

A favorably-scaling natural-orbital functional theory based on higher-order occupation probabilities

Ralph Gebauer^{*}, Morrel H. Cohen^{† ‡}, and Roberto Car^{‡ §}

^{*}ICTP – The Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics, Strada Costiera 11, 34151 Trieste, Italy, [†]Department of Physics and Astronomy, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ 08854, [‡]Department of Chemistry, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, and [§]Department of Physics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544

Submitted to Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America

We introduce a novel energy functional for ground-state electronic-structure calculations. Its fundamental variables are the natural spin-orbitals of the implied singlet many-body wave function and their joint occupation probabilities. The functional derives from a sequence of controlled approximations to the two-particle density matrix. Algebraic scaling of computational cost with electron number is obtainable in general, and Hartree-Fock scaling in the seniority-zero version of the theory. Results obtained with the latter version for saturated small molecular systems are compared with those of highly-accurate quantum-chemical computations. The numerical results are variational, capturing most of the correlation energy from equilibrium to dissociation. Their accuracy is considerably greater than that obtainable with current density-functional theory approximations and with current functionals of the one-particle density matrix only.

Electronic structure | correlation | density matrix

Introduction

Computing the ground-state energy of N interacting electrons is central to quantum chemistry, condensed-matter physics, and related sciences. Reducing its complexity significantly below that of the many-body wave function has been a major goal since the early days of quantum mechanics. Density-functional theory (DFT) [1, 2] achieved maximal reduction by using electron density as the basic variable. DFT transformed many sciences and technologies, but finding accurate, parameter-free approximations to its exchange-correlation energy functional that avoid self-interaction and capture strong electron correlation has remained difficult. One-particle density-matrix (1-DM) functional theories [3] have one more degree of complexity. In them, the 1-DM is often represented by its eigenvalues, the occupation numbers, and the corresponding eigenvectors, the natural spin-orbitals (NSOs), e.g. [4, 5]. While avoiding the mean-field form of the 1-DM of DFT [2], the approximations to the exchange-correlation functional of the 1-DM have difficulties like those of the DFT approximations. Two-particle density-matrix (2-DM) functional theories, e.g. [6], are less reduced, an advantage. The ground-state energy is a known, explicit functional of the 2-DM in Coulombic systems. However, while necessary and sufficient conditions are known for the N -representability of the 1-DM, no such conditions exist for the 2-DM [7]; reconstructing the N -particle wave function from the 2-DM is a QMA-hard problem [8]. Nevertheless, major progress has been made towards necessary conditions for N -representability that can be systematically refined [9, 10]. While not variational, the resulting calculations are almost as accurate as full configuration interaction (FCI) calculations [9, 11, 12]. Their computational cost scales as the 6th power of the basis-set size, significantly worse than the asymptotic 3rd power scaling of Hartree-Fock (HF) theory. Here we introduce a new natural-orbital-functional theory, OP-NOFT, in which the basic variables are the NSOs, their occupation numbers, and their joint occupation probabilities (OP). The latter allow us to represent the 2-DM accurately and transcend the limita-

tions of the 1-DM theories. Its general form contains single-NSO through 4-NSO joint-occupation probabilities and scales as the 5th power of the basis-set size. Its simplest formulation, for seniority 0, OP-NOFT-0, corresponds to doubly-occupied configuration interaction (DOCI) [13]. It contains only single- and 2-natural-orbital (NO) OPs and retains the 3rd power scaling of HF energy-functional minimization, albeit with a higher prefactor. It describes the dissociation of simple diatomic molecules and multi-atom chains with accuracy comparable to that of DOCI, which uses a compact basis of Slater determinants (SD) but retains exponential scaling. OP-NOFT-0 is powerful at high correlation, i.e. for static correlation at intermediate and large interatomic separations where HF fails due to the multi-reference character of the ground-state wavefunction. There, OP-NOFT-0 outperforms HF, DFT and quantum-chemistry methods such as (single-reference) coupled cluster with single, double and perturbative triple electron-hole excitations (CCSD(T)), a standard of accuracy near equilibrium separations. This introduction of higher-order OPs as variational parameters, with closure of the theory at their level, is the essential novelty of our work and is responsible for its favorable scaling with high accuracy.

Significance

Computations of the locations of the nuclei and the movement of electrons within molecules and materials are widely used in science and technology. Direct computation of a system's wave function for that purpose becomes impractical as system size grows. Current alternative methods can have difficulty with strongly-correlated electron motion or spurious electron self-interaction. By using “natural spin orbitals” to describe the motion of individual electrons, solving for them together with their joint and individual probabilities of occurrence within the system, we are able to account better for electron correlation when strong while avoiding self-interaction and maintaining the growth of computation cost with system size at the level of Hartree-Fock theory. Our numerical results for small test molecules are excellent.

Reserved for Publication Footnotes

OP-NOFT, general formulation

The NSO basis. We consider time-reversal invariant saturated systems with non-degenerate, singlet ground states. The inverse approach [6] starts from a set of N -representability conditions on the 2-DM needed for it to be derivable from a generic N -electron wavefunction. Instead, we take a forward approach: we introduce a specific form for the trial wavefunction and derive the 2-DM explicitly. Our starting point is that of conventional FCI, except that our one-particle basis is the complete set of NSOs of the trial function Ψ , $\psi_k(x) = \phi_k(\mathbf{r})\chi_k(\sigma)$, with \mathbf{r} space and σ spin coordinates. The NOs $\phi_k(\mathbf{r})$ are real and independent of the spin function $\chi_k(\sigma)$. The complete set of N -electron orthonormal SDs $\Phi_{\mathbf{k}}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$, $\mathbf{k} = k_1, k_2, \dots, k_N$, formed from its NSOs supports representation of any trial wavefunction $\Psi(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$ as the expansion

$$\Psi(x_1, \dots, x_N) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} C_{\mathbf{k}} \Phi_{\mathbf{k}}(x_1, \dots, x_N). \quad [1]$$

As the ground-state wave function is real, so are the trial functions and the normalized $C_{\mathbf{k}}$ ($\sum_{\mathbf{k}} C_{\mathbf{k}}^2 = 1$). As the trial function or the coefficients vary in the search for the ground state, so do the NSOs, as in any NOFT. The exponential complexity of determining the ground-state energy by variation of the $C_{\mathbf{k}}$ is composed of the separate exponential complexities of the signs and the magnitudes of the coefficients $C_{\mathbf{k}}$. We use distinct reductive approximations for their signs and magnitudes. The signs and consequently the sign-approximation scheme depend on the sign convention chosen for the SDs. We use the Leibniz form for the SDs,

$$\Phi_{\mathbf{k}}(x_1, \dots, x_N) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N!}} \sum_P \text{sgn}\{P\} P_P \psi_{k_1}(x_1) \cdots \psi_{k_N}(x_N). \quad [2]$$

The sum is over the elements of the symmetric group of order N , the permutations P_P . The sign of $\Phi_{\mathbf{k}}$ is fixed by the ordering $k_1 < k_2 < \dots < k_N$ in the product of the NSO ψ_{k_i} in **2**. Once this sign convention is understood, the SDs and their coefficients can be specified simply by listing the NSOs occupied in the SDs, i.e. by the index \mathbf{k} .

The 1-DM, the orthogonality constraint, the PDC. The 1-DM of Ψ ,

$$\rho(x', x) = N \int dx_2 \cdots dx_N \Psi(x', x_2, \dots, x_N) \Psi^*(x, x_2, \dots, x_N), \quad [3]$$

becomes

$$\rho(x', x) = \left[\sum_{\mathbf{k}; i, j \notin \mathbf{k}} C_{i, \mathbf{k}} C_{j, \mathbf{k}} \right] \psi_i(x') \psi_j(x) \quad [4]$$

after **1** and **2** are inserted into **3**. In **4** the subindex \mathbf{k} specifies the $N - 1$ NSOs present in $\Phi_{i, \mathbf{k}}$ and $\Phi_{j, \mathbf{k}}$, excluding ψ_i and ψ_j . As the ψ are the NSOs of Ψ , the eigenfunctions of $\rho(x', x)$, the bracketed quantity in **4** must vanish for $i \neq j$. Regard the coefficients $C_{i, \mathbf{k}}$ and $C_{j, \mathbf{k}}$ as the components of vectors \mathbf{C}_i and \mathbf{C}_j and the bracket as their scalar product $\mathbf{C}_i \cdot \mathbf{C}_j$, which must vanish. There are two realizations of this orthogonality constraint, a condition of consistency between Ψ and the ψ . In the first, an *inclusive* and most general form (OC), the presence of $\Phi_{i, \mathbf{k}}$ in Ψ does not exclude the presence of $\Phi_{j, \mathbf{k}}$. The individual terms in the scalar product need not vanish, only their sum must. In the second, an *exclusive* form, the pair-difference constraint (PDC) is a special case of the OC, in which the presence of $\Phi_{i, \mathbf{k}}$ excludes $\Phi_{j, \mathbf{k}}$ so that either $C_{i, \mathbf{k}}$ or $C_{j, \mathbf{k}}$ is zero for each \mathbf{k} , and the sum vanishes term by term. Under the PDC, those Φ present in the expansion of Ψ must differ from one another by at least two NSOs, forming a subspace $\{\Phi\}_{\text{PDC}}$ of the SD space $\{\Phi\}$ and restricting the trial function space $\{\Psi\}$ to $\{\Psi\}_{\text{PDC}}$. The OC is a necessary and sufficient con-

dition for N -representability, whereas the PDC is only sufficient. We impose the PDC on the Φ as a simplifying variational approximation.

Under the OC or PDC, $\rho(x', x)$ takes the diagonal form

$$\rho(x', x) = \sum_k p_1(k) \psi_k(x') \psi_k(x). \quad [5]$$

Here, the $p_1(k) = \sum_{\mathbf{n}} C_{\mathbf{n}}^2 \nu_{k, \mathbf{n}}$, where $\nu_{k, \mathbf{n}} = 1$ if $k \in \mathbf{n}$ and 0 otherwise, are the eigenvalues of $\rho(x', x)$, the occupation numbers or occupation probabilities (1-OP) of its eigenfunctions ψ_k . They satisfy the necessary and sufficient conditions $0 \leq p_1(k) \leq 1$ and $\sum_k p_1(k) = N$. In general, only $M > N$ occupation numbers $p_1(k)$ are non-negligible, and only the corresponding active NSOs need be included in the representation of any trial function, providing a natural cutoff. The 1-DM is thus of algebraic complexity in the 1-OPs and the NSOs, as M scales linearly with N .

The 2-DM, the sign conjecture, the ξ -approximation. The 2-DM of Ψ ,

$$\pi(x'_1 x'_2; x_1 x_2) = N(N-1) \int dx_3 \cdots dx_N \Psi(x'_1, x'_2, x_3, \dots, x_N) \Psi^*(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_N),$$

becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(x'_1 x'_2; x_1 x_2) &= \sum_{\substack{i < i', j < j', \mathbf{k} \\ i, i', j, j' \notin \mathbf{k}}} C_{ii' \mathbf{k}} C_{jj' \mathbf{k}} \\ &\quad (\psi_i(x'_1) \psi_{i'}(x'_2) - \psi_{i'}(x'_1) \psi_i(x'_2)) \\ &\quad (\psi_j(x_1) \psi_{j'}(x_2) - \psi_{j'}(x_1) \psi_j(x_2)). \end{aligned}$$

π separates into a part π^d diagonal in the indices, i.e. with $ii' = jj'$, and an off-diagonal part, π^{od} , with $ii' \neq jj'$:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^d(x'_1 x'_2; x_1 x_2) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} p_{11}(ij) \\ &\quad (\psi_i(x'_1) \psi_j(x'_2) - \psi_j(x'_1) \psi_i(x'_2)) \\ &\quad (\psi_i(x_1) \psi_j(x_2) - \psi_j(x_1) \psi_i(x_2)) \quad [6] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^{od}(x'_1 x'_2; x_1 x_2) &= \sum_{\substack{i < i' \neq j < j', \mathbf{k} \\ i, i', j, j' \notin \mathbf{k}}} C_{ii' \mathbf{k}} C_{jj' \mathbf{k}} \\ &\quad (\psi_i(x'_1) \psi_{i'}(x'_2) - \psi_{i'}(x'_1) \psi_i(x'_2)) \\ &\quad (\psi_j(x_1) \psi_{j'}(x_2) - \psi_{j'}(x_1) \psi_j(x_2)) \quad [7] \end{aligned}$$

Electron correlation is expressed through π^{od} . The analogous off-diagonal part of $\rho(x', x)$ is suppressed by the OC, an advantage of the NSO basis. Note also that the PDC has eliminated 3-index terms from π^{od} in **7**.

The $p_{11}(ij) = \sum_{\mathbf{n}} C_{\mathbf{n}}^2 \nu_{i, \mathbf{n}} \nu_{j, \mathbf{n}}$ in π^d are joint 2-state occupation probabilities (2-OPs). Establishing the N -representability conditions for the 2-OPs is a hard problem because new conditions constrain the 2-OPs that arise from the positivity conditions for the q -OPs, i.e. the $p_{11 \dots 1}(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_q) = \sum_{\mathbf{n}} C_{\mathbf{n}}^2 \nu_{i_1, \mathbf{n}} \nu_{i_2, \mathbf{n}} \cdots \nu_{i_q, \mathbf{n}}$, at any order q . These conditions derive from the so-called (2, q) positivity conditions [14] restricted to the diagonal elements of the 2-DM [15]. Limiting ourselves to the (2, 2) and (2, 3) conditions, the following conditions for the 2-OPs hold:

$$\sup(p_1(i) + p_1(j) - 1, 0) \leq p_{11}(ij) \leq p_1(<) \quad [8]$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup(p_1(i) + p_1(j) + p_1(k) - 1, 0) &\leq p_{11}(ij) + \\ &\quad p_{11}(ik) + p_{11}(jk) \quad [9] \end{aligned}$$

$p_1(<)$ is the lesser of $p_1(i)$ and $p_1(j)$. In addition the sum rule

$$\sum_{j(\neq i)} p_{11}(ij) = (N-1)p_1(i) \quad [10]$$

must be satisfied. Conditions **8–10** were first established by Weinhold and Bright Wilson [16]. They are necessary but not sufficient conditions for N -representability [15, 17]. Establishing a complete set of conditions is a QMA-hard problem because the number of $(2, q)$ positivity conditions increases combinatorially with increasing q . Fortunately numerical calculations on atoms and molecules indicate that sufficiently accurate lower-bound ground-state energies often result by imposing $(2, q)$ -positivity conditions with $q \leq 3$ [9, 18]. This suggests that even in the most difficult situations, fermionic problems in atoms and molecules should require only a finite and small set of positivity conditions. Here we shall limit ourselves to conditions **8–10**, as we found in our numerical calculations that they are sufficient to produce accurate lower-bounds. If higher order conditions were found to be necessary, it would not be hard to add a few more of them in the numerical scheme presented later.

The π^d of **6** contains only 2-OPs and products of 2 distinct NSOs; it has at most algebraic complexity $\sim M^3$ deriving from condition **9**. Thus when only conditions **8–10** are imposed, the exponential complexity of the ground-state problem resides entirely in the π^{od} of **7**. We extract the sign $s(ii'\mathbf{k})$ of the coefficient $C_{ii'\mathbf{k}}$ in **7** and, relating its magnitude to the joint N -OP $p_{11\dots 1}(ii'\mathbf{k}) \equiv C_{ii'\mathbf{k}}^2$, we rewrite **7** as

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^{od}(x'_1 x'_2; x_1 x_2) = & \sum_{\substack{i < i' \neq j < j', \mathbf{k} \\ i, i', j, j' \notin \mathbf{k}}} s(ii'\mathbf{k})s(jj'\mathbf{k}) \\ & p_{11\dots 1}^{1/2}(ii'\mathbf{k})p_{11\dots 1}^{1/2}(jj'\mathbf{k}) \\ & (\psi_i(x'_1)\psi_{i'}(x'_2) - \psi_{i'}(x'_1)\psi_i(x'_2)) \\ & (\psi_j(x_1)\psi_{j'}(x_2) - \psi_{j'}(x_1)\psi_j(x_2)). \end{aligned} \quad [11]$$

We suppose that a variational approximation exists in which

$$s(ii'\mathbf{k})s(jj'\mathbf{k}) = s(ii')s(jj'), \forall \mathbf{k}. \quad [12]$$

The *sign conjecture* **12** reduces the sign complexity to algebraic, scaling as M^2 . π^{od} simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^{od}(x'_1 x'_2; x_1 x_2) = & \sum_{i < i' \neq j < j'} s(ii')s(jj') \\ & \left[\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k} \\ i, i', j, j' \notin \mathbf{k}}} p_{11\dots 1}^{1/2}(ii'\mathbf{k})p_{11\dots 1}^{1/2}(jj'\mathbf{k}) \right] \\ & (\psi_i(x'_1)\psi_{i'}(x'_2) - \psi_{i'}(x'_1)\psi_i(x'_2)) \\ & (\psi_j(x_1)\psi_{j'}(x_2) - \psi_{j'}(x_1)\psi_j(x_2)) \end{aligned} \quad [13]$$

The quantities $p_{11\dots 1}^{1/2}(ii'\mathbf{k})$ and $p_{11\dots 1}^{1/2}(jj'\mathbf{k})$ are \mathbf{k} -th components of vectors $\mathbf{p}_{11\dots 1}^{1/2}(ii')$ and $\mathbf{p}_{11\dots 1}^{1/2}(jj')$. The bracketed quantity in **13** is their scalar product. Express it as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k} \\ i, i', j, j' \notin \mathbf{k}}} p_{11\dots 1}^{1/2}(ii'\mathbf{k})p_{11\dots 1}^{1/2}(jj'\mathbf{k}) = & \\ p_{1100}^{1/2}(ii'jj')p_{0011}^{1/2}(ii'jj')\xi(ii'jj'), \end{aligned} \quad [14]$$

where $p_{1100}(ii'jj')$ is the square magnitude of the vector $\mathbf{p}_{11\dots 1}^{1/2}(ii')$ and $p_{0011}(ii'jj')$ that of $\mathbf{p}_{11\dots 1}^{1/2}(jj')$. $p_{1100}(ii'jj')$ is the probability that ψ_i and $\psi_{i'}$ are occupied while ψ_j and $\psi_{j'}$ are not:

$$\begin{aligned} p_{1100}(ii'jj') = & \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k} \\ i, i', j, j' \notin \mathbf{k}}} p_{11\dots 1}(ii'\mathbf{k}) \\ = & \sum_{\mathbf{n}} C_{\mathbf{n}}^2 \nu_{i,\mathbf{n}} \nu_{i',\mathbf{n}} (1 - \nu_{j,\mathbf{n}}) (1 - \nu_{j',\mathbf{n}}), \end{aligned}$$

and the reverse is true for $p_{0011}(ii'jj')$.

The Schwarz inequality $0 \leq \xi(ii'jj') \leq 1$ imposes bounds on $\xi(ii'jj')$, the cosine of the hyper-angle between the vectors. Substituting **14** into **13** yields

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^{od}(x'_1 x'_2; x_1 x_2) = & \sum_{i < i' \neq j < j'} s(ii')s(jj') \\ & [p_{1100}(ii'jj')p_{0011}(ii'jj')]^{1/2} \xi(ii'jj') \\ & (\psi_i(x'_1)\psi_{i'}(x'_2) - \psi_{i'}(x'_1)\psi_i(x'_2)) \\ & (\psi_j(x_1)\psi_{j'}(x_2) - \psi_{j'}(x_1)\psi_j(x_2)), \end{aligned} \quad [15]$$

in which only $\xi(ii'jj')$ retains exponential complexity:

$$\xi(ii'jj') = \frac{\sum' p_{11\dots 1}^{1/2}(ii'\mathbf{k})p_{11\dots 1}^{1/2}(jj'\mathbf{k})}{(\sum' p_{11\dots 1}(ii'\mathbf{k}) \sum' p_{11\dots 1}(jj'\mathbf{k}))^{1/2}},$$

where the primed sums are over all \mathbf{k} with $i, i', j, j' \notin \mathbf{k}$.

Inserting 4-OPs like

$$p_{1111}(ii'kl) = \sum_{\mathbf{n}} C_{\mathbf{n}}^2 \nu_{ii',\mathbf{n}} \nu_{kl,\mathbf{n}}; \quad k < l \neq i, i', j, j'$$

in place of the N -OPs in ξ reduces the complexity of π^{od} to algebraic. The resulting approximation,

$$\xi(ii'jj') \approx \frac{\sum''_{k < l} p_{1111}^{1/2}(ii'kl)p_{1111}^{1/2}(jj'kl)}{(\sum''_{k < l} p_{1111}(ii'kl) \sum''_{k < l} p_{1111}(jj'kl))^{1/2}}, \quad [16]$$

is not variational, but obeys the 0,1 bounds of the Schwarz inequality. It is exact for $N = 4$ within the PDC, and scales as M^4 . In **16** the doubly primed sums are over the indices $k < l$, which must differ from i, i', j, j' . Bounds on the p_{1111} that are the generalizations of **8–10** for 3-OPs and 4-OPs can be formulated.

The OP-NOFT energy functional. The trial energy, $E[\Psi] = (\Psi, \hat{H}\Psi)$, the expectation value of the Hamiltonian \hat{H} , is an explicit functional of the 1- and 2-DM:

$$E[\Psi] = E[\rho, \pi] = \text{tr} \{ \rho \hat{h} \} + \text{tr} \{ \pi \hat{w} \}.$$

Here \hat{h} is the single-particle kinetic-energy operator plus the external potential, and \hat{w} is the 2-electron Coulomb interaction. $E[\rho, \pi]$ splits into two parts, E^d diagonal and E^{od} off-diagonal in the SD:

$$\begin{aligned} E &= E^d + E^{od} \\ E^d &= \text{tr} \{ \rho \hat{h} \} + \text{tr} \{ \pi^d \hat{w} \} \\ E^{od} &= \text{tr} \{ \pi^{od} \hat{w} \}. \end{aligned} \quad [17]$$

The HF wave function minimizes E^d ; π^{od} introduces electron correlation into E^{od} . The explicit forms of E^d and E^{od} follow from **5, 6**, and **15**:

$$E^d = \sum_i p_1(i)h_{ii} + \sum_{i < j} p_{11}(ij) [\mathcal{J}_{ij} - \mathcal{K}_{ij}], \quad [18]$$

where $h_{ii} = (\psi_i, \hat{h}\psi_i)$, and $\mathcal{J}_{ij} = (\psi_i\psi_i, \hat{w}\psi_j\psi_j)$ and $\mathcal{K}_{ij} = (\psi_i\psi_j, \hat{w}\psi_j\psi_i)$ are the usual Coulomb and exchange integrals, respectively.

$$\begin{aligned} E^{od} = & \sum_{i < i' \neq j < j'} s(ii')s(jj')p_{1100}^{1/2}(ii'jj')p_{0011}^{1/2}(ii'jj') \\ & \xi(ii'jj') [\mathcal{K}_{ii'jj'} - \mathcal{K}_{ii'j'j}], \end{aligned} \quad [19]$$

where $\mathcal{K}_{ii'j'j} = (\psi_i\psi_{i'}, \hat{w}\psi_j\psi_{j'})$. **17–19** define the OP-NOFT energy functional. Including the complexity of efficient evaluation of the matrix elements, it scales as M^5 if the N -representability conditions for the 3- and 4-OPs can be limited to those deriving from the $(3, q)$ and $(4, q)$ positivity conditions with $q \leq 4$.

Proof of the sign conjecture. A variational sign approximation must be a statement about the sign $s(ii'\mathbf{k})$ or $s(jj'\mathbf{k})$ of each coefficient appearing in 7. To prove the sign conjecture 12, we must find one in which the \mathbf{k} -dependences of $s(ii'\mathbf{k})$ and $s(jj'\mathbf{k})$ cancel out. One, for the general case of matrix elements $[\mathcal{K}_{ii',jj'} - \mathcal{K}_{ii',j'j}]$ of arbitrary sign, is presented here. Another, valid only for positive matrix elements, is presented in Section S1 of the Supporting Information (SI). The two approximations yield the same results for OP-NOFT-0.

Arbitrary signs of matrix elements: Assigning each index l in $C_{\mathbf{k}}$ a sign $s(l)$ and taking $s(\mathbf{k})$ as their product,

$$s(\mathbf{k}) = \prod_{l \in \mathbf{k}} s(l),$$

is a variational approximation. Consequently $s(ii'\mathbf{k}) = s(i)s(i')s(\mathbf{k})$ and

$$s(ii'\mathbf{k})s(jj'\mathbf{k}) = s(i)s(i')s(j)s(j'), \quad [20]$$

and the sign conjecture is proved for arbitrary signs of matrix elements. This approximation treats the form and phase, 0 or π , of each NSO as independent variables. The choice of signs for each index is not specified in 20. Most computation schemes start their convergence towards the minimum energy with random initial NSOs, and similarly the choice of signs in 20 should be random, half positive and half negative. The number L of initial NSOs should be greater than M to allow for the possibility of unequal numbers of positive and negative signs associated with the M active NSOs.

OP-NOFT-0

The SD's in 1 can be classified by their seniority, the number A of singly-occupied one-particle states they contain. For N even and for a global spin singlet ($S = 0$) state, the N -particle Hilbert space divides into sectors of increasing even seniority starting with $A = 0$, where all SD's contain only doubly occupied states. That only even seniority occurs is a consequence of the orthogonality constraint. For molecular systems CI expansions converge rapidly with seniority, and $A = 0$ calculations (DOCI calculations) describe dissociation rather well, as demonstrated in [19].

We now formulate OP-NOFT explicitly in the $A = 0$ sector both to illustrate further how an OP-NOFT functional is constructed and to prepare for numerical implementation; it becomes OP-NOFT-0, in which the PDC is automatically satisfied. Tracing out the spins, 5 becomes:

$$\rho(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}) = 2 \sum_k p_1(k) \phi_k(\mathbf{r}') \phi_k(\mathbf{r}). \quad [21]$$

k now labels $M (> N/2)$ active doubly-occupied NO states, and the following conditions hold:

$$0 \leq p_1(k) \leq 1 \text{ and } 2 \sum_k p_1(k) = N. \quad [22]$$

In 21 and 22 $p_1(k)$ is the occupation number of either of the paired NSOs having the NO ϕ_k .

In the 2-DM, the impact of double occupancy on the structure of π^d is minor, but it results in a major simplification of the structure of π^{od} . We make the orbital and spin components of the NSO indices explicit, so that they take the form is , with i now the orbital index and $s = \pm$ the spin index. Because of double occupancy, the only index pairs that can enter π^{od} in 15 are $i+$, $i-$ and $j+$, $j-$. Similarly, the only sets of two index pairs that can enter the rhs of 16 are $i+$, $i-$, $k+$, $k-$ and $j+$, $j-$, $k+$, $k-$. The occupation numbers ν_{i+} and ν_{i-} are always equal, with values 0 or 1, so that all 4-NSO OPs in 16 and 15 are identical to the corresponding spin independent 2-NSO OPs, e.g. $p_{1111}(i+i-k+k-) = p_{11}(ik)$. Correspondingly, the signs in 15 depend only on a single orbital index, $s(i+i-) = s(i)$, and the ξ depend only on two-orbital indices, $\xi(i+i-j+j-) = \xi(ij)$. With

these simplifications, the 2-DM of 6 and 15 becomes

$$\pi(\mathbf{r}'_1 \mathbf{r}'_2; \mathbf{r}_1 \mathbf{r}_2) = \pi^d(\mathbf{r}'_1 \mathbf{r}'_2; \mathbf{r}_1 \mathbf{r}_2) + \pi^{od}(\mathbf{r}'_1 \mathbf{r}'_2; \mathbf{r}_1 \mathbf{r}_2), \quad [23]$$

after tracing out the spins, with

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^d(\mathbf{r}'_1 \mathbf{r}'_2; \mathbf{r}_1 \mathbf{r}_2) &= 2 \sum_{ij} p_{11}(ij) \\ &\quad (2\phi_i(\mathbf{r}'_1)\phi_j(\mathbf{r}'_2)\phi_i(\mathbf{r}_1)\phi_j(\mathbf{r}_2) - \\ &\quad \phi_i(\mathbf{r}'_1)\phi_j(\mathbf{r}'_2)\phi_j(\mathbf{r}_1)\phi_i(\mathbf{r}_2)) \end{aligned} \quad [24]$$

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^{od}(\mathbf{r}'_1 \mathbf{r}'_2; \mathbf{r}_1 \mathbf{r}_2) &= 2 \sum_{i \neq j} s(i)s(j) \\ &\quad [p_{10}(ij)p_{01}(ij)]^{1/2} \xi(ij) \\ &\quad \phi_i(\mathbf{r}'_1)\phi_i(\mathbf{r}'_2)\phi_j(\mathbf{r}_1)\phi_j(\mathbf{r}_2). \end{aligned} \quad [25]$$

The sum in 24 includes the term $i = j$, for which $p_{11}(ii) = p_1(i)$ because of double occupancy, and $\xi(ij)$ in 25 is now

$$\xi(ij) \approx \frac{\sum_{k(\neq i,j)} p_{11}^{1/2}(ik)p_{11}^{1/2}(jk)}{[\sum_{k(\neq i,j)} p_{11}(ik) \sum_{k(\neq i,j)} p_{11}(jk)]^{1/2}}. \quad [26]$$

The one- and two-orbital OPs of OP-NOFT-0 lie within the same bounds as in the general case, 8–9, if we impose only the (2, 2) and (2, 3) positivity conditions, and their sum rules become, respectively, 22 and

$$2 \sum_{j(\neq i)} p_{11}(ij) = (N - 2)p_1(i). \quad [27]$$

The π of 23 satisfies two important sum rules

$$\begin{aligned} \int d\mathbf{r}_2 \pi(\mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}_2; \mathbf{r}'\mathbf{r}_2) &= (N - 1)\rho(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \\ \int d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 \pi(\mathbf{r}_1 \mathbf{r}_2; \mathbf{r}_1 \mathbf{r}_2) w(r_{12}) &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The OP-NOFT-0 form for π , 23–26, is exact when $N = 2$ with $\xi = 1$. It is equivalent to DOCI for $N = 4$. When $N > 4$, the ξ -approximation of 26 and the assumption on the N -representability condition break the equivalence to DOCI. Our numerical results presented below and our detailed examinations of its formal structure at dissociation suggest that it is a very good approximation to DOCI, with algebraic instead of exponential complexity.

The expectation value $E = \langle \Psi | H | \Psi \rangle$ of the Hamiltonian $H = h + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} w(r_{ij})$, where h is a sum of one-body terms, becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} E &= 2 \sum_i p_1(i) \langle \phi_i | h | \phi_i \rangle + \\ &\quad \sum_{ij} p_{11}(ij) (2J_{ij} - K_{ij}) + \\ &\quad \sum_{i \neq j} s(i)s(j) p_{10}^{1/2}(ij) p_{01}^{1/2}(ij) \xi(ij) K_{ij}, \end{aligned} \quad [28]$$

where J_{ij} and K_{ij} are Hartree- and exchange integrals defined in terms of the NOs $\{\phi_i\}$. With 26 for $\xi(ij)$, E in 28 is a functional of the NOs, and the 1- and 2-state OPs. The signs are chosen a priori by a sign rule and are not variables. p_{10} is related to p_{11} and p_1 by $p_1(i) = p_{11}(ij) + p_{10}(ij)$ and can be eliminated from the functional. Each sum in the denominator of $\xi(ij)$ in 26 can be simplified by use of the sum rule of 27 to, e.g.,

$$\sum_{k(\neq i,j)} p_{11}(ik) = \frac{1}{2}(N - 2)p_1(i) - p_{11}(ij).$$

As stated in the general section on the 2-DM, we assume that the (2, 2) and (2, 3) positivity conditions are sufficient in practice. Were

this not the case, it would be straightforward to add a few more positivity conditions to achieve practical sufficiency. Under this circumstance, the infimum of E with respect to the NOs and the OPs, subject to the constraints **22** and **8, 9, 27**, yields a variational approximation to the ground-state energy, apart from the ξ -approximation for $N > 4$.

The last term on the rhs of **28** originates from π^{od} and drives electron correlation; without it the infimum is the HF energy. The second term on the rhs of **28** originates from π^d , the form of which is represented exactly in our theory. It contains only positive contributions and is essential; the integral relation connecting π and ρ depends only on π^d and guarantees that the functional E is self-interaction free. **28** is a generalization of the NOFT formulations of 1-DM functional theories, which require only 1-state OPs. The extra complexity from 2-state OPs and implicit 4-state OPs is more than compensated by the substantial gain in accuracy it makes possible. The computational cost of calculating E from **28** scales like HF energy-functional minimization with a greater prefactor (M^3 vs $(N/2)^3$) due to fractional occupation of NOs.

Numerical results for simple molecular systems

To test this $A = 0$ version, we studied several diatomic molecules and linear chains of H atoms with open boundary conditions. We included all electrons (core and valence) and expanded the NOs in a contracted Gaussian 6-31G** basis, unless otherwise specified. The constrained minimization of the functional was performed by damped Car-Parrinello dynamics [20], as detailed in Section S2 of the SI.

We started the minimization from NOs and OPs obeying the constraints but otherwise random. The matrix element K_{ij} is positive in **28**. The signs were therefore taken from the sign rule of the Table S1 in Sec. S1 of the SI, except that the (1, 1) case does not occur in zero seniority: for $i \leq N/2$, $R(i+, i-) = 0$, and $s(i) = +1$; for $i > N/2$, $R(i+, i-) = 2$, and $s(i) = -1$. They were kept fixed during optimization.

At convergence, a subset of NOs, the active NOs, had $p_1 \geq 10^{-3}$. The remaining NOs contributed negligibly to the energy. The same active NOs and signs were also found for several test cases starting from a sufficiently large set of random NOs, half with positive and half with negative signs¹. It is significant for the rule of **20** for arbitrary matrix-element signs that for the systems tested, the PWBT-based rule of the Table and the alternative of random initial assignment of signs to pairs yield the same results for positive matrix elements. The procedure of **20** also yields half positive and half negative signs for the pairs when signs are assigned randomly to the individual NSOs with no reference to the matrix-element signs.

We also performed restricted HF, DFT (PBE [22] and/or PBE0 [23]), and CCSD(T) calculations, with the same basis. The relatively small 6-31G** set is adequate for the comparisons of interest. We report the dissociation energy curves of the dimers H_2 , LiH and HF in Figs. S1, S2, and S3 in Section S3 of the SI. For H_2 , our functional depends only on 1-state OPs and reduces to the exact expression of Löwdin and Shull [24]. The OP-NOFT-0 dissociation energy curve thus coincides with CASSCF at all interatomic separations. Even in a system as simple as H_2 , (spin-restricted) HF and DFT fail badly at dissociation because these single reference theories cannot recover the Heitler-London form of the wavefunction. The 4-electron case of LiH provides the first test of 2-state OPs. The conditions **8,9**, and **27** simplify in this case as discussed in Section S4 of the SI. Expression **26** for ξ is exact here, but the restriction to $A = 0$ is not. That the OP-NOFT-0 dissociation energy curve of LiH almost coincides with CASSCF indicates that higher seniorities contribute negligibly to its ground-state energy. Finally, HF, a 10-electron system, provides the first complete test of the theory. Here the OP-NOFT-0 dissociation energy curve follows that of CASSCF with a positive energy shift over the entire separation range. This indicates that the ξ and $A = 0$ approximations work well. We cannot exclude compensation of errors between the




Fig. 1. Symmetric dissociation curve of a linear H_8 chain. The squares indicate one half of the energy of a H_{16} chain (black square: HF energy; green squares: OP-NOFT energy).

two approximations, but the results below suggest that it is not the main factor behind their quality.

The results in Section 3 of the SI depict the breaking of a single-bond in simple molecules. To assess the performance of OP-NOFT-0 in more challenging situations with many bonds or a multiple-bond, we studied the symmetric dissociation of linear H chains and the dissociation of the N_2 dimer. These cases have been used to test compact CI expansions controlled by seniority [19]; FCI calculations are thus available for comparison.

We consider linear H chains first. These are relatively simple systems whose energy surfaces present a serious challenge for single reference methods. Fig. 1 shows the dissociation energy curve of H_8 obtained with different methods. OP-NOFT-0 provides a consistent description of the energy close to and everywhere above the




Fig. 2. Electronic pair-correlation function along the H_8 axis when one electron is placed at the position of the vertical dashed line on the molecular axis. The vertical black lines show the atom positions. The H-H distance is 1.8 Å.

¹For H_2 the sign rule ($s(i \leq N) = +1$ and $s(i > N) = -1$) holds near equilibrium, but a more complex pattern emerges at large separation where additional positive signs are needed for the van der Waals tail of the interaction potential [21]. In principle, these positive signs could be obtained with our minimization procedure, but their effect is beyond the accuracy of the present calculations

²We do not give the CASSCF energies in this case, as the dimension of the active subspace would make these calculations very expensive.

CASSCF reference. The breakdown of CCSD(T) at large separations is caused by the single-reference character of this method. The deviation of OP-NOFT-0 from CASSCF should be attributed mainly to the restriction to the $A = 0$ sector, a conclusion supported by the seniority-restricted CI calculations of Ref. [19]. Close comparison with those calculations is not entirely straightforward, as Ref. [19] used the slightly smaller 6-31G basis and a fixed, symmetric or broken symmetry, molecular orbital (MO) basis, whereas we used NOs that were determined self-consistently. Note that our results are better than the CI results with $A = 0, 2$ and symmetric MO's. OP-NOFT-0 describes the dissociation limit correctly.

OP-NOFT-0 provides not only the ground-state energy but also the 1- and 2-DM. The former displays the entanglement due to correlation through variation of the occupation numbers and the Von Neumann entanglement entropy with interatomic separation shown in Fig. S4 in Section S5 of the SI. The increase of entanglement entropy with separation signals a dramatic increase of correlation corresponding to multi-reference character. The 2-DM gives access to electron pair correlations. Fig. 2 depicts the pair-correlation function when one electron is placed outside the molecule's right end. An asymmetric exchange-correlation hole associated with the charging of the end atom can clearly be seen. The alternating bonding/antibonding character of the links between adjacent atoms is also manifest. This reflects the instability of the open-bounded chain toward a dimerizing distortion and is evident in the pair correlations when an electron resides respectively in the mid-bond or in the mid-antibond, as shown in Fig. S5, left and right panels respectively, in Section S6 of the SI.

To test the dependence of the ξ approximation **26** on electron number, we studied the symmetric dissociation of H_{16} .² Results for the energy of H_{16} divided by 2 are shown as squares in Fig. 1. OP-NOFT-0 works equally well for this longer chain. The total energy at dissociation is twice that of H_8 , and the slightly increased binding energy per atom at equilibrium arises from an increase in the correlation energy, as expected from more effective screening in the larger system.

The N_2 molecule is a severe test for correlated electronic structure methods because of its triple-bond. Our results are compared to other methods in Fig. 3. The OP-NOFT-0 curve is above the CASSCF reference at all interatomic separations and deviates little from it until 2Å, beyond which the deviation increases with separation until it stabilizes at 5Å. OP-NOFT-0 correctly dissociates the molecule into two non-interacting fragments, but cannot capture correlations among the 3 electrons with unpaired spin in each isolated atom. It captures only intra-shell correlations among electrons of opposite spin, consistent with seniority restricted CI calculations in Ref. [19].

It is interesting to note that in all the systems studied, the positivity condition (2, 2) was found to be sufficient at near equilibrium up to intermediate separations dominated by dynamic correlation. Moreover, only in the case of H_8 , H_{16} and N_2 at large separations did inclusion of the (2, 3) positivity condition turn out to be essential to enforce numerically the variational character of the ground-state solution.

Discussion

We have introduced a new method for correlated electronic-structure calculations, OP-NOFT, that scales algebraically. Its DOCI-like sim-

plification, OP-NOFT-0 scales favorably with system size, with HF energy-minimization scaling. The variational character of the energies calculated via OP-NOFT-0 supports the accuracy of the ξ approximation **26** and of limiting the positivity conditions to **8-9**. OP-NOFT-0 is restricted to the $A = 0$ sector of the Hilbert space. While providing an accurate description of single-bond breaking and achieving a considerable improvement over single-reference methods in all cases studied, it overestimates the dissociation energy of a triple-bond, missing the correlations between same-spin electrons in the open-shell fragments. That error should be eliminated by including the contribution of the $A = 2, 4$ sectors as shown in Ref. [19]. Including those sectors would require use of the full theory and its functional, **19**. While 4-state NSO OPs and 4-index integrals would be required, the theory would still scale polynomially.

It will be straightforward to add the computation of interatomic forces to the OP-NOFT-0 energy-minimization methodology, making possible the use of the theory for structural optimization and ab-initio molecular dynamics [20].

From the practical point of view, minimization of the functional is significantly more laborious than minimization of the HF or the DFT functional because considerably more minimization steps are needed to minimize the functional **28**. We attribute this difficulty to the need to include in **28** occupation numbers that are sufficiently small. In damped dynamics minimization the forces acting on the corresponding NOs are thus very weak compared to the forces acting on the NOs with occupation numbers close to 1, slowing down considerably the entire procedure. This difficulty is common to all NO-based methods including those based on the 1-DM. Solving it is essential to making OP-NOFT methods widely applicable in practice.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. The authors acknowledge illuminating discussions with Paul Ayers and Kieron Burke. Refs. [13] and [16] were brought to the authors' attention by Paul Ayers. The authors further wish to thank J. E. Moussa for important comments. M.H.C. and R.C. acknowledge support from the DOE under grant DE-FG02-05ER46201.




Fig. 3. Dissociation curve of the N_2 molecule.

- Hohenberg P, Kohn W (1964) Inhomogeneous Electron Gas. *Physical Review* 136:B864–B871.
- Kohn W, Sham LJ (1965) Self-Consistent Equations Including Exchange and Correlation Effects. *Physical Review* 140:A1133–A1138.
- Gilbert TL (1975) Hohenberg-Kohn theorem for nonlocal external potentials. *Physical Review B* 12:2111–2120.
- Gritsenko O, Pernal K, Baerends EJ (2005) An improved density matrix functional by physically motivated repulsive corrections. *The Journal of chemical physics* 122:204102.

- Lathiotakis NN, Marques MAL (2008) Benchmark calculations for reduced density-matrix functional theory. *The Journal of chemical physics* 128:184103.
- Garrod C, Percus JK (1964) Reduction of the N-Particle Variational Problem. *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 5:1756.
- Coleman AJ (1963) Structure of Fermion Density Matrices. *Reviews of Modern Physics* 35:668–686.
- Liu YK, Christandl M, Verstraete F (2007) Quantum Computational Complexity of the N-Representability Problem: QMA Complete. *Physical Review Letters* 98:110503.

9. Zhao Z, Braams BJ, Fukuda M, Overton ML, Percus JK (2004) The reduced density matrix method for electronic structure calculations and the role of three-index representability conditions. *The Journal of chemical physics* 120:2095 – 2104.
10. Mazziotti D (2012) Structure of Fermionic Density Matrices: Complete N-Representability Conditions. *Physical Review Letters* 108:263002.
11. Nakata M, et al. (2001) Variational calculations of fermion second-order reduced density matrices by semidefinite programming algorithm. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 114:8282.
12. Gidofalvi G, Mazziotti DA (2008) Active-space two-electron reduced-density-matrix method: complete active-space calculations without diagonalization of the N-electron Hamiltonian. *The Journal of chemical physics* 129:134108.
13. Weinhold F, Bright Wilson E (1967) Reduced Density Matrices of Atoms and Molecules. I. The 2 Matrix of Double-Occupancy, Configuration-Interaction Wavefunctions for Singlet States. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 46:2752.
14. Mazziotti D (2012) Significant conditions for the two-electron reduced density matrix from the constructive solution of N representability. *Physical Review A* 85:062507.
15. Ayers PW, Davidson ER (2007) Linear Inequalities for Diagonal Elements of Density Matrices. *Advances in Chemical Physics* 134:443 – 483.
16. Weinhold F, Bright Wilson E (1967) Reduced Density Matrices of Atoms and Molecules. II. On the N-Representability Problem. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 47:2298.
17. Davidson ER (1969) Linear Inequalities for Density Matrices. *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 10:725.
18. Mazziotti DA (2012) Two-electron reduced density matrix as the basic variable in many-electron quantum chemistry and physics. *Chemical reviews* 112:244–62.
19. Bytautas L, Henderson TM, Jiménez-Hoyos CA, Ellis JK, Scuseria GE (2011) Seniority and orbital symmetry as tools for establishing a full configuration interaction hierarchy. *The Journal of chemical physics* 135:044119.
20. Car R, Parrinello M (1985) Unified Approach for Molecular Dynamics and Density-Functional Theory. *Physical Review Letters* 55:2471–2474.
21. Sheng XW, Mentel AM, Gritsenko OV, Baerends EJ (2013) A natural orbital analysis of the long range behavior of chemical bonding and van der Waals interaction in singlet H₂: The issue of zero natural orbital occupation numbers. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 138:164105.
22. Perdew JP, Burke K, Ernzerhof M (1996) Generalized Gradient Approximation Made Simple. *Physical Review Letters* 77:3865–3868.
23. Adamo C, Barone V (1999) Toward reliable density functional methods without adjustable parameters: The PBE0 model. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 110:6158.
24. Löwdin PO, Shull H (1956) Natural Orbitals in the Quantum Theory of Two-Electron Systems. *Physical Review* 101:1730–1739.