7}$$

and that

$$\partial_\alpha \mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{2tm}}_{\omega,t}(\alpha)\big|_{\alpha=0} = -\int_{\mathbb{R}} s\, \mathrm{d}Q^{\mathrm{2tm}}_{\omega,t}(s) = \mathrm{Ent}(\omega_t|\omega). \tag{2.8}$$

The equalities (2.7) are however broken if ω is replaced by some other state $\nu \in \mathscr{S}_{\mathcal{O}}$.

C. Fluctuation theorems and the principle of regular entropic fluctuations

We first strengthen **(SFM2)** to

(SFM3) $f_{j,k,m} \in \mathrm{Dom}\left(\mathrm{e}^{a|h_j|}\right)$ for all $a > 0$ and all j, k, m.

Since $\varsigma^\theta_\omega(\varphi_j(f)) = \varphi\left(\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\theta\beta_j h_j} f\right)$, Assumption **(SFM3)** guarantees that V is an entire element for the modular group ς_ω, so that the regularity assumption (**AnV(ϑ)**) of Ref. 5 is satisfied for any $\vartheta > 0$.

Our next assumption ensures that all the reservoir subsystems $(\mathcal{O}_j, \tau_j, \omega_j)$ are ergodic. As a consequence, the probability distribution $Q^{\mathrm{2tm}}_{\omega_+,t}$ and entropic functional $\mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{2tm}}_{\omega_+,t}$ are well-defined.

(**SFM4**) h_j has purely absolutely continuous spectrum for all j.

The last two assumptions have the following consequence.

Theorem 2.4. *Suppose that **(SFM1)**, **(SFM3)** and (**SFM4**) hold. Then, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$:*

(1) *The map*

$$\mathrm{i}\mathbb{R} \ni \alpha \mapsto [D\omega_t : D\omega]_\alpha \in \mathcal{O}$$

extends to an entire analytic function.

(2) *The maps*

$$\alpha \mapsto \mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{2tm}}_{\omega,t}(\alpha),$$
$$\alpha \mapsto \mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{2tm}}_{\omega_+,t}(\alpha),$$
$$\alpha \mapsto \mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{ancilla}}_{\omega_+,t}(\alpha),$$
$$\alpha \mapsto \mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{qpsc}}_{\omega_+,t}(\alpha),$$

defined for $\alpha \in \mathrm{i}\mathbb{R}$, extend to entire analytic functions. Moreover, for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$\mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{2tm}}_{\omega,t}(\alpha) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha s} \mathrm{d}Q^{\mathrm{2tm}}_{\omega,t}(s), \qquad \mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{2tm}}_{\omega_+,t}(\alpha) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha s} \mathrm{d}Q^{\mathrm{2tm}}_{\omega_+,t}(s).$$

(3) *The measures $Q^{\mathrm{2tm}}_{\omega,t}$ and $Q^{\mathrm{2tm}}_{\omega_+,t}$ are equivalent* (they have the same sets of measure zero), *and for some constants $k, K > 0$ and all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$k \le \frac{\mathrm{d}Q^{\mathrm{2tm}}_{\omega_+,t}}{\mathrm{d}Q^{\mathrm{2tm}}_{\omega,t}} \le K.$$

Proof. Part (1) follows from **(SFM3)** and Ref. 5, Proposition 2.11 while Part (2) is a consequence of **(SFM1)** + **(SFM3)**, Ref. 5, Proposition 3.2 and a well known property of Laplace transforms. Finally, Part (3) follows from (**SFM4**) and Ref. 1, Theorem 1.6. □

19 March 2026 15:06:40

© Author(s) 2026

Assuming that **(SFM1)**–(**SFM4**) hold, we are now ready to introduce the principle of regular entropic fluctuations (abbreviated the PREF) of Ref. 5. There, the PREF was introduced in several forms: weak, strong, and *strong + qpsc*. Here we will deal only with the latest (and strongest) form, and therefore we drop its qualification.

Definition 2.5. Let $I =]\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+[$ be an open interval containing 0. We say that $(\mathscr{O}, \tau_\lambda, \omega)$ satisfies the PREF on the interval I if, for all $\alpha \in I$, the limits

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{F}_{\omega}^{2\mathrm{tm}}(\alpha) &= \lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathfrak{F}_{\omega,t}^{2\mathrm{tm}}(\alpha), \\ \boldsymbol{F}_{\omega_+}^{2\mathrm{tm}}(\alpha) &= \lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathfrak{F}_{\omega_+,t}^{2\mathrm{tm}}(\alpha), \\ \boldsymbol{F}_{\omega_+}^{\mathrm{ancilla}}(\alpha) &= \lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathfrak{F}_{\omega_+,t}^{\mathrm{ancilla}}(\alpha), \\ \boldsymbol{F}_{\omega_+}^{\mathrm{qpsc}}(\alpha) &= \lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathfrak{F}_{\omega_+,t}^{\mathrm{qpsc}}(\alpha) \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

exist, and define differentiable functions on I, satisfying

$$\boldsymbol{F}_{\omega}^{2\mathrm{tm}} = \boldsymbol{F}_{\omega_+}^{2\mathrm{tm}} = \boldsymbol{F}_{\omega_+}^{\mathrm{ancilla}} = \boldsymbol{F}_{\omega_+}^{\mathrm{qpsc}}. \tag{2.10}$$

We denote by $\boldsymbol{F}$ the common function in (2.10).

Remark 2.6. While $\mathfrak{F}_{\omega,t}^{2\mathrm{tm}}(\alpha)$, $\mathfrak{F}_{\omega_+,t}^{2\mathrm{tm}}(\alpha)$ and $\mathfrak{F}_{\omega_+,t}^{\mathrm{ancilla}}(\alpha)$ are obviously positive for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, the quantity $\mathfrak{F}_{\omega_+,t}^{\mathrm{qpsc}}(\alpha)$ is *a priori* complex. The principal branch of the logarithm should be understood in the definition of $\boldsymbol{F}_{\omega_+}^{\mathrm{qpsc}}$. This makes $\log \mathfrak{F}_{\omega_+,t}^{\mathrm{qpsc}}(\alpha)$ well-defined for λ small enough (this is not restrictive since all our results will be perturbative in λ) and t large, see (5.8) and Remark 5.6.

Definition 2.5 has several aspects. By the Gärtner-Ellis theorem, the existence and differentiability of the first limit in (2.9) give that the family of measures $\left(Q_{\omega,t}^{2\mathrm{tm}}(t\,\cdot\,)\right)_{t>0} \subset \mathscr{P}(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies a large deviation principle on the interval $]a, b[$, where $]a, b[= \mathbb{R}$ if $I = \mathbb{R}$, and otherwise

$$a = \lim_{\alpha\downarrow\vartheta_-} \partial_\alpha \boldsymbol{F}_{\omega}^{2\mathrm{tm}}(\alpha), \qquad b = \lim_{\alpha\uparrow\vartheta_+} \partial_\alpha \boldsymbol{F}_{\omega}^{2\mathrm{tm}}(\alpha),$$

with the rate function

$$\mathbb{I}(s) = \sup_{-\alpha\in I} (s\alpha - \boldsymbol{F}_{\omega}^{2\mathrm{tm}}(-\alpha)).$$

This is the quantum Evans–Searles fluctuation theorem. When the system is TRI one moreover has $\mathfrak{F}_{\omega,t}^{2\mathrm{tm}}(\alpha) = \mathfrak{F}_{\omega,t}^{2\mathrm{tm}}(1-\alpha)$ for all real α and all t, see Ref. 1, Theorem 1.4. This leads to the celebrated symmetry

$$\mathbb{I}(-s) = s + \mathbb{I}(s), \tag{2.11}$$

called the quantum Evans–Searles fluctuation relation, that holds for $|s| < \min\{-a, b\}$, see Ref. 5, Proposition 2.6.

The existence and differentiability of the second limit in (2.9) give that $\left(Q_{\omega_+,t}^{2\mathrm{tm}}(t\,\cdot\,)\right)_{t>0} \subset \mathscr{P}(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies a large deviation principle on the interval $]a_+, b_+[$, where $]a_+, b_+[= \mathbb{R}$ if $I = \mathbb{R}$, and otherwise

$$a_+ = \lim_{\alpha\downarrow\vartheta_-} \partial_\alpha \boldsymbol{F}_{\omega_+}^{2\mathrm{tm}}(\alpha), \qquad b_+ = \lim_{\alpha\uparrow\vartheta_+} \partial_\alpha \boldsymbol{F}_{\omega_+}^{2\mathrm{tm}}(\alpha),$$

with the rate function

$$\mathbb{I}_+(s) = \sup_{-\alpha\in I} (s\alpha - \boldsymbol{F}_{\omega_+}^{2\mathrm{tm}}(-\alpha)).$$

This is the quantum Gallavotti–Cohen fluctuation theorem. Theorem 2.4(3) identifies these two fluctuation theorems: $\boldsymbol{F}_{\omega_+}^{2\mathrm{tm}} = \boldsymbol{F}_{\omega}^{2\mathrm{tm}}$, $a = a_+$, $b = b_+$, $\mathbb{I} = \mathbb{I}_+$. If the system is TRI, the symmetry $\mathbb{I}_+(-s) = s + \mathbb{I}_+(s)$ therefore also holds. This is the quantum Gallavotti–Cohen fluctuation relation.

The other equalities in (2.10) link the 2TMEP with EAST and QPSC. For a more thorough discussion about the PREF we refer the reader to Ref. 5 (see in particular Sec. 2.8).

19 March 2026 15:06:40

© Author(s) 2026

D. Main results

We start by introducing our final assumptions. The first two are linked to the complex spectral deformation of Liouvilleans in the so-called "glued" Araki-Wyss GNS representation of $\mathcal{O}_j$ induced by ω_j and originally introduced in Refs. 10, 11, and 24. The third assumption is the Fermi golden rule condition which ensures that the small system S is effectively coupled to the reservoirs. The fourth and last assumption will ensure time-reversal invariance of the coupled system when needed.

(SFM5) There exists a Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}$ such that, for $1 \le j \le M$, $\mathfrak{h}_j = L^2(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathrm{d}s) \otimes \mathfrak{H}$ and h_j is the operator of multiplication by the variable $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

The assumption that $\mathfrak{H}_j = \mathfrak{H}$ for all j is made only for notational convenience. The other parts of **(SFM5)** will play an essential role in our analysis. In what follows we will often write $\mathfrak{h}$ for $\mathfrak{h}_j$ and h for h_j. Note that **(SFM5)** implies (**SFM4**).

We assume that $\mathcal{K}_\mathsf{S}$ and $\mathfrak{H}$ are equipped with complex conjugations which we denote by $\overline{\,\cdot\,}$. These anti-linear involutions extend naturally to $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}_\mathsf{S})$, $\mathfrak{h}$, $\Gamma_-(\mathfrak{h})$ and their tensor products. We will also denote by $\overline{\,\cdot\,}$ these extensions. The assumption that this conjugation is the same for all reservoirs is only for notational convenience, and one could choose a different conjugation in each reservoir. To each $f \in \mathfrak{h}$ we associate the function $\widetilde{f} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathrm{d}s) \otimes \mathfrak{H}$ defined as

$$\widetilde{f}(s) = \begin{cases} f(s) & \text{if } s \ge 0, \\ \overline{f(|s|)} & \text{if } s < 0. \end{cases} \tag{2.12}$$

Let $\mathfrak{I}(r) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |\operatorname{Im} z| < r\}$ and denote by $H^2(r)$ the Hardy class of all analytic functions $f : \mathfrak{I}(r) \to \mathfrak{H}$ such that

$$\|f\|^2_{H^2(r)} = \sup_{|\theta|<r} \int_\mathbb{R} \|f(s + \mathrm{i}\theta)\|^2_\mathfrak{H} \mathrm{d}s < \infty.$$

Our next regularity assumption is

(SFM6) For all $r > 0$ and all $j, k, m, \widetilde{f}_{j,k,m} \in H^2(r)$. In addition, for all $r > 0$ and all $a > 0$,

$$\sup_{|\theta|<r} \int_\mathbb{R} \mathrm{e}^{a|s|} \|\widetilde{f}_{j,k,m}(s + \mathrm{i}\theta)\|^2_\mathfrak{H} \mathrm{d}s < \infty.$$

Note in particular that **(SFM6)** implies **(SFM3)**, and hence **(SFM2)**.

We now turn to the Fermi golden rule condition. Invoking **(SFM0)**, the fermionic Wick theorem gives

$$\omega_j\big(R_{j,k}\tau_j^t(R_{j,l})\big) = \delta_{kl} \prod_{m=1}^{n_{j,k}} \omega_j\Big(\varphi_j\big(f_{j,k,m}\big)\varphi_j\Big(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}th_j} f_{j,k,m}\Big)\Big). \tag{2.13}$$

In Sec. IV B 2 we shall see that Assumptions **(SFM5)**–**(SFM6)** imply that, for any $0 \le a < \pi/\beta_j$,

$$\mathcal{C}_{j,k,m}(t) = \omega_j\Big(\varphi_j\big(f_{j,k,m}\big)\varphi_j\Big(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}th_j} f_{j,k,m}\Big)\Big) = O\Big(\mathrm{e}^{-a|t|}\Big),$$

as $|t| \to \infty$. Note also, see e.g., Refs. 4 and 35, that

$$c_{j,k}(u) = \int_\mathbb{R} \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}ut} \omega_j\big(R_{j,k}\tau_j^t(R_{j,k})\big)\, \mathrm{d}t \ge 0$$

for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$. Our Fermi golden rule assumption is

(SFM7)

(a) $c_{j,k}(u) > 0$ for all $u \in \{E' - E \mid E, E' \in \mathrm{sp}(H_\mathsf{S})\}$ and all j, k. ($\mathrm{sp}(A)$ denotes the spectrum of the operator A.)

(b) For all $j \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$, ($\mathcal{A}'$ denotes the commutant of the set $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}_\mathsf{S})$.)

$$\{Q_{j,k} \mid 1 \le k \le m_j\}' \cap \{H_\mathsf{S}\}' = \mathbb{C}\mathbb{1}.$$

19 March 2026 15:06:40

© Author(s) 2026

Remark 2.7. **(SFM7)**(a) is usually formulated in terms of the non-negative matrices $h_j(u) = [h_j^{(kl)}(u)]$ where

$$h_j^{(kl)}(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}ut} \omega_j(R_{j,k}\tau_j^t(R_{j,l}))\mathrm{d}t,$$

and requires $h_j(u) > 0$ for all $u \in \{E' - E \mid E, E' \in \mathrm{sp}(H_{\mathsf{S}})\}$ and all j. **(SFM0)** however implies that $h_j(u)$ is diagonal, see (2.13), hence $h_j(u) > 0$ indeed reduces to $c_{j,k}(u) > 0$ for all k.

Note that the spin–fermion model may not be time-reversal invariant. The next assumption ensures it is.

(SFM8) The complex conjugation of $\mathfrak{H}$ is such that $\overline{f}_{j,k,m} = f_{j,k,m}$ for all j, k, m. Moreover, the complex conjugation on $\mathscr{K}_{\mathsf{S}}$ is such that H_{S} and $\mathrm{i}^{n_{j,k}(n_{j,k}-1)/2}Q_{j,k}$ are real with respect to the induced complex conjugation on $\mathscr{B}(\mathscr{K}_{\mathsf{S}})$.

Our main result is

Theorem 2.8. *Suppose that* ***(SFM5)–(SFM7)*** *hold. Then:*

(1) *There exists $\Lambda > 0$ such that* ***(SFM1)*** *holds for $0 < |\lambda| < \Lambda$.*
(2) *For any $\vartheta > 0$ there exists $\Lambda > 0$ such that the PREF holds on $]-\vartheta, 1 + \vartheta[$ for $0 < |\lambda| < \Lambda$. Moreover, the function*

$$]-\vartheta, 1 + \vartheta[\ni \alpha \mapsto \boldsymbol{F}(\alpha)$$

is real-analytic. It is identically vanishing on $]-\vartheta, 1 + \vartheta[$ if $\beta_1 = \cdots = \beta_M$, and otherwise strictly convex on this interval.
(3) *If the system is TRI, in particular if* ***(SFM8)*** *holds, it moreover satisfies the symmetry*

$$\boldsymbol{F}(\alpha) = \boldsymbol{F}(1 - \alpha).$$

Part (1) was established in Ref. 24 and is stated here for completeness. We will prove Part (2) using the techniques developed in Refs. 10, 11, and 24 and following the axiomatic quantum transfer operators resonance scheme of Ref. 5; see also Sec. V G. As already mentioned, Part (3) follows readily from time-reversal invariance. It is an equivalent formulation of (2.11), and for this reason is also often called fluctuation relation.

Remark 2.9.

(1) It follows from (2.6) that the function $\boldsymbol{F}$ is real-valued and convex on $]-\vartheta, 1 + \vartheta[$. It satisfies $\boldsymbol{F}(0) = \boldsymbol{F}(1) = 0$ and, due to convexity, $\boldsymbol{F}(\alpha) \le 0$ for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and $\boldsymbol{F}(\alpha) \ge 0$ for $\alpha \notin [0, 1]$. The fact that $\boldsymbol{F}$ is either identically vanishing or is strictly convex on $]-\vartheta, 1 + \vartheta[$ then follows from its analyticity. Finally, $\boldsymbol{F}$ is strictly convex iff $\omega_+(\sigma) > 0$, see Sec. V E.
(2) Although the interval $]-\vartheta, 1 + \vartheta[$ on which the PREF holds can be taken arbitrarily large, our result is not uniform in the sense that Λ has to be taken smaller and smaller as θ grows. This restriction resembles the high temperature one that is present in Ref. 24.
(3) For a discussion of the dependence of Λ on the β_j's see Refs. 23 and 24.

Example: The simplest spin–fermion model

In its simplest version the spin–fermion model S is a two-level system, i.e., $\mathscr{K}_{\mathsf{S}} = \mathbb{C}^2$, with Hamiltonian $H_{\mathsf{S}} = \sigma_z$. The interaction between S and each reservoir R_j is of the form

$$V_j = \sigma_x \otimes \varphi_j(f_j),$$

i.e., in (2.1)–(2.2) and for all j, k we have $m_j = n_{j,k} = 1$, $Q_{j,k} = \sigma_x$, and we assume that the form factors f_j satisfy **(SFM6)** and **(SFM8)**. The operators H_{S} and $Q_{j,k} = \sigma_x$ are real with respect to the usual conjugation on $M_2(\mathbb{C})$ so that the system is TRI. Finally, **(SFM7)** reduces to $\|\tilde{f}_j(2)\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 > 0$ for all j.

Under these assumptions Theorem 2.8 holds true. Although it does not appear in our notation, $\boldsymbol{F}$ also depends on λ, and we have

$$\boldsymbol{F}(\alpha) = \lambda^2 \boldsymbol{F}_2(\alpha) + O(\lambda^3)$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{F}_2(\alpha) = -\frac{\pi}{2}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{M} \|\tilde{f}_j(2)\|_{\mathfrak{H}_j}^2 - \sqrt{\sum_{j,k=1}^{M}\left(\tanh(\beta_j)\tanh(\beta_k) + \frac{\cosh((\beta_j - \beta_k)(1 - 2\alpha))}{\cosh(\beta_j)\cosh(\beta_k)}\right)\|\tilde{f}_j(2)\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 \|\tilde{f}_k(2)\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2}\right). \tag{2.14}$$

19 March 2026 15:06:40

© Author(s) 2026

III. QUANTUM TRANSFER OPERATORS APPROACH TO THE PREF

As mentioned at the end of Sec. II D, the Proof of Theorem 2.8 is based on the study of complex resonances of a suitable family of non self-adjoint operators called α-Liouvilleans. These operators are generators of one-parameter groups of so-called quantum transfer operators.[5] The α-Liouvilleans are defined on the GNS Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}$ and are a generalization of the C-Liouvillean introduced in Ref. 24 in the study of NESS. In this section we briefly recall the "glued" Araki–Wyss GNS representation of the free Fermi gas, introduce the α-Liouvilleans of Ref. 5 in the context of the spin–fermion model, and recall their connection with the entropic functionals.

A. The "glued" Araki–Wyss representation

The original Araki–Wyss representation was introduced in Ref. 36. For pedagogical introductions to the topic we refer to Refs. 28 and 37–39. The "glued" form of this representation was introduced in Ref. 24 and is an essential step in our spectral approach.

Let $\mathfrak{h} = L^2(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathrm{d}s) \otimes \mathfrak{H}$, h be the operator of multiplication by the variable $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$ [recall **(SFM5)**], and let ω be the quasi-free state on $\mathrm{CAR}(\mathfrak{h})$ generated by

$$T = \left(\mathbb{1} + \mathrm{e}^{\beta h}\right)^{-1}$$

where $\beta > 0$. The C^*-dynamics τ is the group of Bogoliubov $*$-automorphisms induced by h. We recall that ω is the unique (τ, β)-KMS state on $\mathrm{CAR}(\mathfrak{h})$.

Setting $\widetilde{\mathfrak{h}} = L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathrm{d}s) \otimes \mathfrak{H}$, to any $f \in \mathfrak{h}$ we associate the pair $(f_\beta, f_\beta^\#) \in \widetilde{\mathfrak{h}} \times \widetilde{\mathfrak{h}}$ given by

$$f_\beta(s) = \left(\mathrm{e}^{-\beta s} + 1\right)^{-1/2} \widetilde{f}(s), \qquad f_\beta^\#(s) = \mathrm{i}\left(\mathrm{e}^{\beta s} + 1\right)^{-1/2} \widetilde{f}(s), \tag{3.1}$$

where $\tilde{f}$ is defined in (2.12). Note that $f_\beta^\#(s) = \mathrm{i}\overline{f_\beta(-s)}$. The "glued" Araki–Wyss representation of $\mathrm{CAR}(\mathfrak{h})$ induced by ω is the triple $(\mathscr{H}, \pi, \Omega)$, where $\mathscr{H} = \Gamma_-(\widetilde{\mathfrak{h}})$ is the antisymmetric Fock space over $\widetilde{\mathfrak{h}}$, $\Omega \in \mathscr{H}$ is the Fock vacuum vector, and

$$\pi(\varphi(f)) = \widetilde{\varphi}(f_\beta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\widetilde{a}^*(f_\beta) + \widetilde{a}(f_\beta)\right),$$

$\widetilde{a}^* / \widetilde{a}$ denoting the fermionic creation/annihilation operator, and $\widetilde{\varphi}$ the associated Segal field operator on the Fock space $\Gamma_-(\tilde{\mathfrak{h}})$.

In this representation the standard Liouvillean of τ is

$$\mathscr{L} = \mathrm{d}\Gamma(s),$$

where, with a slight abuse of notation, s denotes the operator of multiplication by s on $\widetilde{\mathfrak{h}}$. The modular operator of the state ω is

$$\Delta_\omega = \mathrm{e}^{-\beta\mathscr{L}} = \Gamma(\mathrm{e}^{-\beta s}),$$

and the modular group acts as

$$\varsigma_\omega^\theta(\widetilde{\varphi}(f_\beta)) = \Delta_\omega^{\mathrm{i}\theta} \widetilde{\varphi}(f_\beta) \Delta_\omega^{-\mathrm{i}\theta} = \widetilde{\varphi}(\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\theta\beta s} f_\beta).$$

Finally, the modular conjugation J is such that

$$J \widetilde{\varphi}(f_\beta) J = \mathrm{i}\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\pi N} \widetilde{\varphi}(f_\beta^\#),$$

where $N = \mathrm{d}\Gamma(\mathbb{1})$ is the number operator on $\Gamma_-(\widetilde{\mathfrak{h}})$.

We finish with a remark regarding the thermal factors in (3.1).

Remark 3.1. The maps

$$\mathbb{R} \ni s \mapsto \left(\mathrm{e}^{\pm\beta s} + 1\right)^{-1/2}$$

have analytic extension to the strip $|\mathrm{Im}\, z| < \pi/\beta$ and for any $0 < r < \pi/\beta$,

$$\sup_{|\mathrm{Im}\, z| \le r} \left| \left(\mathrm{e}^{\pm\beta z} + 1\right)^{-1/2} \right| < \infty. \tag{3.2}$$

This basic fact will play an important role in what follows.

19 March 2026 15:06:40

© Author(s) 2026

B. The modular structure of the spin–fermion model

For computational purposes it is convenient to work in the following GNS-representation $(\mathscr{H}_{\mathrm{S}}, \pi_{\mathrm{S}}, \Omega_{\mathrm{S}})$ of the small system algebra $\mathscr{O}_{\mathrm{S}} = \mathscr{B}(\mathscr{K}_{\mathrm{S}})$ associated to the faithful state ω_{S}. The GNS Hilbert space is $\mathscr{H}_{\mathrm{S}} = \mathscr{O}_{\mathrm{S}}$, equipped with the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product $\langle X, Y\rangle = \mathrm{tr}(X^* Y)$. The representation is the left multiplication, $\pi_{\mathrm{S}}(A)X = AX$, and the cyclic vector is $\Omega_{\mathrm{S}} = \omega_{\mathrm{S}}^{1/2} = \dim(\mathscr{K}_{\mathrm{S}})^{-1/2}\mathbb{1}$. The modular operator of ω_{S} is trivial, $\Delta_{\omega_{\mathrm{S}}} X = X$, the modular conjugation is $J_{\mathrm{S}} X = X^*$ and the standard Liouvillean of τ_{S} is $\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{S}} X = [H_{\mathrm{S}}, X]$. Note in particular that $\mathrm{sp}(\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{S}}) = \{E - E' \mid E, E' \in \mathrm{sp}(H_{\mathrm{S}})\}$.

For each $1 \le j \le M$ we denote by $(\mathscr{H}_j, \pi_j, \Omega_j)$ the "glued" Araki–Wyss representation of $\mathscr{O}_j$ induced by ω_j, as described in Sec. III A. We also denote by $\widetilde{\varphi}_j$, $\mathscr{L}_j$, Δ_j and J_j the associated field operator, standard Liouvillean, modular operator and conjugation. The GNS representation of the C^*-algebra $\mathscr{O}$ of the spin–fermion model induced by the reference state ω is

$$\mathscr{H} = \mathscr{H}_{\mathrm{S}} \otimes \mathscr{H}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathscr{H}_M,$$
$$\pi = \pi_{\mathrm{S}} \otimes \pi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_M,$$
$$\Omega = \Omega_{\mathrm{S}} \otimes \Omega_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \Omega_M.$$

We adopt the shorthand $\Omega_{\mathrm{R}} = \Omega_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \Omega_M$. The modular operator and modular conjugation of the state ω are

$$\Delta_\omega = \Delta_{\omega_{\mathrm{S}}} \otimes \Delta_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \Delta_M, \qquad J = J_{\mathrm{S}} \otimes J_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes J_M,$$

and the modular group acts as

$$\varsigma_\omega^\theta(\pi(A \otimes \varphi(f_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \varphi(f_M))) = \pi_{\mathrm{S}}(A) \otimes \widetilde{\varphi}_1\left(\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\theta\beta_1 s} f_{1,\beta_1}\right) \otimes \cdots \otimes \widetilde{\varphi}_M\left(\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\theta\beta_M s} f_{M,\beta_M}\right).$$

The standard Liouvillean of the free dynamics τ_{fr} is

$$\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}} = \mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{S}} + \mathscr{L}_1 + \cdots + \mathscr{L}_M,$$

and the standard Liouvillean of the interacting dynamics τ_λ is

$$\mathscr{L}_\lambda = \mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}} + \lambda\pi(V) - \lambda J\pi(V)J.$$

Note that $\pi(V)$ is a sum of terms of the form

$$\mathrm{i}^{n_{j,k}(n_{j,k}-1)/2}\pi_{\mathrm{S}}(Q_{j,k}) \otimes \widetilde{\varphi}_j\left(f_{j,k,1,\beta_j}\right)\cdots\widetilde{\varphi}_j\left(f_{j,k,n_{j,k},\beta_j}\right)$$

corresponding to (2.1) and (2.2). Similarly $J\pi(V)J$ is a sum of terms of the form

$$\mathrm{i}^{n_{j,k}(n_{j,k}-1)/2} J_{\mathrm{S}}\pi_{\mathrm{S}}(Q_{j,k})J_{\mathrm{S}} \otimes \left[\mathrm{i}\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\pi N_j}\widetilde{\varphi}_j\left(f^{\#}_{j,k,1,\beta_j}\right)\right]\cdots\left[\mathrm{i}\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\pi N_j}\widetilde{\varphi}_j\left(f^{\#}_{j,k,n_{j,k},\beta_j}\right)\right], \tag{3.3}$$

where $J_{\mathrm{S}}\pi_{\mathrm{S}}(A)J_{\mathrm{S}}X = XA^*$, and N_j is the number operator on $\mathscr{H}_j$. We will denote by $\bar{\cdot}$ the complex conjugation on $\mathscr{H}$ naturally associated to the ones on $\mathscr{K}_{\mathrm{S}}$ and $\mathfrak{H}$.

C. Two families of Liouvilleans

Central to the Proof of Theorem 2.8 is the following family of α-Liouvilleans $\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}$ of Ref. 5, first introduced in Ref. 28. For $\alpha \in \mathrm{i}\mathbb{R}$ they are given by

$$\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha} = \mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}} + \lambda\left(\pi(V) - J\varsigma_\omega^{-\mathrm{i}\bar{\alpha}}(\pi(V))J\right).$$

Note that, in analogy with (3.3),

$$J\varsigma_\omega^{-\mathrm{i}\bar{\alpha}}(\pi(V))J \tag{3.4}$$

is a sum of terms of the form

$$\mathrm{i}^{n_{j,k}(n_{j,k}-1)/2} J_{\mathrm{S}}\pi_{\mathrm{S}}(Q_{j,k})J_{\mathrm{S}} \otimes \left[\mathrm{i}\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\pi N_j}\widetilde{\varphi}_j\left(\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\beta_j s} f^{\#}_{j,k,1,\beta_j}\right)\right]\cdots\left[\mathrm{i}\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\pi N_j}\widetilde{\varphi}_j\left(\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\beta_j s} f^{\#}_{j,k,n_{j,k},\beta_j}\right)\right]. \tag{3.5}$$

Under Assumption **(SFM6)**, $\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}$ is defined for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ by analytic continuation of (3.4) in the variable α. Note that, due to the linearity/anti-linearity of the map $\widetilde{\mathfrak{h}} \ni f \mapsto \widetilde{a}_j^*(f)/\widetilde{a}_j(f) \in \pi_j(\mathscr{O}_j)$, the analytic continuation of the factor $\widetilde{\varphi}_j\left(\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\beta_j s} f^{\#}_{j,k,m,\beta_j}\right)$ in the product (3.5) is given, for arbitrary $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, by

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\widetilde{a}_j\left(\mathrm{e}^{\bar{\alpha}\beta_j s} f^{\#}_{j,k,m,\beta_j}\right) + \widetilde{a}_j^*\left(\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\beta_j s} f^{\#}_{j,k,m,\beta_j}\right)\right).$$

© Author(s) 2026

19 March 2026 15:06:40

In what follows, for $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, we set

$$W_j(\alpha) = \pi(V_j) - J\varsigma_\omega^{-\mathrm{i}\bar{\alpha}}(\pi(V_j))J, \qquad W(\alpha) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} W_j(\alpha).$$

For arbitrary $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, the α-Liouvillean $\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}$ generates a bounded, strongly continuous one-parameter group $\left(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}}\right)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ on $\mathscr{H}$, unitary for $\alpha \in \mathrm{i}\mathbb{R}$. These so-called quantum transfer operators $\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}}$ will play a particular role in the analysis of the 2TMEP, EAST and QPSC functionals.

We also introduce the closely related operators

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{L}}_{\lambda,\alpha} = \Delta_\omega^{-\alpha/2}\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,1/2-\alpha}\Delta_\omega^{\alpha/2} = \mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}} + \lambda\Delta_\omega^{-\alpha/2}W\left(\frac{1}{2}-\alpha\right)\Delta_\omega^{\alpha/2}. \tag{3.6}$$

The primary reason for introducing these α-Liouvilleans is the following representation of the entropic functionals [Ref. 5, Proposition 3.2 and Eqs. (5.11)–(5.12)].

Proposition 3.2. For all $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$

$$[D\omega_{-t} : D\omega]_\alpha\Omega = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,1/2-\alpha}}\Omega, \qquad [D\omega_{-t} : D\omega]^*_{\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{2}}[D\omega_{-t} : D\omega]_{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\Omega = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\widetilde{\mathscr{L}}_{\lambda,\alpha}}\Omega.$$

As a consequence, for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ and $t, T \in \mathbb{R}$,

1. $\mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{2tm}}_{\omega,t}(\alpha) = \langle\Omega, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,1/2-\alpha}}\Omega\rangle$.
2. $\mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{qpsc}}_{\omega_T,t}(\alpha) = \langle\Omega, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}T\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,1/2}}[D\omega_{-t} : D\omega]_\alpha\Omega\rangle = \langle\Omega, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}T\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,1/2}}\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,1/2-\alpha}}\Omega\rangle$.
3. $\mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{ancilla}}_{\omega_T,t}(\alpha) = \langle\Omega, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}T\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,1/2}}[D\omega_{-t} : D\omega]^*_{\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{2}}[D\omega_{-t} : D\omega]_{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\Omega\rangle = \langle\Omega, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}T\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,1/2}}\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\widetilde{\mathscr{L}}_{\lambda,\alpha}}\Omega\rangle$.

Remark 3.3. All the above identities are first derived for $\alpha \in \mathrm{i}\mathbb{R}$, and then extended to $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ by analytic continuation. Indeed, as already mentioned, **(SFM3)** implies Assumption (**AnV(ϑ)**) in Ref. 5 holds for arbitrary $\vartheta > 0$, which guarantees that all the involved quantities have entire analytic extensions.

19 March 2026 15:06:40

IV. LIOUVILLIEANS: SPECTRA, RESONANCES AND DYNAMICS

The proof of our main Theorem 2.8 relies on the representation of the entropic functionals given in Proposition 3.2, on complex deformations of the α-Liouvilleans, and on the analysis of the spectral resonances unveiled by these deformations. The general strategy is adapted from Refs. 10, 11, and 24, to which we refer for more details.

For the reader's convenience, in this section we briefly recall the construction of the deformed Liouvilleans and their main properties, introducing their spectral resonances. The central results of this section concern the large time behaviour of the associated quantum transfer operators and are given in Secs. IV C and IV D.

A. Complex deformation of $\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}$

Following on Remark 3.1, we set $\hat{r} = \min_j(\pi/\beta_j)$ and denote by $\mathscr{F}$ the collection of all the f_{j,k,m,β_j} and $f^\#_{j,k,m,\beta_j}$. It then follows from **(SFM6)** and (3.2) that, for any $0 < r < \hat{r}$ and $a > 0$, $\mathscr{F} \subset H^2(r)$ and

$$\sup_{\substack{f\in\mathscr{F}\\|\theta|\le r}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{e}^{a|s|}\|f(s+\mathrm{i}\theta)\|^2_{\mathfrak{H}}\mathrm{d}s < \infty.$$

Let $p = \mathrm{i}\partial_s$ be the generator of the translation group $(\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\theta p}f)(s) = f(s+\theta)$. Set $P = \mathrm{d}\Gamma(p)$ and define the unitary group $(U(\theta))_{\theta\in\mathbb{R}}$ on $\mathscr{H}$ by $U(\theta) = \mathbb{1} \otimes \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\theta P} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\theta P}$. Further setting

$$W(\alpha,\theta) = U(\theta)W(\alpha)U(-\theta), \tag{4.1}$$

we observe that

$$\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\theta) = U(\theta)\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}U(-\theta) = \mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}} + \theta N,$$
$$\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta) = U(\theta)\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}U(-\theta) = \mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}} + \theta N + \lambda W(\alpha,\theta),$$

© Author(s) 2026

where $N = \sum_j N_j$. The map (4.1) has an analytic extension

$$\mathbb{C} \times \mathfrak{I}(\hat{r}) \ni (\alpha, \theta) \mapsto W(\alpha, \theta) \in \mathscr{B}(\mathscr{H}), \tag{4.2}$$

which is bounded on $B \times \mathfrak{I}(r)$, for any $0 < r < \hat{r}$ and any bounded $B \subset \mathbb{C}$. This allows us to define $\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta)$ for $\lambda, \alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\theta \in \mathfrak{I}(\hat{r})$. In what follows, we write

$$\mathfrak{I}^+(r) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid 0 < \operatorname{Im} z < r\}.$$

We now summarize the basic properties of the family $(\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta))_{\theta\in\mathfrak{I}(\hat{r})}$ of complex deformations of the α-Liouvillean $\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}$.

(a) For $\operatorname{Im}\theta \neq 0$, $\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\theta) = \mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}} + \theta N$ is a closed normal operator with domain $\mathrm{Dom}(\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}) \cap \mathrm{Dom}(N)$. Its discrete spectrum is $\mathrm{sp}(\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{S}})$ and its essential spectrum is the union of lines $\mathbb{R} + \mathrm{i}\ \mathrm{Im}\,(\theta)\mathbb{N}^*$. ($\mathbb{N}^* = \mathbb{N}\backslash\{0\}$.) Moreover, $\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\theta)^* = \mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\bar{\theta})$, and for $z \notin \mathrm{sp}(\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\theta))$, one has

$$\|(z - \mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\theta))^{-1}\| = \frac{1}{\mathrm{dist}(z, \mathrm{sp}(\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\theta)))}. \tag{4.3}$$

(b) For $(\lambda, \alpha, \theta) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \times \mathfrak{I}^+(\hat{r})$, $\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta)$ is a closed operator with domain $\mathrm{Dom}(\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}) \cap \mathrm{Dom}(N)$, and adjoint $\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta)^* = \mathscr{L}_{\bar{\lambda},\bar{\alpha}}(\bar{\theta})$. Moreover, with

$$C_{\alpha,\theta} = \|W(\alpha,\theta)\|,$$

one has

$$\mathrm{sp}(\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta)) \subset D_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \mathrm{dist}(z, \mathrm{sp}(\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\theta))) \le |\lambda| C_{\alpha,\theta}\},$$

and for $z \in \mathbb{C}\backslash D_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$,

$$\|(z - \mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta))^{-1}\| \le \frac{1}{\mathrm{dist}(z, \mathrm{sp}(\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\theta))) - |\lambda| C_{\alpha,\theta}}.$$

All these results follow from **(a)** and standard estimates based on the resolvent identity.

(c) For $(\lambda, \alpha, \theta) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \times \mathfrak{I}^+(\hat{r})$, $\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta)$ is an analytic family of type A in each variable separately (see, e.g., Ref. 40, Sec. XII.2).

In the following we fix $0 < r < \hat{r}$ as well as $\vartheta, \zeta > 0$, and set

$$C = \sup_{\substack{|\operatorname{Im}\theta| \le r \\ \alpha \in B(\vartheta,\zeta)}} C_{\alpha,\theta}, \qquad B(\vartheta,\zeta) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |\mathrm{Re} z| < \vartheta, |\operatorname{Im} z| < \zeta\}. \tag{4.4}$$

(d) Suppose that $\alpha \in B(\vartheta,\zeta)$. Then, if $\operatorname{Im} z < -|\lambda| C$,

$$s - \lim_{\operatorname{Im}\theta \downarrow 0} (z - \mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta))^{-1} = (z - \mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\mathrm{Re}\theta))^{-1}.$$

The proof is the same as that of Ref. 10, Lemma 4.8.

(e) Let

$$r_{\mathrm{S}} = \min\{|e - e'| \mid e, e' \in \mathrm{sp}(\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{S}}), e \neq e'\}, \qquad 0 < \kappa < \frac{1}{6},$$

and $\Lambda > 0$ be such that

$$\Lambda C = \Delta = \min\left\{\kappa r, \frac{r_{\mathrm{S}}}{4}\right\}.$$

It then follows from **(b)** that for $|\lambda| < \Lambda$, $\alpha \in B(\vartheta,\zeta)$, and $(1-\kappa)r < \operatorname{Im}\theta \le r$, one has

$$\mathrm{sp}(\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta)) \subset \{w \in \mathbb{C} \mid \operatorname{Im} w > (1-2\kappa)r\} \cup \{w \in \mathbb{C} \mid \mathrm{dist}(w, \mathrm{sp}(\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{S}})) < \Delta\}. \tag{4.5}$$

Moreover, for all

$$z \in \{w \in \mathbb{C} \mid \operatorname{Im} w \le (1-3\kappa)r,\ \mathrm{dist}(w, \mathrm{sp}(\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{S}})) \ge r_{\mathrm{S}}/2\},$$

and for all $|\lambda| < \Lambda$, $\alpha \in B(\vartheta,\zeta)$, $(1-\kappa)r < \operatorname{Im}\theta \le r$, the estimate

$$\|(z - \mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta))^{-1}\| \le \frac{1}{\Delta}, \tag{4.6}$$

holds, see Fig. 1.

19 March 2026 15:06:40

© Author(s) 2026



FIG. 1. Picture of the z-plane (it is assumed here that $\kappa r < r_S/4$). The black dots are the eigenvalues of $\mathscr{L}_S$. If θ is in the hashed area, the spectrum of the deformed Liouvillean $\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta)$ is in the shaded areas (which extends to infinity on the top side).

The first condition $\Delta \le \kappa r$ ensures that the two subsets on the right-hand side of (4.5) are disjoint. It follows that the spectrum of $\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta)$ in the subset $\{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \mathrm{dist}(z, \mathrm{sp}(\mathscr{L}_S)) < \Delta\}$ is discrete. The second condition $\Delta \le r_S/4$ ensures that for any distinct $e, e' \in \mathrm{sp}(\mathscr{L}_S)$

$$\{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z-e| < \Delta\} \cap \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z-e'| < \Delta\} = \emptyset,$$

so that the spectral projection

$$\mathscr{Q}_{\lambda,\alpha,e}(\theta) = \oint_{|z-e|=r_S/2} (z - \mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta))^{-1} \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2\pi\mathrm{i}}$$

onto the part of spectrum of $\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta)$ inside the disk $|z-e| < r_S/2$ has exactly the same rank as the spectral projection $\mathbb{1}_e(\mathscr{L}_S)$ of $\mathscr{L}_S$ for the eigenvalue e. This spectrum actually coincides with the spectrum of a linear map

$$\Sigma_e(\lambda,\alpha) : \mathrm{Ran}\,\mathbb{1}_e(\mathscr{L}_S) \to \mathrm{Ran}\,\mathbb{1}_e(\mathscr{L}_S), \tag{4.7}$$

called quasi-energy operator in Ref. 24, that does not depend on θ. Hence, the spectrum of $\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta)$ in the half-plane $\mathrm{Im}\, z < (1-2\kappa)r$ is discrete and independent of θ as long as $(1-\kappa)r < \mathrm{Im}\,\theta \le r$. The finitely many eigenvalues in this half-plane are called *spectral resonances* of $\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}$. We shall briefly recall the construction of the quasi-energy operators $\Sigma_e(\lambda,\alpha)$ in Sec. IV B 1.

(f) We start with the observation that, for $\mathrm{Im}\,\theta \ge 0$, $\left(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\theta)}\right)_{t\ge 0}$ is a strongly continuous contraction semi-group on $\mathscr{H}$. It then follows that for all $(\lambda,\alpha) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ and $0 \le \mathrm{Im}\,\theta < \hat{r}$, $\left(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta)}\right)_{t\ge 0}$ is also a strongly continuous semi-group on $\mathscr{H}$. For $t, \lambda, \theta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha \in \mathrm{i}\mathbb{R}$, one has

$$\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta)} = \mathfrak{G}^t_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\theta)}$$

with the unitary cocycle

$$\mathfrak{G}^t_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta} = \mathbb{1} + \sum_{n\ge 1} (\mathrm{i}\lambda t)^n \int_{0\le s_1\le\cdots\le s_n\le 1} W_{ts_1}(\alpha,\theta)\cdots W_{ts_n}(\alpha,\theta)\mathrm{d}s_1\cdots\mathrm{d}s_n,$$

where

$$W_t(\alpha,\theta) = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\theta)} W(\alpha,\theta) \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\theta)}.$$

By Assumptions **(SFM5)–(SFM6)**, the map $(\alpha,\theta) \mapsto W_t(\alpha,\theta) \in \mathscr{B}(\mathscr{H})$ extends to an analytic function on $\mathbb{C} \times \mathfrak{I}(\hat{r})$, bounded for $(\alpha, \mathrm{Im}\,\theta)$ in any compact subset of $\mathbb{C}\times]-\hat{r},\hat{r}[$. It follows that for $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $(\lambda,\alpha,\theta) \mapsto \mathfrak{G}^t_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ is an analytic function on $\mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathfrak{I}(\hat{r})$, bounded for $(\lambda,\alpha,\mathrm{Im}\,\theta)$ in any compact subset of $\mathbb{C}^2\times]-\hat{r},\hat{r}[$. Note that since $U(\theta')W_t(\alpha,\theta)U(-\theta') = W_t(\alpha,\theta+\theta')$ for $\theta' \in \mathbb{R}$, one has

$$U(\theta')\mathfrak{G}^t_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}\Psi = \mathfrak{G}^t_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta+\theta'}U(\theta')\Psi.$$

19 March 2026 15:06:40

© Author(s) 2026

Thus, if Ψ is analytic for the group $(U(\theta))_{\theta\in\mathbb{R}}$ in a strip $0 \le \operatorname{Im}\theta < \rho \le \hat{r}$, so is $\mathfrak{G}^t_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}\Psi$, and the latter identity extends by analyticity.

The family $\left(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\theta N}\right)_{\operatorname{Im}\theta\ge 0}$ is a strongly continuous contraction semi-group which is analytic in the open upper half-plane $\operatorname{Im}\theta > 0$. Thus, if $\Psi \in \mathscr{H}$ is analytic for the group $(U(\theta))_{\theta\in\mathbb{R}}$ in a strip $0 \le \operatorname{Im}\theta < \rho$, then, for $t > 0$, the map

$$\mathbb{R} \ni \theta \mapsto \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\theta)}U(\theta)\Psi = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\theta N}\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}}U(\theta)\Psi$$

has a bounded continuous extension to the strip $0 \le \operatorname{Im}\theta < \rho$ which is analytic in its interior. It follows that the same holds for the map

$$\mathbb{R} \ni \theta \mapsto U(\theta)\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}}\Psi,$$

and hence that the respective extensions satisfy

$$\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\theta)}U(\theta)\Psi = U(\theta)\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}}\Psi$$

for $0 \le \operatorname{Im}\theta < \rho$. Combined with the previous results, we conclude that

$$\mathfrak{G}^t_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\theta)}U(\theta)\Psi = \mathfrak{G}^t_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}U(\theta)\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}}\Psi = U(\theta)\mathfrak{G}^t_{\lambda,\alpha,0}\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}}\Psi,$$

and so

$$\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta)}U(\theta)\Psi = U(\theta)\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}}\Psi. \tag{4.8}$$

For later use, see in particular Sec. V C, we summarize the above discussion in the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. If Ψ is analytic for the group $(U(\theta))_{\theta\in\mathbb{R}}$ in a strip $0 \le \operatorname{Im}\theta < \rho \le \hat{r}$, then the map

$$\mathbb{R} \ni \theta \mapsto U(\theta)\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}}\Psi \in \mathscr{H}$$

has an analytic extension to the same strip, which is bounded and continuous on any closed substrip, and for any θ in this strip

$$\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta)}U(\theta)\Psi = U(\theta)\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}}\Psi.$$

B. The quasi-energy operators

In this section we first recall briefly the construction of the maps $\Sigma_e(\lambda,\alpha)$. They go back to Ref. 41 and we refer the reader to e.g., Refs. 10, 24, and 41 for more details. In a second part we study their connection with the Davies generator and the level-shift operator, see e.g., Refs. 4, 16, 35, and 42. This connection plays a key role in the study of spectral properties of $\Sigma(\lambda,\alpha)$, hence of $\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta)$, and which is given in Sec. IV B 3.

The standing assumptions in this section are the ones made in Paragraph **(e)** of Sec. IV A.

1. Construction of $\Sigma_e(\lambda,\alpha)$

The map $(\lambda,\alpha) \mapsto \mathscr{Q}_{\lambda,\alpha,e}(\theta)$ is analytic and

$$\mathscr{Q}_{0,\alpha,e}(\theta) = \mathscr{Q}_{0,0,e}(\theta) = \mathbb{1}_e(\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}) = \mathbb{1}_e(\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{S}}) \otimes |\Omega_{\mathrm{R}}\rangle\langle\Omega_{\mathrm{R}}|.$$

It follows from the estimate (4.6) and the resolvent identity that, by possibly making Λ smaller,

$$\sup_{\substack{|\lambda|<\Lambda\\ \alpha\in B(\vartheta,\zeta)}} \|\mathscr{Q}_{\lambda,\alpha,e}(\theta) - \mathscr{Q}_{0,0,e}(\theta)\| < 1$$

for all $e \in \operatorname{sp}(\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{S}})$. This gives that the map

$$S_{\lambda,\alpha,e}(\theta) = \mathscr{Q}_{0,0,e}(\theta)\mathscr{Q}_{\lambda,\alpha,e}(\theta) : \operatorname{Ran}\mathscr{Q}_{\lambda,\alpha,e}(\theta) \to \operatorname{Ran}\mathscr{Q}_{0,0,e}(\theta)$$

is an isomorphism, reducing to the identity for $\lambda = 0$. The *quasi-energy* operator (4.7) is defined by

$$\Sigma_e(\lambda,\alpha) = S_{\lambda,\alpha,e}(\theta)\mathscr{Q}_{\lambda,\alpha,e}(\theta)\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta)\mathscr{Q}_{\lambda,\alpha,e}(\theta)S_{\lambda,\alpha,e}(\theta)^{-1}. \tag{4.9}$$

As the notation suggests, $\Sigma_e(\lambda,\alpha)$ does not depend on θ, see e.g., Ref. 10. In the following, it will be convenient to identify $\operatorname{Ran}S_{\lambda,\alpha,e}(\theta) = \operatorname{Ran}\mathbb{1}_e(\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}) = \operatorname{Ran}\mathbb{1}_e(\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{S}}) \otimes \Omega_{\mathrm{R}}$ with $\operatorname{Ran}\mathbb{1}_e(\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{S}})$, so that $\Sigma_e(\lambda,\alpha)$ will act on the eigenspace of $\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{S}}$ for its eigenvalue e.

By construction these quasi-energy operators satisfy

$$\operatorname{sp}(\Sigma_e(\lambda,\alpha)) = \operatorname{sp}(\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta)) \cap \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z-e| < r_{\mathrm{S}}/2\},$$

and have the following properties which follow from regular perturbation theory.[40,41,43]

19 March 2026 15:06:40

© Author(s) 2026

(1) The map $(\lambda, \alpha) \mapsto \Sigma_e(\lambda, \alpha)$ is analytic and

$$\Sigma_e(\lambda, \alpha) = e\mathbb{1}_e(\mathscr{L}_S) + \lambda^2 \Sigma_e^{(2)}(\alpha) + O(\lambda^3), \tag{4.10}$$

where the estimate $O(\lambda^3)$ is uniform in $\alpha \in B(\vartheta, \zeta)$. The term linear in λ vanishes due to Assumption **(SFM0)**, and it is at this point that **(SFM0)** enters critically in the proof.

(2) A Fermi golden rule computation gives

$$\Sigma_e^{(2)}(\alpha) = \lim_{\epsilon \uparrow 0} \mathbb{1}_e(\mathscr{L}_S) T_S^* W(\alpha)(e + \mathrm{i}\epsilon - \mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}})^{-1} W(\alpha) T_S \mathbb{1}_e(\mathscr{L}_S), \tag{4.11}$$

where $T_S : \mathscr{H}_S \ni X \mapsto X \otimes \Omega_R$ has the adjoint $T_S^* X \otimes \Psi_R = \langle \Omega_R, \Psi_R \rangle X$.

(3)

$$\Sigma(\lambda, \alpha) = \bigoplus_{e \in \mathrm{sp}(\mathscr{L}_S)} \Sigma_e(\lambda, \alpha), \qquad \Sigma^{(2)}(\alpha) = \bigoplus_{e \in \mathrm{sp}(\mathscr{L}_S)} \Sigma_e^{(2)}(\alpha),$$

defines two operators acting on $\mathscr{H}_S$. The operator $\Sigma^{(2)}(\alpha)$ is the so-called *level-shift* operator for the triple $(\mathscr{H}_S, \mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}, W(\alpha))$, see e.g., Ref. 42. Equation (4.11) also allows to define $\Sigma_e^{(2)}(\alpha)$, hence $\Sigma^{(2)}(\alpha)$, for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$.

2. Quasi-energy operators and deformed Davies generators

In this section we turn to the close relation between $\Sigma^{(2)}(\alpha)$ and the deformed Davies generator introduced in Ref. 35. We will use this connection in Sec. IV B 3 to study spectral properties of $\Sigma^{(2)}(\alpha)$. Those of $\Sigma(\lambda, \alpha)$ will then follow from regular perturbation theory.

It follows from **(SFM5)** and (2.12) that

$$\mathscr{C}_{j,k,m}(t) = \omega_j\Big(\varphi_j(f_{j,k,m})\varphi_j(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}th_j} f_{j,k,m})\Big) = \frac{1}{2}\langle f_{j,k,m}, (\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}th_j}(1 - T_j) + \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}th_j} T_j) f_{j,k,m}\rangle = \frac{1}{4}\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\cosh((\beta_j/2 + \mathrm{i}t)s)}{\cosh(\beta_j s/2)} \tilde{f}_{j,k,m}(-s)\tilde{f}_{j,k,m}(s)\mathrm{d}s$$
$$= \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\tilde{f}_{j,k,m}(-s)\tilde{f}_{j,k,m}(s)}{1 + \mathrm{e}^{-\beta_j s}} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}ts}\mathrm{d}s,$$

and **(SFM6)** allows to deform the integration contour from $\mathbb{R}$ to $\mathbb{R} \pm \mathrm{i}a$, as long as $|a| < \pi/\beta_j$,

$$\mathscr{C}_{j,k,m}(t) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\tilde{f}_{j,k,m}(-(s \pm \mathrm{i}a))\tilde{f}_{j,k,m}(s \pm \mathrm{i}a)}{1 + \mathrm{e}^{-\beta_j(s \pm \mathrm{i}a)}} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t(s \pm \mathrm{i}a)}\mathrm{d}s.$$

This gives that $\mathscr{C}_{j,k,m}(t) = O(\mathrm{e}^{-a|t|})$ for all j, k, m, provided $0 \le a < \hat{r}$. Hence, it holds that

(SFM00) For some $\epsilon > 0$ and all j, k, m,

$$\int_0^\infty |\mathscr{C}_{j,k,m}(t)| t^\epsilon \mathrm{d}t < \infty.$$

Denote by $\tau_{j,\lambda}$ the C^*-dynamics on $\mathscr{O}_S \otimes \mathscr{O}_j$ generated by $\delta_S + \delta_j + \mathrm{i}\lambda[V_j, \cdot\,]$. Assumption **(SFM0)** and **(SFM00)** go back to Ref. 4, where it was shown that, for all $X, Y \in \mathscr{O}_S$,

$$\lim_{\substack{\lambda \to 0 \\ \lambda^2 t = \xi}} \omega_S \otimes \omega_j\big(X\tau_{0,j}^{-t} \circ \tau_{\lambda,j}^t(Y)\big) = \omega_S\Big(X\mathrm{e}^{\xi K_j}(Y)\Big), \tag{4.12}$$

for some $K_j \in \mathscr{B}(\mathscr{O}_S)$. By similar arguments, see Ref. 42, one can show that

$$\lim_{\substack{\lambda \to 0 \\ \lambda^2 t = \xi}} \omega\big(X\tau_0^{-t} \circ \tau_\lambda^t(Y)\big) = \omega_S\Big(X\mathrm{e}^{\xi K}(Y)\Big),$$

with

$$K = \sum_j K_j.$$

K_j is the *Davies generator* of the system $\mathsf{S} + \mathsf{R}_j$ and K that of the full system $\mathsf{S} + \mathsf{R}$. The semi-groups $\big(\mathrm{e}^{tK_j}\big)_{t \ge 0}$ and $\big(\mathrm{e}^{tK}\big)_{t \ge 0}$ are completely positive and unital on $\mathscr{O}_S$. If Assumption **(SFM7)** holds, these semi-groups are also positivity improving, see e.g., Refs. 35 and 44.

19 March 2026 15:06:40

© Author(s) 2026

For $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, following Ref. 35, we define the deformed Davies generators $K_{\alpha,j}$ and K_α acting on $\mathscr{O}_{\mathrm{S}}$ by

$$K_{\alpha,j}(X) = K_j\Big(X\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\beta_j H_{\mathrm{S}}}\Big)\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\beta_j H_{\mathrm{S}}}, \qquad K_\alpha = \sum_j K_{\alpha,j}. \tag{4.13}$$

We note that K_j commutes with δ_{S} (see Ref. 4, Theorem 2.1 or Ref. 42, Theorem 6.1) so that

$$K_{\alpha+z,j}(X) = \mathrm{e}^{-z\beta_j H_{\mathrm{S}}}K_{\alpha,j}\Big(\mathrm{e}^{z\beta_j H_{\mathrm{S}}}X\Big), \tag{4.14}$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$. For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, the semi-groups $\big(\mathrm{e}^{tK_{\alpha,j}}\big)_{t\geq 0}$ and $\big(\mathrm{e}^{tK_\alpha}\big)_{t\geq 0}$ are also completely positive, and they are moreover positivity improving if Assumption **(SFM7)** holds, see Ref. 35, Theorem 3.1.

The following proposition gives the announced connection between these deformed Davies generators and the level-shift operators.

Proposition 4.2. Suppose that ***(SFM0)****,* ***(SFM5)*** *and* ***(SFM6)*** *hold. Then, for all* $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$*,*

$$\Sigma^{(2)}(\alpha) = -\mathrm{i}K_{1/2-\alpha}. \tag{4.15}$$

Corollary 4.3. Suppose that ***(SFM0)****,* ***(SFM5)*** *and* ***(SFM6)*** *hold. Then, for all* $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ *the semi-group* $\Big(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\Sigma^{(2)}(\alpha)}\Big)_{t\geq 0}$ *is completely positive, and unital when* $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$*. If Assumption* ***(SFM7)*** *holds, then this semi-group is also positivity improving.*

The relation (4.15) can be proven by direct computation, see e.g., Ref. 16, Sec. 6.7 or Ref. 42. Alternatively, one can give a structural proof following Ref. 3 where (4.15) was established in the cases $\alpha = 0$ and $\alpha = 1/2$. (Note that our convention for the Davies generator differs from the one in Ref. 3 by a factor i.) For the reader's convenience we finish this section with a Proof of Proposition 4.2 along these lines.

Remark 4.4. Proposition 4.2 can actually be proven under much more general condition than **(SFM6)**. However, making this assumption does not affect the generality of our main result while allowing for a relatively simple proof of Lemma 4.5 below which is the main technical ingredient of the argument.

Recall that Ω_j is the vector representative of the state ω_j in the GNS Hilbert space of the jth reservoir. Setting

$$\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha,j} = \mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{S}} + \mathscr{L}_j + \lambda W_j(\alpha),$$

one has the following lemma, compare with (4.12).

Lemma 4.5. For all $X, Y \in \mathscr{B}(\mathscr{K}_{\mathrm{S}})$ *and* $\alpha \in \mathrm{i}\mathbb{R}$*,*

$$\lim_{\substack{\lambda\to 0\\ \lambda^2 t=\xi}}\langle X\otimes\Omega_j, \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{S}}}\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha,j}}Y\otimes\Omega_j\rangle = \mathrm{tr}\,(X^*\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\xi\Sigma_j^{(2)}(\alpha)}Y),$$

where $\Sigma_j^{(2)}(\alpha)$ *is the level-shift operator for* $(\mathscr{H}_{\mathrm{S}}, \mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{S}} + \mathscr{L}_j, W_j(\alpha))$*,*

$$\Sigma_j^{(2)}(\alpha) = \bigoplus_{e\in\mathrm{sp}(\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{S}})}\lim_{\epsilon\uparrow 0}\mathbb{1}_e(\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{S}})T_{\mathrm{S}}^*W_j(\alpha)(e+\mathrm{i}\epsilon-(\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{S}}+\mathscr{L}_j))^{-1}W_j(\alpha)T_{\mathrm{S}}\mathbb{1}_e(\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{S}}). \tag{4.16}$$

Proof. The proof is an application of Ref. 42, Theorem 3.4. In that theorem the only assumption which requires a comment is the following one: for some $\lambda_0 > 0$

$$\int_0^\infty \sup_{|\lambda|\leq\lambda_0}\Big\|\mathscr{P}W_j(\alpha)\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t(1-\mathscr{P})\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha,j}(1-\mathscr{P})}W_j(\alpha)\mathscr{P}\Big\|\,\mathrm{d}t < \infty,$$

where $\mathscr{P} = I_{\mathrm{S}}\otimes|\Omega_j\rangle\langle\Omega_j|$. To check it, we introduce complex deformations as in Sec. IV A,

$$\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha,j}(\theta) = U(\theta)\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha,j}U(-\theta) = \mathscr{L}_{0,j}(\theta) + \lambda W_j(\alpha,\theta),$$
$$\mathscr{L}_{0,j}(\theta) = \mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{S}} + \mathscr{L}_j + \theta N_j.$$

For $\mathrm{Im}\,\theta \geq 0$, $\Big(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{0,j}(\theta)}\Big)_{t\geq 0}$ is a strongly continuous contraction semi-group on $\mathscr{H}_{\mathrm{S}}\otimes\mathscr{H}_j$. Hence, for all $\lambda, \alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ and $0 \leq \mathrm{Im}\,\theta < \hat{r}$, the perturbed family $\Big(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha,j}(\theta)}\Big)_{t\geq 0}$ is a strongly continuous semi-group on $\mathscr{H}_{\mathrm{S}}\otimes\mathscr{H}_j$. Moreover, since $\mathscr{P}U(\theta) = \mathscr{P} = U(-\theta)\mathscr{P}$, we can write

$$\mathscr{P}W_j(\alpha)\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t(1-\mathscr{P})\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha,j}(1-\mathscr{P})}W_j(\alpha)\mathscr{P} = \mathscr{P}W_j(\alpha,\theta)\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t(1-\mathscr{P})\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha,j}(\theta)(1-\mathscr{P})}W_j(\alpha,\theta)\mathscr{P}. \tag{4.17}$$

19 March 2026 15:06:40

© Author(s) 2026

It follows from **(SFM0)** that $\mathscr{P} V_j \mathscr{P} = 0$, [that $\mathscr{P} V_j \mathscr{P} = 0$ is also necessary to get (4.12), see Ref. 4] and similarly $\mathscr{P} W(\alpha,\theta)\mathscr{P} = 0$. It therefore suffices to prove that

$$\int_0^\infty \sup_{|\lambda|\le\lambda_0} \left\|(1-\mathscr{P})\mathrm{e}^{it(1-\mathscr{P})\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha,j}(\theta)(1-\mathscr{P})}(1-\mathscr{P})\right\| \mathrm{d}t < \infty, \tag{4.18}$$

for some $\lambda_0 > 0$ and some θ such that $0 \le \mathrm{Im}\,\theta < \hat{r}$. Observing that the operator appearing in the last formula belongs to the semi-group acting on $\mathrm{Ker}\mathscr{P}$ and generated by

$$(1-\mathscr{P})\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha,j}(\theta)|_{\mathrm{Ker}\mathscr{P}} = \mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{S}} + \mathrm{d}\Gamma(s+\theta)|_{\Omega_j^\perp} + \lambda(1-\mathscr{P})W(\alpha,\theta)|_{\mathrm{Ker}\mathscr{P}},$$

we get, for $\lambda = 0$ and $t \ge 0$,

$$\left\|(1-\mathscr{P})\mathrm{e}^{it(1-\mathscr{P})\mathscr{L}_{0,j}(\theta)(1-\mathscr{P})}(1-\mathscr{P})\right\| = \mathrm{e}^{-t\,\mathrm{Im}\,(\theta)},$$

and a standard estimate on perturbed semi-groups (Ref. 45, Theorem 3.1) gives

$$\|(1-\mathscr{P})\mathrm{e}^{it(1-\mathscr{P})\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha,j}(\theta)(1-\mathscr{P})}(1-\mathscr{P})\| \le \mathrm{e}^{-t(\mathrm{Im}\,\theta-|\lambda|\|W(\alpha,\theta)\|)},$$

so that the estimate (4.18) follows by fixing θ such that $0 < \mathrm{Im}\,(\theta) < \hat{r}$ and $0 < \lambda_0$ small enough. □

Proof of Proposition 4.2. For $\alpha \in \mathrm{i}\mathbb{R}$ we have that

$$V_j^\#(\alpha) = (J_{\mathrm{S}}\otimes J_j)(\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\beta_j\mathscr{L}_j}V_j\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\beta_j\mathscr{L}_j})(J_{\mathrm{S}}\otimes J_j) = \mathrm{e}^{\alpha\beta_j\mathscr{L}_j}(J_{\mathrm{S}}\otimes J_j)V_j(J_{\mathrm{S}}\otimes J_j)\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\beta_j\mathscr{L}_j}.$$

Consider now the operator $H_{\mathrm{S}} + \mathscr{L}_j + \lambda V_j$ where, with the usual abuse of notation, H_{S} stands for $\pi(H_{\mathrm{S}})$, and so $H_{\mathrm{S}} + \lambda V_j \in \pi(\mathscr{O})$. By the Trotter product formula,

$$\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\beta_j(H_{\mathrm{S}}+\mathscr{L}_j+\lambda V_j)}(J_{\mathrm{S}}\otimes J_j)V_j(J_{\mathrm{S}}\otimes J_j)\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\beta_j(H_{\mathrm{S}}+\mathscr{L}_j+V_j)} = \lim_{n\to\infty}\left(\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\beta_j(H_{\mathrm{S}}+\lambda V_j)/n}\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\beta_j\mathscr{L}_j/n}\right)^n(J_{\mathrm{S}}\otimes J_j)V_j(J_{\mathrm{S}}\otimes J_j)\left(\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\beta_j(H_{\mathrm{S}}+V_j)/n}\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\beta_j\mathscr{L}_j/n}\right)^n.$$

Since, for $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_j}\pi(\mathscr{O})'\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_j} \subset \pi(\mathscr{O})'$, we derive that for $\alpha \in \mathrm{i}\mathbb{R}$,

$$V_j^\#(\alpha) = \mathrm{e}^{\alpha\beta_j(H_{\mathrm{S}}+\mathscr{L}_j+\lambda V_j)}(J_{\mathrm{S}}\otimes J_j)V_j(J_{\mathrm{S}}\otimes J_j)\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\beta_j(H_{\mathrm{S}}+\mathscr{L}_j+\lambda V_j)}. \tag{4.19}$$

Using that $\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{S}} + \mathscr{L}_j + \lambda V_j = \mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha,j} - \lambda V_j^\#(\alpha)$ commutes with $H_{\mathrm{S}} + \mathscr{L}_j + \lambda V_j$, (4.19) further yields that

$$\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha,j} = \mathrm{e}^{\alpha\beta_j(H_{\mathrm{S}}+\mathscr{L}_j+\lambda V_j)}\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,0,j}\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\beta_j(H_{\mathrm{S}}+\mathscr{L}_j+\lambda V_j)}.$$

Combined with Lemma 4.5, this relation gives that, for $\alpha \in \mathrm{i}(-\zeta,\zeta)$,

$$\Sigma_j^{(2)}(\alpha)(X) = \mathrm{e}^{\alpha\beta_j H_{\mathrm{S}}}\Sigma_j^{(2)}(0)(\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\beta_j H_{\mathrm{S}}}X). \tag{4.20}$$

By analyticity, this relation holds for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, provided its left-hand side is given by (4.16). It was shown in Ref. 3, Theorem 3.1 that

$$\Sigma_j^{(2)}(0) = -\mathrm{i}K_{1/2,j},$$

and so

$$\Sigma^{(2)}(\alpha)(X) = \sum_j \Sigma_j^{(2)}(\alpha)(X) = \sum_j \mathrm{e}^{\alpha\beta_j H_{\mathrm{S}}}\Sigma_j^{(2)}(0)(\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\beta_j H_{\mathrm{S}}}X) = -\mathrm{i}\sum_j \mathrm{e}^{\alpha\beta_j H_{\mathrm{S}}}K_{1/2,j}(\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\beta_j H_{\mathrm{S}}}X).$$

Taking into account (4.13) and (4.14), we finally get

$$\Sigma^{(2)}(\alpha) = -\mathrm{i}\sum_j K_{1/2-\alpha,j} = -\mathrm{i}K_{1/2-\alpha}.$$

□

19 March 2026 15:06:40

© Author(s) 2026

3. Spectral analysis of $\Sigma(\lambda, \alpha)$

As a direct consequence of Corollary 4.3 we first get the following spectral result about the level-shift operator $\Sigma^{(2)}(\alpha)$, see e.g., Ref. 35, Theorem 2.2. Let

$$\mathscr{E}^{(2)}(\alpha) = \mathrm{i}\ \min\left\{\mathrm{Im}\, w \mid w \in \mathrm{sp}\left(\Sigma^{(2)}(\alpha)\right)\right\}.$$

Lemma 4.6. Assuming **(SFM0)** *and* **(SFM5)–(SFM7)***, the following assertions hold for* $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$.

(1) $\mathscr{E}^{(2)}(\alpha)$ *is a purely imaginary simple eigenvalue of* $\Sigma^{(2)}(\alpha)$, *with* $\mathscr{E}^{(2)}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = 0$.
(2) *All the other eigenvalues* $z \in \mathrm{sp}\left(\Sigma^{(2)}(\alpha)\right)\setminus\left\{\mathscr{E}^{(2)}(\alpha)\right\}$ *satisfy* $\mathrm{Im}\left(z - \mathscr{E}^{(2)}(\alpha)\right) > 0$.
(3) *The eigenprojection for the eigenvalue* $\mathscr{E}^{(2)}(\alpha)$ *writes* $P_\alpha = |X_\alpha\rangle\langle Y_\alpha|$, *where* $X_\alpha, Y_\alpha \in \mathscr{H}_{\mathrm{S}} = \mathscr{B}(\mathscr{K}_{\mathrm{S}})$ *are positive definite.*

Proposition 4.7. Under the assumptions of the previous lemma, for any $\vartheta, \zeta > 0$ *there exists* $\Lambda, \epsilon > 0$ *such that:*

(1) *For* $0 < |\lambda| < \Lambda$ *and* $\alpha \in B(\vartheta, \zeta)$, *the linear map* $\Sigma(\lambda, \alpha)$ *has a simple eigenvalue* $\mathscr{E}(\lambda, \alpha)$ *such that for any other eigenvalue* $w \in \mathrm{sp}(\Sigma(\lambda, \alpha))\setminus\{\mathscr{E}(\lambda, \alpha)\}$ *one has*

$$\mathrm{Im}\,(w - \mathscr{E}(\lambda, \alpha)) \geq \lambda^2\epsilon.$$

(2) *For fixed* λ, *the map* $B(\vartheta, \zeta) \ni \alpha \mapsto \mathscr{E}(\lambda, \alpha)$ *is analytic.*
(3) $\mathscr{E}(\lambda, \alpha) \in \mathrm{sp}(\Sigma_0(\lambda, \alpha))$, *in particular* $|\mathscr{E}(\lambda, \alpha)| < \frac{r_{\mathrm{S}}}{4}$.

Proof. (1)–(2) Follow immediately from (4.10), the previous lemma and regular perturbation theory. (3) Since $\mathscr{E}^{(2)}(\alpha)$ is purely imaginary it must be an eigenvalue of $\Sigma_0^{(2)}(\alpha)$. Regular perturbation theory ensures that $\mathscr{E}(\lambda, \alpha)$ is therefore an eigenvalue of $\Sigma_0(\lambda, \alpha)$ for λ small enough. □

Remark 4.8. Using (4.10) we actually have $\mathscr{E}(\lambda, \alpha) = \lambda^2\mathscr{E}^{(2)}(\alpha) + O(\lambda^3)$.

19 March 2026 15:06:40

C. Dynamics of α-Liouvilleans

In this and the next two sections, we assume that **(SFM0)** and **(SFM5)**–**(SFM7)** hold, and we set

$$D = \bigcap_{|\mathrm{Im}\,\theta| < \hat{r}} \mathrm{Dom}\, U(\theta).$$

Recall also that $0 < r < \hat{r}$ is fixed and C is given by (4.4).

Proposition 4.9. For any $\frac{2}{3}r < \varrho < r$ *and* $\vartheta, \zeta > 0$, *there exist constants* $\Lambda, \epsilon > 0$ *such that, for* $\alpha \in B(\vartheta, \zeta)$, $0 < |\lambda| < \Lambda$, *and* $\Phi, \Psi \in D$, *the function*

$$z \mapsto \langle\Phi, (z - \mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha})^{-1}\Psi\rangle, \tag{4.21}$$

originally analytic for $\mathrm{Im}\, z < -\Lambda C$, *has a meromorphic continuation to the half-plane* $\mathrm{Im}\, z < \varrho$, *and its only possible singularity in the region* $\mathrm{Im}\,(z - \mathscr{E}(\lambda, \alpha)) < \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2\epsilon$ *is a simple pole at* $\mathscr{E}(\lambda, \alpha)$.

Proof. Fix $0 < \kappa < \frac{1}{6}$ such that $\varrho = (1 - 2\kappa)r$. Let Λ, ϵ be as Proposition 4.7 and $\Phi, \Psi \in D$. For all $\mathrm{Im}\, z < -\Lambda C$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ one has

$$\langle\Phi, (z - \mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha})^{-1}\Psi\rangle = \langle U(\theta)\Phi, (z - \mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta))^{-1}U(\theta)\Psi\rangle.$$

Note that the functions $\mathbb{R} \ni \theta \mapsto \Psi_\theta = U(\theta)\Psi$ and $\mathbb{R} \ni \theta \mapsto \overline{\Phi}_\theta = \overline{U(\theta)\Phi} = U(-\theta)\overline{\Phi}$ both have analytic continuations to the strip $\mathfrak{I}(\hat{r})$. Thus, the identity

$$\langle\Phi, (z - \mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha})^{-1}\Psi\rangle = \left\langle\overline{\overline{\Phi}_\theta}, (z - \mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta))^{-1}\Psi_\theta\right\rangle \tag{4.22}$$

© Author(s) 2026

holds for all $\theta \in \mathfrak{I}^+(\hat{r})$, $|\lambda| < \Lambda$, $\alpha \in B(\vartheta, \zeta)$ and $\operatorname{Im} z < -\Lambda C$. Using the results from Paragraph **(e)** in Sec. IV A, by setting $\theta = ir$ the right-hand side of this identity provides a meromorphic continuation of its left-hand side to the half-plane $\operatorname{Im} z < \varrho$. Proposition 4.7 then yields the last assertion. □

Remark 4.10. The residue of the function (4.21) at $\mathscr{E}(\lambda, \alpha)$ is given by

$$c_{\lambda,\alpha} = \langle U(-\mathrm{i}r)\Phi, \mathscr{Q}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\mathrm{i}r)U(\mathrm{i}r)\Psi\rangle, \tag{4.23}$$

where $\mathscr{Q}_{\lambda,\alpha}(ir)$ is the spectral projection of $\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(ir)$ for the eigenvalue $\mathscr{E}(\lambda, \alpha)$.

Proposition 4.11. For any $\frac{2}{3}r < \varrho < r$ and $\vartheta, \zeta > 0$, there exist a constants $\Lambda > 0$ such that, for $\alpha \in B(\vartheta, \zeta)$, $0 < |\lambda| < \Lambda$, and $\phi, \psi \in \mathscr{H}$, the function $f(z) = \langle \phi, (z - \mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\mathrm{i}r))^{-1}\psi\rangle$ satisfies

$$\sup_{\substack{y<\varrho \\ j\in\{0,1\}}} \int_{|x|>R} |(\partial^j f)(x + \mathrm{i}y)|^{2-j}\, \mathrm{d}x < +\infty, \tag{4.24}$$

where $R = 1 + \|\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{S}}\|$ and ∂ denotes the Wirtinger derivative w.r.t. z. As a consequence, for any $\Phi, \Psi \in D$, the function $g(z) = \langle \Phi, (z - \mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha})^{-1}\Psi\rangle$ satisfies

$$\sup_{\substack{y<\varrho \\ j\in\{0,1\}}} \int_{|x|>R} |(\partial^j g)(x + \mathrm{i}y)|^{2-j}\, \mathrm{d}x < +\infty. \tag{4.25}$$

Proof. As in the Proof of Proposition 4.9, we fix $0 < \kappa < 1/6$ such that $\varrho = (1 - 2\kappa)r$.

Since $\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(ir)$ is a normal operator, the spectral theorem gives that for z in the resolvent set of $\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(ir)$,

$$\|(z - \mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\mathrm{i}r))^{-1}\psi\|^2 = \int_{\mathrm{sp}(\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\mathrm{i}r))} \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_\psi(\xi)}{|z - \xi|^2},$$

where μ_ψ denotes the spectral measure of $\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(ir)$ for the vector ψ.

For any $\xi \in \mathrm{sp}(\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(ir))$ and $y < \varrho$, one has

$$\int_{|x|>R} \frac{\mathrm{d}x}{|x + \mathrm{i}y - \xi|^2} \le \max\left(\frac{\pi}{2\kappa r}, 2\right),$$

and hence

$$\sup_{y<\varrho} \int_{|x|>R} \|(x + \mathrm{i}y - \mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\mathrm{i}r))^{-1}\psi\|^2 \mathrm{d}x < \infty. \tag{4.26}$$

By the same argument, we also have

$$\sup_{y<\varrho} \int_{|x|>R} \|\left((x + \mathrm{i}y - \mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\mathrm{i}r))^{-1}\right)^* \phi\|^2 \mathrm{d}x < \infty. \tag{4.27}$$

Invoking the identity (4.3), we deduce that if Λ is small enough then, for $|\lambda| < \Lambda$ and $\alpha \in B(\vartheta, \zeta)$, the operator

$$G(z, \lambda, \alpha) = \left(I - \lambda(z - \mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\mathrm{i}r))^{-1} W(\alpha, \mathrm{i}r)\right)^{-1}$$

is well defined for $|\operatorname{Re} z| > R$, $\operatorname{Im} z < \varrho$, and satisfies

$$\sup_{\substack{|\operatorname{Re} z|>R \\ \operatorname{Im} z<\varrho}} \|G(z, \lambda, \alpha)\| \le 2. \tag{4.28}$$

It follows from the second resolvent identity that

$$(z - \mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\mathrm{i}r))^{-1} = G(z, \lambda, \alpha)(z - \mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\mathrm{i}r))^{-1}. \tag{4.29}$$

Combining (4.26), (4.28), and (4.29) gives that (4.24) holds for $j = 0$.

Similarly, the operator

$$\widetilde{G}(z, \lambda, \alpha) = \left(I - \lambda W(\alpha, \mathrm{i}r)(z - \mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\mathrm{i}r))^{-1}\right)^{-1}$$

also satisfies

19 March 2026 15:06:40

© Author(s) 2026

$$\sup_{\substack{|\mathrm{Re} z|>R\\ \mathrm{Im}\, z<\varrho}} \|\widetilde{G}(z,\lambda,\alpha)\| \le 2,$$

and is such that

$$(z-\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\mathrm{i}r))^{-1} = (z-\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\mathrm{i}r))^{-1}\widetilde{G}(z,\lambda,\alpha).$$

We can then write

$$-\partial(z-\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\mathrm{i}r))^{-1} = (z-\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\mathrm{i}r))^{-2} = (z-\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\mathrm{i}r))^{-1}\widetilde{G}(z,\lambda,\alpha)G(z,\lambda,\alpha)(z-\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\mathrm{i}r))^{-1},$$

so that

$$|\partial f(z)| = \left|\partial\langle\phi,(z-\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\mathrm{i}r))^{-1}\psi\rangle\right| \le 4\left\|\left((z-\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\mathrm{i}r))^{-1}\right)^*\phi\right\|\left\|(z-\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\mathrm{i}r))^{-1}\psi\right\|.$$

Combining (4.26), (4.27) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain (4.24) with $j=1$.

Finally, (4.25) follows from (4.22) and (4.24) with $\theta=\mathrm{i}r$, $\phi=U(-\mathrm{i}r)\Phi$ and $\psi=U(\mathrm{i}r)\Psi$. □

Using Propositions 4.9 and 4.11 together with Ref. 5, Proposition 4.1 we obtain the following dynamical result.

Proposition 4.12. For any $\vartheta,\zeta>0$ there exists $\Lambda,\epsilon>0$ such that for any $0<|\lambda|<\Lambda$, $\alpha\in B(\vartheta,\zeta)$ and $\Phi,\Psi\in D$ one has

$$\langle\Phi,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}}\Psi\rangle = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{E}(\lambda,\alpha)}\left(c_{\lambda,\alpha}+O(\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda^2\epsilon t})\right)$$

as $t\uparrow\infty$, where $c_{\lambda,\alpha}$ is the residue given by (4.23).

The next, closely related, result is proven in an identical way and will be used in the sequel. Recall that, for all $(\lambda,\alpha)\in\mathbb{C}^2$ and $0\le\mathrm{Im}\,\theta<\hat{r}$, $\left(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta)}\right)_{t\ge0}$ is also a strongly continuous semi-group on $\mathscr{H}$. Combining (4.24) in Proposition 4.11 with the spectral results about $\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta)$ obtained in Secs. IV A and IV B, and using Ref. 5, Proposition 4.1, we have the following analogue of Proposition 4.12.

Proposition 4.13. For any $\vartheta,\zeta>0$, there exist constants $\Lambda,\epsilon>0$ such that, for all $0<|\lambda|<\Lambda$, $\alpha\in B(\vartheta,\zeta)$ and $\phi,\psi\in\mathscr{H}$ one has

$$\langle\phi,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\mathrm{i}r)}\psi\rangle = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{E}(\lambda,\alpha)}\left(\langle\phi,\mathscr{Q}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\mathrm{i}r)\psi\rangle+O(\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda^2\epsilon t})\right)$$

as $t\uparrow\infty$.

D. The $\widehat{\mathscr{L}}_{\lambda,\alpha}$ Liouvilleans

As mentioned in Sec. III C, the study of the ancilla part of the PREF relies on the closely related Liouvilleans $\widehat{\mathscr{L}}_{\lambda,\alpha}$. It is easy to see that the analysis of $\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}$ presented in the previous sections extends line by line to $\widehat{\mathscr{L}}_{\lambda,\alpha}$ and the associated analytically deformed $\widehat{\mathscr{L}}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta)$. We denote by $\widehat{\Sigma}^{(2)}(\alpha)$ and $\widehat{\Sigma}(\lambda,\alpha)$ the corresponding level-shift and quasi-energy operators.

By the definition (3.6), $\widehat{\mathscr{L}}_{\lambda,\alpha}$ is obtained from $\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,\alpha}$ by replacing $W(\alpha)$ by $\Delta_\omega^{-\alpha/2}W\left(\frac{1}{2}-\alpha\right)\Delta_\omega^{\alpha/2}$. Since $\Delta_\omega^{\alpha/2}$ commutes with $\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}}$ and $\Delta_\omega^{\alpha/2}T_{\mathrm{S}}=T_{\mathrm{S}}$, the associated level-shift operator is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\Sigma}_e^{(2)}(\alpha) &= \lim_{\epsilon\uparrow0}\mathbb{1}_e(\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{S}})T_{\mathrm{S}}^*\Delta_\omega^{-\alpha/2}W\left(\frac{1}{2}-\alpha\right)\Delta_\omega^{\alpha/2}(e+\mathrm{i}\epsilon-\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}})^{-1}\Delta_\omega^{-\alpha/2}W\left(\frac{1}{2}-\alpha\right)\Delta_\omega^{\alpha/2}T_{\mathrm{S}}\mathbb{1}_e(\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{S}})\\ &= \lim_{\epsilon\uparrow0}\mathbb{1}_e(\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{S}})T_{\mathrm{S}}^*W\left(\frac{1}{2}-\alpha\right)(e+\mathrm{i}\epsilon-\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{fr}})^{-1}W\left(\frac{1}{2}-\alpha\right)T_{\mathrm{S}}\mathbb{1}_e(\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{S}}) = \Sigma_e^{(2)}\left(\frac{1}{2}-\alpha\right),\end{aligned}$$

for $\alpha\in\mathrm{i}\mathbb{R}$, hence for all $\alpha\in\mathbb{C}$ by analyticity. In particular the conclusions of Corollary 4.3 hold, with unital property when $\alpha=0$, hence so do those of Lemma 4.6 and Proposition 4.7, i.e., the operator $\widehat{\Sigma}(\lambda,\alpha)$ has a simple eigenvalue $\widehat{\mathscr{E}}(\lambda,\alpha)$ such that for any other eigenvalue w of $\widehat{\Sigma}(\lambda,\alpha)$ one has

$$\mathrm{Im}\left(w-\widehat{\mathscr{E}}(\lambda,\alpha)\right)\ge\lambda^2\epsilon.$$

Arguing as in Sec. IV A, Paragraph **(f)**, we derive that, for all $\lambda,\alpha\in\mathbb{C}$ and $0\le\mathrm{Im}\,\theta<\hat{r}$, the family $\left(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\widehat{\mathscr{L}}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta)}\right)_{t\ge0}$ is a strongly continuous semi-group on $\mathscr{H}$ such that, similarly with (4.8), one has

$$U(\theta)\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\widehat{\mathscr{L}}_{\lambda,\alpha}}\Psi = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\widehat{\mathscr{L}}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\theta)}U(\theta)\Psi \tag{4.30}$$

19 March 2026 15:06:40

© Author(s) 2026

for all $\Psi \in D$ and $0 \le \operatorname{Im}\theta < \hat{r}$. Finally, we have the following analogue of Propositions 4.12 and 4.13.

Proposition 4.14. For any $\vartheta, \zeta > 0$, there exists $\Lambda, \epsilon > 0$ such that for all $0 < |\lambda| < \Lambda$, $\alpha \in B(\vartheta, \zeta)$ and all $\Phi, \Psi \in D$ one has

$$\langle \Phi, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\widehat{\mathscr{L}}_{\lambda,\alpha}}\Psi\rangle = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\widehat{\mathscr{E}}(\lambda,\alpha)}\Big(\langle U(-\mathrm{i}r)\Phi, \widehat{\mathscr{Q}}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\mathrm{i}r)U(\mathrm{i}r)\Psi\rangle + O(\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda^2\epsilon t})\Big) \tag{4.31}$$

as $t \uparrow \infty$, and where $\widehat{\mathscr{Q}}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\mathrm{i}r)$ is the spectral projection of $\widehat{\mathscr{L}}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\mathrm{i}r)$ for its eigenvalue $\widehat{\mathscr{E}}(\lambda,\alpha)$.

Similarly, for all $\phi, \psi \in \mathscr{H}$ one has

$$\langle \phi, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\widehat{\mathscr{L}}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\mathrm{i}r)}\psi\rangle = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\widehat{\mathscr{E}}(\lambda,\alpha)}\Big(\langle \phi, \widehat{\mathscr{Q}}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\mathrm{i}r)\psi\rangle + O(\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda^2\epsilon t})\Big), \tag{4.32}$$

as $t \uparrow \infty$.

V. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.8

We prove separately the 2TMEP, QPSC and EAST parts of the PREF. These three parts are proven respectively in Secs. V B–V D. They all rely on the representation of the various entropic functionals given in Proposition 3.2 and on Propositions 4.12, 4.13 and 4.14.

As a preparation for the proof we establish some analyticity properties of the Connes cocycle. Indeed, for the QPSC and Ancilla parts of the PREF we will first have to consider the large T limit in Proposition 3.2(2)–(3) in order to obtain suitable expressions for $\mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{ancilla}}_{\omega_+,t}$ and $\mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{qpsc}}_{\omega_+,t}$. This large T limit also relies on Proposition 4.12, applied to $\mathrm{e}^{iT\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,1/2}}$. For that purpose one needs to prove that the vectors

$$[D\omega_{-t} : D\omega]_\alpha\Omega \qquad \text{and} \qquad [D\omega_{-t} : D\omega]^*_{\frac{\alpha}{2}}[D\omega_{-t} : D\omega]_{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\Omega$$

belong to the subspace D. This will be a consequence of the analyticity properties of the Connes cocycle we establish in Sec. V A.

A. Analyticity of the Connes cocycle

The main result in this section is

*Proposition 5.1. Suppose that **(SFM6)** holds. Then, for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the map*

$$\mathbb{R} \times \mathrm{i}\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \ni (\lambda, \alpha, \theta) \mapsto U(\theta)[D\omega_t : D\omega]_\alpha U(-\theta) \in \mathscr{B}(\mathscr{H})$$

has an extension to $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \times \mathfrak{I}(\hat{r})$ which is analytic in each variable separately and is uniformly bounded for $(\lambda, \alpha, \operatorname{Im}\theta)$ in compact subsets of $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \times]-\hat{r}, \hat{r}[$.

Remark 5.2. The quantity $U(\theta)[D\omega_t : D\omega]_\alpha U(-\theta)$ depends on λ through the time evolved state ω_t.

Proof. The proof builds on the results established in Ref. 6, Sec. 2. For $\alpha \in \mathrm{i}\mathbb{R}$ recall the identity (2.5)

$$[D\omega_t : D\omega]_\alpha = \mathbb{1} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha^n \int_{0 \le u_1 \le \cdots \le u_n \le 1} \varsigma_\omega^{-\mathrm{i}u_1\alpha}(Q_t)\cdots\varsigma_\omega^{-\mathrm{i}u_n\alpha}(Q_t)\,\mathrm{d}u_1\cdots\mathrm{d}u_n, \tag{5.1}$$

where

$$Q_t = \int_0^t \tau_\lambda^{-s}(\sigma)\mathrm{d}s, \qquad \sigma = \lambda\delta_\omega(V).$$

Let $(\Gamma_s)_{s\in\mathbb{R}}$ denote the cocycle associated to the local perturbation λV of the free dynamics τ_{fr}, i.e., the solution of the Cauchy problem

$$\partial_s\Gamma_s = \mathrm{i}\lambda\Gamma_s\tau^s_{\mathrm{fr}}(V), \qquad \Gamma_0 = \mathbb{1}.$$

Γ_s is a unitary element of $\mathscr{O}$ with the norm convergent expansion

$$\Gamma_s = \mathbb{1} + \sum_{n\ge1}(\mathrm{i}\lambda s)^n \int_{0\le v_1\le\cdots\le v_n\le1} \tau^{sv_1}_{\mathrm{fr}}(V)\cdots\tau^{sv_n}_{\mathrm{fr}}(V)\mathrm{d}v_1\cdots\mathrm{d}v_n, \tag{5.2}$$

and for $u \in \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\varsigma^u_\omega(Q_t) = \int_0^t \varsigma^u_\omega(\Gamma_{-s})\tau^{-s}_{\mathrm{fr}}(\varsigma^u_\omega(\sigma))\varsigma^u_\omega(\Gamma^*_{-s})\,\mathrm{d}s, \tag{5.3}$$

19 March 2026 15:06:40

© Author(s) 2026

see Ref. 6, Eqs. (2.9) and (2.14).

Now, observe that **(SFM6)** gives that the maps

$$\mathbb{R}^3 \ni (s,\alpha,\theta) \mapsto U(\theta)\tau_{\rm fr}^s \circ \varsigma_\omega^\alpha(V)U(-\theta) \in \mathscr{B}(\mathscr{H}), \tag{5.4}$$

$$\mathbb{R}^3 \ni (s,\alpha,\theta) \mapsto U(\theta)\tau_{\rm fr}^s \circ \varsigma_\omega^\alpha(\delta_\omega(V))U(-\theta) \in \mathscr{B}(\mathscr{H}), \tag{5.5}$$

have extensions to $\mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathfrak{I}(\hat{r})$ which are analytic in each variable separately and are uniformly bounded for $(s,\alpha,\operatorname{Im}\theta)$ in compact subsets of $\mathbb{C}^2\times]-\hat{r},\hat{r}[$. Using Eq. (5.2) we get that, for $(\lambda,u,\theta)\in\mathbb{R}^3$,

$$U(\theta)\varsigma_\omega^u(\Gamma_{-s})U(-\theta) = \mathbb{1} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(-\mathrm{i}\lambda s)^n \int_{0\le v_1\le\cdots\le v_n\le 1}[U(\theta)\tau_{\rm fr}^{-sv_1}\circ\varsigma_\omega^u(V)U(-\theta)]\cdots[U(\theta)\tau_{\rm fr}^{-sv_n}\circ\varsigma_\omega^u(V)U(-\theta)]\mathrm{d}v_1\cdots\mathrm{d}v_n,$$

and it follows from (5.4) that the map

$$\mathbb{R}^3 \ni (\lambda,u,\theta)\mapsto U(\theta)\varsigma_\omega^u(\Gamma_{-s})U(-\theta)$$

has an extension to $\mathbb{C}^2\times\mathfrak{I}(\hat{r})$ which is analytic in each variable separately and is uniformly bounded for $(\lambda,u,s,\operatorname{Im}\theta)$ in compact subsets of $\mathbb{C}^2\times\mathbb{R}\times]-\hat{r},\hat{r}[$. The same holds for if Γ_{-s} is replaced by its inverse Γ_{-s}^*. From (5.3) we infer that

$$U(\theta)\varsigma_\omega^u(Q_t)U(-\theta) = \int_0^t [U(\theta)\varsigma_\omega^u(\Gamma_{-s})U(-\theta)][U(\theta)\tau_{\rm fr}^{-s}\circ\varsigma_\omega^u(\sigma)U(-\theta)][U(\theta)\varsigma_\omega^u(\Gamma_{-s}^*)U(-\theta)]\,\mathrm{d}s,$$

and hence deduce, using (5.5), that

$$\mathbb{R}^3 \ni (\lambda,u,\theta)\mapsto U(\theta)\varsigma_\omega^u(Q_t)U(-\theta)$$

has an extension to $\mathbb{C}^2\times\mathfrak{I}(\hat{r})$ which is analytic in each variable separately and is uniformly bounded for $(\lambda,u,t,\operatorname{Im}\theta)$ in compact subsets of $\mathbb{C}^2\times\mathbb{R}\times]-\hat{r},\hat{r}[$. Finally, going back to (5.1) we have

$$U(\theta)[D\omega_t : D\omega]_\alpha U(-\theta) = \mathbb{1} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\alpha^n \int_{0\le u_1\le\cdots\le u_n\le 1}[U(\theta)\varsigma_\omega^{-\mathrm{i}u_1\alpha}(Q_t)U(-\theta)]\cdots[U(\theta)\varsigma_\omega^{-\mathrm{i}u_n\alpha}(Q_t)U(-\theta)]\mathrm{d}u_1\cdots\mathrm{d}u_n,$$

and Proposition 5.1 follows. □

Since $U(-\theta)\Omega=\Omega$, the following consequence of the previous proposition is immediate.

Corollary 5.3. The vectors $[D\omega_{-t}:D\omega]_\alpha\Omega$ *and* $[D\omega_{-t}:D\omega]_{\frac{\alpha}{2}}^*[D\omega_{-t}:D\omega]_{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\Omega$ *belong to the subspace D, for all* $t\in\mathbb{R}$ *and* $\alpha\in\mathbb{C}$.

B. 2TMEP part of the PREF

In this and the next two sections we fix $0<r<\hat{r}$ as in Sec. IV.

The starting point is the representation given in Proposition 3.2(1). Given $\vartheta,\zeta>0$, using Proposition 4.12 with $\frac{1}{2}-\alpha\in B\left(\frac{1}{2}+\vartheta,\zeta\right)$, and the fact that $U(\theta)\Omega=\Omega$ for all $\theta\in\mathbb{C}$, we can write for all $0<|\lambda|<\Lambda$ and $\alpha\in]-\vartheta,1+\vartheta[$,

$$\mathfrak{F}_{\omega,t}^{\rm 2tm}(\alpha) = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{E}(\lambda,\frac{1}{2}-\alpha)}\left(\langle\Omega,\mathscr{Q}_{\lambda,\frac{1}{2}-\alpha}(\mathrm{i}r)\Omega\rangle + O(\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda^2\epsilon t})\right)$$

as $t\uparrow\infty$. If moreover

$$\langle\Omega,\mathscr{Q}_{\lambda,\frac{1}{2}-\alpha}(\mathrm{i}r)\Omega\rangle \neq 0, \tag{5.6}$$

then

$$\boldsymbol{F}_\omega^{\rm 2tm}(\alpha) = \lim_{t\to\infty}\frac{1}{t}\log\mathfrak{F}_{\omega,t}^{\rm 2tm}(\alpha) = \mathrm{i}\mathscr{E}\left(\lambda,\frac{1}{2}-\alpha\right), \tag{5.7}$$

and the map $\alpha\mapsto\boldsymbol{F}_\omega^{\rm 2tm}(\alpha)$ is analytic by Proposition 4.7. We proceed to prove (5.6).

Denote by $P_{\lambda,\alpha}$ the spectral projection of the quasi-energy operator $\Sigma(\lambda,\alpha)$ associated to its eigenvalue $\mathscr{E}(\lambda,\alpha)$. The map $(\lambda,\alpha)\mapsto P_{\lambda,\alpha}$ is analytic in each variable separately for $0<|\lambda|<\Lambda$ and $\alpha\in B(\vartheta,\zeta)$. Since $\mathscr{E}(\lambda,\alpha)$ is actually an eigenvalue of $\Sigma_0(\lambda,\alpha)$, see Proposition 4.7, $P_{\lambda,\alpha}$ is also the spectral projection of $\lambda^{-2}\Sigma_0(\lambda,\alpha)=\Sigma_0^{(2)}(\alpha)+O(\lambda)$ for the eigenvalue $\lambda^{-2}\mathscr{E}(\lambda,\alpha)=\mathscr{E}^{(2)}(\alpha)+O(\lambda)$. It follows that $\lambda\mapsto P_{\lambda,\alpha}$

19 March 2026 15:06:40

© Author(s) 2026

extends analytically to $\lambda = 0$ where $P_{0,\alpha} = |X_\alpha\rangle\langle Y_\alpha|$ is the spectral projection of $\Sigma_0^{(2)}(\alpha)$ for the eigenvalue $\mathscr{E}^{(2)}(\alpha)$, see Lemma 4.6. Recall that X_α, Y_α are positive definite for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$.

Using (4.9) we then have

$$\mathscr{Q}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\mathrm{i}r) = S_{\lambda,\alpha,0}(\mathrm{i}r)^{-1} P_{\lambda,\alpha} S_{\lambda,\alpha,0}(\mathrm{i}r),$$

so the map $(\lambda, \alpha) \mapsto \mathscr{Q}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\mathrm{i}r)$ is analytic with $\mathscr{Q}_{0,\alpha}(\mathrm{i}r) = P_{0,\alpha}$ [recall that $S_{0,\alpha,0}(\mathrm{i}r)$ is the identity]. In particular, we have

$$\langle \Omega, \mathscr{Q}_{0,\alpha}(\mathrm{i}r)\Omega\rangle = \langle \Omega_{\mathrm{S}}, X_\alpha\rangle\langle Y_\alpha, \Omega_{\mathrm{S}}\rangle = \frac{1}{N}\operatorname{tr}(X_\alpha)\operatorname{tr}(Y_\alpha) > 0$$

for α real. By possibly making Λ and ζ smaller we derive that (5.6), hence (5.7), holds for $|\lambda| < \Lambda$ and $\frac{1}{2} - \alpha \in B\big(\frac{1}{2} + \vartheta, \zeta\big)$.

Finally, the 2TMEP part of the PREF with respect to the NESS ω_+, i.e.,

$$\boldsymbol{F}^{\mathrm{2tm}}_{\omega_+}(\alpha) = \lim_{t\to\infty}\frac{1}{t}\log\mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{2tm}}_{\omega_+,t}(\alpha) = \mathrm{i}\mathscr{E}\left(\lambda, \frac{1}{2} - \alpha\right),$$

follows from Theorem 2.4(3).

Remark 5.4. Recall that $\mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{2tm}}_{\omega,t}(\alpha) > 0$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, see e.g., (2.6). This gives that (5.7) implies that $\mathscr{E}(\lambda, \alpha)$ is purely imaginary for $\alpha \in]-\vartheta - 1/2, \vartheta + 1/2[$.

Remark 5.5. Since $\mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{2tm}}_{\omega,t}(0) = 1$ for all t we have $\mathscr{E}\big(\lambda, \frac{1}{2}\big) = 0$.

C. QPSC part of the PREF

Starting with the representation of Proposition 3.2(2) we have, for all $\lambda, \alpha \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$\mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{qpsc}}_{\omega_T,t}(\alpha) = \langle \Omega, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}T\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,1/2}}[D\omega_{-t} : D\omega]_\alpha\Omega\rangle.$$

Corollary 5.3 guarantees that $[D\omega_{-t} : D\omega]_\alpha\Omega \in D$ so we can invoke Proposition 4.12. Since $\mathscr{E}(\lambda, \frac{1}{2}) = 0$, we obtain that for some $\Lambda > 0$, all $0 < |\lambda| < \Lambda$, and all $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$\mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{qpsc}}_{\omega_+,t}(\alpha) = \lim_{T\to\infty}\langle \Omega, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}T\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,1/2}}[D\omega_{-t} : D\omega]_\alpha\Omega\rangle = \langle \Omega, \mathscr{Q}_{\lambda,\frac{1}{2}}(\mathrm{i}r)U(\mathrm{i}r)[D\omega_{-t} : D\omega]_\alpha\Omega\rangle,$$

where we again used the fact that $U(-\mathrm{i}r)\Omega = \Omega$. Proposition 3.2 leads to

$$[D\omega_{-t} : D\omega]_\alpha\Omega = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,1/2-\alpha}}\Omega,$$

for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$. Using again Corollary 5.3, the fact $U(\mathrm{i}r)\Omega = \Omega$ and invoking Lemma 4.1 we further have

$$\mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{qpsc}}_{\omega_+,t}(\alpha) = \langle \Omega, \mathscr{Q}_{\lambda,\frac{1}{2}}(\mathrm{i}r)\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,1/2-\alpha}(\mathrm{i}r)}\Omega\rangle.$$

Using Proposition 4.13, we hence get

$$\mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{qpsc}}_{\omega_+,t}(\alpha) = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\mathscr{E}(\lambda,\frac{1}{2}-\alpha)}\Big(\langle \Omega, \mathscr{Q}_{\lambda,\frac{1}{2}}(\mathrm{i}r)\mathscr{Q}_{\lambda,\frac{1}{2}-\alpha}(\mathrm{i}r)\Omega\rangle + O(\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda^2\epsilon t})\Big), \tag{5.8}$$

so that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\frac{1}{t}\log\mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{qpsc}}_{\omega_+,t}(\alpha) = \mathrm{i}\mathscr{E}\left(\lambda, \frac{1}{2} - \alpha\right)$$

follows provided

$$\langle \Omega, \mathscr{Q}_{\lambda,\frac{1}{2}}(\mathrm{i}r)\mathscr{Q}_{\lambda,\frac{1}{2}-\alpha}(\mathrm{i}r)\Omega\rangle \neq 0.$$

That for a given $\vartheta > 0$ one can find $\Lambda > 0$ and $\zeta > 0$ such that the latter identity holds for $|\lambda| < \Lambda$ and $\frac{1}{2} - \alpha \in B(\frac{1}{2} + \vartheta, \zeta)$ is now deduced by following the proof of the related relation (5.6) given in Sec. V B.

19 March 2026 15:06:40

© Author(s) 2026

Remark 5.6. When $\lambda = 0$, we actually have

$$\langle \Omega, \mathscr{Q}_{0,\frac{1}{2}}(ir)\mathscr{Q}_{0,\frac{1}{2}-\alpha}(ir)\Omega\rangle = \langle \Omega_S, X_{\frac{1}{2}}\rangle\langle Y_{\frac{1}{2}}, X_{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha}\rangle\langle Y_{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha}, \Omega_S\rangle > 0.$$

This ensures that the logarithm of the complex valued quantity $\mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{qpsc}}_{\omega_+,t}(\alpha)$ is indeed well-defined for λ small and t large.

D. EAST part of the PREF

The proof is completely parallel to the one of Sec. V C. The same reasoning starting from the representation given in Proposition 3.2(3) gives that, for some $\Lambda > 0$, all $0 < |\lambda| < \Lambda$ and all $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$\mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{ancilla}}_{\omega_+,t}(\alpha) = \lim_{T\to\infty}\langle \Omega, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}T\mathscr{L}_{\lambda,1/2}}[D\omega_{-t}:D\omega]^*_{\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{2}}[D\omega_{-t}:D\omega]_{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\Omega\rangle = \langle \Omega, \mathscr{Q}_{\lambda,\frac{1}{2}}(\mathrm{i}r)U(\mathrm{i}r)[D\omega_{-t}:D\omega]^*_{\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{2}}[D\omega_{-t}:D\omega]_{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\Omega\rangle = \langle \Omega, \mathscr{Q}_{\lambda,\frac{1}{2}}(\mathrm{i}r)U(\mathrm{i}r)\mathrm{e}^{it\widehat{\mathscr{L}}_{\lambda,\alpha}}\Omega\rangle$$
$$= \langle \Omega, \mathscr{Q}_{\lambda,\frac{1}{2}}(\mathrm{i}r)\mathrm{e}^{it\widehat{\mathscr{L}}_{\lambda,\alpha}(ir)}\Omega\rangle = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\widehat{\mathscr{E}}(\lambda,\alpha)}\Big(\langle \Omega, \mathscr{Q}_{\lambda,\frac{1}{2}}(\mathrm{i}r)\widehat{\mathscr{Q}}_{\lambda,\alpha}(\mathrm{i}r)\Omega\rangle + O(\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda^2\epsilon t})\Big),$$

where we have also used (4.30) and (4.32). By exactly the same argument as in Sec. V B one can find $\Lambda > 0$ such that for $|\lambda| < \Lambda$ and $\alpha \in B(\vartheta,\zeta)$ one has

$$\langle \Omega, \mathscr{Q}_{\lambda,\frac{1}{2}}(\mathrm{i}r)\widehat{\mathscr{Q}}_{\lambda,\alpha}(ir)\Omega\rangle \neq 0,$$

so that

$$\boldsymbol{F}^{\mathrm{ancilla}}_{\omega_+}(\alpha) = \lim_{t\to\infty}\frac{1}{t}\log\,\mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{ancilla}}_{\omega_+,t}(\alpha) = \mathrm{i}\widehat{\mathscr{E}}(\lambda,\alpha).$$

It remains to prove that this limit coincides with the one of the 2TMEP and QPSC functionals, i.e., that

$$\widehat{\mathscr{E}}(\lambda,\alpha) = \mathscr{E}\Big(\lambda, \frac{1}{2}-\alpha\Big). \tag{5.9}$$

Recall that $\mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{ancilla}}_{\omega,t}(\alpha) = \mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{2tm}}_{\omega,t}(\alpha)$, see (2.7). By Proposition 3.2(3), we have

$$\mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{ancilla}}_{\omega,t}(\alpha) = \langle \Omega, \mathrm{e}^{it\widehat{\mathscr{L}}_{\lambda,\alpha}}\Omega\rangle,$$

so, using (4.31) we further get

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\frac{1}{t}\log\,\mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{ancilla}}_{\omega,t}(\alpha) = \mathrm{i}\widehat{\mathscr{E}}(\lambda,\alpha).$$

Combined with (5.7) this proves (5.9).

E. Nonvanishing of *F*

It remains to establish the assertion dealing with the non-vanishing of $\boldsymbol{F}$. As mentioned in Remark 2.9, the convexity and analyticity of $\boldsymbol{F}$, combined with the symmetry $\boldsymbol{F}(0) = \boldsymbol{F}(1) = 0$, ensure that either $\boldsymbol{F}$ is identically vanishing on $]-\vartheta, 1+\vartheta[$ or is strictly convex. If it is strictly convex, the symmetry also guarantees that 0 is not a minimum so that $\boldsymbol{F}$ is identically vanishing if and only if

$$\partial_\alpha \boldsymbol{F}(\alpha)|_{\alpha=0} = 0.$$

Now, using (2.3) and (2.8) we have

$$\partial_\alpha \mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{2tm}}_{\omega,t}(\alpha)\big|_{\alpha=0} = -\int_0^t \omega_s(\sigma)\mathrm{d}s.$$

This identity and convexity [see e.g., (2.6)] give

$$\partial_\alpha \boldsymbol{F}(\alpha)|_{\alpha=0} = -\omega_+(\sigma).$$

It thus remains to prove that $\omega_+(\sigma) = 0$ if and only if $\beta_1 = \cdots = \beta_M = \beta$.

It is proven in Ref. 24, Theorems 1.3–1.4 and Ref. 23, Theorem 1.15 that if $\beta_i \neq \beta_j$ for some i, j, then under the assumptions of Theorem 2.8 there exists $\Lambda > 0$ such that for $0 < |\lambda| < \Lambda$, $\omega_+(\sigma) > 0$. On the other hand, if $\beta_1 = \cdots = \beta_M = \beta$ then ω_+ is a (τ_λ, β)-KMS state and in particular $\omega_+ \in \mathscr{N}$. By Ref. 46, Theorem 1.3, $\omega_+(\sigma) = 0$.

19 March 2026 15:06:40

© Author(s) 2026

F. The simplest spin–fermion model

The spectrum of $\mathscr{L}_S$ is $\{-2, 0, 2\}$, the eigenvalue 0 having multiplicity 2. Using (4.11) one can compute explicitly $\Sigma_e^{(2)}(\alpha)$. For $\alpha = 0$ and $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ this was done in Ref. 24, and one can then use (4.20) to obtain

$$\Sigma_0^{(2)}(\alpha) = \mathrm{i}\pi \sum_{j=1}^{M} \frac{\|\tilde{f}_j(2)\|_{\mathfrak{S}}^2}{2\cosh\beta_j} \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{e}^{\beta_j} & -\mathrm{e}^{2\alpha\beta_j} \\ -\mathrm{e}^{-2\alpha\beta_j} & \mathrm{e}^{-\beta_j} \end{bmatrix},$$

while $\Sigma_{\pm 2}^{(2)}(\alpha)$ are scalars, which turn out to be independent of α, and are given by

$$\Sigma_{\pm 2}^{(2)}(\alpha) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{M}\left(\mp \mathrm{PV}\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\|\tilde{f}_j(r)\|_{\mathfrak{S}}^2}{r-2}\,\mathrm{d}r + \mathrm{i}\pi\|\tilde{f}_j(2)\|_{\mathfrak{S}}^2 \right),$$

where PV stands for Cauchy's Principal Value.

The eigenvalues of $\Sigma_0^{(2)}(\alpha)$ are

$$E_{0\pm}^{(2)}(\alpha) = \mathrm{i}\frac{\pi}{2}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{M} \|\tilde{f}_j(2)\|_{\mathfrak{S}_j}^2 \pm \sqrt{\sum_{j,k=1}^{M}\left(\tanh(\beta_j)\tanh(\beta_k) + \frac{\cosh(2(\beta_j-\beta_k)\alpha)}{\cosh(\beta_j)\cosh(\beta_k)} \right)\|\tilde{f}_j(2)\|_{\mathfrak{S}}^2 \|\tilde{f}_k(2)\|_{\mathfrak{S}}^2} \right).$$

Obviously, $E_{0-}^{(2)}(\alpha)$ has the smallest imaginary part, so that

$$\mathscr{E}^{(2)}(\alpha) = E_{0-}^{(2)}(\alpha),$$

and (2.14) follows from (5.7).

G. Comparison with the general scheme of Ref. 5

Although our analysis of the α-Liouvilleans mostly follows the abstract scheme given in Ref. 5, the structural properties of the spin-fermion model allow to simplify certain steps. We have for example used Propostion 3.2(3) to analyze the ancilla part of PREF, therefore relying on the variant **(Deform2A)** of the general scheme. Also, the regularity of the map $\alpha \mapsto \mathscr{E}(\lambda, \alpha)$, hence of $\alpha \mapsto \boldsymbol{F}(\alpha)$, is here a consequence of regular perturbation theory that allows us to bypass Assumption **(Deform3)**, see also Remark 2 after Theorem 4.5 in Ref. 5.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work of C.-A.P. and V.J. was partly funded by the CY Initiative grant *Investissements d'Avenir*, Grant No. ANR-16-IDEX-0008. The work of T.B. was funded by the ANR project *ESQuisses*, Grant No. ANR-20-CE47-0014-01, and by the ANR project *Quantum Trajectories*, Grant No. ANR-20-CE40-0024-01. V.J. acknowledges the support of NSERC and the support of the MUR grant "Dipartimento di Eccellenza 2023–2027" of Dipartimento di Matematica, Politecnico di Milano. A part of this work was done during long term visits of L.B. and A.P. to McGill and CRM–CNRS International Research Laboratory IRL 3457 at University of Montreal. The L.B. visit was funded by the CNRS and A.P. visits by the CRM Simons and FRQNT–CRM–CNRS programs. We also acknowledge the support of the ANR project *DYNACQUS*, Grant No. ANR-24-CE40-5714.

AUTHOR DECLARATIONS

Conflict of Interest

The authors have no conflicts to disclose.

Author Contributions

T. Benoist: Conceptualization (equal); Formal analysis (equal); Investigation (equal); Methodology (equal); Writing – original draft (equal); Writing – review & editing (equal). **L. Bruneau**: Conceptualization (equal); Formal analysis (equal); Investigation (equal); Methodology (equal); Validation (equal); Writing – original draft (equal); Writing – review & editing (equal). **V. Jakšić**: Conceptualization (equal); Formal analysis (equal); Investigation (equal); Methodology (equal); Validation (equal); Writing – original draft (equal); Writing – review & editing (equal). **A. Panati**: Conceptualization (equal); Formal analysis (equal); Investigation (equal); Methodology (equal); Validation (equal); Writing – original draft (equal); Writing – review & editing (equal). **C.-A. Pillet**: Conceptualization (equal); Formal analysis (equal); Investigation (equal); Methodology (equal); Validation (equal); Writing – original draft (equal); Writing – review & editing (equal).

19 March 2026 15:06:40

© Author(s) 2026

DATA AVAILABILITY

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analyzed in this study.

REFERENCES

[1] T. Benoist, L. Bruneau, V. Jakšić, A. Panati, and C.-A. Pillet, "A note on two-times measurement entropy production and modular theory," Lett. Math. Phys. **114**, 32 (2024).
[2] C.-A. Pillet, "Quantum dynamical systems," in *Open Quantum Systems. I*, *Lecture Notes in Math.* (Springer, Berlin, 2006), Vol. 1880, pp. 107–182.
[3] J. Dereziński and V. Jakšić, "On the nature of Fermi golden rule for open quantum systems," J. Stat. Phys. **116**, 411–423 (2004).
[4] E. B. Davies, "Markovian master equations," Commun. Math. Phys. **39**, 91–110 (1974).
[5] T. Benoist, L. Bruneau, V. Jakšić, A. Panati, and C.-A. Pillet, "Entropic fluctuations in statistical mechanics II. Quantum dynamical systems," Commun. Math. Phys. **406**, 201 (2025).
[6] T. Benoist, L. Bruneau, V. Jakšić, A. Panati, and C.-A. Pillet, "On the thermodynamic limit of two-times measurement entropy production," Rev. Math. Phys. (published online 2025).
[7] H. Spohn and J. L. Lebowitz, "Irreversible thermodynamics for quantum systems weakly coupled to thermal reservoirs," Adv. Chem. Phys. **38**, 109–142 (1978).
[8] J. Dereziński and V. Jakšić, "Spectral theory of Pauli-Fierz operators," J. Funct. Anal. **180**, 243–327 (2001).
[9] V. Bach, J. Fröhlich, and I. M. Sigal, "Quantum electrodynamics of confined nonrelativistic particles," Adv. Math. **137**, 299–395 (1998).
[10] V. Jakšić and C.-A. Pillet, "On a model for quantum friction. II. Fermi's golden rule and dynamics at positive temperature," Commun. Math. Phys. **176**, 619–644 (1996).
[11] V. Jakšić and C.-A. Pillet, "On a model for quantum friction. III. Ergodic properties of the spin-boson system," Commun. Math. Phys. **178**, 627–651 (1996).
[12] W. K. Abou Salem, "On the quasi-static evolution of nonequilibrium steady states," Ann. Henri Poincaré **8**, 569–596 (2007).
[13] V. Bach, J. Fröhlich, and I. M. Sigal, "Return to equilibrium," J. Math. Phys. **41**, 3985–4060 (2000).
[14] J. Dereziński and W. De Roeck, "Extended weak coupling limit for Pauli-Fierz operators," Commun. Math. Phys. **279**, 1–30 (2008).
[15] J. Dereziński and C. Gérard, "Asymptotic completeness in quantum field theory: Massive Pauli-Fierz Hamiltonians," Rev. Math. Phys. **11**, 383–450 (1999).
[16] J. Dereziński and V. Jakšić, "Return to equilibrium for Pauli-Fierz systems," Ann. Henri Poincaré **4**, 739–793 (2003).
[17] W. De Roeck, "Large deviation generating function for currents in the Pauli-Fierz model," Rev. Math. Phys. **21**, 549–585 (2009).
[18] W. De Roeck and A. Kupiainen, "Approach to ground state and time-independent photon bound for massless spin-boson models," Ann. Henri Poincaré **14**, 253–311 (2013).
[19] J. Fröhlich, M. Griesemer, and B. Schlein, "Asymptotic completeness for Rayleigh scattering," Ann. Henri Poincaré **3**, 107–170 (2002).
[20] J. Fröhlich and M. Merkli, "Another return of 'return to equilibrium,'" Commun. Math. Phys. **251**, 235–262 (2004).
[21] D. Hasler, B. Hinrichs, and O. Siebert, "On existence of ground states in the spin boson model," Commun. Math. Phys. **388**, 419–433 (2021).
[22] M. Hübner and H. Spohn, "Radiative decay: Nonperturbative approaches," Rev. Math. Phys. **7**, 363–387 (1995).
[23] V. Jakšić, Y. Ogata, and C.-A. Pillet, "The Green-Kubo formula for the spin-fermion system," Commun. Math. Phys. **268**, 369–401 (2006).
[24] V. Jakšić and C.-A. Pillet, "Non-equilibrium steady states of finite quantum systems coupled to thermal reservoirs," Commun. Math. Phys. **226**, 131–162 (2002).
[25] J. S. Møller, "Fully coupled Pauli-Fierz systems at zero and positive temperature," J. Math. Phys. **55**, 075203 (2014).
[26] M. Merkli, "Positive commutators in non-equilibrium quantum statistical mechanics: Return to equilibrium," Commun. Math. Phys. **223**, 327–362 (2001).
[27] M. Merkli, M. Mück, and I. M. Sigal, "Theory of non-equilibrium stationary states as a theory of resonances," Ann. Henri Poincaré **8**, 1539–1593 (2007).
[28] V. Jakšić, Y. Ogata, Y. Pautrat, and C.-A. Pillet, "Entropic fluctuations in quantum statistical mechanics—An introduction," in *Quantum Theory from Small to Large Scales*, *Lecture Notes of the Les Houches Summer School*, edited by J. Fröhlich, M. Salmhofer, W. de Roeck, V. Mastropietro, and L. Cugliandolo (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2010), Vol. 95, pp. 213–410.
[29] V. Jakšić, C.-A. Pillet, and L. Rey-Bellet, "Entropic fluctuations in statistical mechanics: I. Classical dynamical systems," Nonlinearity **24**, 699–763 (2011).
[30] V. Jakšić and C.-A. Pillet, "On entropy production in quantum statistical mechanics," Commun. Math. Phys. **217**, 285–293 (2001).
[31] D. Ruelle, "Entropy production in quantum spin systems," Commun. Math. Phys. **224**, 3–16 (2001).
[32] H. Araki, "Relative entropy of states of von Neumann algebras II," Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **13**, 173–192 (1977).
[33] H. Araki, "Relative entropy of states of von Neumann algebras," Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **11**, 809–833 (1975/76).
[34] H. Araki and T. Masuda, "Positive cones and L_p-spaces for von Neumann algebras," Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **18**(339–411), 339–411 (1982).
[35] V. Jakšić, C.-A. Pillet, and M. Westrich, "Entropic fluctuations of quantum dynamical semigroups," J. Stat. Phys. **154**, 153–187 (2014).
[36] H. Araki and W. Wyss, "Representations of canonical anticommutation relations," Helv. Phys. Acta **37**, 136–159 (1964).
[37] O. Bratteli and D. W. Robinson, *Operator Algebras and Quantum-Statistical Mechanics. II*, *Texts and Monographs in Physics* (Springer, New York, 1981).
[38] O. Bratteli and D. W. Robinson, *Operator Algebras and Quantum Statistical Mechanics. I*, *Texts and Monographs in Physics* (Springer, New York, 1987).
[39] J. Dereziński and C. Gérard, *Mathematics of Quantization and Quantum Fields*, *Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013).
[40] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics. IV. Analysis of Operators* (Academic Press [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], New York, London, 1978).
[41] W. Hunziker and C.-A. Pillet, "Degenerate asymptotic perturbation theory," Commun. Math. Phys. **90**, 219–233 (1983).
[42] J. Dereziński and R. Früboes, "Fermi golden rule and open quantum systems," in *Open Quantum Systems. III*, *Lecture Notes in Math.* (Springer, Berlin, 2006), Vol. 1882, pp. 67–116.
[43] T. Kato, *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators*, *Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 132* (Springer, New York, 1966).
[44] H. Spohn, "An algebraic condition for the approach to equilibrium of an open N-level system," Lett. Math. Phys. **2**, 33–38 (1977).
[45] E. Davies, *One-Parameter Semigroups* (Academic Press, New York, London, 1980).
[46] V. Jakšić and C.-A. Pillet, "A note on the entropy production formula," in *Advances in Differential Equations and Mathematical Physics (Birmingham, AL, 2002)*, *Contemp. Math.* (American Mathecatical Society, Providence, RI, 2003), Vol. 327, pp. 175–180.

19 March 2026 15:06:40

© Author(s) 2026