

Exact Entanglement correlation complements the chemical bond description

Józef Spalek* and Maciej Hendzel

Institute of Theoretical Physics, Jagiellonian University,

ul. Łojasiewicza 11, PL-30-348 Kraków, Poland

(Dated: June 11, 2024)

We analyze the properties of the exact solution obtained by us recently for the extended Heter-London model for chemical bonding which has an analytic form. The emphasis is put on defining two-particle entanglement correlation as the complementary characterization of the chemical bond and relating it to the partial atomicity and the so-called true covalency. The newly introduced characteristics remove the deficiency of the standard definition of covalency which now vanishes in the limit of the separated atoms. In effect, a gradual evolution of the system of two indistinguishable electrons in a bound state into their distinguishable correspondents can be traced systematically. The present analysis has a universal meaning and may also be applied to more complex systems.

arXiv:2406.06171v1 [cond-mat.str-el] 10 Jun 2024

*Electronic address: jozef.spalek@uj.edu.pl

A fully quantitative understanding of the nature of the covalent bond is fundamentally important for describing various chemical, physical, and biological systems. In the canonical case of the H_2 molecule, the bond is depicted as a quantum mechanical bound state of two hydrogen atoms in the spin-singlet configuration of two electrons, minimally affected by the proton nuclear spins. Heitler and London established the initial quantitative description of the H_2 molecule [1] within the essentially single-particle (Hartree-Fock) approximation of the two-electron state. This approach still serves as the foundation for a more comprehensive description, incorporating the mixing of virtually excited states of the constituent electrons [2].

Recently, we have rigorously solved the extended Heitler-London model, accounting for all-electron interactions in the ground state of the two-particle system with the inclusion of the $1s$ -orbital contraction contained in the resulting covalent and ionic parts of the total wave function [3]. A crucial feature of this exact solution is the derivation of the precise and analytic form of the two-particle wave function. This enabled a redefinition of the bond covalency and ionicity, along with the introduction of the degree of atomicity persistent upon bond formation, which in turn opens up a new path to a complementary bond characterization.

Here we demonstrate that the previously defined *true covalency* [4–6], based on the ideas of the Mott-Hubbard localization, can be quantitatively related to the von Neumann entropy for the interacting and entangled two-electron states. Essentially, we name this entropy as *the entanglement correlation* between the true covalent and ionic counterparts, thus complementing each other in the quantum mechanical manner. From this perspective, our findings complete the energy-based quantum mechanical description of the covalent bond, here exemplified for the homopolar molecule H_2 . Moreover, our approach resolves the unphysical feature, observed in both the Heitler-London and the succeeding papers, for which the covalency increases with the increasing interatomic distance [7]. Such a refined analysis can be carried out in a physically clear way only by introducing the density matrix formulation with the admixture of atomicity to the pure bonding state. Finally, the quantum information point of view analysis provides us with an insight into the bond evolution with the interatomic distance R gradually approaching the dissociation limit, $R \rightarrow \infty$, when the bonding electrons are getting localized on the parent atoms and thus become *distinguishable in the quantum mechanical sense*.

THEORY. We start with the expression for the two-particle wave function in the spin-singlet ground state, here rewritten in the second-quantized form [4]

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Psi_G\rangle &= \frac{2(t+V)}{\sqrt{2D(D-U+K)}} \left(\hat{a}_{1\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{2\downarrow}^\dagger - \hat{a}_{1\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{2\uparrow}^\dagger \right) |0\rangle \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{D-U+K}{2D}} \left(\hat{a}_{1\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{2\downarrow}^\dagger + \hat{a}_{1\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{2\uparrow}^\dagger \right) |0\rangle \\
&\equiv C\psi_{cov}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) + I\psi_{ion}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where the first and second terms describe the covalent and ionic parts, respectively. The coefficients represent: t and V are the hopping and correlated hopping integrals, U and K are the magnitudes of the intraatomic and interatomic Coulomb repulsion, and $D \equiv \sqrt{(U-K)^2 + 16(t+V)^2}$. The creation operator part represents the intersite (first term) and intrasite spin singlet parts. They reflect microscopic parameters of the Hamiltonian [4, 5] and are calculated microscopically within the EDABI procedure (see Methods). The representation Eq. (1) is written in the basis of molecular wave functions. For the purpose of subsequent analysis we need a representation of Eq. (1) in terms of single-particle Slater-atomic basis. Its explicit form is

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Psi_G\rangle &\equiv (C\beta^2(1+\gamma^2) - 2\gamma I\beta^2) |\phi_{cov}^{at}\rangle \\
&\quad + (I\beta^2(1-\gamma^2) - 2\gamma C\beta^2) |\phi_{ion}^{at}\rangle \\
&\equiv \tilde{C} |\phi_{cov}^{at}\rangle + \tilde{I} |\phi_{ion}^{at}\rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where the sum $C^2 + I^2$, as well as $\tilde{C}^2 + \tilde{I}^2$, should be both normalized to unity and their explicit form has been rigorously determined previously [4, 5]. The physical meaning of the consecutive terms is the same as above. For the purpose of the present analysis, we write those components again in the explicit second-quantized form. Parenthetically, if we disregard the kets in Eq. (1) the resulting entities represent the corresponding wave functions in the Schrödinger position representation.

One important side remark should be made at this point. Namely, when plotting the covalent and ionic coefficients with increasing interatomic distance R , then the covalency ($\gamma_{cov} \equiv C^2/(C^2 + I^2)$) also increases and reaches its maximal value of unity in the $R \rightarrow \infty$

limit. This is an unphysical result and calls for a revision of the covalency definition in this form. To define *the true covalency* ($\gamma_{cov} \equiv (\tilde{C}^2 - \tilde{A}^2)/(\tilde{C}^2 + \tilde{I}^2)$) we have introduced the atomic coefficient ($\tilde{A} \equiv C\beta^2$) and atomicity $\gamma_{at} \equiv \tilde{A}^2/(\tilde{C}^2 + \tilde{I}^2)$ have subtracted the latter and then obtain the proper physical behavior of the quantities in the dissociation limit: $\gamma_{cov} \rightarrow 0$, $\gamma_{ion} \rightarrow 0$, and $\gamma_{at} \rightarrow 1$ [4, 5].

By invoking the atomicity and hence defining the true covalency we introduced a mixed-state ingredient in the so-far pure-state quantum mechanical analysis. Therefore, to select a proper language for this new situation, we turn to the appropriate density matrix description. Intuitively, it amounts to replacing the covalent factor with its true covalency correspondent. Explicitly, as evident from Eq. (1) we can define the two-particle density matrix in the form of 4×4 matrix with the following trial states $|\uparrow_1\downarrow_2\rangle$, $|\downarrow_1\uparrow_2\rangle$, $|\uparrow_1\downarrow_1\rangle$, and $|\downarrow_2\uparrow_2\rangle$ (where the subscripts 1 and 2 label the component atoms) from which all the spin-singlet states are composed of. In effect, the density matrix takes the starting form

$$\rho = \frac{1}{C^2 + I^2} \begin{pmatrix} C^2 & 0 & IC & 0 \\ 0 & C^2 & 0 & IC \\ IC & 0 & I^2 & 0 \\ 0 & IC & 0 & I^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (3)$$

Next, we subtract atomicity \tilde{A} from the above C factor in this expression. Then, the von Neumann entropy for this mixed state is determined in the following way

$$S \equiv -Tr(\rho \ln \rho) = -2(\gamma_{cov} + \gamma_{ion}) \ln(\gamma_{cov} + \gamma_{ion}) = -2\gamma_{bond} \ln(\gamma_{bond}). \quad (4)$$

We are now ready to discuss the results and relate the bonding factors to the von Neumann entropy, which will allow us to interpret the latter as expressing the *entanglement correlation*.

RESULTS. To illustrate the evolution of the bound state we have plotted in Fig. 1 a-d electron density profiles, drawn on (x, y) plane and at two interatomic distances: at equilibrium distance $R = R_{eq} = 1.43a_0$ and the Mott-Hubbard threshold (when the kinetic energy and interaction magnitudes are equal) $R = R_{Mott} = 2.3a_0$ [4, 5]. The actual densities are shown in Fig. 1(a) and (d), whereas the red parts in (b) and (e) mark the atomic- and ionic-part contributions, while the blue parts mark the total electron density. Furthermore,




FIG. 1: Left: Electron density profiles for two interatomic distances (equilibrium distance $R_{eq} = 1.43a_0$ and Mott-Hubbard boundary $R_{Mott} = 2.3a_0$) specified. Right: The purely covalent part of the wave function with the atomic and admixed ionic-covalent part subtracted. Note that the bonding is nonlocal and therefore requires a nonlocal (global characteristic): this is provided by either γ_{cov} or $\gamma_{cov} + \gamma_{ion}$ or by the von Neumann entropy, as discussed in detail in the main text.

Figs. (c) and (d) illustrate the corresponding densities on the plane $z = 0$ with both the atomic part and the ionic-covalent admixture subtracted. From the two last profiles, one can see that the covalent bonding encompasses the space in between the two proton positions, which is not limited only to the region along the line connecting them, as one would presume intuitively, so although its overall magnitude is quite small.

In Fig. 2 we present the von Neumann entropy *versus* the bonding factor, $\gamma_{cov} + \gamma_{ion}$ with characteristic points marked. On the upper scale the corresponding interatomic distances are labelled. The most important feature of this diagram is that the maximal entropy appears in neighborhood of the point where the kinetic energy and the interaction parts are comparable, i.e., close to the Mott-Hubbard (M-H) crossover point. The whole interaction-




FIG. 2: The von Neumann entropy as a function of bonding factor, $\gamma_{cov} + \gamma_{ion}$. The characteristic points are specified. The upper scale marks characteristic interatomic distances. The purple hatched area corresponds to the Mott-Hubard regime, emphasizing the region where electronic correlations are predominant.

dominated M-H regime is also marked. Because of those features, we can call the entropy as the exponent of the *entanglement correlations*. Note also that the entropy vanishes in the $R = 0$ and ∞ limits, as we consider the dynamics only in the spin-singlet subspace of the total Fock space. The entanglement expresses the mutual correlation between the covalent and ionic parts induced by the competition part and the localization tendency induced by strong repulsive Coulomb interaction. The latter is responsible for the emergent atomicity.

The bonding features introduced by us as a complementary characterization to the standard energy considerations (see below) are summarized in Fig. 3, all as a function of the interatomic distance. Explicitly, as said above, the point of maximal entanglement correlation is close to that, where the bonding $\gamma_{cov} + \gamma_{ion}$ and atomicity coincide. The latter may be regarded as a critical point for the crossover trend from the dominant single-particle bonding (characterized by the kinetic energy associated with the electron hopping) to the interaction-dominated (M-H) regime. The point is relatively far away from the equilibrium distance R_{eq} but may play a crucial role in the molecule dissociation process under the presence of a




FIG. 3: Relation between the bonding factor, atomicity and entanglement correlation (von Neumann entropy) as a function of interatomic distance. The shaded blue area corresponds to the Mott-Hubbard (crossover) regime [4, 5].

catalyst. To summarize the meaning of Figs. 2 and 3, they represent a fully complementary quantum characterization of the single chemical bond in the two-atomic molecules such as H_2 and related systems [3]. Nonetheless, the homopolar H_2 case represents the clearest situation as the atoms are the same and hence the quantum evolution with R , not distributed by extrinsic factors such as the component atoms inequivalence.

RELATED ENERGY CHARACTERISTICS. Above we have connected directly the single-particle *versus* interaction energy competition to the entanglement entropy related to it. As our method of approach allows for a detailed decomposition of the total bonding processes into various energy contributions, we now discuss on the evolution of the latter with the interatomic distance. In this manner, a comparison with a more standard approach can be made [8]. For that purpose, we plot in Fig. 4 the bar charts of those terms composing the total ground state energy (per atom): hopping ($2|t| \langle \hat{a}_{1\sigma}^\dagger \hat{a}_{2\sigma} \rangle$), intraatomic Coulomb interaction ($U \langle \hat{n}_{1\uparrow} \hat{n}_{1\downarrow} \rangle$) and interatomic ($\frac{1}{2}K \langle \hat{n}_1 \hat{n}_2 \rangle$) Coulomb repulsion terms, and hopping correlation ($2V \langle \hat{n}_{1\uparrow} \hat{a}_{1\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{2\downarrow} \rangle$) terms (the Heisenberg exchange term $\sim J$ has been ignored as it does not appear in the bonding factors). It follows that between $R = R_{eq}$ and $R = R_{Mott}$ the total hopping ($\sim 2|t+V|$) and the effective Coulomb interaction ($\sim U - K$) terms are of comparable magnitude; this circumstance reflects the Hubbard criterion that $(2|t+V|)/(U -$




FIG. 4: The bar charts specifying the relative energy contributions to the total energy of different components for four interatomic distance values ($1a_0$, equilibrium distance $1.43a_0$, Mott-Hubbard criterion $2.3a_0$, and $5a_0$). The Heisenberg exchange integral is not accounted for in the wave function coefficients and is disregarded here.

K) $\simeq 1$ then. Parenthetically, as elaborated earlier [4, 5] the criterion is the fundamental formal reference point of the whole analysis of atomicity. In effect, we cannot say whether the kinetic energy always represents the signature of the bonding. Instead, the factors displayed in Fig. 5 can be together unequivocally assigned as such. This conclusion can be illustrated further by calculating the dynamic correlations attached to the above terms. Namely, for example the orbital part $\langle \hat{n}_1 \rangle + \langle \hat{n}_2 \rangle = 2$, hopping probability $\langle \hat{a}_{1\sigma}^\dagger \hat{a}_{2\sigma} \rangle = 16|CI|$, intrasite Coulomb correlation $\langle \hat{n}_{1\uparrow} \hat{n}_{1\downarrow} \rangle = 4C^2$, intersite Coulomb correlation $\langle \hat{n}_1 \hat{n}_2 \rangle = 2I^2$, exchange spin correlation for the singlet state is obviously equal to unity, correlated-hopping correlation $\langle \hat{n}_{1\uparrow} \hat{a}_{1\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{2\downarrow} \rangle = 16|CI|$. In this manner, we relate directly the dynamic correlations to the bonding characteristics. This very important side conclusion could be also elaborated




FIG. 5: The adjusted atomic (ϵ_{at}) dynamic contribution to the energy for H_2 molecule with readjusted atomic orbital size for the specified interatomic distances R . The enhancement above reflects the orbital size contraction. The atomic energy is largely compensated by the intersite Coulomb interaction.

for heteropolar systems such as LiH , HeH^+ , etc., where the atomic energy part shifts the balance toward enhanced ionicity and atomicity. In the end, we should note that even the atomic part of the energy varies substantially with increasing R , as illustrated in Fig. 5. We see that this energy (on an absolute scale) is enhanced in the molecular state with respect to the value of R it would be in the limit of separated atoms (cf. dashed red line). The latest property provides an additional rationale for subtracting the atomic part in Figs. 1 (c) and (f) when explaining the meaning of the true covalency.

METHOD. Our approach is based on the method EDABI (**E**xact **D**iagonalization **A**b **I**nitio) proposed earlier for nanosystems with correlated electrons [4, 5]. We start with the assumption of the trial single-particle wave function basis which defines a truncated Hilbert-Fock space, in which a complete Hamiltonian in the second quantization representation is determined. The truncated basis is composed of both molecular (Mulliken-Wannier) states $w_{i\sigma}(\mathbf{r}) \equiv w_{\sigma}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_i)$, $i = 1, 2$ is formed in terms of which the microscopic parameters of the Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ in the Fock space are determined. The Wannier states are composed as a superposition of atomic Slater states with their size (determined analytically) the inter-correlated state (eigenstates of $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$). The lowest eigenstate is one of the three $^1\Sigma_g^+$ ground

states representing the ground state. The remaining five eigenstates (two singlets and three triplets) are the excited states. Finally, the two-particle wave function in an analytic form is determined by the transformation of the eigenvector in terms of the Fock space back to the Hilbert space [9]. The two-particle wave functions are determined analytically and for each of them, the crucial physical properties are discussed elsewhere [MH & JS, in preparation].

OUTLOOK. We reiterate that the molecular state, analyzed here within the exact solution of the extended Hetero-London model, presents itself as a distinct case of the entanglement evolution when compared to that of noninteracting bosons [10]. This is because here the particles interact and for interatomic distance $R \rightarrow \infty$ gradually become disentangled but still bound to the parent atoms, i.e., *distinguishable* in the quantum-mechanical sense [11]. In this respect the *indistinguishability* \rightarrow *distinguishability* transformation is quite analogous to that of delocalization-localization (Mott-Hubbard) transition in condensed multiparticle systems [12–14]. Here the transformation is gradual but still conveys the same physics as the supercritical delocalization-localization behavior in the other nanosystems [15]. In effect, it brings this aspect of Mott phenomenon to the molecular level. In effect, a degree of quantum statistical behavior may be implemented into the pure quantum-mechanical analysis of those systems. Obviously, the analysis of more involved and heterogeneous systems (e.g. LiH, HeH⁺, H₂⁻ etc.) may contribute to the possibility of modifying the particle indistinguishability and analyze resulting specific emergent potentially atomic behavior.

One may also raise the question of how the behavior beyond the standard equilibrium configuration ($R = R_{eq}$) of molecules (e.g. H₂) can be made accessible for studying the most interesting situation with $R \gtrsim R_{Mott}$. One can think of screening the Coulomb interaction by invoking either its reduction by a medium or a proper catalyst. But then, one must be very careful and do not change the component particles' indistinguishability. Finally, the physics of, e.g., H₂ molecule beyond $R = R_{eq}$ may be useful in enhancing its reactivity.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by Grants No. UMO–2021/41/B/ST3/04070 and 2023/49/B/ST3/03545 from Narodowe Centrum Nauki. The authors are very grateful to Ryszard, Michał, and Paweł Horodecki for their insights and critical remarks concerning the entanglement. We thank also our colleague Maciej Fidrysiak for numerous discussions.

-
- [1] W. Heitler and F. London, *Z. Phys.* **44**, 455 (1927).
- [2] M. Pendas and E. A. Francisco, *Nat. Commun.* **13**, 3327 (2022).
- [3] M. Hendzel, M. Fidrysiak, and J. Spalek, *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* **55**, 185101 (2022), URL <https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6455/ac8298>.
- [4] M. Hendzel, M. Fidrysiak, and J. Spalek, *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* **13**, 10261 (2022).
- [5] E. Broclawik, M. Fidrysiak, M. Hendzel, and J. Spalek, in *Polish Quantum Chemistry from Kotos to Now*, edited by M. Musiał and I. Grabowski (Academic Press, 2023), vol. 87 of *Advances in Quantum Chemistry*, p. 351–373, URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0065327623000151>.
- [6] M. Hendzel and J. Spalek, *Acta Physica Polonica A* **143**, 189 (2023), URL http://appol.ifpan.edu.pl/index.php/appa/article/view/143_189.
- [7] M. A. Pendas and E. Francisco, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **20**, 12368 (2018), URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1039/C8CP01519H>.
- [8] L. Zhao, M. Hermann, W. H. E. Schwarz, and G. Frenking, *Nature Reviews Chemistry* **3**, 48 (2019), ISSN 2397-3358, URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41570-018-0060-4>.
- [9] J. Spalek, R. Podsiadły, W. Wójcik, and A. Rycerz, *Phys. Rev. B* **61**, 15676 (2000), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.61.15676>.
- [10] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 865 (2009), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/RevModPhys.81.865>.
- [11] R. Jördens, N. Strohmaier, K. Günter, H. Moritz, and T. Esslinger, *Nature* **455**, 204 (2008), ISSN 1476-4687, URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature07244>.
- [12] N. F. Mott, *Metal-Insulator Transitions* (Taylor & Francis, London, 1991), 2nd ed.
- [13] J. Hubbard, *Proc. Roy. Soc.* **281**, 401 (1964), URL <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.1964.0190>.
- [14] J. Spalek, A. Datta, and J. M. Honig, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59**, 728 (1987), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.59.728>.
- [15] J. Spalek, *Mott physics in correlated nanosystems : localization-delocalization transition by the exact diagonalization ab initio method*, vol. 10 of *In: Topology, entanglement, and strong correlations edited by Pavarini E. and Koch E.* (Forschungszentrum Jülich GmbH, Institute

for Advanced Simulation, 2020), ISBN 978-3-95806-466-9, URL <https://www.cond-mat.de/events/correl20/manuscripts/spalek.pdf>.