

Flat-band ferromagnetism in the $SU(N)$ Hubbard and Kondo lattice models

Kensuke Tamura

Department of Physics, The University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan

E-mail: tamura-kensuke265@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Hosho Katsura

Department of Physics, The University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan

Institute for Physics of Intelligence, The University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan

Trans-scale Quantum Science Institute, The University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan

E-mail: katsura@phys.s.u-tokyo.ac.jp

29 March 2023

Abstract. We develop a general theory of flat-band ferromagnetism in the $SU(N)$ Fermi-Hubbard model, which describes the behavior of N -component fermions with $SU(N)$ symmetric interactions. We focus on the case where the single-particle spectrum has a flat band and establish a necessary and sufficient condition for the $SU(N)$ Hubbard model to exhibit ferromagnetism when the number of particles is the same as the degeneracy. We show that the occurrence of ferromagnetism is equivalent to the irreducibility of the projection matrix onto the space of single-particle ground states. We also demonstrate that this result can be exploited to establish a rigorous result for the ferromagnetic $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model with a flat band. Specifically, we prove that when the $SU(N)$ Hubbard model is ferromagnetic, the ferromagnetic $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model with the same hopping matrix also exhibits $SU(N)$ ferromagnetism.

Keywords: $SU(N)$ Hubbard model, $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model, flat-band ferromagnetism. Submitted to: *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.*

1. Introduction

In recent years, advances in experimental techniques with ultracold atoms have allowed for the simulation of various quantum systems in optical lattices [1–5]. With the ability to precisely control lattice potentials and interaction strengths, ultracold atomic systems are expected to be a versatile tool for investigating many-body physics in strongly correlated systems. It is worth noting that ultracold atoms are not restricted to simulating known models describing conventional quantum systems but can also realize novel quantum systems with no counterpart in conventional materials.

One example of such a novel quantum system is fermionic systems with $SU(N)$ symmetry realized with alkaline-earth-like atoms. These atoms trapped in an optical lattice are described by the $SU(N)$ Fermi-Hubbard model [6], which generalizes the standard Hubbard model with $SU(2)$ symmetry [7–11]. In conventional condensed-matter physics, the $SU(N)$ Hubbard model has mainly been explored with the large- N approach [12, 13]. This approach is primarily concerned with the behavior of the model with infinitely large N , and little attention has been paid to the properties of the model for finite N ($N > 2$). However, recent experimental realizations of the $SU(N)$ Hubbard model with ultracold atoms have inspired theoretical studies on the properties of the $SU(N)$ Hubbard model with finite N [14–16]. Recent studies have shown that the $SU(N)$ Hubbard model can exhibit phases, and interest in this model has continued to grow.

Moreover, in a specific limit, the system of alkaline-earth-like atoms can be described by the $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model [6, 17], in which itinerant fermions and localized $SU(N)$ spins interact with $SU(N)$ symmetric exchange interaction. Efforts have also been made to realize such systems described by the $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model using two-orbital alkaline-earth-like atoms [18–20]. The $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model was also introduced in the large- N approach to study the $SU(2)$ Kondo lattice model [21–23]. However, in this approach, the main focus was on the case with infinitely large N , and the properties of the models at finite N have been less studied except for the case of $N = 2$.

While the $SU(N)$ Hubbard and Kondo lattice models have attracted much interest both theoretically and experimentally, such models are notoriously difficult to solve analytically. Nevertheless, obtaining mathematically rigorous results in special situations would be possible. Although the model in such a situation may be unrealistic, it can serve as a basis for other theoretical studies. Here we review rigorous results for $SU(N)$ symmetric models, mostly for the $SU(N)$ Hubbard model (including the case with $N = 2$).

The Nagaoka ferromagnetism is the first rigorous result for the $SU(2)$ Hubbard model [24, 25]. It was proved that when the Coulomb repulsions are infinitely large, and there is exactly one hole, the ground state of the Hubbard model is ferromagnetic and unique, provided the lattice satisfies a certain connectivity condition. Recently, Refs. [26, 27] have reported that the Nagaoka ferromagnetism can be extended to the

$SU(N)$ Hubbard model with general N . In the multiorbital Hubbard model, theorems regarding ferromagnetism have been rigorously proved in the Refs. [28, 29]. These theorems have also been extended to the $SU(N)$ case, as discussed in [28].

In Ref. [30], Lieb established rigorous results for both attractive and repulsive $SU(2)$ Hubbard model. In particular, for the repulsive case, it was proved that Lieb's ferrimagnetism is exhibited in a wide range of models, which can also be considered as the case with a flat band. Subsequently, Mielke [31] and Tasaki [32] independently established new rigorous results for the $SU(2)$ Hubbard model, known as flat-band ferromagnetism. The term flat band refers to the structure of the single-particle energy spectrum with macroscopic degeneracy. They constructed tight-binding models that produce a flat band at the bottom of the single-particle spectrum and then showed that the ground states of the Hubbard model are ferromagnetic and unique when the number of particles equals the multiplicity of the single-particle ground states. There are systematic methods for constructing tight-binding models with flat bands. For example, Mielke proposed a method based on line graphs [31]. Another method called cell construction was introduced by Tasaki [32–35]. Other methods of constructing various classes of flat bands have also been proposed [36–41]. Based on these methods, various types of flat-band ferromagnetism have been studied so far [42–46]. Furthermore, extensions of flat-band ferromagnetism to the $SU(N)$ case have recently been discussed, and rigorous results were proved in Refs. [47–49].

Although there are various tight-binding models that have a flat band at the bottom of their energy spectrum, we should note that it is not always guaranteed that the ground state of the Hubbard model, which is formed by adding the on-site interaction term to the tight-binding model, is uniquely ferromagnetic. In the case of the $SU(2)$ Hubbard model, a general theory of flat-band ferromagnetism has been developed [35, 50, 51]. This theory provides a necessary and sufficient condition to determine whether an $SU(2)$ Hubbard model with a bottom flat band exhibits ferromagnetism in the ground state. However, the corresponding general theory of flat-band ferromagnetism in the $SU(N)$ Hubbard model has not yet been established.

We also comment on rigorous results for the Kondo lattice model. As for the $SU(2)$ Kondo lattice model, a few rigorous results are known. In Ref. [52], the equivalence between the antiferromagnetic $SU(2)$ Kondo lattice model in the strong-coupling limit and the $SU(2)$ Hubbard model with infinitely large Coulomb repulsion was found. It was shown that there exist some ferromagnetic regions. In Ref. [53], the antiferromagnetic $SU(2)$ Kondo lattice model with one electron was investigated, and it was rigorously proved that the ground state exhibits a ferromagnetic order. The $SU(2)$ Kondo lattice model with a flat band was also discussed in Ref. [54]. For the $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model, the one-dimensional $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model has recently been discussed in Ref. [17]. In the strong-coupling limit, the effective Hamiltonian of the model was derived, and rigorous results for the ground states were proved, which can be seen as a generalization of the result in Ref. [55] to the $SU(N)$ case.

This paper presents a general theory of flat-band ferromagnetism in the $SU(N)$

Hubbard model. This is a natural extension of the general theory in the $SU(2)$ Hubbard model presented in Refs. [50, 51]. We consider a hopping matrix whose ground states are degenerate. Then we study the $SU(N)$ Hubbard model with the hopping matrix. We give a necessary and sufficient condition for the model to exhibit $SU(N)$ ferromagnetism. It is proved that the emergence of $SU(N)$ ferromagnetism is equivalent to the irreducibility of the orthogonal projection matrix onto the space spanned by the lowest energy states of the single-particle spectrum.

In addition, we find an application of the result to the ferromagnetic $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model and prove a rigorous result for flat-band ferromagnetism in the ferromagnetic $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model. Supposing that the $SU(N)$ Hubbard model exhibits $SU(N)$ ferromagnetism, it is rigorously proved that the ferromagnetic $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model with the same hopping matrix also exhibits $SU(N)$ ferromagnetism in its ground states.

The present paper is organized as follows. In Sec. 2, we consider the $SU(N)$ Hubbard model with degenerate single-particle ground states. We then discuss the necessary and sufficient condition for the $SU(N)$ Hubbard model to exhibit ferromagnetism when the number of particles is the same as the degeneracy and prove that the irreducibility of the projection matrix onto the space of single-particle ground states is equivalent to the occurrence of ferromagnetism. In Sec. 3, we further discuss the ferromagnetic $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model with a flat band. By exploiting the general theory for the Hubbard model, we also establish a rigorous result for flat-band ferromagnetism in the ferromagnetic $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model. Finally, in Sec. 4, we give a summary and present some remarks on the theorem concerning the $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model.

2. The $SU(N)$ Hubbard model and main result

2.1. The $SU(N)$ Hubbard model

Let Λ be a finite lattice. We denote by $\hat{c}_{x,\alpha}^\dagger$ and $\hat{c}_{x,\alpha}$, respectively, the fermionic creation and the annihilation operators at site $x \in \Lambda$ with color $\alpha = 1, \dots, N$. They satisfy the anticommutation relations

$$\{\hat{c}_{x,\alpha}, \hat{c}_{y,\beta}\} = \{\hat{c}_{x,\alpha}^\dagger, \hat{c}_{y,\beta}^\dagger\} = 0, \quad (1)$$

$$\{\hat{c}_{x,\alpha}, \hat{c}_{y,\beta}^\dagger\} = \delta_{\alpha,\beta} \delta_{x,y}. \quad (2)$$

The number operator of fermion at site x with color α is defined by $\hat{n}_{x,\alpha} = \hat{c}_{x,\alpha}^\dagger \hat{c}_{x,\alpha}$, and the total fermion number is $\hat{N}_c = \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \hat{n}_x$, where $\hat{n}_x = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \hat{n}_{x,\alpha}$. The Fock space of the fermionic operators is denoted by $\mathcal{H}(\Lambda)$. The Hamiltonian of the $SU(N)$ Hubbard

model is given by

$$\hat{H}_{\text{Hub}} = \hat{H}_{\text{hop}} + \hat{H}_{\text{int}}, \quad (3)$$

$$\hat{H}_{\text{hop}} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \sum_{x,y \in \Lambda} t_{x,y} \hat{c}_{x,\alpha}^\dagger \hat{c}_{y,\alpha}, \quad (4)$$

$$\hat{H}_{\text{int}} = U \sum_{\alpha < \beta} \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \hat{n}_{x,\alpha} \hat{n}_{x,\beta}, \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbb{T} = (t_{x,y})_{x,y \in \Lambda}$ is the hopping matrix on the lattice Λ , and the parameter U is assumed to be positive.

In the $SU(N)$ Hubbard model, the total number of fermions is trivially conserved, which can be seen as

$$[\hat{H}_{\text{Hub}}, \hat{N}_c] = 0. \quad (6)$$

We define color raising and lowering operators by

$$\hat{F}^{\alpha,\beta} = \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \hat{c}_{x,\alpha}^\dagger \hat{c}_{x,\beta} \quad \text{for } \alpha \neq \beta, \quad (7)$$

and the total number operator of fermions with color α by

$$\hat{F}^{\alpha,\alpha} = \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \hat{c}_{x,\alpha}^\dagger \hat{c}_{x,\alpha} \quad \text{for } \alpha = 1, \dots, N. \quad (8)$$

Due to the $SU(N)$ symmetry, one can see that the operators $\hat{F}^{\alpha,\beta}$ commutes with \hat{H}_{Hub} . Together with the conservation of the total number of fermions, the Hamiltonian (3) possesses $U(N) = U(1) \times SU(N)$ symmetry. In what follows, we denote the eigenvalues of $\hat{F}^{\alpha,\alpha}$ by M_α , and the eigenvalue of \hat{N}_c by N_c .

Let us introduce some subspaces of $\mathcal{H}(\Lambda)$. We define a subspace $\mathcal{H}_{N_c}(\Lambda)$ by

$$\mathcal{H}_{N_c}(\Lambda) = \{|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}(\Lambda) \mid \hat{N}_c |\Phi\rangle = N_c |\Phi\rangle\}. \quad (9)$$

We also define a subspace $\mathcal{H}_{M_1, \dots, M_N}(\Lambda)$ by

$$\mathcal{H}_{M_1, \dots, M_N}(\Lambda) = \{|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}(\Lambda) \mid \hat{F}^{\alpha,\alpha} |\Phi\rangle = M_\alpha |\Phi\rangle \text{ for all } \alpha = 1, \dots, N\}. \quad (10)$$

To define $SU(N)$ ferromagnetism, we introduce the quadratic Casimir operator \hat{C}_2 of the $SU(N)$ group, which is defined by [56]

$$\hat{C}_2 = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{\alpha, \beta=1}^N \hat{F}^{\alpha,\beta} \hat{F}^{\beta,\alpha} - \frac{\hat{N}_c^2}{N} \right). \quad (11)$$

When $N = 2$, in the standard notation, one may write $\hat{S}_{\text{tot}}^+ = \hat{F}^{1,2}$, $\hat{S}_{\text{tot}}^- = \hat{F}^{2,1}$, and $\hat{S}_{\text{tot}}^z = (\hat{F}^{1,1} - \hat{F}^{2,2})/2$. With the notation, the operator \hat{C}_2 is written as

$$\hat{C}_2 = \frac{1}{2} \left(\hat{S}_{\text{tot}}^+ \hat{S}_{\text{tot}}^- + \hat{S}_{\text{tot}}^- \hat{S}_{\text{tot}}^+ \right) + \left(\hat{S}_{\text{tot}}^z \right)^2 \quad \text{for } N = 2. \quad (12)$$

This operator is the square of the magnitude of the total spin operator defined by $\left(\hat{\mathbf{S}}_{\text{tot}}\right)^2 = \left(\hat{S}_{\text{tot}}^x\right)^2 + \left(\hat{S}_{\text{tot}}^y\right)^2 + \left(\hat{S}_{\text{tot}}^z\right)^2$. Therefore, the operator \hat{C}_2 can be seen as a generalization of the operator $\left(\hat{\mathbf{S}}_{\text{tot}}\right)^2$.

Now we are ready to state the definition of $SU(N)$ ferromagnetism.

Definition 1. Consider the Hamiltonian (3) with the total fermion number N_c . We say that the model exhibits $SU(N)$ ferromagnetism if any ground state $|\Phi_{\text{GS}}\rangle$ has the maximum eigenvalue of \hat{C}_2 in $\mathcal{H}_{N_c}(\Lambda)$, i.e.,

$$\hat{C}_2 |\Phi_{\text{GS}}\rangle = \frac{N_c(N-1)}{2} \left(\frac{N_c}{N} + 1\right) |\Phi_{\text{GS}}\rangle. \quad (13)$$

Note that the above definition of ferromagnetism is the strongest form of ferromagnetism, which should be referred to as complete ferromagnetism or saturated ferromagnetism. In the case $N = 2$, let $S_{\text{tot}}(S_{\text{tot}} + 1)$ be the eigenvalue of $\left(\hat{\mathbf{S}}_{\text{tot}}\right)^2$. Even if S_{tot} of the ground states is macroscopically large but not the maximum value, it is commonly considered that ferromagnetism is manifested. In this paper, however, we only study the complete ferromagnetism and refer to it simply as ferromagnetism.

We call a state satisfying Eq. (13) as a fully polarized state. The eigenvalue equation (13) is satisfied if a state has no double occupancy and is fully symmetrized with respect to the color degrees of freedom. Conversely, a state satisfying Eq. (13) is such a fully symmetrized state.

2.2. Main theorem

Here we state our main theorem. First, we introduce some notation and make assumptions about the model. The single-particle Hilbert space is denoted by $\mathfrak{h} \cong \mathbb{C}^{|\Lambda|}$, and we write a $|\Lambda|$ -dimensional vector in \mathfrak{h} as $\phi = (\phi(x))_{x \in \Lambda}$. The inner product of two vectors, ϕ and ψ , is defined by

$$\langle \phi, \psi \rangle = \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \phi(x)^* \psi(x). \quad (14)$$

We now assume that

$$\mathbb{T} \geq 0, \quad (15)$$

and denote the kernel of \mathbb{T} by $\mathfrak{h}_0 = \ker \mathbb{T}$. We also assume that \mathfrak{h}_0 is not empty and write $D_0 = \dim \mathfrak{h}_0$. Let \mathbf{P}_0 be the orthogonal projection matrix onto the subspace \mathfrak{h}_0 , and we define $\Lambda_0 = \{x \in \Lambda | (\mathbf{P}_0)_{x,x} \neq 0\}$. We say the $|\Lambda_0| \times |\Lambda_0|$ matrix $\left((\mathbf{P}_0)_{x,y}\right)_{x,y \in \Lambda_0}$ is reducible if and only if Λ_0 can be decomposed as $\Lambda_0 = \Lambda_1 \cup \Lambda_2$ with $\Lambda_1 \cap \Lambda_2 = \emptyset$, $\Lambda_0 \neq \emptyset$, and $\Lambda_2 \neq \emptyset$ so that $(\mathbf{P}_0)_{x,y} = 0$ for any $x \in \Lambda_1$ and $y \in \Lambda_2$. The matrix $\left((\mathbf{P}_0)_{x,y}\right)_{x,y \in \Lambda_0}$ is said to be irreducible if it is not reducible. If \mathbb{T} has translation symmetry, we have energy bands as a function of wave vectors. Moreover, if D_0 is proportional to the number of sites $|\Lambda|$, it suggests that the lowest band is flat at zero energy. Now we are ready to state our theorem.

Theorem 1. Consider the $SU(N)$ Hubbard model (3) with $\mathbb{T} \geq 0$ and $N_c = D_0$. The model exhibits $SU(N)$ ferromagnetism if and only if the $|\Lambda_0| \times |\Lambda_0|$ matrix $\left((\mathbf{P}_0)_{x,y} \right)_{x,y \in \Lambda_0}$ is irreducible.

2.3. Proof of Theorem 1

In this subsection, we prove Theorem 1. We first prove the following lemma.

Lemma 1. One can take a subset $I \subset \Lambda$ with $|I| = D_0$ and a basis $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\}_{z \in I}$ of \mathfrak{h}_0 in such a way that for each $z \in I$, the basis vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}_z = (\mu_z(x))_{x \in \Lambda}$ satisfies $\mu_z(z) \neq 0$ and $\mu_z(z') = 0$ for any $z' \in I \setminus \{z\}$.

Proof. Our proof is essentially the same as the proof of Lemma 11.16 in Ref. [35]. We see that the rank of \mathbb{T} is $|\Lambda| - D_0$ since $\dim \mathfrak{h}_0 = D_0$. Then there exists a subset $\Lambda' \subset \Lambda$ with $|\Lambda'| = |\Lambda| - D_0$ such that the determinant of the submatrix $(t_{x,y})_{x,y \in \Lambda'}$ is nonzero, and any $(|\Lambda| - D_0 + 1) \times (|\Lambda| - D_0 + 1)$ submatrix of \mathbb{T} has determinant zero [57]. Let $I = \Lambda \setminus \Lambda'$. We find that, for arbitrary $z \in I$, the submatrix $(t_{x,y})_{x,y \in \Lambda' \cup \{z\}}$ has determinant zero, which implies that this matrix has a zero eigenvalue. We denote the corresponding eigenvector by $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_z = (\tilde{\mu}_z(x))_{x \in \Lambda' \cup \{z\}}$. We can see that $\tilde{\mu}_z(z) \neq 0$. This is because if $\tilde{\mu}_z(z) = 0$, then $(\tilde{\mu}_z(x))_{x \in \Lambda'}$ is an eigenvector of $(t_{x,y})_{x,y \in \Lambda'}$ with eigenvalue zero. This contradicts that the matrix $(t_{x,y})_{x,y \in \Lambda'}$ has nonzero determinant. Thus, we have $\mu_z(z) \neq 0$. We then define a $|\Lambda|$ -dimensional vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}_z = (\mu_z(x))_{x \in \Lambda}$ as

$$\mu_z(x) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\mu}_z(x) & \text{if } x \in \Lambda' \cup \{z\}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

for $z \in I$. We note that $\mu_z(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in I$ and $\mu_z(z') = 0$ for $z' \in I \setminus \{z\}$. Using $\sum_{y \in \Lambda' \cup \{z\}} t_{x,y} \tilde{\mu}_z(y) = 0$, we can see that

$$\langle \boldsymbol{\mu}_z, \mathbb{T} \boldsymbol{\mu}_z \rangle = 0. \quad (17)$$

Because of the positive semidefiniteness of \mathbb{T} , it holds that $\mathbb{T} \boldsymbol{\mu}_z = 0$. Since $\mu_z(z) \neq 0$ and $\mu_z(z') = 0$, the set $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\}_{z \in I}$ is linearly independent, and hence it is a basis of \mathfrak{h}_0 satisfying the conditions of Lemma 1. \square

With the basis $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\}_{z \in I}$, we can characterize Λ_0 as

$$\Lambda_0 = \{x \in \Lambda | \mu_z(x) \neq 0 \text{ for some } z \in I\}. \quad (18)$$

This can be seen as follows. Let $\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_i\}_{i=1,\dots,D_0}$ be an orthonormal basis of \mathfrak{h}_0 . The projection matrix \mathbf{P}_0 is written as $(\mathbf{P}_0)_{x,y} = \sum_{i=1}^{D_0} \psi_i(x) \psi_i(y)^*$. Suppose that $\mu_z(x) = 0$ for all $z \in I$ for some $x \in \Lambda$. Then we see that $\psi_i(x) = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, D_0$ since the vector $\boldsymbol{\psi}_i$ can be written as a linear combination of $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\}_{z \in I}$. Therefore, we have $(\mathbf{P}_0)_{x,x} = \sum_{i=1}^{D_0} \psi_i(x) \psi_i(x)^* = 0$, which means that $x \notin \Lambda_0$ if $\mu_z(x) = 0$ for all $z \in I$. Conversely, suppose that for some $x \in \Lambda$, there exists $z \in I$ such that $\mu_z(x) \neq 0$. Let \mathbf{P}_z

be the projection matrix onto the one-dimensional subspace spanned by $\boldsymbol{\mu}_z$. Then we see that $(\mathbf{P}_0)_{x,x} \geq (\mathbf{P}_z)_{x,x}$. Since $\mu_z(x) \neq 0$, $(\mathbf{P}_z)_{x,x} > 0$. Therefore, we have $(\mathbf{P}_0)_{x,x} \neq 0$, and hence, $x \in \Lambda_0$. Thus, $\Lambda_0 = \{x \in \Lambda | \mu_z(x) \neq 0 \text{ for some } z \in I\}$.

We write $\boldsymbol{\mu}_z \sim \boldsymbol{\mu}_{z'}$ if there is a site $x \in \Lambda$ such that $\mu_z(x)\mu_{z'}(x) \neq 0$. We say that the basis $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\}_{z \in I}$ is connected if there is a sequence $\{z_i\}_{i=0,\dots,n}$ with $z_i \in I$ such that $z_0 = z$, $z_n = z'$, and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{z_{i-1}} \sim \boldsymbol{\mu}_{z_i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. We also write $\boldsymbol{\mu}_z \approx \boldsymbol{\mu}_{z'}$ if there is no site x such that $\mu_z(x)\mu_{z'}(x) \neq 0$.

Then we can prove the following lemma.

Lemma 2. *Consider the $SU(N)$ Hubbard model with $N_c = D_0$. The model exhibits the $SU(N)$ ferromagnetism if and only if the basis $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\}_{z \in I}$ is connected.*

Proof. Since the hopping matrix \mathbb{T} is positive semidefinite, \hat{H}_{hop} is also positive semidefinite. This can be seen as follows. Since $\dim \mathfrak{h} = |\Lambda|$ and $\dim \mathfrak{h}_0 = D_0$, there are $|\Lambda| - D_0$ linearly independent eigenvectors of \mathbb{T} with positive eigenvalues. We denote the eigenvectors by $\boldsymbol{\phi}_i$ ($i = 1, \dots, |\Lambda| - D_0$), which satisfy $\mathbb{T}\boldsymbol{\phi}_i = \lambda_i\boldsymbol{\phi}_i$ with $\lambda_i > 0$. Since they can always be taken to be orthogonal to each other, we assume that $\langle \boldsymbol{\phi}_i, \boldsymbol{\phi}_j \rangle = \delta_{i,j}$. With the vectors $\boldsymbol{\mu}_z$ and $\boldsymbol{\phi}_i$, we define a new set of operators

$$\hat{a}_{z,\alpha}^\dagger = \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \mu_z(x) \hat{c}_{x,\alpha}^\dagger, \quad (19)$$

$$\hat{b}_{i,\alpha}^\dagger = \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \phi_i(x) \hat{c}_{x,\alpha}^\dagger. \quad (20)$$

They satisfy

$$\{\hat{a}_{z,\alpha}, \hat{a}_{w,\beta}\} = \{\hat{b}_{i,\alpha}, \hat{b}_{j,\beta}\} = \{\hat{a}_{z,\alpha}, \hat{b}_{i,\beta}\} = 0, \quad (21)$$

$$\{a_{z,\alpha}, a_{w,\beta}^\dagger\} = \delta_{\alpha,\beta} \langle \boldsymbol{\mu}_z, \boldsymbol{\mu}_w \rangle, \quad (22)$$

$$\{\hat{b}_{i,\alpha}, \hat{b}_{j,\beta}^\dagger\} = \delta_{\alpha,\beta} \delta_{i,j}, \quad (23)$$

$$\{\hat{a}_{z,\alpha}, \hat{b}_{i,\beta}^\dagger\} = 0, \quad (24)$$

where the last line follows since $\langle \boldsymbol{\mu}_z, \boldsymbol{\phi}_i \rangle = 0$. Because the hopping matrix can be written as $t_{x,y} = \sum_{i=1}^{|\Lambda|-D_0} \lambda_i \phi_i(x) \phi_i(y)^*$, we can represent the hopping Hamiltonian as

$$\hat{H}_{\text{hop}} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^{|\Lambda|-D_0} \lambda_i \hat{b}_{i,\alpha}^\dagger \hat{b}_{i,\alpha}. \quad (25)$$

Since $\hat{b}_{i,\alpha}^\dagger \hat{b}_{i,\alpha} \geq 0$ and $\lambda_i > 0$, \hat{H}_{hop} is positive semidefinite. The interaction term \hat{H}_{int} is also positive semidefinite because $\hat{n}_{x,\alpha} \hat{n}_{x,\beta} = (\hat{c}_{x,\alpha} \hat{c}_{x,\beta})^\dagger \hat{c}_{x,\alpha} \hat{c}_{x,\beta} \geq 0$. Hence, the entire Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{Hub} is positive semidefinite.

We define the fully polarized states as follows. First, the fully polarized state with color α is given by

$$|\Phi_{\text{all } \alpha}\rangle = \left(\prod_{z \in I} \hat{a}_{z,\alpha}^\dagger \right) |\Phi_{\text{vac}}\rangle, \quad (26)$$

where $|\Phi_{\text{vac}}\rangle$ is the normalized vacuum state for $\hat{c}_{x,\alpha}$. We can easily see that the $|\Phi_{\text{all } \alpha}\rangle$ is an eigenstate of \hat{H}_{Hub} with zero energy. Since $\hat{H}_{\text{Hub}} \geq 0$, the state $|\Phi_{\text{all } \alpha}\rangle$ is the ground state of \hat{H}_{Hub} in $\mathcal{H}_{D_0}(\Lambda)$. Due to the $SU(N)$ symmetry, one can obtain other ground states of the following form

$$|\Phi_{M_1, M_2, \dots, M_N}\rangle = \left(\hat{F}^{N,1}\right)^{M_N} \dots \left(\hat{F}^{2,1}\right)^{M_2} |\Phi_{\text{all } 1}\rangle, \quad (27)$$

where $M_1 = D_0 - \sum_{\alpha=2}^N M_\alpha$. We also refer to the states of the form (27) as fully polarized states. It is easily seen that

$$\hat{C}_2 |\Phi_{\text{all } \alpha}\rangle = \frac{D_0(N-1)}{2} \left(\frac{D_0}{N} + 1\right) |\Phi_{\text{all } \alpha}\rangle, \quad (28)$$

which means that the state $|\Phi_{\text{all } \alpha}\rangle$ has the maximum eigenvalue of \hat{C}_2 in $\mathcal{H}_{D_0}(\Lambda)$. Because $[\hat{C}_2, \hat{F}^{\alpha,\beta}] = 0$, the fully polarized states of the form (27) also have the same eigenvalue for \hat{C}_2 . Thus, all the fully polarized states are ground states of \hat{H}_{Hub} with the maximum eigenvalue of \hat{C}_2 in $\mathcal{H}_{D_0}(\Lambda)$.

In the following, we prove that there are no other ground states if and only if $\{\mu_z\}_{z \in I}$ is connected. Let $|\Phi_{\text{GS}}\rangle$ be an arbitrary ground state of \hat{H}_{Hub} in $\mathcal{H}_{D_0}(\Lambda)$. In general, we can express the state as

$$|\Phi_{\text{GS}}\rangle = \sum_{\substack{I_1, \dots, I_N \subset I \\ \tilde{I}_1, \dots, \tilde{I}_N \subset \tilde{I}}} f(\{I_\alpha\}, \{\tilde{I}_\alpha\}) \times \\ \left(\prod_{z_1 \in I_1} \hat{a}_{z_1,1}^\dagger\right) \cdots \left(\prod_{z_N \in I_N} \hat{a}_{z_N,N}^\dagger\right) \left(\prod_{i_1 \in \tilde{I}_1} \hat{b}_{i_1,1}^\dagger\right) \cdots \left(\prod_{i_N \in \tilde{I}_N} \hat{b}_{i_N,N}^\dagger\right) |\Phi_{\text{vac}}\rangle, \quad (29)$$

where $f(\{I_\alpha\}, \{\tilde{I}_\alpha\})$ is a coefficient, and I_α and \tilde{I}_α are subsets of I and $\tilde{I} = \{1, 2, \dots, |\Lambda| - D_0\}$, respectively, such that $\sum_{\alpha=1}^N (|I_\alpha| + |\tilde{I}_\alpha|) = D_0$. The ground state satisfies $\hat{H}_{\text{Hub}} |\Phi_{\text{GS}}\rangle = 0$, and the inequalities $\hat{H}_{\text{hop}} \geq 0$ and $\hat{H}_{\text{int}} \geq 0$ imply that $\hat{H}_{\text{hop}} |\Phi_{\text{GS}}\rangle = 0$ and $\hat{H}_{\text{int}} |\Phi_{\text{GS}}\rangle = 0$. Since the hopping Hamiltonian can be expressed as in Eq. (25) and $\hat{b}_{i,\alpha}^\dagger \hat{b}_{i,\alpha} \geq 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, |\Lambda| - D_0$ and α , the condition $\hat{H}_{\text{hop}} |\Phi_{\text{GS}}\rangle = 0$ leads to

$$\hat{b}_{i,\alpha} |\Phi_{\text{GS}}\rangle = 0 \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, |\Lambda| - D_0 \text{ and } \alpha = 1, \dots, N. \quad (30)$$

Similarly, the equation $\hat{H}_{\text{int}} |\Phi_{\text{GS}}\rangle = 0$ reduces to

$$\hat{c}_{x,\alpha} \hat{c}_{x,\beta} |\Phi_{\text{GS}}\rangle = 0 \quad \text{for any } x \in \Lambda \text{ and } \alpha \neq \beta. \quad (31)$$

Here we consider the condition (30). Noting the anticommutation relations (24), we find that the ground state $|\Phi_{\text{GS}}\rangle$ consists only of $\hat{a}_{z,\alpha}^\dagger$ operators, i.e., the state $|\Phi_{\text{GS}}\rangle$ is written as

$$|\Phi_{\text{GS}}\rangle = \sum_{I_1, \dots, I_N \subset I} g(\{I_\alpha\}) \left(\prod_{z_1 \in I_1} \hat{a}_{z_1,1}^\dagger\right) \cdots \left(\prod_{z_N \in I_N} \hat{a}_{z_N,N}^\dagger\right) |\Phi_{\text{vac}}\rangle, \quad (32)$$

where $g(\{I_\alpha\})$ is a coefficient, and $\sum_{\alpha=1}^N |I_\alpha| = D_0$.

Then we examine Eq. (31). We first consider the case where $x = z \in I$. In general, it holds that

$$\{\hat{c}_{x,\alpha}, \hat{a}_{z,\beta}^\dagger\} = \delta_{\alpha,\beta} \mu_z(x), \quad (33)$$

for any $x \in \Lambda$ and $z \in I$. In particular, when $x = z \in I$, we have the following anticommutation relations

$$\{\hat{c}_{z,\alpha}, \hat{a}_{z',\beta}^\dagger\} = \delta_{\alpha,\beta} \delta_{z,z'} \mu_z(z) \quad (34)$$

for all $z, z' \in I$. Using the anticommutation relations (34), we find that $g(\{I_\alpha\}) = 0$ if there is a pair of colors α and β such that $I_\alpha \cap I_\beta \neq \emptyset$. Since $\sum_{\alpha=1}^N |I_\alpha| = D_0$, we have $\cup_{\alpha=1}^N I_\alpha = I$ when $I_\alpha \cap I_\beta = \emptyset$. Therefore, the ground state takes the form

$$|\Phi_{\text{GS}}\rangle = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} C(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \left(\prod_{z \in I} \hat{a}_{z,\alpha_z}^\dagger \right) |\Phi_{\text{vac}}\rangle, \quad (35)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_z)_{z \in I}$ represents a color configuration over I , and the sum is taken over all possible color configurations.

We next consider Eq. (31) for $x \in \Lambda \setminus I$. With the use of Eq. (33), the condition (31) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{z_1 < z_2} \sum_{\substack{\gamma \\ \gamma_{z_1} = \beta, \gamma_{z_2} = \alpha}} \text{sgn}(z_1, z_2; I) \mu_{z_1}(x) \mu_{z_2}(x) \\ & \times (C(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) - C(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{z_1 \leftrightarrow z_2})) \left(\prod_{z \in I \setminus \{z_1, z_2\}} \hat{a}_{z,\gamma_z}^\dagger \right) |\Phi_{\text{vac}}\rangle = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where $\text{sgn}(z_1, z_2; I)$ is a sign factor arising from exchanges of the fermion operators. The configuration $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{z_1 \leftrightarrow z_2}$ is obtained from $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ by swapping γ_{z_1} and γ_{z_2} . Since all the states in the sum are linearly independent, we find that

$$\mu_{z_1}(x) \mu_{z_2}(x) (C(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) - C(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{z_1 \leftrightarrow z_2})) = 0. \quad (37)$$

for all $z_1, z_2 \in I$ such that $z_1 \neq z_2$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$. When z_1 and z_2 satisfy $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{z_1} \sim \boldsymbol{\mu}_{z_2}$, then by definition, there is a site $x \in \Lambda \setminus I$ such that $\mu_{z_1}(x) \mu_{z_2}(x) \neq 0$. Consequently, we have $C(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) = C(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{z_1 \leftrightarrow z_2})$ if $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{z_1} \sim \boldsymbol{\mu}_{z_2}$. When the basis $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\}_{z \in I}$ is connected, for any $z, z' \in I$, we can take a sequence $z_1 = z, z_2, \dots, z_n = z'$ such that $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{z_i} \sim \boldsymbol{\mu}_{z_{i+1}}$. Thus, we see $C(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) = C(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{z \leftrightarrow z'})$ for any $z, z' \in I$. By noting that any permutation of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ can be obtained by repeatedly swapping two colors, we have

$$C(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = C(\boldsymbol{\beta}), \quad (38)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is any color configuration obtained as a permutation of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$. As a result, when M_α in Eq. (10) is fixed so that $\sum_{\alpha=1}^N M_\alpha = D_0$, the ground state is unique in $\mathcal{H}_{M_1, \dots, M_N}(\Lambda)$.

We can verify that the states satisfying Eq. (38) are actually the fully polarized states defined by Eqs. (26) and (27). To see this, we use a concept of a word. A word $w = (w_1, \dots, w_{D_0})$ is a sequence in which $w_i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, D_0$. We denote the number of occurrences of α in w by $|w_\alpha|$. The set of words for which $|w_\alpha| = M_\alpha$ is defined by $W(M_1, \dots, M_N) = \{w \mid |w_\alpha| = M_\alpha \text{ for all } \alpha\}$. For example, $W(2, 0, 1)$ consists of $(1, 1, 3)$, $(1, 3, 1)$, and $(3, 1, 1)$. With the notation, the ground state in $\mathcal{H}_{M_1, \dots, M_N}(\Lambda)$ satisfying Eq. (38) is written as

$$\left| \tilde{\Phi}_{M_1, \dots, M_N} \right\rangle = \sum_{w \in W(M_1, \dots, M_N)} \hat{a}_{z_1, w_1}^\dagger \hat{a}_{z_2, w_2}^\dagger \cdots \hat{a}_{z_{D_0}, w_{D_0}}^\dagger |\Phi_{\text{vac}}\rangle, \quad (39)$$

where we have denoted the set I by $I = \{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{D_0}\}$. Noting the commutation relations $[\hat{F}^{\alpha, \beta}, \hat{a}_{z, \gamma}^\dagger] = \delta_{\alpha, \gamma} \hat{a}_{z, \beta}^\dagger$, we see that

$$(\hat{F}^{2,1})^{M_2} |\Phi_{\text{all } 1}\rangle = M_2! \sum_{w \in W(D_0 - M_2, M_2, 0, \dots, 0)} \hat{a}_{z_1, w_1}^\dagger \hat{a}_{z_2, w_2}^\dagger \cdots \hat{a}_{z_{D_0}, w_{D_0}}^\dagger |\Phi_{\text{vac}}\rangle. \quad (40)$$

By repeating the same procedure, we obtain $\left| \tilde{\Phi}_{M_1, \dots, M_N} \right\rangle$ is the same as $|\Phi_{M_1, \dots, M_N}\rangle$ up to a normalization. Therefore, the unique ground state $\left| \tilde{\Phi}_{M_1, \dots, M_N} \right\rangle$ is the fully polarized state.

If the basis $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}\}_{z \in I}$ is not connected, we can construct a different ground state other than fully polarized states. Hence, the $SU(N)$ Hubbard model exhibits the $SU(N)$ ferromagnetism if and only if the basis $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\}_{z \in I}$ is connected. \square

The degeneracy of the ground states does not depend on how we take I and $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\}_{z \in I}$. Hence, the connectivity of the basis characterized by Lemma 1 is independent of the choice of I and $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\}_{z \in I}$.

Finally, we show that the irreducibility of $\left((P_0)_{x,y} \right)_{x,y \in \Lambda_0}$ is equivalent to the connectivity of $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\}_{z \in I}$.

Lemma 3. *The matrix $\left((P_0)_{x,y} \right)_{x,y \in \Lambda_0}$ is irreducible if and only if $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\}_{z \in I}$ introduced in Lemma 1 is connected.*

Proof. We first show that non-connectivity of $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\}_{z \in I}$ leads to reducibility of $\left((P_0)_{x,y} \right)_{x,y \in \Lambda_0}$. Let I and $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\}_{z \in I}$ be a subset and a basis characterized by Lemma 1. We assume that I can be decomposed as $I = I_1 \cup I_2$ with $I_1 \cap I_2 = \emptyset$, $I_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $I_2 \neq \emptyset$, in which $\boldsymbol{\mu}_z \approx \boldsymbol{\mu}_{z'}$ for any $z \in I_1$ and $z' \in I_2$. When $\boldsymbol{\mu}_z \approx \boldsymbol{\mu}_{z'}$, it holds that $\langle \boldsymbol{\mu}_z, \boldsymbol{\mu}_{z'} \rangle = 0$ since $\mu_z(x) \mu_{z'}(x) = 0$ for any $x \in \Lambda$. We then define subsets Λ_1 and Λ_2 as

$$\Lambda_j = \{x \in \Lambda \mid \mu_z(x) \neq 0 \text{ for some } z \in I_j\} \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2. \quad (41)$$

Because $\boldsymbol{\mu}_z \approx \boldsymbol{\mu}_{z'}$ for any $z \in I_1$ and $z' \in I_2$, we see that $\Lambda_1 \cap \Lambda_2 = \emptyset$, and obviously $\Lambda_0 = \Lambda_1 \cup \Lambda_2$. By taking a linear combination of $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\}_{z \in I_1}$, we obtain an orthonormal set $\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_i^{(1)}\}_{i=1, \dots, |I_1|}$ which spans the same space spanned by $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\}_{z \in I_1}$. Similarly, we can take

an orthonormal set $\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_j^{(2)}\}_{j=1,\dots,|I_2|}$ which spans the same space spanned by $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{z'}\}_{z' \in I_2}$. The subspace \mathfrak{h}_0 is spanned by the orthonormal basis $\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_i^{(1)}\}_{i=1,\dots,|I_1|} \cup \{\boldsymbol{\psi}_j^{(2)}\}_{j=1,\dots,|I_2|}$, and the projection matrix \mathbf{P}_0 can be written as

$$(\mathbf{P}_0)_{x,y} = \sum_{i=1}^{|I_1|} \psi_i^{(1)}(x) \left(\psi_i^{(1)}(y) \right)^* + \sum_{j=1}^{|I_2|} \psi_j^{(2)}(x) \left(\psi_j^{(2)}(y) \right)^*. \quad (42)$$

Since the states $\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_i^{(1)}\}_{i=1,\dots,|I_1|}$ are obtained by taking a linear combination of $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\}_{z \in I_1}$, $\psi_i^{(1)}(x)$ is zero when $x \in \Lambda_2$, and similarly $\psi_j^{(2)}(x) = 0$ when $x \in \Lambda_1$. Therefore, we have $(\mathbf{P}_0)_{x,y} = 0$ when $x \in \Lambda_1$ and $y \in \Lambda_2$. This, together with the Hermiticity of \mathbf{P}_0 , implies that the matrix $\left((\mathbf{P}_0)_{x,y} \right)_{x,y \in \Lambda_0}$ is reducible.

We then show that reducibility of $\left((\mathbf{P}_0)_{x,y} \right)_{x,y \in \Lambda_0}$ implies that $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\}_{z \in I}$ is not connected. Assume that Λ_0 can be decomposed as $\Lambda_0 = \Lambda_1 \cup \Lambda_2$ with $\Lambda_1 \cap \Lambda_2 = \emptyset$, $\Lambda_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $\Lambda_2 \neq \emptyset$, in such a way that $(\mathbf{P}_0)_{x,y} = 0$ for any $x \in \Lambda_1$ and $y \in \Lambda_2$. Let \mathbf{P}_1 and \mathbf{P}_2 be $|\Lambda| \times |\Lambda|$ matrices defined as

$$(\mathbf{P}_j) = \begin{cases} (\mathbf{P}_0)_{x,y} & \text{if } x, y \in \Lambda_j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (43)$$

for $j = 1, 2$. Both \mathbf{P}_1 and \mathbf{P}_2 are also projection matrices, and we see that $\mathbf{P}_0 = \mathbf{P}_1 + \mathbf{P}_2$ and $\mathbf{P}_1\mathbf{P}_2 = \mathbf{P}_2\mathbf{P}_1 = 0$. Let \mathbf{l} be the $|\Lambda| \times |\Lambda|$ identity matrix. Because $\mathbf{l} - \mathbf{P}_j \geq 0$, we can repeat the same argument in Lemma 1 for $\mathbf{l} - \mathbf{P}_j$ for $j = 1, 2$. Then, for $j = 1$ and 2 , we can take a subset $I_j \subset \Lambda$ with $|I_j| = \dim \ker(\mathbf{l} - \mathbf{P}_j)$ and a basis $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^{(j)}\}_{z \in I_j}$ of $\ker(\mathbf{l} - \mathbf{P}_j)$ in such a way that $\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^{(j)}(z) \neq 0$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^{(j)}(z') = 0$ for any $z' \in I_j \setminus \{z\}$. Since $\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^{(j)}$ is an element of $\ker(\mathbf{l} - \mathbf{P}_j)$, it holds that

$$\mathbf{P}_j \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^{(j)} = \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^{(j)}. \quad (44)$$

We can also see that $\langle \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\mu}_{z'}^{(2)} \rangle = 0$ because

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\mu}_{z'}^{(2)} \rangle &= \langle \mathbf{P}_1 \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^{(1)}, \mathbf{P}_2 \boldsymbol{\mu}_{z'}^{(2)} \rangle \\ &= \langle \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^{(1)}, \mathbf{P}_1 \mathbf{P}_2 \boldsymbol{\mu}_{z'}^{(2)} \rangle \\ &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

where we have used Eq. (44), $\mathbf{P}_1^\dagger = \mathbf{P}_1$ and $\mathbf{P}_1\mathbf{P}_2 = 0$. From the relation $\mathbf{P}_1\mathbf{P}_2 = 0$ and Eq. (44), we find

$$\mathbf{P}_0 \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^{(j)} = \mathbf{P}_0 \mathbf{P}_j \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^{(j)} = \mathbf{P}_j^2 \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^{(j)} = \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^{(j)}, \quad (46)$$

which means that $\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^{(j)} \in \mathfrak{h}_0$. We note that $\text{Tr } \mathbf{P}_0 = \dim \mathfrak{h}_0 = D_0$, and similarly, $\text{Tr } \mathbf{P}_1 = |I_1|$, and $\text{Tr } \mathbf{P}_2 = |I_2|$. Since $\text{Tr } \mathbf{P}_0 = \text{Tr } \mathbf{P}_1 + \text{Tr } \mathbf{P}_2$, we have

$$D_0 = |I_1| + |I_2|. \quad (47)$$

Therefore, the set of vectors $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^{(1)}\}_{z \in I_1} \cup \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{z'}^{(2)}\}_{z' \in I_2}$ is a basis of \mathfrak{h}_0 characterized by Lemma 1. From Eq. (44), we see that $\mu_z^{(j)}(x)$ can be nonzero only if $x \in \Lambda_j$ for $j = 1$ and 2, which implies that

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^{(1)} \approx \boldsymbol{\mu}_{z'}^{(2)} \text{ for any } z \in I_1 \text{ and } z' \in I_2. \quad (48)$$

Hence, the basis $\{\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(1)}\}_{z \in I_1} \cup \{\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(2)}\}_{z' \in I_2}$ is not connected. \square

By combining Lemmas 2 and 3, we obtain the desired result, Theorem 1.

3. Rigorous results for the ferromagnetic $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model

As an application of Theorem 1, we shall establish a theorem about $SU(N)$ ferromagnetism of the $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model with a flat band.

3.1. The $SU(N)$ spin operators

We first introduce the standard Schwinger fermion representation of the $SU(N)$ group. Let the $N \times N$ matrices G^A ($A = 1, \dots, N^2 - 1$) be the generators of the $SU(N)$ group such that

$$\text{Tr}(G^A G^B) = \delta_{A,B}, \quad (49)$$

$$[G^A, G^B] = \sum_{C=1}^{N^2-1} i f^{A,B,C} G^C, \quad (50)$$

$$\sum_{A=1}^{N^2-1} (G^A)_{\alpha,\beta} (G^A)_{\mu,\nu} = \delta_{\alpha,\nu} \delta_{\beta,\mu} - \frac{1}{N} \delta_{\alpha,\beta} \delta_{\mu,\nu}, \quad (51)$$

where $f^{A,B,C}$ are structure constants of the $\mathfrak{su}(N)$ Lie algebra. Let \hat{c}_α^\dagger and \hat{c}_α be fermion creation and annihilation operators, where $\alpha = 1, \dots, N$. They satisfy $\{\hat{c}_\alpha, \hat{c}_\beta\} = \{\hat{c}_\alpha^\dagger, \hat{c}_\beta^\dagger\} = 0$ and $\{\hat{c}_\alpha, \hat{c}_\beta^\dagger\} = \delta_{\alpha,\beta}$. With these operators, one can obtain the standard Schwinger fermion representation as

$$\hat{S}^A = \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^N \hat{c}_\alpha^\dagger (G^A)_{\alpha,\beta} \hat{c}_\beta. \quad (52)$$

We see that

$$[\hat{S}^A, \hat{S}^B] = \sum_{C=1}^{N^2-1} i f^{A,B,C} \hat{S}^C, \quad (53)$$

which means that the operators \hat{S}^A form a representation of the $\mathfrak{su}(N)$ Lie algebra. In the following, we call the operators of the form Eq. (52) the $SU(N)$ spin operators.

3.2. The Hamiltonian of the $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model

Here, we define the Hamiltonian of the $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model. Let Λ be a finite lattice. The operators $\hat{c}_{x,\alpha}^\dagger$ and $\hat{c}_{x,\alpha}$ are creation and annihilation operators for itinerant fermions, which were introduced in Section 2. The operators $\hat{f}_{x,\alpha}^\dagger$ and $\hat{f}_{x,\alpha}$ are creation and annihilation operators for localized fermions at site $x \in \Lambda$ with color α . They satisfy

$$\{\hat{f}_{x,\alpha}, \hat{f}_{y,\beta}\} = \{\hat{f}_{x,\alpha}^\dagger, \hat{f}_{y,\beta}^\dagger\} = 0, \quad (54)$$

$$\{\hat{f}_{x,\alpha}, \hat{f}_{y,\beta}^\dagger\} = \delta_{\alpha,\beta} \delta_{x,y}, \quad (55)$$

$$\{\hat{c}_{x,\alpha}, \hat{f}_{y,\beta}\} = \{\hat{c}_{x,\alpha}^\dagger, \hat{f}_{y,\beta}^\dagger\} = \{\hat{c}_{x,\alpha}, \hat{f}_{y,\beta}^\dagger\} = \{\hat{c}_{x,\alpha}^\dagger, \hat{f}_{y,\beta}\} = 0. \quad (56)$$

The number operator of localized fermion at site x with color α is denoted by $\hat{n}_{x,\alpha}^{(f)} = \hat{f}_{x,\alpha}^\dagger \hat{f}_{x,\alpha}$. In the following, the number operator of the itinerant fermions $\hat{n}_{x,\alpha}$ is denoted by $\hat{n}_{x,\alpha}^{(c)} = \hat{c}_{x,\alpha}^\dagger \hat{c}_{x,\alpha}$. We also write $\hat{n}_x^{(c)} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \hat{n}_{x,\alpha}^{(c)}$. We denote the Fock space of the operators $\hat{c}_{x,\alpha}$ and $\hat{f}_{x,\alpha}$ by $\mathcal{H}'(\Lambda)$. At each $x \in \Lambda$, we define the $SU(N)$ spin operators for itinerant and localized fermions by using the representation of Eq. (52) as

$$\hat{s}_x^A = \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^N \hat{c}_{x,\alpha}^\dagger (G^A)_{\alpha,\beta} \hat{c}_{x,\beta}, \quad (57)$$

$$\hat{S}_x^A = \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^N \hat{f}_{x,\alpha}^\dagger (G^A)_{\alpha,\beta} \hat{f}_{x,\beta}, \quad (58)$$

respectively. The total $SU(N)$ spin operator is given by $\hat{S}_{\text{tot}}^A = \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \hat{S}_{\text{tot},x}^A$, where $\hat{S}_{\text{tot},x}^A = \hat{s}_x^A + \hat{S}_x^A$. The Hamiltonian of the $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model is defined by

$$\hat{H}_{\text{KLM}} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \sum_{x,y \in \Lambda} t_{x,y} \hat{c}_{x,\alpha}^\dagger \hat{c}_{y,\alpha} + J_{\text{K}} \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \sum_{A=1}^{N^2-1} \hat{s}_x^A \hat{S}_x^A. \quad (59)$$

In the following, we study the case where the $SU(N)$ spins of itinerant and localized fermions are ferromagnetically coupled. That is, we assume that $J_{\text{K}} < 0$. We also assume that there is exactly one fermion described by $\hat{f}_{x,\alpha}^\dagger$ ($\alpha = 1, \dots, N$) localized at each site $x \in \Lambda$, i.e., at each site, there is the $SU(N)$ spin in the fundamental representation corresponding to a single box \square . In what follows, we only consider the subspace $\mathcal{W}(\Lambda) = \{|\Psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}'(\Lambda) | \hat{n}_x^{(f)} |\Psi\rangle = |\Psi\rangle \text{ for all } x \in \Lambda\}$, where $\hat{n}_x^{(f)} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \hat{n}_{x,\alpha}^{(f)}$.

The $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model has the $SU(N)$ symmetry, which can be seen from the following relations

$$[\hat{H}_{\text{KLM}}, \hat{S}_{\text{tot}}^A] = 0 \text{ for all } A = 1, \dots, N^2 - 1. \quad (60)$$

The $SU(N)$ symmetry can also be described by using the color raising and lowering operators. The color raising and lowering operators are given as

$$\hat{F}_{\text{tot}}^{\alpha,\beta} = \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \left(\hat{c}_{x,\alpha}^\dagger \hat{c}_{x,\beta} + \hat{f}_{x,\alpha}^\dagger \hat{f}_{x,\beta} \right) \text{ for } \alpha \neq \beta, \quad (61)$$

and the total number of itinerant and localized fermions with color α is given as

$$\hat{F}_{\text{tot}}^{\alpha,\alpha} = \sum_{x \in \Lambda} (\hat{n}_{x,\alpha}^{(c)} + \hat{n}_{x,\alpha}^{(f)}). \quad (62)$$

The $SU(N)$ symmetry of the model implies that

$$[\hat{H}_{\text{KLM}}, \hat{F}_{\text{tot}}^{\alpha,\beta}] = 0. \quad (63)$$

The total number of itinerant and localized fermions is given by $\hat{N}_{\text{tot}} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \hat{F}_{\text{tot}}^{\alpha,\alpha}$, and the Hamiltonian (59) also commutes with \hat{N}_{tot} . We note that the Hamiltonian (59) also satisfies

$$[\hat{H}_{\text{KLM}}, \hat{N}_c] = 0, \quad (64)$$

which means the model conserves the number of itinerant fermions described by $\hat{c}_{x,\alpha}^\dagger$. Therefore, the numbers of itinerant fermions and the number of localized fermions are independently conserved. In the following, we denote the eigenvalue of \hat{N}_{tot} , \hat{N}_c , and $\hat{F}_{\text{tot}}^{\alpha,\alpha}$ by N_{tot} , N_c , and L_α , respectively. Since it holds that $\hat{n}_x^{(f)} |\Psi\rangle = |\Psi\rangle$ in the subspace $\mathcal{W}(\Lambda)$, we have $\sum_{x \in \Lambda} \hat{n}_x^{(f)} |\Psi\rangle = |\Lambda| |\Psi\rangle$. When the number of itinerant fermions is fixed to N_c , then $N_{\text{tot}} = N_c + |\Lambda|$. As in Section 2, we define the subspaces $\mathcal{H}'_{N_{\text{tot}}}(\Lambda)$ and $\mathcal{H}'_{L_1, \dots, L_N}(\Lambda)$ by

$$\mathcal{H}'_{N_{\text{tot}}}(\Lambda) = \{|\Psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}'(\Lambda) \mid \hat{N}_{\text{tot}} |\Psi\rangle = N_{\text{tot}} |\Psi\rangle\}, \quad (65)$$

$$\mathcal{H}'_{L_1, \dots, L_N}(\Lambda) = \{|\Psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}'(\Lambda) \mid \hat{F}_{\text{tot}}^{\alpha,\alpha} |\Psi\rangle = L_\alpha |\Psi\rangle \text{ for all } \alpha = 1, \dots, N\}. \quad (66)$$

To define the $SU(N)$ ferromagnetism, we again define the Casimir operator $\hat{C}_{\text{tot},2}$ of the $SU(N)$ group as

$$\hat{C}_{\text{tot},2} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{\alpha, \beta=1}^N \hat{F}_{\text{tot}}^{\alpha,\beta} \hat{F}_{\text{tot}}^{\beta,\alpha} - \frac{\hat{N}_{\text{tot}}^2}{N} \right). \quad (67)$$

Here we define the $SU(N)$ ferromagnetism of the $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model as follows.

Definition 2. Consider the Hamiltonian (59) with a fixed N_{tot} . We say that the model exhibits $SU(N)$ ferromagnetism if any ground state $|\Psi_{\text{GS}}\rangle$ has the maximum eigenvalue of $\hat{C}_{\text{tot},2}$ in $\mathcal{H}'_{N_{\text{tot}}}(\Lambda)$, i.e.,

$$\hat{C}_{\text{tot},2} |\Psi_{\text{GS}}\rangle = \frac{N_{\text{tot}}(N-1)}{2} \left(\frac{N_{\text{tot}}}{N} + 1 \right) |\Psi_{\text{GS}}\rangle. \quad (68)$$

3.3. Theorem for the $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model with a flat band

In the following, we again assume that $\mathbb{T} \geq 0$ and $\mathfrak{h}_0 = \ker \mathbb{T}$ is not empty. The dimension of \mathfrak{h}_0 is denoted by $D_0 > 0$. With the basis introduced in Lemma 1, we can

define the set of operators $\hat{a}_{z,\alpha}^\dagger$ as in Eq. (19). We then define the fully polarized states with the same color α for itinerant and localized fermions as

$$|\Psi_{\text{all } \alpha}\rangle = \left(\prod_{z \in I} \hat{a}_{z,\alpha}^\dagger \right) \left(\prod_{x \in \Lambda} \hat{f}_{x,\alpha}^\dagger \right) |\Psi_{\text{vac}}\rangle, \quad (69)$$

where $|\Psi_{\text{vac}}\rangle$ is the normalized vacuum state for $\hat{c}_{x,\alpha}$ and $\hat{f}_{x,\alpha}$ operators. We also define the state of the form,

$$|\Psi_{L_1, \dots, L_N}\rangle = \left(\hat{F}_{\text{tot}}^{N,1} \right)^{L_N} \cdots \left(\hat{F}_{\text{tot}}^{2,1} \right)^{L_2} |\Psi_{\text{all } 1}\rangle, \quad (70)$$

where $L_1 = D_0 + |\Lambda| - \sum_{\alpha=2}^N L_\alpha$. We also call the states of the form (70) fully polarized states. In the same manner as Eq. (28), it can be checked that

$$\hat{C}_{\text{tot},2} |\Psi_{\text{all } \alpha}\rangle = \frac{N_{\text{tot}}(N-1)}{2} \left(\frac{N_{\text{tot}}}{N} + 1 \right) |\Psi_{\text{all } \alpha}\rangle, \quad (71)$$

where $N_{\text{tot}} = D_0 + |\Lambda|$. We can see that the fully polarized states of the form (70) also have the same eigenvalue of $\hat{C}_{\text{tot},2}$, and thus all the fully polarized states have the maximum eigenvalue of $\hat{C}_{\text{tot},2}$.

Using Theorem 1, we can prove the following theorem:

Theorem 2. *Consider the Hamiltonian (59) with $N_{\text{tot}} = D_0 + |\Lambda|$ and $J_K < 0$. The ferromagnetic $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model exhibits $SU(N)$ ferromagnetism when the subset Λ_0 introduced in Theorem 1 satisfies $\Lambda_0 = \Lambda$, and the matrix $\left((\mathbf{P}_0)_{x,y} \right)_{x,y \in \Lambda_0}$ is irreducible.*

3.4. Proof of Theorem 2

We decompose the Hamiltonian (59) as

$$\hat{H}_{\text{KLM}} = \hat{H}_{\text{Hub}} + J_K \left(1 - \frac{1}{N} \right) \hat{N}_c + \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \hat{V}_x, \quad (72)$$

where \hat{H}_{Hub} is the Hamiltonian of the $SU(N)$ Hubbard model,

$$\hat{H}_{\text{Hub}} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \sum_{x,y \in \Lambda} t_{x,y} \hat{c}_{x,\alpha}^\dagger \hat{c}_{y,\alpha} + U \sum_{\alpha < \beta} \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \hat{n}_{x,\alpha}^{(c)} \hat{n}_{x,\beta}^{(c)}, \quad (73)$$

with $U > 0$. The local interaction \hat{V}_x is defined by

$$\hat{V}_x = -U \sum_{\alpha < \beta} \hat{n}_{x,\alpha}^{(c)} \hat{n}_{x,\beta}^{(c)} - J_K \left(1 - \frac{1}{N} \right) \hat{n}_x^{(c)} + J_K \sum_{A=1}^{N^2-1} \hat{s}_x^A \hat{S}_x^A. \quad (74)$$

In the proof, we use the following lemma.

Lemma 4. *The local interaction \hat{V}_x is positive semidefinite when $|J_K|/U > N/2$.*

Proof. To prove this, we study the eigenvalues of \hat{V}_x , which is denoted by V_x in the following. We can express \hat{V}_x as

$$\hat{V}_x = -\frac{U}{2}\hat{n}_x^{(c)}(\hat{n}_x^{(c)} - 1) - J_K \left(1 - \frac{1}{N}\right) \hat{n}_x^{(c)} \quad (75)$$

$$+ J_K \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{A=1}^{N^2-1} \hat{S}_{\text{tot},x}^A \hat{S}_{\text{tot},x}^A - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{A=1}^{N^2-1} \hat{s}_x^A \hat{s}_x^A - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{A=1}^{N^2-1} \hat{S}_x^A \hat{S}_x^A \right). \quad (76)$$

Since we consider the subspace $\mathcal{W}(\Lambda)$, the operator $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{A=1}^{N^2-1} \hat{S}_x^A \hat{S}_x^A$ is the quadratic Casimir operator for the fundamental representation, and its eigenvalue is

$$C_2 \left(\square \right) = \frac{1}{2N}(N^2 - 1). \quad (77)$$

Because $\hat{n}_x^{(c)}$ commutes with \hat{V}_x , we can fix the number of itinerant fermions, which is denoted by $n^{(c)}$ ($n^{(c)} = 0, \dots, N$). In this sector, the operator $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{A=1}^{N^2-1} \hat{s}_x^A \hat{s}_x^A$ is the quadratic Casimir operator for the representation

$$n^{(c)} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \square \\ \vdots \\ \square \end{array} \right\}, \quad (78)$$

and its eigenvalue is given by

$$C_2 \left(n^{(c)} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \square \\ \vdots \\ \square \end{array} \right\} \right) = \frac{N+1}{2N} n^{(c)} (N - n^{(c)}). \quad (79)$$

Therefore, when $n^{(c)}$ is fixed, the local interaction \hat{V}_x acts as

$$\hat{V}_x = -\frac{U}{2}n^{(c)}(n^{(c)} - 1) - J_K \left(1 - \frac{1}{N}\right) n^{(c)} \quad (80)$$

$$+ J_K \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{A=1}^{N^2-1} \hat{S}_{\text{tot},x}^A \hat{S}_{\text{tot},x}^A - \frac{N+1}{2N} n^{(c)} (N - n^{(c)}) - \frac{1}{2N} (N^2 - 1) \right). \quad (81)$$

When the number of itinerant fermions is $n^{(c)}$, there are two possible total $SU(N)$ spins in the representations

$$n^{(c)} + 1 \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \square \\ \vdots \\ \square \end{array} \right\}, \quad n^{(c)} \left\{ \begin{array}{cc} \square & \square \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \square & \square \end{array} \right\}, \quad (82)$$

and the eigenvalues of the quadratic Casimir operator for these representations are

$$C_2 \left(n^{(c)} + 1 \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \square \\ \vdots \\ \square \end{array} \right\} \right) = \frac{N+1}{2N} (n^{(c)} + 1) (N - n^{(c)} - 1), \quad (83)$$

and

$$C_2 \left(n^{(c)} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \square \square \\ \square \\ \vdots \\ \square \end{array} \right\} \right) = n^{(c)} + 1 + \frac{N+1}{2N} (n^{(c)} + 1)(N - n^{(c)} - 1). \quad (84)$$

When $n^{(c)} = 0$, there is only one possible total $SU(N)$ spin described by \square . When $n^{(c)} = N$, the itinerant fermions form the $SU(N)$ singlet, in which the $SU(N)$ spin transforms in the trivial representation corresponding to the Young diagram with no box. Thus, in this case, there is also one possible total $SU(N)$ spin in the representation \square . The eigenvalue of the quadratic Casimir operator for the representation \square is given by Eq. (77). In this way, we find

$$V_x = 0 \quad \text{for } n^{(c)} = 0, \quad (85)$$

$$V_x = -\frac{U}{2} n^{(c)} (n^{(c)} - 1) - 2J_K n^{(c)} \quad \text{for } n^{(c)} + 1 \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \square \\ \vdots \\ \square \end{array} \right\} \quad (1 \leq n^{(c)} \leq N - 1), \quad (86)$$

$$V_x = -\frac{U}{2} n^{(c)} (n^{(c)} - 1) - J_K (n^{(c)} - 1) \quad \text{for } n^{(c)} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \square \square \\ \vdots \\ \square \end{array} \right\} \quad (1 \leq n_c \leq N - 1), \quad (87)$$

$$V_x = -\frac{U}{2} N(N - 1) - J_K(N - 1) \quad \text{for } n^{(c)} = N. \quad (88)$$

When $n^{(c)} = 0$, we see that $V_x = 0$. For $n^{(c)} = 1, \dots, N - 1$, when $J_K < 0$, the eigenvalue of Eq. (86) is strictly larger than that of Eq. (87). One can easily see the eigenvalues (87) cannot be negative when $|J_K|/U > N/2$. For $n^{(c)} = N$, the eigenvalue (88) is positive when $|J_K|/U > N/2$. Thus, all the eigenvalues of \hat{V}_x are greater than or equal to zero, which implies that $\hat{V}_x \geq 0$. \square

We note that in the decomposition Eq. (72), one can take the parameter $U > 0$ arbitrarily. For a given J_K , there always exists U such that $|J_K|/U > N/2$. In the following proof, U is assumed to be such that $|J_K|/U > N/2$, and hence $\hat{V}_x \geq 0$.

Here we show that the fully polarized states (69) and (70) are ground states. Since $\hat{H}_{\text{Hub}} \geq 0$ and $\hat{V}_x \geq 0$, we get a lower bound

$$\hat{H}_{\text{KLM}} \geq -D_0 |J_K| \left(1 - \frac{1}{N} \right), \quad (89)$$

where we have used $N_c = D_0$ because we consider the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}'_{D_0+|\Lambda|}(\Lambda)$. We can easily check that the fully polarized state $|\Psi_{\text{all } 1}\rangle$ satisfies

$$\hat{H}_{\text{KLM}} |\Psi_{\text{all } 1}\rangle = -D_0 |J_K| \left(1 - \frac{1}{N} \right) |\Psi_{\text{all } 1}\rangle, \quad (90)$$

and hence the state $|\Psi_{\text{all } 1}\rangle$ is a ground state of \hat{H}_{KLM} . Due to the $SU(N)$ symmetry, all the fully polarized states are ground states of \hat{H}_{KLM} .

In the rest of the proof, we prove that there are no other ground states. Let $|\Psi_{\text{GS}}\rangle$ be an arbitrary ground state, which satisfies

$$\hat{H}_{\text{KLM}} |\Psi_{\text{GS}}\rangle = -D_0 |J_{\text{K}}| \left(1 - \frac{1}{N}\right) |\Psi_{\text{GS}}\rangle. \quad (91)$$

With the decomposition (72), noting that $\hat{H}_{\text{Hub}} \geq 0$ and $\hat{V}_x \geq 0$, we find

$$\hat{H}_{\text{Hub}} |\Psi_{\text{GS}}\rangle = 0, \quad (92)$$

and

$$\hat{V}_x |\Psi_{\text{GS}}\rangle = 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in \Lambda. \quad (93)$$

We first consider the condition (92). According to Theorem 1, the ground state $|\Psi_{\text{GS}}\rangle$ can be written as

$$|\Psi_{\text{GS}}\rangle = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} C(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \left(\prod_{z \in I} \hat{a}_{z, \alpha_z}^\dagger \right) \left(\prod_{x \in \Lambda} \hat{f}_{x, \beta_x}^\dagger \right) |\Psi_{\text{vac}}\rangle, \quad (94)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_z)_{z \in I}$ is a color configuration of itinerant fermions over the subset I , and $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_x)_{x \in \Lambda}$ is a color configuration of localized fermions over the lattice Λ . The coefficients $C(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ must be symmetric under permutations of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$.

Then we consider the condition (93). Using the local constraint $\hat{n}_x^{(f)} |\Psi_{\text{GS}}\rangle = |\Psi_{\text{GS}}\rangle$ and Eq. (51), we have

$$\hat{V}_x |\Psi_{\text{GS}}\rangle = \left(-\frac{U}{2} \hat{n}_x^{(c)} (\hat{n}_x^{(c)} - 1) + |J_{\text{K}}| \sum_{\alpha < \beta} \left(\hat{f}_{x, \beta}^\dagger \hat{c}_{x, \alpha}^\dagger - \hat{f}_{x, \alpha}^\dagger \hat{c}_{x, \beta}^\dagger \right) \left(\hat{c}_{x, \alpha} \hat{f}_{x, \beta} - \hat{c}_{x, \beta} \hat{f}_{x, \alpha} \right) \right) |\Psi_{\text{GS}}\rangle. \quad (95)$$

Since $\hat{n}_x^{(c)} (\hat{n}_x^{(c)} - 1) |\Psi_{\text{GS}}\rangle = 0$, the ground state satisfies

$$|J_{\text{K}}| \sum_{\alpha < \beta} \left(\hat{f}_{x, \beta}^\dagger \hat{c}_{x, \alpha}^\dagger - \hat{f}_{x, \alpha}^\dagger \hat{c}_{x, \beta}^\dagger \right) \left(\hat{c}_{x, \alpha} \hat{f}_{x, \beta} - \hat{c}_{x, \beta} \hat{f}_{x, \alpha} \right) |\Psi_{\text{GS}}\rangle = 0, \quad (96)$$

which leads to

$$\left(\hat{c}_{x, \alpha} \hat{f}_{x, \beta} - \hat{c}_{x, \beta} \hat{f}_{x, \alpha} \right) |\Psi_{\text{GS}}\rangle = 0, \quad (97)$$

for any $x \in \Lambda$ and $\alpha \neq \beta$. Using the anticommutation relations (33) and (56), from Eq. (97), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & (-1)^{D_0} \sum_{z \in I} \sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \\ \alpha_z = \alpha}} \sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\beta} \\ \beta_x = \beta}} \text{sgn}(z; I) \mu_z(x) (C(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) - C(\boldsymbol{\alpha}|_{\alpha_z = \beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}|_{\beta_x = \alpha})) \\ & \times \left(\prod_{z' \in I \setminus \{z\}} \hat{a}_{z', \alpha_{z'}}^\dagger \right) \left(\prod_{x' \in \Lambda \setminus \{x\}} \hat{f}_{x', \beta_{x'}}^\dagger \right) |\Psi_{\text{vac}}\rangle = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (98)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\alpha}|_{\alpha_z=\beta}$ is the color configuration obtained from $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ by replacing α_z with β , and similarly, $\boldsymbol{\beta}|_{\beta_x=\alpha}$ is the color configuration obtained from $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ by replacing β_x with α . The function $\text{sgn}(z; I)$ is a sign factor arising from exchanges of the fermion operators.

Since all the states in the sum are linearly independent and α and β are arbitrary, we get

$$\mu_z(x) (C(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) - C(\boldsymbol{\alpha}|_{\alpha_z=\beta_x}, \boldsymbol{\beta}|_{\beta_x=\alpha_z})) = 0, \quad (99)$$

for any $x \in \Lambda$, $z \in I$, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. By assumption, it holds that $\Lambda_0 = \Lambda$, and hence, for any $x \in \Lambda$, there exists $z_0 \in I$ such that $\mu_{z_0}(x) \neq 0$. For such $z_0 \in I$, we obtain

$$C(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = C(\boldsymbol{\alpha}|_{\alpha_{z_0}=\beta_x}, \boldsymbol{\beta}|_{\beta_x=\alpha_{z_0}}) \quad \text{for any } \boldsymbol{\alpha} \text{ and } \boldsymbol{\beta}. \quad (100)$$

Noting that $C(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is symmetric under the permutations of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $x \in \Lambda$ is arbitrary, we see that

$$C(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = C(\boldsymbol{\alpha}|_{\alpha_z=\beta_x}, \boldsymbol{\beta}|_{\beta_x=\alpha_z}), \quad (101)$$

for all $x \in \Lambda$ and $z \in I$. Using Eq. (101), we also find that $C(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = C(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{x \leftrightarrow y})$, where $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{x \leftrightarrow y}$ is obtained from $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ by swapping β_x and β_y . Since any permutation of can be obtained by repeatedly swapping two colors, we have

$$C(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = C(\boldsymbol{\alpha}', \boldsymbol{\beta}'), \quad (102)$$

where $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}', \boldsymbol{\beta}')$ is a permutation of $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ with $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ being a color configuration over I and Λ . Consequently, when we fix L_α for all $\alpha = 1, \dots, N$, the coefficient $C(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is a constant, and hence the ground state is unique in $\mathcal{H}'_{L_1, \dots, L_N}(\Lambda)$.

Finally, we can also check that the unique ground state in $\mathcal{H}'_{L_1, \dots, L_N}(\Lambda)$ is the fully polarized state $|\Psi_{L_1, \dots, L_N}\rangle$ in a similar way as in Section 2. Here we introduce a word $w' = (w'_1, \dots, w'_{D_0}, w'_{D_0+1}, \dots, w'_{D_0+|\Lambda|})$ whose length is $D_0 + |\Lambda|$ and denote the set of words for which $|w'_\alpha| = L_\alpha$ by $W'(L_1, \dots, L_N) = \{w' \mid |w'_\alpha| = L_\alpha \text{ for all } \alpha\}$. The ground state in $\mathcal{H}'_{L_1, \dots, L_N}(\Lambda)$ satisfying Eq. (102) is written as

$$\left| \tilde{\Psi}_{L_1, \dots, L_N} \right\rangle = \sum_{w' \in W'(L_1, \dots, L_N)} \hat{a}_{z_1, w'_1}^\dagger \cdots \hat{a}_{z_{D_0}, w'_{D_0}}^\dagger \hat{f}_{1, w'_{D_0+1}}^\dagger \cdots \hat{f}_{|\Lambda|, w'_{D_0+|\Lambda|}}^\dagger |\Psi_{\text{vac}}\rangle, \quad (103)$$

where we have labeled each site $x \in \Lambda$ by integers as $x = 1, \dots, |\Lambda|$. With the commutation relations $[\hat{F}_{\text{tot}}^{\alpha, \beta}, \hat{a}_{z, \gamma}^\dagger] = \delta_{\alpha, \gamma} \hat{a}_{z, \beta}^\dagger$, and $[\hat{F}_{\text{tot}}^{\alpha, \beta}, \hat{f}_{x, \gamma}^\dagger] = \delta_{\alpha, \gamma} \hat{f}_{x, \beta}^\dagger$, we find that

$$\left(\hat{F}_{\text{tot}}^{2,1} \right)^{L_2} |\Psi_{\text{all } 1}\rangle = L_2! \sum_{w' \in W'(D_0+|\Lambda|-L_2, L_2, 0, \dots, 0)} \hat{a}_{z_1, w'_1}^\dagger \cdots \hat{a}_{z_{D_0}, w'_{D_0}}^\dagger \hat{f}_{1, w'_{D_0+1}}^\dagger \cdots \hat{f}_{|\Lambda|, w'_{D_0+|\Lambda|}}^\dagger |\Psi_{\text{vac}}\rangle. \quad (104)$$

By repeating the same calculations, we see that the states $\left| \tilde{\Psi}_{L_1, \dots, L_N} \right\rangle$ and $|\Psi_{L_1, \dots, L_N}\rangle$ are the same up to a normalization. Therefore, the unique ground state $\left| \tilde{\Psi}_{L_1, \dots, L_N} \right\rangle$ in $\mathcal{H}'_{D_0+|\Lambda|}(\Lambda)$ is indeed the fully polarized state.

3.5. Remark

Here we would like to comment on the stability of the flat-band ferromagnetism for the $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model. In previous studies, rigorous results regarding the stability of the flat-band ferromagnetism in the $SU(2)$ Hubbard model have been obtained [35, 58–62]. The extension of these results to the $SU(N)$ case has also been made for a particular class of systems [48, 49]. By combining these results with the technique for the proof of Theorem 2, we can also discuss the stability of flat-band ferromagnetism for the ferromagnetic $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model in a mathematically rigorous way. To illustrate this, let us consider a sufficiently large interaction strength U such that the $SU(N)$ Hubbard model exhibits $SU(N)$ ferromagnetism and assume that the other parameters are also in the range where $SU(N)$ ferromagnetism occurs. For the Kondo coupling J_K such that $|J_K|/U > N/2$, we can repeat the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 2. In this way, one can establish rigorous results on the stability of ferromagnetism in the ferromagnetic $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model with a nearly flat band.

4. Conclusion and remark

In this paper, we have established rigorous results on flat-band ferromagnetism for the $SU(N)$ Hubbard model and the ferromagnetic $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model. For the former, we found the necessary and sufficient condition for the ground state to exhibit $SU(N)$ ferromagnetism when the number of particle is equal to the degeneracy of the lowest-energy single-particle states. The condition says that the irreducibility of the projection matrix onto the space of the lowest-energy single-particle states is equivalent to the presence of $SU(N)$ ferromagnetism. We also showed that this general theory could be applied to the ferromagnetic $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model with the hopping term of itinerant fermions that has a flat band at the bottom. Specifically, we considered the case in which the number of itinerant fermions is the same as the degeneracy of the flat band, and each site is occupied by one localized fermion. We then proved that the model with a nonzero ferromagnetic Kondo coupling exhibits $SU(N)$ ferromagnetism when certain conditions with respect to the hopping matrix are satisfied.

Finally, we discuss a potential extension of Theorem 2. As we discussed, the $SU(N)$ Kondo lattice model is expected to be experimentally realizable with ultracold atomic gases. While the Kondo lattice model neglects the on-site interaction among itinerant fermions, in principle, such interaction can be present. Thus it is worth investigating flat-band ferromagnetism for the models with both the on-site interaction $U > 0$ and the ferromagnetic Kondo coupling $J_K < 0$. Since it has been rigorously proved that the $SU(N)$ Hubbard and ferromagnetic Kondo lattice model with a flat band exhibit $SU(N)$ ferromagnetism when certain conditions are met, it would be possible to establish rigorous results on flat-band ferromagnetism in the presence of both interactions.

Acknowledgments

K.T. was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant No. 21J11575. H.K. was supported in part by JSPS Grant in-Aid for Scientific Research on Innovative Areas No. JP20H04630, JSPS KAKENHI Grant No. JP18K03445, Grant-in-Aid for Transformative Research Areas A “Extreme Universe” No. JP21H05191, and the Inamori Foundation.

References

- [1] Bloch I, Dalibard J and Zwirger W 2008 *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **80** 885
- [2] Bloch I, Dalibard J and Nascimbene S 2012 *Nat. Phys.* **8** 267–276
- [3] Lewenstein M, Sanpera A and Ahufinger V 2012 *Ultracold Atoms in Optical Lattices: Simulating quantum many-body systems* (Oxford University Press)
- [4] Gross C and Bloch I 2017 *Science* **357** 995–1001
- [5] Schäfer F, Fukuhara T, Sugawa S, Takasu Y and Takahashi Y 2020 *Nat. Rev. Phys.* **2** 411–425
- [6] Gorshkov A V, Hermele M, Gurarie V, Xu C, Julienne P S, Ye J, Zoller P, Demler E, Lukin M D and Rey A 2010 *Nat. Phys.* **6** 289–295
- [7] Kanamori J 1963 *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **30** 275–289
- [8] Gutzwiller M C 1963 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **10** 159
- [9] Hubbard J 1963 *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. Ser. A* **276** 238–257
- [10] Montorsi A 1992 *The Hubbard Model: A Reprint Volume* (World Scientific)
- [11] Fazekas P 1999 *Lecture notes on electron correlation and magnetism* (World scientific)
- [12] Affleck I and Marston J B 1988 *Phys. Rev. B* **37** 3774
- [13] Marston J B and Affleck I 1989 *Phys. Rev. B* **39** 11538
- [14] Taie S, Yamazaki R, Sugawa S and Takahashi Y 2012 *Nat. Phys.* **8** 825
- [15] Hofrichter C, Riegger L, Scazza F, Höfer M, Fernandes D R, Bloch I and Fölling S 2016 *Phys. Rev. X* **6** 021030
- [16] Ozawa H, Taie S, Takasu Y and Takahashi Y 2018 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121** 225303
- [17] Totsuka K 2023 *Phys. Rev. A* **107** 033317
- [18] Cappellini G, Mancini M, Pagano G, Lombardi P, Livi L, De Cumis M S, Cancio P, Pizzocaro M, Calonico D, Levi F *et al.* 2014 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113** 120402
- [19] Ono K, Kobayashi J, Amano Y, Sato K and Takahashi Y 2019 *Phys. Rev. A* **99** 032707
- [20] Cappellini G, Livi L, Franchi L, Tusi D, Orenes D B, Inguscio M, Catani J and Fallani L 2019 *Phys. Rev. X* **9** 011028
- [21] Coleman P 1983 *Phys. Rev. B* **28** 5255
- [22] Read N, Newns D and Doniach S 1984 *Phys. Rev. B* **30** 3841
- [23] Tsunetsugu H, Sigrist M and Ueda K 1997 *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **69** 809
- [24] Nagaoka Y 1966 *Phys. Rev.* **147** 392
- [25] Tasaki H 1989 *Phys. Rev. B* **40** 9192
- [26] Katsura H and Tanaka A 2013 *Phys. Rev. A* **87** 013617
- [27] Bobrow E, Stubis K and Li Y 2018 *Phys. Rev. B* **98** 180101
- [28] Li Y, Lieb E H and Wu C 2014 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112** 217201
- [29] Li Y 2015 *Phys. Rev. B* **91** 115122
- [30] Lieb E H 1989 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62** 1201
- [31] Mielke A 1991 *J. Phys. A* **24** L73
- [32] Tasaki H 1992 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69** 1608
- [33] Mielke A and Tasaki H 1993 *Commun. Math. Phys.* **158** 341–371
- [34] Tasaki H 1998 *Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys.* **99** 489–548
- [35] Tasaki H 2020 *Physics and Mathematics of Quantum Many-Body Systems* (Springer)
- [36] Nishino S, Goda M and Kusakabe K 2003 *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn* **72** 2015–2023

- [37] Nishino S and Goda M 2005 *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn* **74** 393–400
- [38] Hatsugai Y and Maruyama I 2011 *Europhys. Lett.* **95** 20003
- [39] Hatsugai Y, Shiraishi K and Aoki H 2015 *New J. Phys.* **17** 025009
- [40] Katsura H and Isao M 2015 *Solid State Physics* **50** 257–270 (in Japanese)
- [41] Ogata T, Kawamura M and Ozaki T 2021 *Phys. Rev. B* **103** 205119
- [42] Sekizawa T 2003 *J. Phys. A* **36** 10451
- [43] Ueda H, Tanaka A and Idogaki T 2004 *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.* **272** 950–951
- [44] Gulácsi Z, Kampf A and Vollhardt D 2007 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99** 026404
- [45] Katsura H, Maruyama I, Tanaka A and Tasaki H 2010 *Europhys. Lett.* **91** 57007
- [46] Tanaka A 2020 *J. Stat. Phys.* **181** 897–916
- [47] Liu R, Nie W and Zhang W 2019 *Sci. Bull.* **64** 1490–1495
- [48] Tamura K and Katsura H 2019 *Phys. Rev. B* **100** 214423
- [49] Tamura K and Katsura H 2021 *J. Stat. Phys.* **182** 1–20
- [50] Mielke A 1993 *Phys. Lett. A* **174** 443–448
- [51] Mielke A 1999 *J. Phys. A* **32** 8411
- [52] Lacroix C 1985 *Solid State Commun.* **54** 991–994
- [53] Sigrist M, Tsunetsugu H and Ueda K 1991 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67** 2211
- [54] Shen S Q 1998 *Eur. Phys. J. B* **2** 11–16
- [55] Kubo K 1982 *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **51** 782–786
- [56] Ping J, Wang F and Chen J Q 2002 *Group representation theory for physicists* (World Scientific Publishing Company)
- [57] Prasolov V V 1994 *Problems and theorems in linear algebra* vol 134 (American Mathematical Soc.)
- [58] Tasaki H 1994 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **73** 1158
- [59] Tasaki H 1995 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75** 4678
- [60] Tasaki H 1996 *J. Stat. Phys.* **84** 535–653
- [61] Tanaka A and Ueda H 2003 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90** 067204
- [62] Tanaka A 2018 *J. Stat. Phys.* **170** 399–420