

# Transfer learning of many-body electronic correlation entropy from local measurements

Faluke Aikebaier,<sup>1,2,3</sup> Teemu Ojanen,<sup>2,3</sup> and Jose L. Lado<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Applied Physics, Aalto University, 00076, Espoo, Finland*

<sup>2</sup>*Computational Physics Laboratory, Physics Unit,*

*Faculty of Engineering and Natural Sciences, Tampere University, FI-33014 Tampere, Finland*

<sup>3</sup>*Helsinki Institute of Physics P.O. Box 64, FI-00014, Finland*

The characterization of quantum correlations in many-body systems is instrumental to understanding the nature of emergent phenomena in quantum materials. The correlation entropy serves as a key metric for assessing the complexity of a quantum many-body state in interacting electronic systems. However, its determination requires the measurement of all single-particle correlators across a macroscopic sample, which can be impractical. Machine learning methods have been shown to allow learning the correlation entropy from a reduced set of measurements, yet these methods assume that the targeted system is contained in the set of training Hamiltonians. Here we show that a transfer learning strategy enables correlation entropy learning from a reduced set of measurements in families of Hamiltonians never considered in the training set. We demonstrate this transfer learning methodology in a wide variety of interacting models including local and non-local attractive and repulsive many-body interactions, long range hopping, doping, magnetic field and spin-orbit coupling. Furthermore, we show how this transfer learning methodology allows detecting quantum many-body phases never observed during their training set without prior knowledge about them. Our results demonstrate that correlation entropy learning can be potentially performed experimentally without requiring training in the experimentally realized Hamiltonian.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum correlations between interacting particles are essential for understanding complex behaviors in many-body quantum systems [1, 2], and reflect the intrinsic complexity of these states [3–6]. Traditional entanglement measures, such as the von Neumann and Renyi entropies, are commonly used to quantify quantum correlations [7–9]. However, these measures can yield non-zero values even for non-interacting systems [10–13]. A more direct approach is to use the von Neumann entropy of the one-particle density matrix (ODM), which vanishes in the noninteracting limit and more accurately reflects the correlations arising from many-body interactions [14–17]. Nevertheless, directly measuring such correlation entropy remains challenging, as it requires detailed particle-particle correlators of systems, which is especially impractical for large systems [18–23].

Machine learning strategies allow extracting non-trivial properties of quantum many-body states without requiring solely from specific observables [24–43]. In the case of the fermionic correlation entropy, machine learning allows inference from a handful of local measurements without requiring access to the full set of correlators [42, 43]. This approach significantly simplifies the process, offering a more efficient way to determine the correlation entropy while retaining accuracy, thereby serving as a valuable tool for bridging the gap between theory and experiment. This strategy is analogous to machine learning-enabled quantum tomography methods [44–48], which allow characterizing exponentially large quantum many-body states from a properly chosen set of measurements. However, a potential limitation for machine learning correlation entropy stems from




FIG. 1. Schematics of the model. (a) The neural network algorithms to extract quantum correlations from local measurable correlators. (b) A neural network algorithm trained on correlators extracted from one interacting fermionic chain is used to predict the correlation entropy of another interacting fermionic chain with a different parameter regime.

the fact that the training data must be generated with specific quantum models, which may or may not correspond to the system observed experimentally. Transfer learning [49, 50] tackles the question of whether machine learning algorithms can be extended beyond their simplified and highly controlled training set, a common scenario

for machine learning methodologies in physics, ranging from soft matter[51, 52], electronic structure[53, 54] and many-body physics[55, 56]. This motivates the question of whether an algorithm trained with models that do not correspond to the experimental one would enable learning the correlation entropy.

Here we demonstrate a machine learning strategy to extract the correlation entropy of a many-body system, where the training is performed on a different class of Hamiltonians from the tested ones. Our methodology enables predicting the correlation entropy of many-body models never seen during the training. This enhancement broadens the applicability of machine learning methodologies to learn the correlation entropy, allowing for the characterization of quantum correlations in a wider variety of electronic systems without the need for potential retraining. To achieve this goal, we use a transfer strategy as shown in Fig. 1(b), to create a robust algorithm that maintains high predictive accuracy even when applied to different unseen systems. Furthermore, we also show the robustness of such models to potential noise in the expectation values used, ensuring that the model remains reliable in practical conditions. The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we introduce the concept of correlation entropy and outline the family of Hamiltonians considered. In Sec. III, we provide a detailed discussion of the transfer learning framework and evaluate the predictive performance of the neural network algorithms. Sect. IV examines the impact of noise on the accuracy of the model. Finally, we present our conclusions in Sec. V.

## II. CORRELATION ENTROPY

In the presence of many-body interactions, quantum many-body states may strongly depart from conventional mean-field Hartree-Fock states. As a measure of such deviation, the correlation entropy is defined in terms of the correlation matrix[14, 15, 42, 57–66]. The correlation matrix constitutes of particle-particle correlators

$$C_{ij}^{ss'} = \langle \Psi_0 | c_{is}^\dagger c_{js'} | \Psi_0 \rangle, \quad (1)$$

where  $|\Psi_0\rangle$  is the many-body ground state,  $c_{is}$ ,  $c_{is}^\dagger$  are the annihilation and creation operators at site  $i$  and spin  $s$ . Due to Fermi statistics, the eigenvalues  $\alpha_\nu$  of the correlation matrix satisfy  $0 \leq \alpha_\nu \leq 1$ . This allows to define the correlation entropy as

$$S_{\text{corr}} = - \sum_{\nu=1}^{2N} \alpha_\nu \log \alpha_\nu. \quad (2)$$

The correlation entropy is nonnegative, scales linearly with the system size for ground states of local Hamiltonians [7], and is exactly zero for the ground state of non-interacting fermionic systems. The correlation entropy is a measure of how far away a given state, and in particular the ground state of a many-body Hamiltonian, is from the set of fermionic Hartree-Fock product states.

We consider various one-dimensional extended models of spinful interacting fermionic chains of the form

$$H = H_0 + H_p, \quad (3)$$

where

$$H_0 = -t \sum_{j,\sigma} \left( c_{j,\sigma}^\dagger c_{j+1,\sigma} + h.c. \right) + U \sum_j \left( n_{j,\uparrow} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \left( n_{j,\downarrow} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \quad (4)$$

is the half filled pure Hubbard model and  $p = \mu, t', V, h, \lambda_R, J$  represents chemical potential, next nearest-neighbour hopping, nearest-neighbour interaction, magnetic field in  $z$  direction, Rashba spin-orbit interaction, and spin-spin interaction, respectively. Then the last term in the Hamiltonian can be specifically written as

$$H_\mu = -\mu \sum_j (n_{j,\uparrow} + n_{j,\downarrow}) \quad (5)$$

$$H_{t'} = t' \sum_{j,\sigma} \left( c_{j,\sigma}^\dagger c_{j+2,\sigma} + h.c. \right) \quad (6)$$

$$H_V = V \sum_j (n_j - 1) (n_{j+1} - 1) \quad (7)$$

$$H_h = -\frac{h}{2} \sum_j (n_{j,\uparrow} - n_{j,\downarrow}) \quad (8)$$

$$H_{\lambda_R} = i\lambda_R \sum_{\langle jk \rangle ss'} c_{j,s}^\dagger (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{ss'} \times \mathbf{d}_{jk})_z c_{k,s'} + h.c. \quad (9)$$

$$H_J = J \sum_i \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i+1}. \quad (10)$$

The phases of selected extended models based on the correlation entropy are shown in Fig. 2(a-d). The Hamiltonians are solved by using the tensor-network formalism [67–70] on a one-dimensional fermionic chain with 32 spinful sites, and the correlation entropy is calculated by Eq. (2). As shown, for vanishing interactions  $U = 0$ , the correlation entropy vanishes. The correlation entropy also vanishes for quantum states that do not support sizable many-body quantum entanglement even at finite many-body interactions [10, 12, 21, 71]. For quantum states with sizeable entanglement, the correlation entropy saturates to the value  $\ln 2$  per site [20]. For a system with  $N$  spinful sites, the correlation matrix has dimensions  $2N \times 2N$ . For a large system, measuring the correlation entropy faces significant challenges as it would require knowledge of the full correlation matrix [72].




FIG. 2. Phase diagrams of the correlation entropy for several interacting models. The upper panels show the true phase diagrams of (a)  $\mu U$ , (b)  $t'U$ , (c)  $VU$ , (d)  $hU$ . The lower panels show the predicted phase diagrams of the model trained with the parameter regime  $H = H(t, U, \mu > 0)$  in the corresponding order. The fidelity of these predictions are all  $\mathcal{F} \simeq 1$ .

While the formal definition of the correlation entropy requires the full particle-particle correlation matrix (Eq. (1)), machine learning methodologies offer a workaround only employing a small number of local measurements [42, 43]. The information lost by only considering local measurements is compensated by including both local particle-particle and density-density correlators [42, 43]

$$f_{ij}^{ss'} = \langle \Psi_0 | n_{is} n_{js'} | \Psi_0 \rangle \quad (11)$$

extracted from the same sites [42]. These two types of correlators offer complementary insight into the many-body state [73]. The core concept of developing a supervised algorithm is to reverse-engineer the correlation entropy from a limited set of these local correlators [42, 43]. A supervised algorithm on a one-dimensional generalized model of an interacting spinful fermionic chain allows to accurately predict the correlation entropy across different parameter subspaces of the chain depicted in Fig. 1(a). However, for correlators outside the parameter regime of the training data, the algorithm must be trained again in general.

### III. TRANSFER LEARNING

The scenario we are focusing in our manuscript is whether an algorithm trained in one family of models enables predicting the correlation entropy in a different family of models, thus realizing a transferable algorithm between different quantum many-body systems [55, 56]. To demonstrate our transfer learning strategy, we consider the schematic shown in Fig. 1(b). By training a neural-network algorithm on correlators from one fermionic chain, we aim to predict the correlation entropy of another fermionic chain in a different parameter

regime. However, carrying out this procedure directly with the correlation matrices in Eq. (1) and Eq. (11) leads to a failure of the transfer learning. We can overcome this limitation by enforcing using only correlators between different sites, and redefining the particle-particle correlators as

$$F_{i \neq j}^{ss'} = \langle \Psi_0 | n_{is} n_{js'} | \Psi_0 \rangle - \langle \Psi_0 | n_{is} | \Psi_0 \rangle \langle \Psi_0 | n_{js'} | \Psi_0 \rangle. \quad (12)$$

Hence the correlators are extracted from the revised correlation matrices  $\Lambda_{ij}^{ss'} = \{C_{i \neq j}^{ss'}, F_{i \neq j}^{ss'}\}$ . In order to reduce the influence of finite-size effect, the correlators are extracted from the central four sites of the fermionic chain.

In order to examine the accuracy of the model on unseen Hamiltonian parameter regime, we use the same neural-network structure for all the possible algorithms, with three hidden layers and 512 nodes on each layer. We characterize the quality of the prediction by means of the prediction fidelity [38, 43], defined as

$$\mathcal{F} = \frac{|\langle S_{\text{corr}}^{\text{pred}} \cdot S_{\text{corr}}^{\text{true}} \rangle - \langle S_{\text{corr}}^{\text{pred}} \rangle \cdot \langle S_{\text{corr}}^{\text{true}} \rangle|}{\sqrt{[\langle (S_{\text{corr}}^{\text{true}})^2 \rangle - \langle S_{\text{corr}}^{\text{true}} \rangle^2] [\langle (S_{\text{corr}}^{\text{pred}})^2 \rangle - \langle S_{\text{corr}}^{\text{pred}} \rangle^2]}} \quad (13)$$

and standard deviation

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_i^N \left( S_{1, \text{corr}}^{\text{pred}} - \langle S_{\text{corr}}^{\text{pred}} \rangle \right)^2}{N}}, \quad (14)$$

where  $i$  runs over all the trained neural-network algorithms, as the metrics for the algorithms.

The transferability of the neural-network algorithms can be examined by training a neural-network algorithm within one Hamiltonian parameter regime, namely, one extended version of Hamiltonian in Eq. (3), and predicting on another. The accuracy of the prediction is represented by the fidelity in Eq. (13), and the results are




FIG. 3. (a) Fidelity table for the transfer learning. On each row, a neural-network algorithm trained on the Hamiltonian parameters labeled on the left, and predict on the dataset with the Hamiltonian parameters labeled on the top. (b) Histogram of (a) based on the fidelity value, and (c) shows a smaller fidelity value range.

shown in Fig. 3(a) as a fidelity table. For simplicity, we only consider repulsive interaction  $U > 0$  and denote each extended versions of Hamiltonian by the second term  $H_p$  in Eq. (3), including both positive and negative values of the tight-binding parameters.

The fidelity table shows that neural-network algorithms can accurately predict correlation entropy as evidenced by the high values in the table. Trivially, high accuracy is maintained within their Hamiltonian parameter subspaces and when changing the sign of Hamiltonian parameters, as the correlators used in training for these cases are quite similar. More importantly, the algorithms generally perform well in predicting the correlation entropy across different Hamiltonian parameter regimes. However, notable exceptions include systems with ferromagnetic phase, specifically  $H_{J<0}$ , and systems with Rashba spin-orbit interaction  $H_{\lambda_R}$ . These phases exhibit distinct patterns in their correlators that differ significantly from those in the majority of extended Hubbard models described in Eq. (3). To illustrate clearly, we take an algorithm trained with  $H_{\mu>0}$ , and show the best prediction on four cases in Eq. (3). The corresponding phase diagrams are shown in Fig. 2(e-h).

The difficulty of algorithms in predicting certain data sets can be further quantified by examining the standard deviation in the prediction. It reflects the inconsistency in the performance of the algorithm in these different parameter regimes. Specifically, we can apply all trained algorithms separately to each data set with unseen parameter regimes and analyze the resulting phase diagrams in terms of the standard deviation and the total standard deviation. The results of the ferromagnetic state is shown




FIG. 4. (a, b) The true and the predicted phase diagrams of  $H_{J<0}$ , with the algorithm trained on the data extracted from  $H_{\mu>0}$ . (c, d) Schematic illustration and the result of the standard deviation of the datasets  $H_{J<0}$  predicted by all the trained algorithms, respectively. The total standard deviation  $\bar{\sigma}$  is given as the title of (d).

in Fig. 4. As shown in Fig. 4, the predictions exhibit wide deviations in some parameter ranges representing rather distinct quantum phases compared to the trained data sets. In the case of the ferromagnetic phase induced by the spin-spin interaction, the algorithms struggle to accurately predict the true values of the correlation entropy. However, they can still distinguish the ferromagnetic phase from the antiferromagnetic phase.

A statistical analysis of the transferability of the neural-network algorithms in terms of the fidelity table is shown in Fig. 3(b,c). It is observed that half of the datasets are accurately predicted with  $\mathcal{F} = 1$ . Combining with the results represented by standard deviation in Fig. 4, the rest of the predictions are sufficiently accurate to correctly identify the phases. We observe that the predicted correlation entropy is reliable as long as the quantum order of the target system is not drastically different from that of the system on which the algorithm was trained, even if its parent Hamiltonian is completely different. Since most of the algorithms in our study were trained on systems featuring antiferromagnetic quantum correlations, they tend to perform poorly when predicting systems with ferromagnetic fluctuations and systems with Rashba spin-orbit interaction.

#### IV. EFFECT OF NOISE

In actual experimental scenarios, measured correlators feature some unavoidable noise. Therefore, it is instrumental to examine the robustness of the algorithms in the presence of noisy expectation values, ensuring that the trained algorithm would be reliable under experimental conditions. The robustness of the neural network model can be examined by introducing random noise in






FIG. 5. (a) The fidelity of the prediction of each dataset as a function of the noise rate  $\omega$ . The algorithm is trained on the model  $H_{\mu>0}$ . (b) True  $Uh$  phase diagram. (c-f) Predicted  $Uh$  phase diagrams at different noise rate.

the correlators. For each example in the training data, the random noise is included as follows,

$$\Lambda_{ij}^{ss'} = \Lambda_{ij}^{ss',0} + \chi_{ij}^{ss'}, \quad (15)$$

where  $\Lambda_{ij}^{ss',0} = \{C_{i \neq j}^{ss'}, F_{i \neq j}^{ss'}\}$  is the original correlators, and  $\chi_{ij}^{ss'}$  the random noise between  $[-\omega, \omega]$ , and  $\omega$  is the noise amplitude. To quantify the impact of noise, we evaluate the fidelity for different levels of noise.

For each value of the noise amplitude, the trained neural network algorithm in a parameter regime is used to predict the correlation entropy of other parameter regimes. The result is shown in Fig. 5. Here, the algorithm is trained on  $H_{\mu>0}$ , and the fidelity of some predicted data sets is plotted as a function of the noise rate  $\omega$ .

As expected, the fidelity of all the predictions decreases

as the noise rate increases. However, datasets with an antiferromagnetic nature are more robust to noise, especially for smaller noise. The  $Uh$  phase at different noise rates is shown as examples in Fig. 5(c-f). The prediction of the correlation entropy of a system with Rashba spin-orbit coupling on the other hand, is largely affected by random noise and fluctuates for different noise rates. This is expected as the trained data set  $H_{\mu>0}$  does not include similar quantum orders.

## V. CONCLUSION

Here we demonstrated that machine learning algorithms to extract correlation entropy can be applied in regimes widely different from the original trained regimes. Our methodology relies on deep neural network algorithms to predict quantum correlation entropy from local measurements in interacting fermionic systems. By incorporating transfer learning, we demonstrated the ability to predict correlation entropy across families of Hamiltonians not considered in the training set. Our results demonstrate that neural network algorithms trained on systems with similar quantum order can accurately predict correlation entropy in regimes with different microscopic parameters, even when parent Hamiltonians are widely different. We also showed that in the selected cases where transfer learning fails, such failure can be automatically detected from the machine learning models alone by using the prediction fluctuation, and does not require knowledge of the real correlation entropy. Furthermore, the prediction fluctuation allows to directly signal phase transitions in the quantum many-body phase diagram, even when those phases were never considered in the training. We showed that our algorithm is robust to moderate levels of noise in the input correlators without significant loss in prediction accuracy. Our transfer learning approach shows that correlation entropy learning could be performed experimentally using selected local measurements, even in regimes where systems feature Hamiltonians that have not been considered in the training.

**Acknowledgements:** We acknowledge financial support from the Finnish Quantum Flagship. T.O. acknowledges the Academy of Finland Project No. 331094 for support. J. L. acknowledges financial support from the Academy of Finland Projects Nos. 331342, and 349696, InstituteQ, the Jane and Aatos Erkkö Foundation F.A. and J.L.L. acknowledge the computational resources provided by the Aalto Science-IT project.

[1] P. Fulde, *Electron Correlations in Molecules and Solids* (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1995).  
 [2] S. Paschen and Q. Si, Quantum phases driven by strong correlations, *Nature Reviews Physics* **3**, 9–26 (2020).  
 [3] P. W. Anderson, The resonating valence bond state in  $\text{La}_2\text{CuO}_4$  and superconductivity, *Science* **235**, 1196 (1987).

[4] L. Savary and L. Balents, Quantum spin liquids: a review, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **80**, 016502 (2016).  
 [5] B. Keimer and J. E. Moore, The physics of quantum materials, *Nature Physics* **13**, 1045 (2017).  
 [6] C. N. Lau, F. Xia, and L. Cao, Emergent quantum materials, *MRS Bulletin* **45**, 340 (2020).  
 [7] J. Eisert, M. Cramer, and M. B. Plenio, Colloquium:

- Area laws for the entanglement entropy, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **82**, 277 (2010).
- [8] L. Amico, R. Fazio, A. Osterloh, and V. Vedral, Entanglement in many-body systems, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **80**, 517 (2008).
- [9] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Quantum entanglement, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **81**, 865 (2009).
- [10] S.-J. Gu, S.-S. Deng, Y.-Q. Li, and H.-Q. Lin, Entanglement and quantum phase transition in the extended hubbard model, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 086402 (2004).
- [11] V. E. Korepin, Universality of entropy scaling in one dimensional gapless models, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 096402 (2004).
- [12] S.-S. Deng, S.-J. Gu, and H.-Q. Lin, Block-block entanglement and quantum phase transitions in the one-dimensional extended hubbard model, *Physical Review B* **74**, 10.1103/physrevb.74.045103 (2006).
- [13] F. Iemini, T. O. Maciel, and R. O. Vianna, Entanglement of indistinguishable particles as a probe for quantum phase transitions in the extended hubbard model, *Phys. Rev. B* **92**, 075423 (2015).
- [14] H. Wang and S. Kais, Quantum entanglement and electron correlation in molecular systems, *Israel Journal of Chemistry* **47**, 59–65 (2007).
- [15] M. C. Tichy, F. Mintert, and A. Buchleitner, Essential entanglement for atomic and molecular physics, *Journal of Physics B: Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics* **44**, 192001 (2011).
- [16] T. S. Hofer, On the basis set convergence of electron–electron entanglement measures: helium-like systems, *Frontiers in Chemistry* **1**, 10.3389/fchem.2013.00024 (2013).
- [17] R. O. Esquivel, S. López-Rosa, and J. S. Dehesa, Correlation energy as a measure of non-locality: Quantum entanglement of helium-like systems, *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **111**, 40009 (2015).
- [18] R. O. Esquivel, A. L. Rodríguez, R. P. Sagar, M. Hô, and V. H. Smith, Physical interpretation of information entropy: Numerical evidence of the collins conjecture, *Physical Review A* **54**, 259 (1996).
- [19] P. Gersdorf, W. John, J. P. Perdew, and P. Ziesche, Correlation entropy of the h<sub>2</sub> molecule, *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry* **61**, 935 (1997).
- [20] P. Ziesche, O. Gunnarsson, W. John, and H. Beck, Two-site hubbard model, the bardeen-cooper-schrieffer model, and the concept of correlation entropy, *Physical Review B* **55**, 10270 (1997).
- [21] Z. Huang, H. Wang, and S. Kais, Entanglement and electron correlation in quantum chemistry calculations, *Journal of Modern Optics* **53**, 2543 (2006).
- [22] C. L. Benavides-Riveros, N. N. Lathiotakis, C. Schilling, and M. A. L. Marques, Relating correlation measures: The importance of the energy gap, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 032507 (2017).
- [23] D. L. B. Ferreira, T. O. Maciel, R. O. Vianna, and F. Iemini, Quantum correlations, entanglement spectrum, and coherence of the two-particle reduced density matrix in the extended hubbard model, *Phys. Rev. B* **105**, 115145 (2022).
- [24] D. Carvalho, N. A. García-Martínez, J. L. Lado, and J. Fernández-Rossier, Real-space mapping of topological invariants using artificial neural networks, *Phys. Rev. B* **97**, 115453 (2018).
- [25] J. Benestad, A. Tsintzis, R. S. Souto, M. Leijnse, E. van Nieuwenburg, and J. Danon, Machine-learned tuning of artificial kitaev chains from tunneling spectroscopy measurements, *Phys. Rev. B* **110**, 075402 (2024).
- [26] Y. Yu, L.-W. Yu, W. Zhang, H. Zhang, X. Ouyang, Y. Liu, D.-L. Deng, and L.-M. Duan, Experimental unsupervised learning of non-hermitian knotted phases with solid-state spins, *npj Quantum Information* **8**, 10.1038/s41534-022-00629-w (2022).
- [27] N. Käming, A. Dawid, K. Kottmann, M. Lewenstein, K. Sengstock, A. Dauphin, and C. Weitenberg, Unsupervised machine learning of topological phase transitions from experimental data, *Machine Learning: Science and Technology* **2**, 035037 (2021).
- [28] E. Lustig, O. Yair, R. Talmon, and M. Segev, Identifying topological phase transitions in experiments using manifold learning, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 127401 (2020).
- [29] N. Yoshioka, Y. Akagi, and H. Katsura, Learning disordered topological phases by statistical recovery of symmetry, *Phys. Rev. B* **97**, 205110 (2018).
- [30] J. F. Rodríguez-Nieva and M. S. Scheurer, Identifying topological order through unsupervised machine learning, *Nature Physics* **15**, 790 (2019).
- [31] R. Koch, D. van Driel, A. Bordin, J. L. Lado, and E. Grepova, Adversarial hamiltonian learning of quantum dots in a minimal kitaev chain, *Phys. Rev. Appl.* **20**, 044081 (2023).
- [32] D. Liu, A. B. Watson, M. Hott, S. Carr, and M. Luskin, Learning the local density of states of a bilayer moiré material in one dimension, *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2405.06688 (2024), arXiv:2405.06688 [math-ph].
- [33] G. Lupi and J. L. Lado, Hamiltonian learning quantum magnets with non-local impurity tomography, *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2412.07666 (2024), arXiv:2412.07666 [cond-mat.mes-hall].
- [34] O. Simard, A. Dawid, J. Tindall, M. Ferrero, A. M. Sengupta, and A. Georges, Learning interactions between Rydberg atoms, *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2412.12019 (2024), arXiv:2412.12019 [quant-ph].
- [35] A. Valenti, G. Jin, J. Léonard, S. D. Huber, and E. Grepova, Scalable hamiltonian learning for large-scale out-of-equilibrium quantum dynamics, *Phys. Rev. A* **105**, 023302 (2022).
- [36] F. Noronha, A. Canabarro, R. Chaves, and R. G. Pereira, Predicting topological invariants and unconventional superconducting pairing from density of states and machine learning, *Phys. Rev. B* **111**, 014501 (2025).
- [37] N. Karjalainen, Z. Lippo, G. Chen, R. Koch, A. O. Fumega, and J. L. Lado, Hamiltonian inference from dynamical excitations in confined quantum magnets, *Phys. Rev. Appl.* **20**, 024054 (2023).
- [38] M. Khosravian, R. Koch, and J. L. Lado, Hamiltonian learning with real-space impurity tomography in topological moiré superconductors, *Journal of Physics: Materials* **7**, 015012 (2024).
- [39] G. R. Schleder, A. C. M. Padilha, C. M. Acosta, M. Costa, and A. Fazzio, From DFT to machine learning: recent approaches to materials science—a review, *Journal of Physics: Materials* **2**, 032001 (2019).
- [40] E. Bedolla, L. C. Padierna, and R. Castañeda-Priego, Machine learning for condensed matter physics, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **33**, 053001 (2020).
- [41] N. L. Holanda and M. A. R. Griffith, Machine learning topological phases in real space, *Phys. Rev. B* **102**,

- 054107 (2020).
- [42] F. Aikebaier, T. Ojanen, and J. L. Lado, Extracting electronic many-body correlations from local measurements with artificial neural networks, *SciPost Phys. Core* **6**, 030 (2023).
- [43] F. Aikebaier, T. Ojanen, and J. L. Lado, Machine learning the kondo entanglement cloud from local measurements, *Phys. Rev. B* **109**, 195125 (2024).
- [44] G. Torlai, C. J. Wood, A. Acharya, G. Carleo, J. Carrasquilla, and L. Aolita, Quantum process tomography with unsupervised learning and tensor networks, *Nature Communications* **14**, 10.1038/s41467-023-38332-9 (2023).
- [45] H.-Y. Huang, S. Chen, and J. Preskill, Learning to predict arbitrary quantum processes, *PRX Quantum* **4**, 040337 (2023).
- [46] G. White, F. Pollock, L. Hollenberg, K. Modi, and C. Hill, Non-markovian quantum process tomography, *PRX Quantum* **3**, 020344 (2022).
- [47] T. Surawy-Stepney, J. Kahn, R. Kueng, and M. Guta, Projected Least-Squares Quantum Process Tomography, *Quantum* **6**, 844 (2022).
- [48] H. Zhao, L. Lewis, I. Kannan, Y. Quek, H.-Y. Huang, and M. C. Caro, Learning quantum states and unitaries of bounded gate complexity, *PRX Quantum* **5**, 040306 (2024).
- [49] C. Tan, F. Sun, T. Kong, W. Zhang, C. Yang, and C. Liu, *A survey on deep transfer learning* (2018).
- [50] M. Iman, H. R. Arabnia, and K. Rasheed, A review of deep transfer learning and recent advancements, *Technologies* **11**, 40 (2023).
- [51] A. Goetz, A. R. Durmaz, M. Müller, A. Thomas, D. Britz, P. Kerfriden, and C. Eberl, Addressing materials' microstructure diversity using transfer learning, *npj Computational Materials* **8**, 10.1038/s41524-022-00703-z (2022).
- [52] Q. Wang and A. Jain, A transferable machine-learning framework linking interstice distribution and plastic heterogeneity in metallic glasses, *Nature Communications* **10**, 10.1038/s41467-019-13511-9 (2019).
- [53] P. Rowe, V. L. Deringer, P. Gasparotto, G. Csányi, and A. Michaelides, An accurate and transferable machine learning potential for carbon, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **153**, 10.1063/5.0005084 (2020).
- [54] J. A. Keith, V. Vassilev-Galindo, B. Cheng, S. Chmiela, M. Gastegger, K.-R. Müller, and A. Tkatchenko, Combining machine learning and computational chemistry for predictive insights into chemical systems, *Chemical Reviews* **121**, 9816–9872 (2021).
- [55] R. Zen, L. My, R. Tan, F. Hébert, M. Gattobigio, C. Miniatura, D. Poletti, and S. Bressan, Transfer learning for scalability of neural-network quantum states, *Phys. Rev. E* **101**, 053301 (2020).
- [56] S. Sayyad and J. L. Lado, Transfer learning from hermitian to non-hermitian quantum many-body physics, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **36**, 185603 (2024).
- [57] P.-O. Löwdin, Quantum theory of many-particle systems. i. physical interpretations by means of density matrices, natural spin-orbitals, and convergence problems in the method of configurational interaction, *Phys. Rev.* **97**, 1474 (1955).
- [58] R.-Q. He and Z.-Y. Lu, Quantum renormalization groups based on natural orbitals, *Phys. Rev. B* **89**, 085108 (2014).
- [59] M. T. Fishman and S. R. White, Compression of correlation matrices and an efficient method for forming matrix product states of fermionic gaussian states, *Phys. Rev. B* **92**, 075132 (2015).
- [60] T. I. Vanhala and T. Ojanen, Complexity of fermionic states, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **6**, 023178 (2024).
- [61] M. Debertolis, S. Florens, and I. Snyman, Few-body nature of kondo correlated ground states, *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, 235166 (2021).
- [62] I. Snyman, Structure of quasiparticles in a local fermi liquid, *Phys. Rev. B* **108**, 205120 (2023).
- [63] C. L. Benavides-Riveros, T. Wasak, and A. Recati, Extracting many-body quantum resources within one-body reduced density matrix functional theory, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **6**, L012052 (2024).
- [64] C. L. Benavides-Riveros, Orbital-free quasidensity functional theory, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **6**, 013060 (2024).
- [65] Z. Lippo, E. L. Pereira, J. L. Lado, and G. Chen, Topological zero modes and correlation pumping in an engineered Kondo lattice, *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2409.17202 (2024), arXiv:2409.17202 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [66] I. Giorgadze, H. Huang, J. Gaines, E. J. König, and J. I. Väyrynen, Characterizing maximally many-body entangled fermionic states by using  $M$ -body density matrix, *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2412.09576 (2024), arXiv:2412.09576 [quant-ph].
- [67] S. R. White, Density matrix formulation for quantum renormalization groups, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 2863 (1992).
- [68] M. Fishman, S. R. White, and E. M. Stoudenmire, The ITensor Software Library for Tensor Network Calculations, *SciPost Phys. Codebases*, 4 (2022).
- [69] ITensor Library <http://itensor.org>.
- [70] DMRGpy library, <https://github.com/joselado/dmrgpy>.
- [71] S. Glocke, A. Klümper, and J. Sirker, Half-filled one-dimensional extended hubbard model: Phase diagram and thermodynamics, *Physical Review B* **76**, 10.1103/physrevb.76.155121 (2007).
- [72] A. Bergschneider, V. M. Klinkhamer, J. H. Becher, R. Klemt, L. Palm, G. Zürn, S. Jochim, and P. M. Preiss, Experimental characterization of two-particle entanglement through position and momentum correlations, *Nature Physics* **15**, 640 (2019).
- [73] A. D. Maestro, H. Barghathi, and B. Rosenow, Measuring postquench entanglement entropy through density correlations, *Physical Review Research* **4**, 10.1103/physrevresearch.4.1022023 (2022).