

# A general formalism for machine-learning models based on multipolar-spherical harmonics

M. Domina<sup>1,2</sup> and S. Sanvito<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*School of Physics, AMBER and CRANN Institute, Trinity College, Dublin 2, Ireland*

<sup>2</sup>*Laboratory of Computational Science and Modeling, Institut des Matériaux,  
École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland*

(Dated: March 14, 2025)

The formulation of descriptors of the local chemical environment, enabling the construction of machine-learning models, is usually obtained by studying the properties of the expansion coefficients of a neighborhood density. In this work, we show that all the transformation properties of the descriptors and their behaviour under rotation, inversion and complex conjugation, are derived from the choice of the basis over which the density is expanded. Furthermore, crucially they are independent from the explicit mathematical form of the neighborhood density. In particular, we show that all the descriptors investigated, can be obtained by an expansion in multipolar spherical harmonics, which constitutes the core of this work, and which is introduced and analysed in great detail. By exploiting the orthogonality and the transformation rules of the multipolar spherical harmonics, we show that several formulations are simplified, such as the one needed to obtain the  $\lambda$ -SOAP kernel and its properties. We close this work by applying our framework to several multi-body descriptors available in literature, providing an in-depth analysis of their main properties, as made clear from the vantage viewpoint of a basis-centered approach.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years there has been a paradigm shift in the computational study of materials, ignited by the rapid establishment of machine-learning potentials (MLPs) as essential tools for performing molecular dynamics and evaluating thermodynamical properties of molecules and solids [1–4]. The ambitious goal of MLPs is to reach the same state-of-the-art accuracy of computationally expensive *ab initio* methods, such as density functional theory (DFT) [5, 6], at a fraction of their cost. In practice, one first aims to perform a limited number of highly accurate calculations for selected structures and configurations. This is usually done at the DFT or quantum-chemistry level. The resulting dataset, is then used to *train* a carefully selected and optimized MLP, which will be able to predict quantities of interest on previously unseen configurations, ranging from different atomic environments to large-sized systems, inaccessible to *ab-initio* calculations [7–10].

A MLP is mainly made of three parts. The first, called *descriptors* (or fingerprints), corresponds to the choice of an adequate mathematical representation for the system at hand. The *targets* are the quantity that the MLP will predict, while the mathematical relation between the descriptors and the targets constitute the optimized interpolative model. Clearly, the choice of the fingerprints is crucial to determine the descriptive capability of the model and its ability to properly account for the aimed targets. This results in a careful selection of the symmetries of the descriptors, which have to mirror the ones of the targets, under translation, rotation, inversion (parity) and atoms permutations. In recent years, there has been a large effort aimed to define descriptors capable of addressing the most disparate targets, ranging from scalar quantities, namely energies [11–13, 36], with a fo-

cus on multi-specie systems [14, 16], or with the inclusion of the spin degree of freedom [17–19], to vectorial and tensorial quantities [20–24], or even to electronic densities [25–29], and Hamiltonians [30]. Also the choice of the ML models has been thoroughly explored. These include neural networks (NN) [31–34], kernel-based methods [35–37], linear models [38–40] and message-passing schemes [41, 42].

For the majority of these schemes, the construction of the descriptors proceeds from the definition of a local atomic density, which describes the atomic neighborhood surrounding a central atom. This is usually taken as the fundamental quantity, from which all the descriptors are derived. The spotlight in the study of the atomic density is taken by its expansion coefficients with respect to a suitable basis. In particular, since the density represents an atom-centered environment, the choice of basis falls into selecting a set of radial functions, for the radial expansion, and in spherical harmonics, for the angular one. Crucially, the evaluation of the expansion coefficients scales linearly with respect to the number of atoms in the neighborhood, making it computationally convenient. Because of the central role of the atomic density, the properties of its expansion coefficients have been thoroughly studied. The investigation of such *atomic basis* is usually performed by means of the explicit expression of this coefficients [43, 44] or by means of a Dirac-bracket-derived formalism [45, 46].

The first approach consists in taking appropriate contractions of products of the expansion coefficients, and directly investigate their explicit expressions. This way of proceeding, however, does not fully exploit the fact that such objects can be obtained from products of atomic densities. In fact, all the properties should be obtainable with no knowledge of the explicit form of the expansion coefficients, as this is the fundamental rationale

behind the use of an atomic density. This is, indeed, the idea behind the second approach, where the product of atomic densities takes the central role. In that case, all the properties of interests are obtained by studying the projection of these products onto the basis of interests, which is usually a coupled multi-body basis. On the one hand, this approach enforces and exploits the idea of the atomic density as the main quantity behind the design of MLPs descriptors. On the other hand, as it mostly study the properties of the projections (namely expansion coefficients with respect to the multi-body basis), it does not fully exploit the fact that most properties are inherited from the multi-body basis itself. Moreover, the derivations usually follow a bottom-up approach, obtaining properties for the density product from the expansion coefficients of single-density ones.

This work aims to investigate a third route. We take elements from both the previous methods and show that, not only the choice of the basis represents the most fundamental step in the design of ML descriptors, but also that a top-down approach can be followed, with a direct focus on the expansion over a multi-body basis. The proposed approach can be seen as a middle ground between the two strategies discussed above. On the one hand, it exploits the expansion of products of atomic densities (as the second formalism). On the other hand, it also follows a position representation for the basis (as done in the first). In particular, we will show that all the properties of interests can be derived from a formalism based on *multipolar-spherical harmonics* (MultiSHs) [47], which are the many-body generalization of the spherical harmonics. These have been already exploited in astrophysical studies [48, 49] (we also refer to Ref. [50] for a general and in-depth treatment of the isotropic case). Indeed, a crucial result of this paper is that all the derivations and properties of the most well-known ML descriptors are directly inherited from the choice of MultiSHs as a multi-body basis, and do require just an handful of symmetries of the atomic density.

Therefore, this work has two explicit goals. The first consists in deriving and discussing the MultiSHs-expansion-based formalism. We will show that it is possible to derive all the most well-known ML fingerprints, namely the powerspectrum, bispectrum and Smooth Overlap of Atomic Positions (SOAP) kernels, as a straightforward application of the core properties of the MultiSHs basis (orthogonality, behaviour under rotation and under inversion), without any explicit study of the expansion coefficients. This will disentangle the role of the density and of the basis, clarifying what are the crucial symmetries of the atomic density. The second goal consists in providing a general recipe to derive linear ML models (for both scalar and tensor fields), which can be used to perform deep analytical studies of their properties and to establish connections across formalisms. In particular, we will use the case of the Atomic Cluster Expansion (ACE) [38] and the Spectral Neighbor Analysis Potential (SNAP) as examples to show that exploiting

a MultiSHs based formalism offers the right tools for in-depth investigations.

This work is structured as follows. In the next section, Section II, we will introduce some descriptors for state-of-the-art ML models. Then, we will begin the discussion of the MultiSHs formalism, which will be tackled in a hierarchical way. We will first introduce the two- and three-points generalization of the spherical harmonics, namely the bipolar- and tripolar-spherical harmonics. These form the backbone for the full MultiSHs formalism, which will be introduced in Section II.D. Then, we will proceed with providing a first example of the usefulness of the MultiSHs-based approach: by exploiting only the orthogonality and the rotational covariance of the MultiSHs, we will be able to provide a compact and straightforward evaluation of the general-body  $\lambda$ -SOAP kernel [24]. We will conclude the section by showing that the crucial properties of the expansion coefficients, namely their transformation under rotation, inversion and conjugation, are inherited by analogous properties of the basis, and by only using the fact that we are expanding a real and scalar function. In particular, we will show that the explicit form of the expansion coefficients is irrelevant for this discussion.

In Section III, by further exploiting the fact that the expanded function is a *product* of atomic densities, we will show that the MultiSHs formalism leads to the usual definition of the powerspectrum and bispectrum components as the rotationally invariant terms of the MultiSHs expansion. We will also show how to evaluate the explicit expression of the SOAP kernel [36]. In Section IV, we will finally discuss the explicit form of the expansion coefficients, in order to connect the formalism of the MultiSHs to a multi-body expansion: this will be the only instance throughout this work in which the explicit form of these coefficients has any relevance. Thus, in Section V, we will exploit this connection to define a general linear models based on the MultiSHs expansion. In doing so, we will re-derive the ACE expansion, as the general basis for scalar quantities. We will also investigate the SNAP formalism, demonstrating how the MultiSHs framework provides a useful tool to an in-depth investigation of the potential at hand, in particular showing how the compactness of the SNAP model is also related to an incomplete expansion of four-body potentials. We will conclude this section by providing the formal connection between the MultiSHs formalism and internal-coordinates based expansions, by explicitly investigating the case of the Moments Tensor Potential (MTP) and our Jacobi-Legendre Potential (JLP). In the last section, VI, we will generalize the recipe for constructing linear model targeting scalar quantities, to the tensorial case. Not only we will be able to provide a general recipe to construct the covariant components of a tensor, but we will also exploit the inherent property of the MultiSHs concerning the coupling scheme of the angular momenta, to show how to severely reduce the number of independent expansion coefficients. Crucially, the MultiSHs will make manifest that this re-

duction holds only when expanding symmetric functions.

## II. METHODS

### A. Introduction

The main aim of this work is to introduce the MultiSHs and to show how they can be used to immediately generate all the main ML models for both scalar and tensorial quantities. Here, we will consider only the short-ranged contribution to the physical quantities of interests. For example, when targeting the potential energy surface (PES), the total energy is assumed to be partitioned as the sum of a long- and a short-range contribution,

$$E = E_{\text{short}} + E_{\text{long}}, \quad (1)$$

and then only  $E_{\text{short}}$  will be considered. Moreover, we always assume the further partition of  $E_{\text{short}}$  in local-atomic contributions. This implies the decomposition

$$E_{\text{short}} = \sum_i^{\text{atoms}} E_i,$$

where  $E_i$  are the local terms, which are defined for each atom of the system. We will adopt the same hypothesis also for the case of a general tensor  $\mathbf{T}$  (as done in Ref. [24]), and that one can write

$$\mathbf{T} \simeq \sum_i^{\text{atoms}} \mathbf{T}_i, \quad (2)$$

for some local contribution,  $\mathbf{T}_i$ .

An important object in the designing of ML models is the atomic density,  $\rho_i$ , which has the form

$$\rho_i(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_j^{\text{atoms}} h_{Z_j Z_i}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_{ji}). \quad (3)$$

Here the  $h_{Z_j Z_i}$ 's are localization functions, usually Gaussians or Dirac-deltas. The vector  $\mathbf{r}_{ji} := \mathbf{r}_j - \mathbf{r}_i$ , is the relative vector between the positions of the  $i$ -th atom, taken as the center of the reference frame, and its  $j$ -th neighbor. Thus, the atomic density  $\rho_i$  is a mathematical representation of the atomic environment around the  $i$ -th atom. We observe that the localization functions can be defined as parametrically dependent on the atomic species,  $Z_i$  and  $Z_j$ , of the two atoms involved. Taking the Dirac-deltas as an example, the localization functions can be written as

$$h(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_{ji}) = f_{\text{cut}}(r_{ji})\delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_{ji}), \quad (4)$$

where the cut-off function,  $f_c(\text{cut})$ , smoothly vanishes when the distance  $r_{ji}$  between the two atoms approaches an optimized distance, called the cut-off radius,  $r_{\text{cut}}$ . Its

role is to enforce the short-ranged nature of the mathematical description in a continuous way [31].

A crucial role in the design of a description for  $\rho_i(\mathbf{r})$  is covered by its expansion coefficients over the product of a radial basis with spherical harmonics. Namely, we adopt the expansion

$$\rho_i(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{nlm} c_{i,nlm} R_{nl}(r) Y_l^m(\hat{\mathbf{r}}), \quad (5)$$

with the expansion coefficients,  $c_{i,nlm}$ , given by

$$c_{i,nlm} = \int d\mathbf{r} \rho_i(\mathbf{r}) R_{nl}(r) Y_l^{m*}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}). \quad (6)$$

We remark that this expression holds only when the radial basis is real and ortho-normal. For example, in the case of the Dirac's-delta localization functions of Eq. (4) (also called "sharp"-case [4]), the coefficients take the form

$$c_{i,nlm} = \sum_j^{\text{atoms}} f_c(r_{ji}) R_{nl}(r_{ji}) Y_l^{m*}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{ji}). \quad (7)$$

The expansion coefficients of the atomic density can be considered as the most relevant and delicate quantity for the construction of physically driven ML models. This is because the cost of their computation scales linearly with the number of atoms in the atomic environment, a property that becomes crucial when considering relatively large number of neighbouring atoms.

In this work we will explicitly address two ML methods: the linear one and  $\lambda$ -SOAP. In both cases, we will consider an expansion of the atomic energies in terms of body-order terms such as, for example [38, 40],

$$E_i = E_i^{(1)} + E_i^{(2)} + E_i^{(3)} + \dots \quad (8)$$

Here, the  $E_i^{(2)}$  and  $E_i^{(3)}$  can be written in terms of the powerspectrum and the bispectrum components [36] as

$$\begin{cases} E_i^{(2)} := \sum_{n_1 n_2 l} a_{n_1 n_2 l} p_{i, n_1 n_2 l}, \\ E_i^{(3)} := \sum_{\substack{n_1 n_2 n_3 \\ l_1 l_2 l_3}} a_{n_1 n_2 n_3} B_{i, l_1 l_2 l_3}, \\ \dots, \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

with the powerspectrum components defined as

$$p_{i, n_1 n_2 l} := \sum_m (-1)^m c_{i, n_1 l m} c_{i, n_2 l - m}, \quad (10)$$

and the bispectrum components as

$$B_{i, l_1 l_2 l_3}^{n_1 n_2 n_3} := \sum_{m_1 m_2 m_3} c_{i, n_3 l_3 m_3}^* C_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}^{l_3 m_3} c_{i, n_1 l_1 m_1} c_{i, n_2 l_2 m_2}. \quad (11)$$

Here the  $C_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}^{l_3 m_3}$  are Clebsch-Gordan (CG) coefficients [47], while the unknown coefficients,  $a_{n_1 n_2 l}$  and  $a_{n_1 n_2 n_3, l_1 l_2 l_3}$ ,

are obtained by means of some optimization method, such the  $L^2$  minimization. We will not discuss here such optimizations and we will simply assume that a proper solver is in place. The rotational invariance of both powerspectrum and bispectrum has been fully established (see, for example, Ref. [36]), and in this work we will prove that such invariance is a straightforward consequence of the MultiSHs formalism introduced here.

Similar expressions can be obtained for the (harmonic-)covariant components of the tensor  $\mathbf{T}_i$ , here indicated as  $T_{i,\lambda\mu}$ . In particular, we can assume the multi-body expansion

$$T_{i,\lambda\mu} = T_{i,\lambda\mu}^{(1)} + T_{i,\lambda\mu}^{(2)} + T_{i,\lambda\mu}^{(3)} + \dots, \quad (12)$$

with

$$T_{i,\lambda\mu}^{(2)} := \sum_{\substack{n_1 l_1 \\ n_2 l_2}} a_{n_1 l_1} \sum_{m_1 m_2} C_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}^{\lambda\mu} c_{i,n_1 l_1 m_1}^* c_{i,n_2 l_2 m_2}^*, \quad (13)$$

and

$$T_{i,\lambda\mu}^{(3)} := \sum_{\substack{n_1 n_2 n_3 \\ l_1 l_2 l_3 L}} a_{n_1 n_2 n_3} \sum_{m_3 M} C_{LM l_3 m_3}^{\lambda\mu} c_{i,n_3 l_3 m_3}^* \\ \times \sum_{m_1 m_2} C_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}^{LM} c_{i,n_1 l_1 m_1}^* c_{i,n_2 l_2 m_2}^*. \quad (14)$$

This is, essentially, the basis employed in Reference [46]. Importantly, these cases reduce to the scalar ones when  $\lambda = \mu = 0$ , as can be seen by the example

$$T_{i,00}^{(2)} = \sum_{n_1 n_2 l} a_{n_1 n_2 l} \frac{(-1)^l}{\sqrt{2l+1}} p_{i,n_1 n_2 l} = E_i^{(2)}, \quad (15)$$

obtained by re-defining the expansion coefficients  $a_{n_1 n_2 l}$  and by using the facts that

$$C_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}^{00} = (-1)^{l_1 - m_1} \frac{\delta_{l_1 l_2} \delta_{m_1 - m_2}}{\sqrt{2l_1 + 1}}, \quad (16)$$

and that the powerspectrum components are real. As for the scalar case, the proof that these expansions possess the correct transformation rules will be easily derived by means of the MultiSHs framework.

Another possible approach is provided by the Gaussian approximation potential (GAP) framework [13], which establishes a kernel-based alternative for the fit of the PES and of tensorial components. In general, the model is defined as

$$E_i^{(\nu)} = \sum_{k=1}^{\text{config}} \alpha_k K^{(\nu)}(\rho_i, \rho^{(k)}), \quad (17)$$

where  $K^{(\nu)}(\rho_i, \rho^{(k)})$  is the kernel, which provides a measure of similarity between the atomic environments describing  $\rho_i$  and  $\rho^{(k)}$ . Here, the sum runs over the  $k$ -configurations used to train the model. If we indicate the kernel evaluated between two configurations in the

training set with  $\mathbf{K}_{kk'}^{(\nu)} := K^{(\nu)}(\rho^{(k)}, \rho^{(k')})$ , the expansion coefficients are obtained by the analytical formula

$$\alpha_k = \sum_{k'=1}^{\text{config}} (\mathbf{K}^{(\nu)} + \gamma^2 \mathbb{I})_{kk'}^{-1} E_{k'}, \quad (18)$$

where  $\mathbb{I}$  is the identity,  $\gamma$  is an optimized regularization constant and  $E_{k'}$  is the energy of the  $k'$ -th configuration in the training set.

Explicitly, the SOAP kernel is defined as [36]

$$K^{(\nu)}(\rho, \rho') = \int d\hat{R} \left| \int d\mathbf{r} \rho(\mathbf{r}) \rho'(\hat{R}\mathbf{r}) \right|^\nu, \quad (19)$$

where the first integration is an Haar integral performed over all possible rotations,  $\hat{R}$ , usually parameterized by Euler angles. Here, increasing  $\nu$  increases the body order of this expression, as we will show in later sections. While an explicit expression for this kernel exists, usually in the form of inner products of powerspectrum and bispectrum components, a result of this work will consist in providing a simple derivation for the explicit evaluation for any order  $\nu$  of interest.

Also in the kernel case, a similar approach can be adopted for the covariant components of a tensor,  $\mathbf{T}$ , more explicitly

$$T_{i,\lambda\mu}^{(\nu)} = \sum_{k=1}^{\text{config}} \alpha_{k,\mu'} (K^{(\nu)}(\rho_i, \rho^{(k)}))_{\mu\mu'}^\lambda, \quad (20)$$

where again this admits an analytical solution for the coefficients  $\alpha_{k,\mu'}$ . Here,  $(K^{(\nu)}(\rho_i, \rho^{(k)}))_{\mu\mu'}^\lambda$  is the covariant generalization of the scalar kernel and, as such, it correctly reduces to the scalar case for  $\lambda = \mu = 0$ .

The covariant,  $\lambda$ -SOAP, generalized version of the kernel above is provided by (see references [24, 51])

$$(K^{(\nu)}(\rho, \rho'))_{\mu\mu'}^\lambda = \int d\hat{R} \left( \mathbf{D}^\dagger(\hat{R}) \right)_{\mu\mu'}^\lambda \left| \int d\mathbf{r} \rho(\mathbf{r}) \rho'(\hat{R}\mathbf{r}) \right|^\nu, \quad (21)$$

where the covariance is enforced by means of the Hermitian conjugate of the Wigner- $D$  matrix [47],  $\mathbf{D}^\dagger$ . From the fact that  $D_{00}^0 = 1$ , we can see how this expression does, indeed, reduce to the scalar one for  $\lambda = 0$ . We anticipate that the result of Section IID 3, which can be regarded as the first result of this work, will provide a compact derivation and formula for the covariant kernel of Eq. (21). This will be achieved by exploiting just two properties of the MultiSHs formalism.

Before proceeding with the introduction of the bipolar spherical harmonics, it is interesting to show that all the formulas introduced till this point can be casted in terms of the product of atomic densities, defined as

$$\rho^{\otimes\nu}(\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_\nu) := \rho(\mathbf{r}_1) \cdot \dots \cdot \rho(\mathbf{r}_\nu), \quad (22)$$

which is arguably the core quantity in the construction of models and descriptors, as already observed previously [4, 45]. In order to provide two meaningful examples, we can first observe that the product of  $\nu$  expansion

coefficients  $c_{i,nlm}$  is given by

$$\prod_{\alpha=1}^{\nu} c_{i,n_{\alpha}l_{\alpha}m_{\alpha}} = \int d\mathbf{r}_1 \dots d\mathbf{r}_{\nu} \rho^{\otimes \nu}(\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_{\nu}) \times \left[ \prod_{\alpha=1}^{\nu} R_{n_{\alpha}l_{\alpha}}(r_{\alpha}) Y_{l_{\alpha}}^{m_{\alpha}}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{\alpha}) \right].$$

This implies that any expression like the one in Eq. (14) can be evaluated from  $\rho^{\otimes \nu}$ . Analogously, the expression for the covariant kernel can be written as

$$(K^{(\nu)}(\rho, \rho'))_{\mu\mu'}^{\lambda} = \int d\mathbf{r}_1 \dots d\mathbf{r}_{\nu} \rho^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_{\nu}) \times \int d\hat{R} D_{\mu'\mu}^{\lambda*}(\hat{R}) \rho'^{\otimes n}(\hat{R}\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \hat{R}\mathbf{r}_{\nu}), \quad (23)$$

which again is written in terms of  $\rho^{\otimes \nu}$  only.

Having identified  $\rho^{\otimes \nu}$  as the principal object of our investigation, the remaining of this section will be devoted to the definition of a suitable basis for a function that depends, simultaneously, on the  $\nu$  vectors  $\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_{\nu}$ . We want to remark that the actual form of the  $\rho^{\otimes \nu}$  is not crucial. Indeed, most of the properties of interests will be derived only by means of the properties of the basis, encoded in Eqs. (54), (55) and (58), together with the fact that  $\rho^{\otimes \nu}$  is real, scalar, and is constructed from a product of functions. The specific form of the local atomic density, as given in Eq. (3), will be first discussed as far as Section IV, and used only as a bridge towards a compact and general recipe to define linear model for PES and tensorial quantities.

We will now introduce the formalism based on the MultiSHs in a systematic way, starting from the simpler cases of the bipolar- and tripolar-spherical harmonics. In this way, we will develop the basic tools and form the intuition that will be then used in the general formulation of the formalism of Section IID.

## B. Bipolar spherical harmonics


Let us start the discussion on the MultiSHs formalism by looking at the simpler case of the bipolar spherical harmonics (BipoSHs). Firstly, we will provide the formal definition and then we will show the core properties of these objects.

A bipolar spherical harmonic is defined as

$$\mathcal{Y}_{l_1 l_2}^{\lambda \mu}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2) := \sum_{m_1 m_2} C_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}^{\lambda \mu} Y_{l_1}^{m_1}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1) Y_{l_2}^{m_2}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2), \quad (24)$$

namely it is obtained by contracting two spherical harmonics with a set of CG coefficients. Within standard angular-momentum theory [47, 52], the BipoSHs can be seen as the position representation of the coupling of two angular momenta,  $l_1$  and  $l_2$ , namely

$$\mathcal{Y}_{l_1 l_2}^{\lambda \mu}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2) \equiv \langle \hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2 | l_1 l_2 \lambda \mu \rangle,$$



Symbolically:




FIG. 1. A pictorial view of all the main ingredients associated to the BipoSHs. The BipoSHs constitute a basis set for the space of two-points functions defined on the surfaces of a sphere. In particular, they can be constructed from the product of two spherical harmonics projected on the space of total angular momentum ( $\lambda\mu$ ). For this reason, the main property of the BipoSHs is that, under a global rotation, they transform as the single spherical harmonic  $Y_{\lambda}^{\mu}$ . Symbolically, we can interpret the BipoSHs as the projection of the outer product of the representation of the two angular momentum channels,  $l_1$  and  $l_2$ , into the space of total angular momentum  $\lambda$ .

where the coupled basis is defined as

$$|l_1 l_2 \lambda \mu\rangle = \sum_{m_1 m_2} C_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}^{\lambda \mu} |l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2\rangle.$$

Introducing the BipoSHs enables one to immediately exploit their core properties. Firstly and foremostly, the BipoSHs constitute a complete orthonormal basis, namely

$$\int d\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1 d\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2 \mathcal{Y}_{l_1 l_2}^{\lambda \mu}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2) \mathcal{Y}_{l_1' l_2'}^{\lambda' \mu'*}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2) = \delta_{l_1 l_1'} \delta_{l_2 l_2'} \delta_{\lambda \lambda'} \delta_{\mu \mu'}. \quad (25)$$

Thus, a general two points function depending on the vectors,  $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2$ , that admits an expansion in terms of spherical harmonics, can be expanded as

$$f(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2) = \sum_{l_1 l_2 \lambda \mu} u_{l_1 l_2}^{\lambda \mu} \mathcal{Y}_{l_1 l_2}^{\lambda \mu}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2), \quad (26)$$

with the expansion coefficients given by

$$u_{l_1 l_2}^{\lambda \mu} = \int d\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1 d\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2 f(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2) \mathcal{Y}_{l_1 l_2}^{\lambda \mu*}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2). \quad (27)$$

As shown in Appendix A, this formulation can be obtained from the standard expansion in terms of two spherical harmonics through the completeness of the CG coefficients, namely [47]

$$\sum_{\lambda \mu} C_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}^{\lambda \mu} C_{l_1 m_1' l_2 m_2'}^{\lambda \mu} = \delta_{m_1 m_1'} \delta_{m_2 m_2'}. \quad (28)$$

This, incidentally, also shows that the CG coefficients constitute the (orthogonal) matrix of the change of basis between the two representations. As we will see in this section, such property will be crucial in constructing the MultiSHs formalism, since the matrix of the change of basis from a spherical harmonics representation to MultiSHS, can be always represented in terms of contractions of products of CG coefficients.

The second crucial property of the BipoSHs, which is the main reason behind the development of this formalism, is their behaviour under the simultaneous rotation,  $\hat{R}$ , of its arguments. Explicitly, the following relation holds

$$\mathcal{Y}_{l_1 l_2}^{\lambda \mu}(\hat{R}\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{R}\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2) = \sum_{\mu'} D_{\mu \mu'}^{\lambda *}(\hat{R}) \mathcal{Y}_{l_1 l_2}^{\lambda \mu'}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2), \quad (29)$$

where, again, we have used the Wigner- $D$  matrices. By comparing this behaviour with the transformation of a single spherical harmonics under rotation,

$$Y_{\lambda}^{\mu}(\hat{R}\hat{\mathbf{r}}) = \sum_{\mu'} D_{\mu \mu'}^{\lambda *}(\hat{R}) Y_{\lambda}^{\mu'}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}), \quad (30)$$

we can see how the two transformations are analogous, namely the BipoSHs transforms under rotations as a single spherical harmonics. A pictorial representation of the BipoSHs, obtained by using this property, is shown in Fig. 1. It is worth noticing that Eq. (29) can be obtained by using Eq. (28) and the so-called CG series, which states the relation between the CG coefficients and the Wigner- $D$  matrices. Explicitly, the CG series is given by [47],

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m_1 m_2} C_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}^{\lambda \mu} D_{m_1 m_1'}^{l_1 *}(\hat{R}) D_{m_2 m_2'}^{l_2 *}(\hat{R}) \\ = C_{l_1 m_1' l_2 m_2'}^{\lambda \mu'} D_{m_1' m_1}^{\lambda *}(\hat{R}), \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

a relation that shows how two rotations (represented by the Wigner- $D$  matrices) are decomposed into a single one by means of the CG coefficients. As we will show in the following paragraphs, it is possible to iteratively use this property to obtain a generalization of Eq. (30) to the MultiSHs case.

Given the rotation rule of Eq. (29), the expansion of a general function  $f$  in terms of BipoSH results in a decomposition over the irreducibles of the rotations group with respect to a *global* rotation of all the inputs of the function. Indeed, a rotation  $\hat{R}$  results in

$$\begin{aligned} f(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2) \xrightarrow{\hat{R}} f(\hat{R}\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{R}\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2) \\ = \sum_{\lambda \mu} \left( \sum_{\mu'} D_{\mu \mu'}^{\lambda *}(\hat{R}) u_{l_1 l_2}^{\lambda \mu'} \right) \mathcal{Y}_{l_1 l_2}^{\lambda \mu}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2), \end{aligned}$$

namely the coefficients of the expansion inherit the transformation rule

$$u_{l_1 l_2}^{\lambda \mu} \xrightarrow{\hat{R}} \sum_{\mu'} D_{\mu \mu'}^{\lambda *}(\hat{R}) u_{l_1 l_2}^{\lambda \mu'}. \quad (32)$$

In other words, also the coefficients belong to the subspace of angular momentum  $\lambda$ . At this point, it is crucial to notice that we have derived the transformation properties of the expansion coefficient *regardless* of the specific form of the function  $f$ . This is an example of the general fact that investigating the transformation properties of the basis is enough to fully determine the behaviour of its coefficients.

Another example of the fact that investigating the properties of the basis can be extremely informative stems from the fact that the arguments can be interchanged by means of the following transformation

$$\mathcal{Y}_{l_1 l_2}^{\lambda \mu}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2) = (-1)^{l_1 + l_2 - \lambda} \mathcal{Y}_{l_2 l_1}^{\lambda \mu}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_1), \quad (33)$$

which can be directly derived from the analogous symmetry of the CG coefficients. This property has consequences over the expansion of a generic symmetric function  $f$ . Indeed, if  $f(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2) = f(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_1)$ , then the coefficients inherit the same transformation rules of the BipoSH, namely

$$u_{l_1 l_2}^{\lambda \mu} = (-1)^{l_1 + l_2 - \lambda} u_{l_2 l_1}^{\lambda \mu}, \quad (34)$$

as can be easily proven by following the same derivation of Eq. (32). Again, it is worth noticing that we have been able to recover this property without any information on the explicit form of the coefficients  $u_{l_1 l_2}^{\lambda \mu}$ . Moreover, Eq. (34) implicitly states that any expression writeable as a linear combination of the coefficients  $u_{l_1 l_2}^{\lambda \mu}$ , can be obtained by considering only the  $l_1 \geq l_2$  terms. This property, appropriately generalized in the very last section of this work, is extremely useful in removing redundancies from linear ML models.

### 1. Graphical Representation

We conclude this section by showing that the BipoSHs admit a graphical representation by means of the definition

$$\frac{\lambda \mu}{\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1 \quad \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2} \equiv \mathcal{Y}_{l_1 l_2}^{\lambda \mu}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2). \quad (35)$$

Comparing this representation with the definition of Eq. (24), we can notice how the horizontal line represents the CG coefficients connecting the channels of angular momentum  $l_1$  and  $l_2$ . With this representation, Eq. (33) can be graphically written as

$$\frac{\lambda \mu}{\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1 \quad \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2} \equiv (-1)^{l_1 + l_2 - \lambda} \frac{\lambda \mu}{\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2 \quad \hat{\mathbf{r}}_1}. \quad (36)$$

This shows that the graph is oriented, from left to right, and that changing the order gives rise to a phase change. This graphical representation is trivial for the case of the BipoSH, but it will become a useful tool in the following sections, when we will deal with different choices of coupling schemes.

### C. Tripolar spherical harmonics

Following the same approach of the previous section, we start here with the definition of the tripolar-spherical harmonics (TripoSHs), followed by a discussion of their most important properties and of their use as a basis.

The TripoSHs are the generalization of the BipoSHs for the case of three-points functions. Indeed, they can be defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Y}_{(l_1 l_2) L l_3}^{\lambda \mu}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_3) & \\ := \sum_{\substack{m_1 m_2 \\ m_3 M}} C_{LM l_3 m_3}^{\lambda \mu} C_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}^{LM} Y_{l_1}^{m_1}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1) Y_{l_2}^{m_2}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2) Y_{l_3}^{m_3}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_3), \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

and can be represented graphically as

$$\begin{array}{c} \lambda \mu \\ \left. \begin{array}{c} L \\ \hline l_1 \quad l_2 \quad l_3 \\ \hat{\mathbf{r}}_1 \quad \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2 \quad \hat{\mathbf{r}}_3 \end{array} \right\} \equiv \mathcal{Y}_{(l_1 l_2) L l_3}^{\lambda \mu}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_3). \end{array} \quad (38)$$

The TripoSHs form an orthonormal basis for the three-points functions defined on the surface of a sphere. Explicitly, their orthogonality reads

$$\begin{aligned} \int d\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1 d\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2 d\hat{\mathbf{r}}_3 \mathcal{Y}_{(l_1 l_2) L l_3}^{\lambda \mu}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_3) \mathcal{Y}_{(l'_1 l'_2) L' l'_3}^{\lambda' \mu' *}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_3) \\ = \delta_{\lambda \lambda'} \delta_{\mu \mu'} \delta_{l_1 l'_1} \delta_{l_2 l'_2} \delta_{l_3 l'_3} \delta_{L L'}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the TripoSHs form a basis, when a function  $f(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_3)$  admits an expansion in terms of spherical harmonics, then it can be also expanded as

$$f(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_3) = \sum_{\substack{l_1 l_2 \\ l_3 L}} \sum_{\lambda \mu} u_{(l_1 l_2) L l_3}^{\lambda \mu} \mathcal{Y}_{(l_1 l_2) L l_3}^{\lambda \mu}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_3), \quad (39)$$

with the expansion coefficients given by

$$u_{(l_1 l_2) L l_3}^{\lambda \mu} = \int d\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1 d\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2 d\hat{\mathbf{r}}_3 f(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_3) \mathcal{Y}_{(l_1 l_2) L l_3}^{\lambda \mu *}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_3). \quad (40)$$

Similarly to the BipoSHs of Eq. (29), the defining property of the TripoSHs is their behaviour under rotation, which is analogous to the rotation of a single spherical harmonics of order  $\lambda \mu$ . Explicitly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Y}_{(l_1 l_2) L l_3}^{\lambda \mu}(\hat{R}\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{R}\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2, \hat{R}\hat{\mathbf{r}}_3) \\ = \sum_{\mu'} D_{\mu \mu'}^{\lambda *}(\hat{R}) \mathcal{Y}_{(l_1 l_2) L l_3}^{\lambda \mu'}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_3). \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

From their definition and graphical representation, it follows that a TripoSH can be constructed by contracting a BipoSHs with a spherical harmonic, namely

$$\mathcal{Y}_{(l_1 l_2) L l_3}^{\lambda \mu}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_3) = \sum_{m_3 M} C_{LM l_3 m_3}^{\lambda \mu} \mathcal{Y}_{l_1 l_2}^{LM}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2) Y_{l_3}^{m_3}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_3). \quad (42)$$

The importance of this recursion relation is twofold. On the one hand, once the BipoSHs have been already evaluated and stored, the TripoSHs can be constructed in a simple way. On the other hand, it allows to prove Eq. (41), by using the CG series of Eq. (31). Indeed, since rotating the arguments of BipoSHs introduces only one Wigner- $D$  matrix, we are again in the situation in which we are contracting two Wigner- $D$  matrices and one CG coefficients, namely we can directly apply the CG series. Not only this proves Eq. (41), but it also shows a general property. Namely, sequentially contracting spherical harmonics with CG-coefficients projects the expression into the space of the required global angular momentum. This statement will be crucial for the construction of the general MultiSHs formalism. Before proceeding, let us briefly discuss the choice of the coupling scheme in the definition of the TripoSHs.

#### 1. Change of coupling for symmetric functions

An important difference between the BipoSHs and the TripoSHs, is that the definition of the latter requires the selection of a coupling scheme. Indeed, in the example above, we have that the channel  $l_1$  and  $l_2$  are first coupled into the  $L$  channel, which is then coupled to the channel  $l_3$  and finally projected into the space  $(\lambda, \mu)$ . This is represented by the string  $((l_1 l_2) L l_3)$ . However, not only it is possible to define other coupling schemes by means of different strings or graphs, but these also form a separate set of TripoSHs. For example, the string  $(l_1 (l_2 l_3) L)$  produces the TripoSHs

$$\begin{array}{c} \lambda \mu \\ \left. \begin{array}{c} L \\ \hline l_1 \quad l_2 \quad l_3 \\ \hat{\mathbf{r}}_1 \quad \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2 \quad \hat{\mathbf{r}}_3 \end{array} \right\} \equiv \mathcal{Y}_{l_1 (l_2 l_3) L}^{\lambda \mu}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_3), \end{array} \quad (43)$$

which corresponds to the analytical expression

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Y}_{l_1 (l_2 l_3) L}^{\lambda \mu}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_3) \\ = \sum_{\substack{m_1 m_2 \\ m_3 M}} C_{l_1 m_1 L M}^{\lambda \mu} C_{l_2 m_2 l_3 m_3}^{LM} Y_{l_1}^{m_1}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1) Y_{l_2}^{m_2}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2) Y_{l_3}^{m_3}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_3). \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

It is clear that, by comparing this graph with the one of Eq. (38), the two sets of TripoSHs are different. However, since both produce a basis, there must exist a unitary transformation connecting the two different couplings. For example, in the cases just discussed, we have the following relation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Y}_{(l_1 l_2) L l_3}^{\lambda \mu}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_3) = \sum_{L'} \sqrt{(2L+1)(2L'+1)} \\ \times W(l_1 l_2 \lambda l_3; L L') \mathcal{Y}_{l_1 (l_2 l_3) L'}^{\lambda \mu}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_3), \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

where the components of the unitary matrix are given by the Racah- $W$  coefficients (see reference [47]). Another

possible case has already been given in Eq. (36), where the change of ordering can be interpreted as a trivial change of coupling.

To further stress the importance of the coupling-scheme choice, let us proceed with an example. Consider a 3-points function,  $f(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_3)$ , symmetric under any permutation of its arguments. This can be expanded as

$$f(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_3) = \sum_{\substack{l_2 l_3 \\ l_1 L}} \sum_{\lambda \mu} u_{(l_2 l_3) L l_1}^{\lambda \mu} \mathcal{Y}_{(l_2 l_3) L l_1}^{\lambda \mu}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_3, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_1). \quad (46)$$

On the one hand, because of the symmetries of the function  $f$ , this expression must be equal to the expansion of Eq. (39). On the other hand we know that there must be a unitary matrix that allows the change of coupling

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{Y}_{(l_2 l_3) L l_1}^{\lambda \mu}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_3, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_1) \\ &= \sum_{L'} \langle (l_1 l_2) L' l_3, \lambda | (l_2 l_3) L l_1, \lambda \rangle \mathcal{Y}_{(l_1 l_2) L' l_3}^{\lambda \mu}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_3), \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

namely that restores the order of the arguments of the function. Here we have expressed the unitary matrix through a Dirac-braket notation, since its explicit expression (in terms of Racah- $W$  coefficients) is unessential for our discussion. By inserting this last expression into the expansion of  $f$ , and comparing with Eq. (39), leads to the relation

$$u_{(l_1 l_2) L l_3}^{\lambda \mu} = \sum_{L'} \langle (l_1 l_2) L l_3, \lambda | (l_2 l_3) L' l_1, \lambda \rangle u_{(l_2 l_3) L' l_1}^{\lambda \mu}, \quad (48)$$

for the expansion coefficients. Several other relations similar to this one can be obtained by a change of coupling. Crucially, the example shows that, in the case of a symmetric function, the order of the  $l$ -s channels can be always changed by means of an appropriate change of coupling. This fact will be important in reducing the redundancies for the general MultiSHs formalism, as shown in the last section of this work. Again, we remark that this symmetry has been obtained by exploiting the symmetry of the function  $f$ , but with no knowledge of the specific form of the expansion coefficients  $u$ .

Before proceeding to a discussion of the general MultiSHs formalism, we point out that, as a matter of notation, we will indicate different graphs (or coupling trees) with the letter  $\tau$ . For example, a possible choice is to label the graph of Eq. (38) with  $\tau_1$  and the one of Eq. (43) with  $\tau_2$ .

## D. Multipolar spherical harmonics (MultiSHs)

### 1. Notation and definitions

In this section, we will introduce the MultiSHs in their generality. Because of the rapid growth in the number of indexes involved in the various expressions, and in order to keep the notation more compact and readable, let us

first define a few practical short-hands (analogously to the ones introduced in reference [38]).

Firstly,  $\nu$ -position vectors will be defined by the single vector

$$\mathbf{x} := (\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_\nu). \quad (49)$$

From this, we can define the collection of lengths and directions as

$$x := (r_1, \dots, r_\nu), \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mathbf{x}} := (\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_\nu), \quad (50)$$

respectively. To further reduce the number of indexes, we will always imply the dimensionality of these vectors, which will be understood from the context. Similarly, we can also collect all the  $l$ -indexes in a vector  $\mathbf{l}$ , defined as

$$\mathbf{l} := (l_1, \dots, l_\nu). \quad (51)$$

In contrast, we will indicate the intermediate coupling channels by means of the vector

$$\mathbf{L} := (L_1, \dots, L_{\nu-2}). \quad (52)$$

We remark here that, if the length of the vector  $\mathbf{l}$  is  $\nu \geq 2$ , then the length of  $\mathbf{L}$  will always be  $(\nu - 2)$ . In general, the specific coupling tree (or, equivalently, the string of the coupling) will be labelled by  $\tau$ .

With these definitions in place, the MultiSHs will be written as

$$\mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \equiv \mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L},\tau}^{\lambda\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}), \quad (53)$$

with the coupling tree,  $\tau$ , usually implied. The explicit construction of the MultiSHs will be presented shortly and investigated in detail. Before that, however, we will introduce the core properties that the basis is required to satisfy, and we will show that they already lead to a practical evaluation of the general  $\nu$ -points  $\lambda$ -SOAP kernel of Eq. (23). Then, in the explicit construction of the MultiSHs, we will show how these properties are satisfied.

### 2. Core properties of the MultiSHs

The core properties for the MultiSHs are (for fixed coupling) their orthonormality,

$$\int d\hat{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{l}'\mathbf{L}'}^{\lambda'\mu'*}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = \delta_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{l}'} \delta_{\mathbf{L}\mathbf{L}'} \delta_{\lambda\lambda'} \delta_{\mu\mu'}, \quad (54)$$

and transformation rule for simultaneous rotation of all the arguments,

$$\mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}(\hat{R}\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = \sum_{m'} D_{\mu\mu'}^{\lambda\lambda'}(\hat{R}) \mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda'\mu'}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}). \quad (55)$$

Here, we have defined the Kronecker delta between two vectors as the product of the Kronecker deltas of each component, and we have introduced  $d\hat{\mathbf{x}} := d\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1 \dots d\hat{\mathbf{r}}_\nu$ ,

and  $\hat{R}\hat{\mathbf{x}} := (\hat{R}\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \dots, \hat{R}\hat{\mathbf{r}}_\nu)$ . These properties, which generalize the analogous ones for the BipoSHs and TripoSHs, together with the fact that the MultiSHs constitute a basis (for any fixed coupling scheme), are among the most useful expressions for this work.

It is now also necessary to construct a global radial basis, namely an expansion over the vector  $x$ . With the short-hand notation

$$\mathbf{n} := (n_1, \dots, n_\nu), \quad (56)$$

a suitable basis is given by the product of  $\nu$  orthonormal-radial basis of single variable, namely

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}}(x) := R_{n_1 l_1}(r_1) \cdot \dots \cdot R_{n_\nu l_\nu}(r_\nu). \quad (57)$$

Here, the orthogonality of this basis is expressed by means of the integral

$$\int dx r_1^2 \cdot \dots \cdot r_\nu^2 \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}}(x) \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{n}'\mathbf{l}'}(x) = \delta_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{n}'} \delta_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{l}'}, \quad (58)$$

where, again,  $dx = dr_1 \dots dr_\nu$ . With this radial basis and the MultiSHs at hand, we can now define an expansion for a general  $\nu$ -points function,  $f(\mathbf{x})$ , and we can write

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}} \sum_{\lambda\mu} u_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu} \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}}(x) \mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}), \quad (59)$$

where

$$u_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu} = \int d\mathbf{x} \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}}(x) \mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu*}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) f(\mathbf{x}). \quad (60)$$

With all the definitions in place, we will now show that representing a function over the MultiSHs greatly simplifies the calculation of all the properties of interests for ML models. A first example to demonstrate the usefulness of this representation is provided by the calculation of the general covariant kernel of Eq. (23). We wish to remark that what follows will not be connected with the specific form of the expansion coefficients  $u_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}$  and, instead, will be derived uniquely by the properties of Eqs. (54) and (55) of the MultiSHs basis.

### 3. Calculation of the general $\lambda$ -SOAP covariant kernel

In order to evaluate the explicit form of the general  $\lambda$ -kernel of Eq. (23) we will expand the densities  $\rho^{\otimes n}$  and  $(\rho')^{\otimes n}$  in terms of the basis  $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}}(x) \mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ . If the expansion coefficients are labelled by  $u_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}$  and  $v_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}$ , respectively, then, from Eq. (23), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (K^{(\nu)}(\rho, \rho'))_{\mu_1 \mu_2}^\lambda &= \\ &= \int d\mathbf{x} \rho^{\otimes \nu}(\mathbf{x}) \int d\hat{R} D_{\mu_2 \mu_1}^{\lambda*}(\hat{R}) (\rho')^{\otimes \nu}(\hat{R}\mathbf{x}) = \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{n}' \\ \mathbf{l}'\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}} \sum_{\substack{\lambda'\mu' \\ \lambda''\mu''}} u_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda'\mu'} v_{\mathbf{n}'\mathbf{l}'\mathbf{L}'}^{\lambda''\mu''*} \int dx r_1^2 \cdot \dots \cdot r_\nu^2 \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}}(x) \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{n}'\mathbf{l}'}(x) \\ &\quad \times \int d\hat{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda'\mu'}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \int d\hat{R} D_{\mu_2 \mu_1}^{\lambda*}(\hat{R}) \mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{l}'\mathbf{L}'}^{\lambda''\mu''*}(\hat{R}\hat{\mathbf{x}}), \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

where we have conveniently used the fact that the density function  $(\rho')^{\otimes \nu}$  is real, when expanding its complex conjugate. Now, we can use the rotation rule of Eq. (55) to explicitly calculated the MultiSHs with rotated arguments, namely we write

$$\begin{aligned} &\int d\hat{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda'\mu'}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \int d\hat{R} D_{\mu_2 \mu_1}^{\lambda*}(\hat{R}) \mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{l}'\mathbf{L}'}^{\lambda''\mu''*}(\hat{R}\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = \\ &= \sum_{m''} \int d\hat{R} D_{\mu_2 \mu_1}^{\lambda*}(\hat{R}) D_{\mu'' \mu''}^{\lambda''}(\hat{R}) \int d\hat{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda'\mu'}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{l}'\mathbf{L}'}^{\lambda''\mu''*}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = \\ &= \frac{8\pi^2}{2\lambda + 1} \delta_{\lambda\lambda''} \delta_{\lambda'\lambda''} \delta_{\mu_1 \mu''} \delta_{\mu_2 \mu''} \delta_{\mu' \mu''} \delta_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{l}'}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the orthogonality of the Wigner- $D$  matrices [47] and of the MultiSHs [see Eq. (54)]. If we now use also the orthogonality of the radial basis, Eq. (58), then the final expression for the kernel is

$$(K^{(\nu)}(\rho, \rho'))_{\mu_1 \mu_2}^\lambda = \frac{8\pi^2}{2\lambda + 1} \sum_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}} u_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu_1} v_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu_2*}, \quad (62)$$

where, again, we remark that  $u_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}$  and  $v_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}$  are the expansion coefficients of  $\rho^{\otimes \nu}$  and  $(\rho')^{\otimes \nu}$ , respectively. This result does not depend on the explicit form of these functions: for the actual expressions of the expansion coefficients we refer to Section IV.

This compact derivation, holding for any order  $\nu$  and derived by exploiting *only* the properties of Eqs. (54), (55) and (58) (and the reality of  $\rho^{\otimes \nu}$ ), can be regarded as the first result of this work. Not only this expression shows that the kernel is an inner product of the  $\mathbf{n}$ ,  $\mathbf{l}$ , and  $\mathbf{L}$  channels of the expansion coefficients, but it can also be used to prove its covariance. Indeed, we can generalize Eq. (32) by means of Eq. (55), and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{\otimes \nu}(\mathbf{x}) &\xrightarrow{\hat{R}} \rho^{\otimes \nu}(\hat{R}\mathbf{x}) = \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}} \sum_{\lambda\mu'} \left( \sum_m D_{\mu\mu'}^{\lambda*}(\hat{R}) u_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu} \right) \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}}(x) \mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu'}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}). \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

From this we deduce that, under a rotation  $\hat{R}$ , the coefficients undergo the following transformation

$$u_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu} \xrightarrow{\hat{R}} \sum_{\mu'} D_{\mu\mu'}^{\lambda*}(\hat{R}) u_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu'}. \quad (64)$$

Now, in order to properly interpret the transformation properties of the kernel and its applicability, we need to investigate the difference between the covariant and the contravariant nature of its components, alongside their relation with passive and active rotation. The importance of this investigation lies in the fact that this kernel is usually adopted in simulating covariant quantities. Our analysis begins by noticing that the rotation  $\hat{R}$  written above is a *passive* rotation (here we define a passive rotation as a rotation of the frame of reference, while an

active rotation is a rotation of the atomic position). Indeed, if we take the density around the  $i$ -th atom,  $\rho_i^{\otimes\nu}$ , then, the coefficients  $u$  will depend on the atomic positions,  $\{\mathbf{r}_{ji}\}$ . Therefore, a rotation  $\hat{R}$ , acting on  $\mathbf{x}$ , can be interpreted as a rotation that acts on the system's reference frame, here represented by the MultiSHs' basis. Because  $\rho^{\otimes\nu}$  is a scalar function, this is equivalent to perform a rotation  $\hat{R}^{-1}$  of the atomic positions. On the contrary, if we want to investigate an *active* rotation,  $\hat{R}_{\text{active}}$ , on the atomic positions, we have to perform a rotation  $\hat{R}^{-1}$  on the reference frame, namely  $\hat{R}^{-1} = \hat{R}_{\text{active}}$ . Thus, by using the following properties of the Wigner D-matrices

$$D_{\mu\mu'}^\lambda(\hat{R}^{-1}) = D_{\mu'\mu}^{\lambda*}(\hat{R}), \quad (65)$$

we have that Eq. (64) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} u_{i,\mathbf{n}lL}^{\lambda\mu*} &\xrightarrow{\hat{R}_{\text{active}}=\hat{R}^{-1}} \sum_{\mu} D_{\mu\mu'}^\lambda(\hat{R}^{-1}) u_{i,\mathbf{n}lL}^{\lambda\mu*} \\ &= \sum_{\mu} D_{\mu'\mu}^{\lambda*}(\hat{R}) u_{i,\mathbf{n}lL}^{\lambda\mu*}, \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

which is exactly analogous to the transformation rule of Eq. (30) for the spherical harmonic  $Y_l^m$ . In other words, we can claim that the expansion coefficients transform contravariantly, while their complex conjugate transforms covariantly. This fact will be explored also in the next section, and confirmed again when we will investigate the explicit expression of the expansion coefficients, in Section IV. Finally, if we define an active rotation on the atoms of  $\rho^{\otimes\nu}$  as

$$\hat{R}\rho^{\otimes\nu}(\mathbf{x}; \{\mathbf{r}_{ji}\}) := \rho^{\otimes\nu}(\mathbf{x}; \{\hat{R}\mathbf{r}_{ji}\}) = \rho^{\otimes\nu}(\hat{R}^{-1}\mathbf{x}; \{\mathbf{r}_{ji}\}), \quad (67)$$

where in the last equality we use the fact that  $\rho_i$  is a scalar field, then we can derive the transformation rule for the  $\lambda$ -SOAP kernel as

$$\begin{aligned} (K^{(\nu)}(\hat{R}_1\rho, \hat{R}_2\rho'))_{\mu_1\mu_2}^\lambda &= \\ &= \sum_{\mu'_1\mu'_2} D_{\mu_1\mu'_1}^\lambda(\hat{R}_1)(K^{(\nu)}(\rho, \rho'))_{\mu'_1\mu'_2}^\lambda D_{\mu_2\mu'_2}^{\lambda*}(\hat{R}_2). \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

This agrees with the derivation of reference [24] and proves that the general  $\lambda$ -SOAP kernel is suitable to describe *covariant* quantities. In other words, we can state that such kernel is contravariant in its the first component and covariant in its the second component.

We close this section by remarking once again that the explicit form of the  $\lambda$ -SOAP kernel, and a proof of its behaviour under rotation, has been achieved by means of the properties of Eqs. (54), (55) and (58) only. Indeed, it is remarkable that we still have not discussed how to explicitly construct the MultiSHs. The next paragraph will show how such construction can be achieved, by exploiting the graphical methods presented in the previous section.

#### 4. Construction of the MultiSHs

Following the same strategy used in Sections II B and II C, we can construct the MultiSHs as a contraction of the product of  $\nu$  spherical harmonics, by mean of the CG coefficients. Explicitly, the general form of MultiSHs is given by

$$\mathcal{Y}_{l\mathbf{L},\tau}^{\lambda\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \Gamma_{l\mathbf{m}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}(\tau) Y_{l_1}^{m_1}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1) \cdots Y_{l_\nu}^{m_\nu}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_\nu), \quad (69)$$

where we have introduced the additional short-hand notation

$$\mathbf{m} := (m_1, \dots, m_\nu). \quad (70)$$

Here, the form of the tensor  $\Gamma$  depends on the choice of coupling scheme (or tree). For example, in the discussion on the BipoSHs in Section II B ( $\nu = 2$ ), we have shown the two set of coupling tensors

$$\Gamma_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}^{\lambda\mu}(\tau_1) = C_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}^{\lambda\mu}, \quad (71)$$

and

$$\Gamma_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}^{\lambda\mu}(\tau_2) = C_{l_2 m_2 l_1 m_1}^{\lambda\mu}, \quad (72)$$

where the two graphs  $\tau_1$  and  $\tau_2$  are given by

$$\tau_1 : \frac{\lambda\mu}{l_1 \quad l_2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_2 : \frac{\lambda\mu}{l_2 \quad l_1}. \quad (73)$$

It is clear that these coupling trees are the fundamental blocks to define the graphical representation of Eq. (36), which is realized by the combination of such trees together with the position representation provided by the vectors  $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2$ . From these examples, we can see how an horizontal line in the tree implies the introduction of a CG coefficient in the construction of the tensor. Further insight can be acquired from the example provided in Section II C, where we have introduced the two coupling trees

$$\tau_1 : \frac{\lambda\mu}{l_1 \quad l_2 \quad l_3}, \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_2 : \frac{\lambda\mu}{l_1 \quad l_2 \quad l_3}, \quad (74)$$

contained in Eqs. (38) and (43), respectively. Moreover, as can be seen from Eqs. (37) and (44), the corresponding  $\Gamma$  tensors are given by

$$\Gamma_{l_1 l_2 l_3, L}^{\lambda\mu}_{m_1 m_2 m_3}(\tau_1) = \sum_M C_{LM l_3 m_3}^{\lambda\mu} C_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}^{LM}, \quad (75)$$

and

$$\Gamma_{l_1 l_2 l_3, L}^{\lambda\mu}_{m_1 m_2 m_3}(\tau_2) = \sum_M C_{l_2 m_2 l_3 m_3}^{LM} C_{l_1 m_1 LM}^{\lambda\mu}. \quad (76)$$

These two expressions show that the tensors  $\Gamma$  are always constructed from the contraction of products of CG

coefficients. In particular, the contractions are always performed over all the CG coefficients with the only exception being the last projection onto the  $(\lambda\mu)$  space. With only these rules, once a coupling tree is selected, constructing the corresponding tensor  $\Gamma$  (and therefore the relative MultiSH), is straightforward. For example, the construction suggested in ACE for the  $\nu = 4$  terms, is given by the following coupling scheme

$$\tau : \frac{\frac{\lambda\mu}{L_1}}{l_1} \frac{L_2}{l_2} \frac{L_2}{l_3} \frac{l_4}{l_4}, \quad (77)$$

which corresponds to the tensor

$$\begin{aligned} & \Gamma_{m_1 m_2 m_3 m_4}^{\lambda\mu, L_1 L_2}(\tau) \\ &= \sum_{M_1 M_2} C_{L_1 M_1 L_2 M_2}^{\lambda\mu} C_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}^{L_1 M_1} C_{l_3 m_3 l_4 m_4}^{L_2 M_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

Another important example is provided by the generalized CG coefficients used in reference [44], and described by the tree

$$\tau : \frac{\frac{\lambda\mu}{L_2} \dots \frac{L_{\nu-2}}{L_{\nu-2}}}{l_1} \frac{L_1}{l_2} \frac{l_3}{l_3} \dots \frac{l_\nu}{l_\nu}, \quad (79)$$

and corresponding to the tensor

$$\begin{aligned} & \Gamma_{m_1 \dots m_{\nu-2}}^{\lambda\mu}(\tau) \\ &= \sum_{M_1 \dots M_{\nu-2}} C_{L_{\nu-2} M_{\nu-2} l_\nu m_\nu}^{\lambda\mu} \dots C_{L_1 M_1 l_3 m_3}^{L_2 M_2} C_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}^{L_1 M_1}. \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

This example is important, since it allows us to study the property of the tensor  $\Gamma$  in a general way. In particular, since different coupling-scheme choices are always connected by a unitary transformation, any conclusion drawn for one choice of the coupling tree can be read in terms of another coupling. This makes the above choice ideal, since it allows us to deduce the following recursion relation

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{Y}_{l_{\nu+1} L L_{\nu-1}, \tau'}^{\lambda\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{\nu+1}) \\ &= \sum_{m_{\nu+1} M_{\nu-1}} C_{L_{\nu-1} M_{\nu-1} l_{\nu+1} m_{\nu+1}}^{\lambda\mu} \mathcal{Y}_{l L, \tau}^{L_{\nu-1} M_{\nu-1}}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) Y_{l_{\nu+1}}^{m_{\nu+1}}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{\nu+1}), \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

which connects the MultiSHs of order  $\nu$  with the ones of order  $(\nu + 1)$ . Here,  $\tau'$  is a tree that contains  $\tau$ , namely the progressive coupling scheme of the graph in (79). This relation is the generalization of the one obtained in Eq. (42) for the TripoSHs case. On the one hand, it allows for a recursive computation of the MultiSHs of high order, based on those of lower one. On the

other hand it allows us to perform proof by induction. For example, it can be used to prove that the CG series of Eq. (31) implies that the tensor  $\Gamma$  of Eq. (80) satisfies the rotation property of the MultiSHs of Eq. (55). This is obtained by a straightforward generalization of the same argument used for the TripoSHs, in Section II C.

Another crucial property of the tensor  $\Gamma$  is that it is unitary. We have just shown that the recursion relation introduced above allows one to seamlessly prove that the tensor  $\Gamma$ , constructed from contraction of CG coefficients, satisfies the rotation condition of Eq. (55). In the same way, the following relation

$$\sum_{\lambda\mu\mathbf{L}} \Gamma_{l\mathbf{m}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}(\tau) \Gamma_{l\mathbf{m}'\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}(\tau) = \delta_{\mathbf{m}\mathbf{m}'}, \quad (82)$$

can be obtained by repeatedly applying the analogous property of the CG coefficients of Eq. (28). This, together with the orthogonality of the standard spherical harmonics, allows us to prove the orthogonality condition of Eq. (54). Crucially, this property also allows one to move from a representation in terms of product of spherical harmonics to one in terms of MultiSHs, as we will now show, also justifying the use of the MultiSHs as a basis.

### 5. General formula for the expansion coefficients

We will now discuss how to move from a representation in terms of spherical harmonics to one based on the MultiSHs formalism. In doing so, we will also provide the corresponding relations for the expansion coefficients in the two representations. Let us expand a general function  $f(\mathbf{x})$  over a product of radial-basis functions and spherical harmonics, namely

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{nlm} f_{nlm} \mathcal{R}_{nl}(x) Y_{l_1}^{m_1}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1) \dots Y_{l_\nu}^{m_\nu}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_\nu). \quad (83)$$

Let us now change the basis into the MultiSHs formalism, in a way completely analogous to what done in Section II B. This is achieved by introducing  $\sum_{\mathbf{m}'} \delta_{\mathbf{m}\mathbf{m}'}$ , and by changing all the spherical harmonics indexes from  $\mathbf{m}$  to  $\mathbf{m}'$ , in order to have them separated from the expansion coefficients  $f_{nlm}$ . We can then exploit Eq. (82) to introduce the contraction of two  $\Gamma_{l\mathbf{m}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}$  tensors in place of the  $\delta_{\mathbf{m}\mathbf{m}'}$ . Since the contraction between these tensors and the spherical harmonics produces the MultiSHs [See Eq. (69)], after factorizing, we obtain

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{nl\mathbf{L}} \sum_{\lambda\mu} \left[ \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \Gamma_{l\mathbf{m}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}(\tau) f_{nlm} \right] \mathcal{R}_{nl}(x) \mathcal{Y}_{l\mathbf{L}, \tau}^{\lambda\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}). \quad (84)$$

By comparing this expression with that in Eq. (59), we are able to make the identification

$$u_{nl\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu} = \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \Gamma_{l\mathbf{m}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}(\tau) f_{nlm}, \quad (85)$$

which relates the expansion coefficients in terms of the standard spherical harmonics,  $f_{nlm}$  with those over the MultiSHs,  $u_{nlL}^{\lambda\mu}$ . Remarkably, the relation is obtained through the *same contraction* that defines the MultiSHs in the first place [compare with Eq. (69)], and gives a general recipe to obtain the coefficients  $u_{nlL}^{\lambda\mu}$ , once the coefficients  $f_{nlm}$  are known.

### 6. Parity, Conjugation and Scalar Terms

In this foundational section, we will derive the remaining properties of the coefficients  $u_{nlL}^{\lambda\mu}$ . Following the same approach used to analyse their transformation under rotation [see Eq. (64)], we will be able to derive their behaviour under inversion and conjugation. All that follows will be deduced directly from the MultiSHs, with no prior knowledge of the function  $f(\mathbf{x})$  itself and we will be strictly tied to the transformation character of *proper* and *pseudo* tensors.

Let us begin from the parity of the MultiSHs (transformation under reflection). The transformation rules of a proper tensor belonging to the space of angular momentum  $\lambda$  can be inferred by the transformation rule of a single spherical harmonics. Explicitly we have [47]

$$Y_l^m(-\hat{\mathbf{r}}) = (-1)^l Y_l^m(\hat{\mathbf{r}}). \quad (86)$$

This encodes the fact, for example, that proper scalars ( $\lambda = 0$ ) remain unchanged under inversion, while proper vectors ( $\lambda = 1$ ) change sign. On the contrary, a pseudoscalar would have an opposite behaviour, such as the chirality (a pseudo-scalar,  $\lambda = 0$ , that changes sign under parity transformation) or the cross-product, which is invariant under inversion despite rotating as a vector ( $\lambda = 1$ ).

Moving to the analogous transformation for the MultiSHs, Eq. (86) trivially implies that

$$\hat{P} \mathcal{Y}_{lL}^{\lambda\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = \mathcal{Y}_{lL}^{\lambda\mu}(-\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = (-1)^{\Sigma(l)+\lambda} \left( (-1)^\lambda \mathcal{Y}_{lL}^{\lambda\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \right), \quad (87)$$

where  $\hat{P}$  is the parity operator. Here, we introduced the symbols

$$\Sigma(l) := l_1 + \dots + l_\nu, \quad (88)$$

for the sum of the  $l$ -s intermediate channels. We casted have Eq. (87) in a way that allows for a direct comparison with Eq. (86). The latter has a sign change depending on the parity of the angular momentum channel  $l$ . A similar inversion is present for the MultiSHs with respect to the angular channel  $\lambda$ , but an additional phase factor, with respect to the parity of the sum  $\Sigma(l) + \lambda$ , is present. Intuitively, this shows that whenever this sum is even the MultiSHs behaves like a proper tensor (in agreement with the corresponding transformation of the spherical harmonics). Instead, an odd sum causes an additional

sign change, pointing to a pseudo-tensorial transformation. We will now briefly prove these statements by exploiting a scalar contraction of the MultiSHs.

Given the MultiSH  $\mathcal{Y}_{lL}^{\lambda\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ , we can perform a scalar contraction with another spherical harmonics, by means of the recursion relation (81), projected into the rotationally invariant space. Namely, let us consider the  $\lambda' = \mu' = 0$  components of the higher-order MultiSHs, given by

$$\mathcal{Y}_{l\lambda L\lambda}^{00}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{\nu+1}) = \frac{(-1)^\lambda}{\sqrt{2\lambda+1}} \sum_{\mu} (-1)^\mu \mathcal{Y}_{lL}^{\lambda\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) Y_\lambda^\mu(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{\nu+1}), \quad (89)$$

obtained from

$$C_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}^{00} = \delta_{l_1 l_2} \delta_{m_1 - m_2} (-1)^{l_1 - m_1} / \sqrt{2l_1 + 1}.$$

One can directly prove that we are into the rotationally invariant space, since the rotation property of Eq. (55) implies that

$$\mathcal{Y}_{l\lambda L\lambda}^{00}(\hat{R}\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{R}\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{\nu+1}) = \mathcal{Y}_{l\lambda L\lambda}^{00}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{\nu+1}),$$

obtained from  $D_{00}^{0*} = 1$ . If we now perform an inversion of the frame of reference and use Eq. (87), we will obtain

$$\mathcal{Y}_{l\lambda L\lambda}^{00}(-\hat{\mathbf{x}}, -\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{\nu+1}) = (-1)^{\Sigma(l)+\lambda} \mathcal{Y}_{l\lambda L\lambda}^{00}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{\nu+1}).$$

Thus, when the sum  $\Sigma(l) + \lambda$  is even, we conclude that the expression above behaves as a scalar. In contrast, for an odd sum we have a pseudoscalar (because of the sign change under inversion). Note that, again,  $\mathcal{Y}_{l\lambda L\lambda}^{00}$  is constructed by contracting  $\mathcal{Y}_{lL}^{\lambda\mu}$  with a proper tensor (the spherical harmonics). Therefore, whenever we have a pseudoscalar ( $\Sigma(l) + \lambda$  is odd) we must have that  $\mathcal{Y}_{lL}^{\lambda\mu}$  is a pseudotensor. Instead, for a scalar ( $\Sigma(l) + \lambda$  is even) the multipolar spherical harmonics  $\mathcal{Y}_{lL}^{\lambda\mu}$  must be a tensor, as expected.

If we now apply the parity to the MultiSHs when used to expand a (proper) scalar function  $f(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ , its expansion coefficients must satisfy the same transformation of Eq. (87), namely

$$u_{nlL}^{\lambda\mu} \xrightarrow{\hat{P}} (-1)^{\Sigma(l)+\lambda} \left( (-1)^\lambda u_{nlL}^{\lambda\mu} \right). \quad (90)$$

This, combined with Eq. (64) for the transformation under a general rotation, gives the full behaviour of the coefficients for any transformation of the  $O(3)$  group, without any reference to their actual analytical form.

Another important property is the behaviour of the coefficients under complex-conjugation. By using the conjugation relation for the single spherical harmonics

$$Y_l^{m*}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) = (-1)^m Y_l^{-m}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}),$$

and the relation  $C_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}^{lm} = (-1)^{l_1 + l_2 - l} C_{l_1 - m_1 l_2 - m_2}^{l-m}$ , we are able to derive an expression for the complex conjugate of a MultiSH, namely

$$\mathcal{Y}_{lL}^{\lambda\mu*}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = (-1)^{\Sigma(l)+\lambda} \mathcal{Y}_{lL}^{\lambda-\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}).$$

Since the function  $f(\mathbf{x})$  is real, we obtain that also the coefficients must satisfy the same relation, namely

$$u_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu*} = (-1)^{\Sigma(\mathbf{l})+\lambda} u_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda-\mu}. \quad (91)$$

As we will see in the following section, coefficients that behave as scalars are at the core of the construction of ML models for scalar quantities. These coefficients are obtained by setting  $\lambda = \mu = 0$ . Indeed, from Eq. (64), we know that

$$u_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{00} \xrightarrow{\hat{R}} D_{00^*}^{00*}(\hat{R}) u_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{00} = u_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{00}, \quad (92)$$

which proves that these coefficients are rotationally invariant. Moreover, by combining Eqs. (90) and (91), we also deduce

$$u_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{00} \xrightarrow{\hat{P}} (-1)^{\Sigma(\mathbf{l})} u_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{00} = u_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{00*}. \quad (93)$$

This implies the important result that the rotationally invariant coefficients behave like scalars and are real, when  $\Sigma(\mathbf{l})$  is even. In contrast, when  $\Sigma(\mathbf{l})$  is odd, they behave like pseudo-scalar, and are imaginary.

With these information at hand, we can now calculate a  $\lambda$ -SOAP kernel, which is covariant with respect to any transformation of the group  $O(3)$ . This is done by following a derivation analogous to the one performed in section IID 3, with the inclusion of a sum over a parity inverted density. Since the details of the calculation are similar to what already shown, here we only mention that the result is again an inner product, restricted to coefficients with  $\Sigma(\mathbf{l}) + \lambda$  even. For an explicit derivation we refer to Appendix B.

We conclude this section by noticing that all the properties listed above have been derived by investigating only the analogous properties of the MultiSHs basis, and by exploiting the fact that  $\rho^{\otimes\nu}(\mathbf{x})$  is a real and scalar function. Indeed, remarkably, the explicit form of the expansion coefficients  $u_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}$  is still left completely general. This proves that, not only adopting the point of view of the MultiSHs allows one to simplify the investigation of all the properties of the expansion coefficients, but it also generalize them, showing how they hold for a general representation that is not at all linked with a formulation in terms of atomic densities.

### III. THE POWERSPECTRUM, THE BISPECTRUM AND THE SCALAR KERNEL

Having derived all the transformation rules for the coefficients, we are now able to investigate what happens when we choose a special form for the function  $f(\mathbf{x})$ . In particular, we are going to investigate the case when we have a product function, such as  $\rho^{\otimes\nu}$ . We will show that this will lead to a straightforward formulation of the powerspectrum and the bispectrum components, with an immediate proof of their rotational invariance. Moreover, we will also derive the form of the SOAP-kernel, as

obtained in reference [36]. We anticipate that the only requirement for the derivations presented in this section is that the expanded functions are in the form of products, with their explicit form not being relevant. Moreover, this section can be seen as a first application of the MultiSHs formalism, with the explicit calculation of the tensors  $\Gamma(\tau)$  for various order,  $\nu$ .

Let us consider again the product  $\rho_i^{\otimes\nu}(\mathbf{x})$ . By expanding this function in terms of the standard spherical harmonics, we obtain the chain of relations

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_i^{\otimes\nu}(\mathbf{x}) &= \prod_{\alpha=1}^{\nu} \rho_i(\mathbf{r}_\alpha) = \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{m}} \left[ \prod_{\alpha=1}^{\nu} c_{i,n_\alpha l_\alpha m_\alpha} R_{n_\alpha l_\alpha}(r_\alpha) Y_{l_\alpha}^{m_\alpha}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha) \right] = \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{m}} \left[ \prod_{\alpha=1}^{\nu} c_{i,n_\alpha l_\alpha m_\alpha} \right] \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}}(\mathbf{x}) Y_{l_1}^{m_1}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1) \cdots Y_{l_\nu}^{m_\nu}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_\nu). \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

The first equality just remarks that  $\rho_i^{\otimes\nu}(\mathbf{x})$  is obtained as a simple product, while in the second we have expanded each of the constituent functions,  $\rho_i(\mathbf{r}_\alpha)$ , independently. By comparing this expression with that of a generic function  $f(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ , Eq. (83), we can make the identification

$$f_{i,\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{m}} = \prod_{\alpha=1}^{\nu} c_{i,n_\alpha l_\alpha m_\alpha}. \quad (95)$$

Therefore, by using Eq. (85) for the connection between the coefficients  $f_{i,\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{m}}$  and the MultiSHs' coefficients,  $u_{i,\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}$ , we can write

$$u_{i,\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu} = \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \Gamma_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{m}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}(\tau) \prod_{\alpha=1}^{\nu} c_{i,n_\alpha l_\alpha m_\alpha}, \quad (96)$$

where, for the sake of readability, we remark again that

$$c_{i,\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{m}} = \int d\mathbf{r} \rho_i(\mathbf{r}) R_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}}(r) Y_{\mathbf{l}}^{\mathbf{m}}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}).$$

These expressions are among the most useful of this work, since they establish the connection between the single-density formalism, incorporated into the coefficients  $c_{i,\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{m}}$ , and the MultiSHs one. With these formulas in place, we are now in the position to re-derive the powerspectrum and the bispectrum components by considering the cases for  $\nu = 2$  and  $\nu = 3$ , respectively.

#### 1. The powerspectrum components

As explicitly stated in the definition of Eq. (10), here reported for completeness

$$p_{i,n_1 n_2 l} = \sum_m (-1)^m c_{i,n_1 l m} c_{i,n_2 l -m},$$

the powerspectrum components are the rotational invariants obtained from an appropriate contraction of products of two set of coefficients,  $c_{i,nlm}$ . Therefore, we expect them to be related to the rotationally invariant coefficients of a MultiSHs formalism, namely the ones satisfying Eq. (92), for  $\nu = 2$ . Indeed, by using Eq. (96), the rotationally invariant coefficients read

$$u_{i,n_1 n_2 l_1 l_2}^{00} = \sum_{m_1 m_2} \Gamma_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}^{00}(\tau) c_{i,n_1 l_1 m_1} c_{i,n_2 l_2 m_2}. \quad (97)$$

By selecting the first graph represented in (73), which corresponds to the tensor  $\Gamma(\tau_1)$  given in Eq. (71), we have the simple identification

$$\Gamma_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}^{00} = C_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}^{00} = \delta_{l_1 l_2} \delta_{m_1 - m_2} \frac{(-1)^{l_1 - m_1}}{\sqrt{2l_1 + 1}}, \quad (98)$$

where we have used the explicit expression for the CG coefficients. By substituting this expression into Eq. (97), we obtain

$$u_{i,n_1 n_2 l_1 l_2}^{00} = \delta_{l_1 l_2} \frac{(-1)^{l_1}}{\sqrt{2l_1 + 1}} \sum_m (-1)^m c_{i,n_1 l_1 m_1} c_{i,n_2 l_1 - m}. \quad (99)$$

When we compare this expression with the definition of the powerspectrum, we obtain

$$u_{i,n_1 n_2 l l'}^{00} = \delta_{ll'} \frac{(-1)^l}{\sqrt{2l + 1}} p_{i,n_1 n_2 l}, \quad (100)$$

namely, the powerspectrum components are nothing but the scalar coefficients of the  $\nu = 2$  case. Thus, not only the MultiSH formalism leads directly to the expression for the powerspectrum components, but it also implicitly proves their rotational invariance (since those are scalar components). Moreover, using Eqs. (90) and (91), respectively for the parity and the conjugation of the expansion coefficients, we also have the immediate information that the powerspectrum components are always scalars and real. In particular, since all this informations are obtained *regardless* of the explicit form of the coefficients  $c_{i,nlm}$ , the same conclusion could be obtained from a more generic product function of the form  $\rho_{12}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) := \rho_1(\mathbf{r}_1)\rho_2(\mathbf{r}_2)$ , namely that obtained by the product of two different atomic densities. The same will hold true also for the bispectrum components.

## 2. The bispectrum components

As the powerspectrum components are obtained by imposing rotational invariance to the product of two single-density expansion coefficients, the bispectrum components are connected with the scalar components in the  $\nu = 3$  case. Indeed, by following the same procedure that led to the powerspectrum components, we can write

the rotationally invariant coefficients as

$$u_{i, l_1 l_2 l_3}^{00, n_1 n_2 n_3 L} = \sum_{m_1 m_2 m_3} \Gamma_{l_1 l_2 l_3, L}^{00, m_1 m_2 m_3}(\tau) c_{i,n_1 l_1 m_1} c_{i,n_2 l_2 m_2} c_{i,n_3 l_3 m_3}. \quad (101)$$

Now, by taking Eq. (75) as our choice for the  $\Gamma(\tau)$  tensor and, again, by considering that  $C_{LMl_3 m_3}^{00} = \delta_{Ll_3} \delta_{M-m_3} (-1)^{l_3 - m_3} / \sqrt{2l_3 + 1}$ , we obtain

$$u_{i, l_1 l_2 l_3}^{00, n_1 n_2 n_3 L} = \delta_{l_3 L} \frac{(-1)^{l_3}}{\sqrt{2l_3 + 1}} \times \sum_{m_1 m_2 m_3} c_{i,n_3 l_3 m_3}^* C_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}^{l_3 m_3} c_{i,n_1 l_1 m_1} c_{i,n_2 l_2 m_2}. \quad (102)$$

Here we have used the property  $c_{i,nlm}^* = (-1)^m c_{i,nl-m}$ , which holds whenever  $\rho(\mathbf{r})$  is a scalar function. By comparing this expression with the definition of the bispectrum components of Eq. (11), we obtain that

$$u_{i, l_1 l_2 l_3}^{00, n_1 n_2 n_3 L} = \delta_{l_3 L} \frac{(-1)^{l_3}}{\sqrt{2l_3 + 1}} B_{i, l_1 l_2 l_3}^{n_1 n_2 n_3}, \quad (103)$$

namely, the bispectrum components are proportional to the rotationally-invariant coefficients of a MultiSHs expansion. Thus, also in this case, not only we have derived the bispectrum components with a straightforward evaluation of expansion coefficients of the MultiSHs formalism, but we have also implicitly proved their rotational invariance. Moreover, given the parity and conjugation properties of Eqs. (90) and (91), respectively, we have also obtain the additional information that the bispectrum components behave like imaginary pseudo-scalars when the sum  $l_1 + l_2 + l_3$  is odd, and they are real scalars when the same sum is even.

The same method can be expanded to any body order of choice. For example, the approach proposed for the ACE potential for the  $\nu = 4$  terms can be obtained from an evaluation of the rotationally invariant coefficients with the  $\Gamma$  tensor give by Eq. (78). Furthermore, the results of reference [44] can be obtained by using the tensor  $\Gamma(\tau)$  from Eq. (80), with the invariants that can be derived for any  $\nu$  by evaluating the  $\lambda = \mu = 0$  case in Eq. (96) (and constraining  $\Sigma(\mathbf{l})$  to be even for the scalar-real case).

## 3. The SOAP kernel

Another example of the application of the MultiSH formalism is provided in the evaluation of the SOAP kernel. By using the results of Eq. (62) for  $\lambda = 0$ , we can write the scalar (SOAP) kernel as

$$K^{(\nu)}(\rho, \rho') := (K^{(\nu)}(\rho, \rho'))_{00}^0 = 8\pi^2 \sum_{nlL} u_{nlL}^{00} v_{nlL}^{00*}.$$

We are now in the position to study more in detail this expression and provide more information about this inner

product. Firstly, by using the conjugation property of Eq. (91) on the coefficients  $v$ , we obtain the expression

$$K^{(\nu)}(\rho, \rho') = 8\pi^2 \sum_{nl\mathbf{L}} (-1)^{\Sigma(l)} u_{nl\mathbf{L}}^{00} v_{nl\mathbf{L}}^{00}, \quad (104)$$

which holds true for any  $\nu$ , and includes also pseudo-scalar components, as one can read from the parity transformation of Eq. (90). From this, and with the results provided by Eqs. (100) and (103), we can immediately deduce that the  $\nu = 2$  case takes the form

$$K^{(2)}(\rho, \rho') = \sum_{n_1 n_2 l} \frac{8\pi^2}{2l+1} p_{n_1 n_2 l} p'_{n_1 n_2 l}, \quad (105)$$

where  $p_{n_1 n_2 l}$  and  $p'_{n_1 n_2 l}$  are the powerspectrum obtained from  $\rho$  and  $\rho'$  respectively, and where we have used the fact that the powerspectrum is real. Analogously, for  $\nu = 3$ , we obtain

$$K^{(3)}(\rho, \rho') = \sum_{\substack{n_1 n_2 n_3 \\ l_1 l_2 l_3}} (-1)^{l_1 + l_2 + l_3} \frac{8\pi^2}{2l_3 + 1} B_{n_1 n_2 n_3} B'_{n_1 n_2 n_3}. \quad (106)$$

These expressions reproduce the known results [see Reference [36] for their derivation in the context of Gaussian atomic densities] that the SOAP kernel can be obtained by weighted inner products of the powerspectrum and bispectrum components, respectively. However, not only the MultiSH formalism recovers these results without even taking into account the specific expression for the density  $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ , but it also provides a generalization to any order  $\nu$ , by means of Eq. (104).

Having recovered most of the descriptors employed in state-of-the-art ML models, we are now in the position to discuss the models themselves and to derive a full framework to obtain them. Before proceeding, however, it is important to remark that the requirement to obtain all the descriptors introduced above is the fact of dealing with a product function,  $\rho^{\otimes \nu}(\mathbf{x}) = \rho(\mathbf{r}_1) \cdots \rho(\mathbf{r}_\nu)$ , and nothing more. This implies that the MultiSH formalism, and the corresponding descriptors, are *independent* of the specific shape of the atom density,  $\rho_i(\mathbf{r})$ . This means that, in order to construct the product  $\rho^{\otimes \nu}$ , we can use up to  $\nu$  different atomic-densities.

#### IV. ON THE ATOMIC DENSITY

In this section, we are finally going to discuss the explicit form of the atomic density  $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ , and that of the expansion coefficients of  $\rho^{\otimes \nu}$ . We anticipate that such investigation is not required to derive and investigate the properties of the expansion coefficients  $u_{nl\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}$ . Instead, this study is necessary only to connect the MultiSH formalism to frameworks based on a multi-body expansion. In particular, the connection will be realised by mean of an atomic density defined as a sum of Dirac-delta functions.

Let us consider again an atomic density of the form of Eq. (3), here reported for completeness

$$\rho_i(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_j^{\text{atoms}} h_{Z_j Z_i}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_{ji}).$$

By expanding this expression onto an orthonormal radial basis and spherical harmonics, we obtain the coefficients  $c_{i,nlm}$  of Eq. (7) of the general form

$$c_{i,nlm} = \sum_j g_{nlm}(\mathbf{r}_{ji}; Z_j, Z_i), \quad (107)$$

where  $g_{nlm}$  are the expansion coefficients of the functions  $h$ , namely

$$g_{nlm}(\mathbf{r}_{ji}; Z_j, Z_i) = \int d\mathbf{r} h_{Z_j Z_i}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_{ji}) R_{nl}(r) Y_l^{m*}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}). \quad (108)$$

From this expression one can appreciate how the coefficients depend on the atomic positions, a dependence indicating that they can be further expanded over a radial basis and spherical harmonics. Moreover, since  $\rho_i(\mathbf{r})$  is a scalar function, the sum of products  $\sum_m g_{nlm}(\mathbf{r}_{ji}) Y_l^m(\hat{\mathbf{r}})$  must behave as a scalar. Therefore, we have that the only possible expansion for such coefficients takes the form

$$g_{nlm}(\mathbf{r}_{ji}) = q_{nl}(r_{ji}) Y_l^{m*}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{ji}), \quad (109)$$

where we have implied the dependence on the atomic species, and where the functions  $q_{nl}(r_{ji})$  are of the form

$$q_{nl}(r_{ji}) := \frac{1}{2l+1} \int d\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{ji} \sum_m g_{nlm}(\mathbf{r}_{ji}) Y_l^m(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{ji}). \quad (110)$$

This expression is explicitly derived in Appendix C by exploiting the orthogonality of the spherical harmonics and the MultiSHs expansion.

Remarkably, despite the simplicity of this layered expansion, such an expression has important consequence when analyzed from MultiSH-formalism point of view. Indeed, we now have that the coefficients of the atomic density,  $c_{i,nlm}$ , take the form

$$c_{i,nlm} = \sum_j q_{nl}(r_{ji}) Y_l^{m*}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{ji}),$$

a feature that can be used in Eq. (96) for the expansion coefficients of  $\rho_i^{\otimes \nu}$ . Explicitly, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} u_{i,nl\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu} &= \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \Gamma_{l\mathbf{m}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}(\tau) \prod_{\alpha=1}^{\nu} c_{i,n_\alpha l_\alpha m_\alpha} = \\ &= \sum_{j_1 \cdots j_\nu} q_{n_1 l_1}(r_{j_1}) \cdots q_{n_\nu l_\nu}(r_{j_\nu}) \times \\ &\quad \times \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \Gamma_{l\mathbf{m}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}(\tau) Y_{l_1}^{m_1*}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{j_1 i}) \cdots Y_{l_\nu}^{m_\nu*}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{j_\nu i}). \end{aligned} \quad (111)$$

By using the definition MultiSHs of Eq. (69) and by exploiting the fact that the tensor  $\Gamma_{lm\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}(\tau)$  is real, we obtain the following expression for the coefficients  $u_{i,\mathbf{n}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}$

$$u_{i,\mathbf{n}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu} = \sum_j Q_{nl}(x_{j_i}) \mathcal{Y}_{i\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu*}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{j_i}), \quad (112)$$

where, to have a more compact expression, we have introduced the short-hand notation

$$\mathbf{j} := (j_1, \dots, j_\nu), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{x}_{j_i} := (\mathbf{r}_{j_{i1}}, \dots, \mathbf{r}_{j_{i\nu}})$$

and the corresponding lengths and directions, encoded in  $x_{j_i}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{j_i}$  respectively. We have also defined

$$Q_{nl}(x_{j_i}) := q_{n_1 l_1}(r_{j_{i1}}) \cdots q_{n_\nu l_\nu}(r_{j_{i\nu}}).$$

The expression in Eq. (112) implies that, *regardless of the explicit form* of the localization functions  $h(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_{j_i})$ , the coefficients of the MultiSH expansion are essentially MultiSHs themselves. We remark that, not only we have just derived a simple expression for the expansion coefficients  $u_{i,\mathbf{n}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}$ , but we have also determined that the actual choice of the localization function  $h$  has consequences only on the radial functions  $Q_{nl}$ , and not on the angular part of the description. Indeed, these are the only terms that explicitly depend on the actual localization functions chosen to define the local environment described by  $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ . Everything else, including the behaviour under rotation, is fully determined by adopting the general expression of Eq. (3). It is now important to notice how these conclusions agree with our finding on the properties against rotation, parity and conjugation, of Eqs. (64), (90) and (91), respectively. Moreover, it also agrees with our discussion on the active and passive rotations, encoded in Eq. (66). Indeed, the coefficients  $u_{i,\mathbf{n}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}$ , being constructed from the complex conjugate of MultiSHs, transform in a contravariant way, while their own complex conjugate,  $u_{i,\mathbf{n}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}$ , transforms in a fully covariant way. This also justifies the use of such complex conjugates in Eqs. (13) and (14). In order to target the covariant components of a tensor with a linear model, it is necessary to use the complex conjugate of the coefficients  $c_{i,\mathbf{n}\mathbf{L}m}$ .

An important example for the radial expansion of the coefficients  $u_{i,\mathbf{n}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu}$  is provided in the case the  $h$  functions are Dirac-deltas,  $h(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_{j_i}) = \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_{j_i})$ . From these we have

$$u_{i,\mathbf{n}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu} \stackrel{\text{Dirac-}\delta}{=} \sum_j \mathcal{R}_{nl}(x_{j_i}) \mathcal{Y}_{i\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu*}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{j_i}). \quad (113)$$

This expression plays a fundamental role in connecting the MultiSH formalism to the general case of a multi-body expansion. Indeed, it can be read as the basis for an expansion in  $(\nu + 1)$ -body clusters, as done in reference [44]. We remark again that the choice of the localization function has an effect only on the radial part of the expansion coefficients, since the angular part can always be casted in terms of MultiSHs.

This section concludes our study of the most important properties of the expansion of the product density,  $\rho^{\otimes\nu}$ , in terms of MultiSHs. In doing so, we have successfully reproduced all the most wide-used descriptors of state-of-the-art ML models, and we have been able to obtain a compact and general derivation for a general  $\lambda$ -SOAP kernel. The next section will be devoted to define a simple strategy to produce a linear model based on the MultiSH formalism. For this part, we will explore the connection between the expansion in terms of the MultiSHs, and cluster-expansion-based schemes. This will lead to a derivation of the ACE formalism [38] and to uncover properties of the SNAP [39]. We will also explore the connection between the MultiSH formalism and internal-coordinate based representations, reproducing the MTP [11] and JL formalism [40]. We will conclude this work with a section on linear models for covariant quantities, which will lead to the derivation of the basis used in the NICE formalism [46].

## V. REPRODUCING LINEAR MODELS: CONNECTION WITH MULTI-BODY EXPANSIONS

The aim of this section is to reproduce some of the most used ML models with the aid of the MultiSH formalism. In doing so we will provide a straightforward approach to the construction of linear models, which will show the connection between the MultiSHs and multi-body expansions. In the next section, following the same derivation of the JL potential of reference [40], we will derive a general framework for the construction of linear models for scalar quantities. On the one hand, this will allow us to reproduce the ACE model. On the other hand, it will lay down the foundations for the investigation of the SNAP. In particular, in pursuing the connection between SNAP and the MultiSH formalism, we will show how the SNAP descriptors do not fully cover the intended rotationally-invariant space. We will then proceed by exploring the connection between the MultiSH formalism and internal-coordinate representations, an analysis that will lead to a derivation of the MTP and the JLP models.

### A. Linear models for scalar quantities: ACE

We will now introduce a general framework for the construction of linear ML potentials. A summary of the procedure outlined in this section is provided in Fig. 2. The main hypothesis governing this section is that the short-ranged contribution to the energy,  $E_{\text{short}}$ , can be expanded in atom-centered contributions,  $E_i$ . Furthermore, we assume a multi-body expansion of each  $E_i$  term, such that we have

$$E_{\text{short}} = \sum_i^{\text{atoms}} E_i = \sum_i \sum_{\nu=0} \varepsilon_i^{(\nu+1)}. \quad (114)$$




FIG. 2. Schematic of a general cluster-expansion formalism. The left-hand side figure shows the partition of the energy into local contributions (indicated by  $i$ ) and body orders (indicated by  $\nu$ ). We can focus our attention on different aspect of this partition by adopting different factorization: in the top branch, we are considering the different global-body order contributions, while in the bottom branch we are considering only the local partitioning. The right-hand side panel displays each fundamental term of the partition. Here,  $\varepsilon_i^{(\nu+1)}$  is further decomposed into  $(\nu + 1)$ -body potentials,  $v_i^{(\nu+1)}$ . The potential are then expanded in terms of the MultiSHs basis. Here we can make the identification with this multi-body expansion and the expansion coefficients  $u_{nlL}^{\lambda\mu}$  of Eq. (113). When looking at the derivation of the properties of the coefficients  $u_{nlL}^{\lambda\mu}$ , this bridge between the expansion of  $\rho^{\otimes\nu}(\mathbf{x})$  and the multi-body formalism is the *only* instance in which the explicit form of the coefficients  $u_{nlL}^{\lambda\mu}$  plays a role. All the other properties (covariance, parity and conjugation) are directly inherited from the MultiSH formalism itself and the symmetries of  $\rho^{\otimes\nu}(\mathbf{x})$  (a real and scalar function that allows for product factorization).

Here,  $(\nu+1)$  indicates the order of the expansion. For example,  $\nu = 1$  indicates a two-bodies expansion, and  $\nu = 2$  indicates a three-bodies expansion, and so on. Practically, this means that we are assuming that each of the  $\varepsilon_i^{(\nu+1)}$  term can be expanded as a sum of  $(\nu + 1)$ -body potentials,  $v_i^{(\nu+1)}$ , such that

$$\varepsilon_i^{(\nu+1)} = \sum_j v_i^{(\nu+1)}(\mathbf{x}_{ji}). \quad (115)$$

Importantly, we are implying that the dimensionality of the vector  $\mathbf{j}$  has to be inferred by the context (the vector  $\mathbf{j}$  has length  $\nu$  and, thus, its length depends on the body order). To clarify the above expression, let us consider two examples. The two-body expression ( $\nu = 1$ ) is given by

$$\varepsilon_i^{(2)} = \sum_j^{\text{atoms}} v_i^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}_{ji}), \quad (116)$$

while the four-body ( $\nu = 3$ ) expression is

$$\varepsilon_i^{(4)} = \sum_{j_1 j_2 j_3}^{\text{atoms}} v_i^{(3)}(\mathbf{r}_{j_1 i}, \mathbf{r}_{j_2 i}, \mathbf{r}_{j_3 i}). \quad (117)$$

We remark that a  $(\nu+1)$ -body order expression is formed by potentials that depend on  $\nu$  atomic positions. This is because all the atomic positions are taken with respect to the central atom  $i$ , which acts as the origin of the local reference frame. Thus, when one also considers the central atom, the expression above contains information about  $(\nu + 1)$  atoms at once. Moreover, as discussed in reference [38], we will not restrict the sum over the atomic labels,  $\mathbf{j}$ . While this will introduce “self-interacting” terms (when at least two labels refer to the

same atom), we can either assume that such terms are absorbed in a lower body order, or we can refer to equivalent formulations that show how to produce similar expressions with restricted summations, see [38].

Now, assuming that the potentials can be expanded over a radial basis and spherical harmonics, we are in the condition to perform an expansion in terms of MultiSHs as

$$\varepsilon_i^{(\nu+1)} = \sum_{\lambda\mu} \sum_{nlL} a_{\nu, nlL}^{\lambda\mu} \sum_j \mathcal{R}_{nl}(x_{ji}) \mathcal{Y}_{nlL}^{\lambda\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{ji}), \quad (118)$$

where the coefficients  $a_{\nu, nlL}^{\lambda\mu}$  are formally obtained through the integral

$$a_{\nu, nlL}^{\lambda\mu} = \int d\mathbf{x}_{ji} \mathcal{R}_{nl}(x_{ji}) \mathcal{Y}_{nlL}^{\lambda\mu*}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{ji}) v_i^{(\nu+1)}(\mathbf{x}_{ji}).$$

If we now compare these expressions with Eq. (113), we recognize that we are indeed using the expansion coefficients of the Dirac-delta  $\rho^{\otimes\nu}$  as a multi-body basis. Thus, we can write

$$\varepsilon_i^{(\nu+1)} = \sum_j v_i^{(\nu+1)}(\mathbf{x}_{ji}) = \sum_{\lambda\mu} \sum_{nlL} a_{\nu, nlL}^{\lambda\mu} u_{i, \nu, nlL}^{\lambda\mu*}, \quad (119)$$

where we have explicitly indicated the order  $\nu$  as a new index in the expansion coefficients. Finally, we observe that the terms  $\varepsilon_i^{(\nu+1)}$  are scalars, and therefore invariant under rotations of the atomic positions. However, not only we already know how the coefficients  $u_{\nu, nlL}^{\lambda\mu*}$  transforms under an active rotation [see Eq. (66)], but we have already discussed how the only rotationally invariant terms are obtained for  $\lambda = \mu = 0$  [see Sec. IID 5]. Moreover, as established from the parity transformation of the expansion coefficients, such coefficients act as scalar (and are real) only when the sum  $\Sigma(\mathbf{l})$  is even [see Eqs. (88)

and (90)]. Thus, we deduce that the coefficients  $a_{\nu, \mathbf{nL}}^{\lambda\mu}$  have to vanish unless  $\lambda = 0$ , and unless the sum  $\Sigma(\mathbf{l})$  is an even number. With these constraints, we obtain

$$\varepsilon_i^{(\nu+1)} = \sum'_{\mathbf{nL}} a_{\nu, \mathbf{nL}} u_{i, \nu, \mathbf{nL}}^{00}, \quad (120)$$

where we have defined  $a_{\nu, \mathbf{nL}} := a_{\nu, \mathbf{nL}}^{00}$ , and the prime indicates that the sum is constrained to take only cases for which  $\Sigma(\mathbf{l})$  is even. If we further define

$$E^{(\nu+1)} := \sum_i \varepsilon_i^{(\nu+1)},$$

then we obtain the following compact expression of a linear ML model

$$E_{\text{short}} = \sum_{\nu=0} E^{(\nu+1)}, \quad (121)$$

$$\text{with } E^{(\nu+1)} = \sum'_{\mathbf{nL}} a_{\nu, \mathbf{nL}} \sum_i u_{i, \nu, \mathbf{nL}}^{00},$$

which holds for every body order  $(\nu + 1)$ . We can now identify this representation with the analogous one of a general ACE model [38, 43]. Indeed, we have already proved that, for  $\nu = 2$  and  $\nu = 3$ , the scalar coefficients  $u_{i, \nu, \mathbf{nL}}^{00}$  are proportional to the powerspectrum and the bispectrum, respectively, as obtained by the ACE formalism. However, writing everything in terms of the MultiSH formalism, not only allows us to automatically obtain expressions up to any order, but it also provides access to all the properties derived for the expansion coefficients of the MultiSHs, namely Eqs. (64), (66) and Section IID 5.

## B. SNAP and 4D Bispectrum

In this section, we are going to show how we can connect the MultiSHs formalism and the linear model described above, with the ones employed in SNAP [36, 39]. This section can be interpreted as an example on how the framework provided by the MultiSHs can be used to perform an in-depth investigation of known and well-established descriptors.

The starting point is to map the 3-dimensional vector  $\mathbf{r}$ , onto a 4-dimensional vector,  $\hat{\mathbf{u}} \in S^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^4$  (here  $S^3$  is the 4-dimensional hypersphere), by mean of a Riemann map. Explicitly, we have that the atomic density is now defined as

$$\rho_i(\mathbf{r}) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{r} \rightarrow \hat{\mathbf{u}}} \rho_i(\hat{\mathbf{u}}) = \sum_j^{\text{atoms}} f_c(r_{ji}) \delta(\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{ji}), \quad (122)$$

where  $f_c(r_{ji})$  is the cut-off function, and with the map realized by defining the 4-dimensional vector

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}} := \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta_0 \\ \sin \theta_0 \hat{\mathbf{r}} \end{pmatrix} \in S^3. \quad (123)$$

Here, the new polar angle,  $\theta_0$ , is defined in terms of the length of the vector  $\mathbf{r}$ , as  $\theta_0 := 4\pi r / (3r_{\text{cut}})$ . Now, the new density  $\rho(\hat{\mathbf{u}})$  can be expanded over the hyper-spherical harmonics (HSH) [53], which are the 4-dimensional counterpart of the standard spherical harmonics. Therefore, we obtain

$$\rho_i(\hat{\mathbf{u}}) = \sum_{l=0, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \dots} \frac{2l+1}{16\pi^2} \sum_{mm'} c_{i, lmm'} U_{mm'}^l(\hat{\mathbf{u}}), \quad (124)$$

where  $U_{mm'}^l(\hat{\mathbf{u}})$  are the HSHs, and where we have introduced the factor  $(2l+1)/16\pi^2$ , since the HSHs  $U_{mm'}^l$  are, in general, not normalized. We also remark that the sum over  $l$  runs over half-integer values. Here, the expansion coefficients are given by

$$c_{i, lmm'} = \int d\mathbf{u} \rho_i(\hat{\mathbf{u}}) U_{mm'}^{l*}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}). \quad (125)$$

At this point, it is important to point out that the HSH can be defined in a multitude of ways from the standard spherical harmonics, as shown in reference [54]. We firstly investigate the construction of reference [36], which utilises the so-called *parabolic-type* HSH [53]. There, the 4-dimensional analogues of the bispectrum components is given by

$$B_{i, l_1 l_2} := \sum_{mm'} c_{i, lmm'}^* \times \sum_{\substack{m_1 m_1' \\ m_2 m_2'}} H_{l_1 m_1 m_1' l_2 m_2 m_2'}^{lmm'} c_{i, l m_1 m_1'} c_{i, l m_2 m_2'}, \quad (126)$$

where the contraction tensor  $H$  is defined as the product of two CG coefficients, namely

$$H_{l_1 m_1 m_1' l_2 m_2 m_2'}^{lmm'} := C_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}^{lm} C_{l_1 m_1' l_2 m_2'}^{lm'}. \quad (127)$$

As proved in reference [36], these bispectrum components are invariant under rotations acting on the full 4-dimensional space. Finally, the SNAP model introduced in reference [39] is obtained as a linear model over the bispectrum components and targeting the energy  $E_{\text{short}}$ . Explicitly

$$E_{\text{short}} \simeq E^{\text{SNAP}} = \sum_{l_1 l_2} a_{l_1 l_2} \sum_i^{\text{atoms}} B_{i, l_1 l_2}. \quad (128)$$

With the definition of SNAP in place, the MultiSHs formalism will provide the tools to further investigate the properties of this model.

### 1. Hypothesis and approximations behind the SNAP

We start our discussion by writing an explicit formula for the bispectrum components obtained from the density of Eq. (122). In order to keep the expressions as compact

as possible, we will employ all the short-hands defined in Sections II D and IV. We also define

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{ji} := (\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{j_1i}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{j_2i}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{j_3i}),$$

as the collection of three 4-dimensional versors corresponding to three atoms in the local environment of the  $i$ -th one. With these definitions, the bispectrum components can be written as

$$B_{i,l_1l_2} \propto \sum_{j_1j_2j_3}^{\text{atoms}} \left[ \prod_{\alpha=1}^3 f_c(r_{j_\alpha i}) \right] b_{i,l_1l_2}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{ji}), \quad (129)$$

with

$$b_{i,l_1l_2l_3}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{ji}) := \sum_{mm'} U_{m_1m'_1}^{l_1}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{j_1i}) \quad (130)$$

$$\times \sum_{\substack{m_1m'_1 \\ m_2m'_2}} H_{l_1m_1m'_1l_2m_2m'_2}^{lmm'} U_{m_2m'_2}^{l_2*}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{j_2i}) U_{m_3m'_3}^{l_3*}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{j_3i}).$$

The proportionality in Eq. (129) is resolved by means of coefficients of the form of  $(2l+1)/16\pi^2$ , which are unessential for the present discussion.

We can now follow the same derivation presented in Section V A, in order to partition the energy in multi-body contributions. In particular, we can consider the four-body term ( $\nu=3$ ) as

$$\varepsilon_i^{(4)} = \sum_{j_1j_2j_3} v_i^{(4)}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{ji}),$$

where the terms  $v_i^{(4)}$  now depend on three 4-dimensional versors. We can now proceed by *assuming* that we can expand the terms  $v_i^{(4)}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{ji})$  as

$$v_i^{(4)}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{ji}) = \left[ \prod_{\alpha=1}^3 f_c(r_{j_\alpha i}) \right] \left( \sum_l a_l b_{i,l}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{ji}) \right), \quad (131)$$

for some coefficients  $a_l$ . This can be regarded as the main hypothesis behind the SNAP model. Finally, inserting this expression back into the definition of  $\varepsilon_i^{(4)}$ , we obtain

$$\varepsilon_i^{(4)} = \sum_l a_l B_{i,l},$$

where all the unessential factors have been absorbed by re-defining the coefficients  $a_l$ . By using the same formalism of Eq. (121), this implies that we can read the SNAP model from the point of view of a multi-body framework as

$$E^{(4)} = \sum_i \varepsilon_i^{(4)} = \sum_l a_l \sum_i B_{i,l} = E^{\text{SNAP}}.$$

This approach to the SNAP model provides two advantages. The first one is that we can clearly see how the SNAP is tailored to target four-body contributions

to a potential energy surface. The second, and most important observation, arises from the expansion assumed in Eq. (131). In particular, if we neglect the role of the products of cut-off functions, the main hypothesis is that the terms  $\mathbf{b}_{i,l}$  are able to expand a scalar function that depends on the versors  $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{ji}$ . If we indicate with  $f(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{ji})$  such general function, this will admit an expansion over products of HSHs as

$$f(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{ji}) = \sum_l f_{lmm'} U_{m_1m'_1}^{l_1}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{j_1i}) U_{m_2m'_2}^{l_2}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{j_2i}) U_{m_3m'_3}^{l_3}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{j_3i}).$$

Thus, for an expansion in terms of  $\mathbf{b}_{i,l}$  to be generally valid, there must exist a unitary matrix that allows to write the scalar components of this expansion as a linear combination of the  $b_{i,l}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{ji})$ . By comparing the expansion in terms of HSH with the explicit expression for  $\mathbf{b}_{i,l}$  provided in Eq. (130), we further notice that the tensor  $H$  must be the required unitary matrix. However, as shown in Eq. (127), this tensor is not orthogonal with respect to a contraction of the indexes  $(lmm')$ , and thus is not unitary (in other words, they do not satisfy a property, which is analogous to Eq. (82)). This proof by contradiction shows that, while an expansion such as the one of Eq. (131) is surely possible, it is not general, and does not span the full rotationally-invariant sub-space.

On the one hand, obtaining generalized CG-coefficients covering the entirety of the invariant sub-space is beyond the scope of this work. On the other hand, the MultiSH formalism provides yet another proof that there are portions of the invariant space not explored by the SNAP's bispectrum components. In particular, we will now show how to explicitly connect the SNAP formalism with a MultiSH expansion.

## 2. SNAP in terms of MultiSHs

We will now apply the MultiSHs formalism to an investigation of the SNAP formalism. This section will show how choosing this basis greatly simplifies the investigations taken in the previous sections. Let us start again from the atomic density  $\rho_i(\hat{\mathbf{u}})$  of Eq. (122) and its expansion in terms of HSHs. The following treatment can be greatly simplified, if instead of using the parabolic-type HSHs,  $U_{mm'}^l$ , we use the so-called *spherical*-type HSHs,  $Y_{\lambda lm}(\hat{\mathbf{u}})$  from the work of Meremianin [53]. The two set of HSH, being two basis spanning the same space, are related by the unitary transformations

$$\begin{cases} U_{\mu\mu'}^\lambda(\hat{\mathbf{u}}) = \sum_{l=0}^{2\lambda} \sum_{m=-l}^l \sqrt{\frac{2l+1}{2\lambda+1}} C_{\lambda\mu l m}^{\lambda\mu'} Y_{\lambda l m}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}), \\ Y_{\lambda l m}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}) = \sqrt{\frac{2l+1}{2\lambda+1}} \sum_{\mu\nu=-\lambda}^{\lambda} C_{\lambda\mu l m}^{\lambda\mu'} U_{\mu\mu'}^\lambda(\hat{\mathbf{u}}), \end{cases} \quad (132)$$

and so, any result obtained for the spherical-type HSHs, can always be casted in terms of parabolic-type ones.

The advantage of adopting the spherical-type HSHs can be appreciated from their explicit definition

$$Y_{\lambda lm}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}) = (-i)^l \sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{2\lambda+1}} \chi_l^\lambda(2\theta_0) Y_l^m(\hat{\mathbf{r}}).$$

Here,  $\chi_l^\lambda$  are the generalised characters of the  $O(3)$  rotation group, see [47, 53], and  $Y_l^m(\hat{\mathbf{r}})$  are the standard spherical harmonics. We remark that, even if this definition neglects the normalization of the basis, we will not consider the unessential normalization constants. If we now compare this expression with the standard basis,  $R_{nl}(r)Y_{ml}(\hat{\mathbf{r}})$ , used throughout this work, we can immediately recognize that this construction can be read in terms of the choice of a specific radial basis. More specifically,

$$R_{nl}(r) \xrightarrow[r \leftrightarrow \theta_0]{n \leftrightarrow \lambda} (-i)^l \sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{2\lambda+1}} \chi_l^\lambda(2\theta_0),$$

where this identification has been induced by the Riemann map (note that we will not investigate the consequences of having a complex radial function, but all the derivations and the properties of this paper should be modified accordingly). With this identification we can now apply all the tools and results derived for the general MultiSH formalism, in particular, the considerations about the rotationally invariant terms.

For example, from Eqs. (102) and (103), we can immediately write the standard, 3-dimensional, bispectrum components as

$$B_{i, \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \lambda_3} \propto \sum_{m_1 m_2 m_3} u_{i, \lambda_3 l_3 m_3}^* C_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}^{l_3 m_3} u_{i, \lambda_1 l_1 m_1} u_{i, \lambda_2 l_2 m_2}, \quad (133)$$

where

$$u_{i, \lambda l m} \propto \int d\hat{\mathbf{u}} \rho_i(\hat{\mathbf{u}}) Y_{\lambda l m}^*(\hat{\mathbf{u}}).$$

Moreover, by writing these bispectrum components in terms of the parabolic HSH and by using Eq. (132), we write

$$B_{i, \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \lambda_3} \propto \sum_{\mu_3 \mu_3'} c_{i, \lambda_3 \mu_3 \mu_3'}^* \sum_{\substack{\mu_1 \mu_1' \\ \mu_2 \mu_2'}} C_{\lambda l \mu \mu'} c_{i, \lambda_1 \mu_1 \mu_1'} c_{i, \lambda_2 \mu_2 \mu_2'},$$

where the expansion coefficients,  $c_{i, \lambda \mu \mu'}$ , are given by Eq. (125), and where the coupling tensor is given by

$$C_{\lambda l \mu \mu'} := C_{\lambda_3 \mu_3 \mu_3'}^{\lambda_3 \mu_3'} C_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}^{l_3 m_3} C_{\lambda_1 \mu_1 l_1 m_1}^{\lambda_3 \mu_3'} C_{\lambda_2 \mu_2 l_2 m_2}^{\lambda_2 \mu_2'}.$$

We can finally compare this result with the 4-dimensional bispectrum components of Eq. (126) and with the corresponding coupling tensor,  $H$ , of Eq. (127). From this comparison we can draw two conclusions. The first one confirms the findings of the last paragraph: indeed, the bispectrum components obtained here are invariant under any rotation of the 3-dimensional space.

However, such rotations can always be represented as particular rotations in the 4-dimensional space. Since the tensor  $C_{\lambda l \mu \mu'}$  cannot be generally obtained by means of a contraction of the tensor  $H$  of Eq. 127, the components obtained here cannot be derived from the ones of the 4-dimensional bispectrum of Eq. (126). This provides another proof of the fact that the SNAP formulation does not include all the possible scalars, since it is already lacks those related with standard 3-dimensional rotations. The second conclusion is that the compactness of the SNAP model is obtained by enforcing a non-physical invariance under rotation of the entire 4-dimensional space. Indeed, the three-dimensional bispectrum components obtained here, still necessitates of six indexes in the expansion, since they enforce rotational invariance with respect to standard 3-dimensional rotations. In contrast, the 4-dimensional bispectrum components are defined only in terms of three indexes, because of the additional invariance constraint under rotations around the unphysical 4-dimensional axis. While it is true that the presence of the cut-off functions in Eq. (129) breaks this symmetry, it also implies that the cut-off functions provide enough descriptive power to express the dependence of the potentials  $v_i^{(4)}$  on the atomic distances. This strong requirement is, generally, not satisfied.

### C. Connection with internal-coordinates representations

In the last section we have derived the SNAP formalism and, with the aid of the general MultiSH expansion, we have also been able to investigate its shortcomings (the presence of uncovered portions of the rotationally-invariant space) and its advantages (such as the compactness of the representation). In this section we are going to investigate the connection between a MultiSHs representation and one written in terms of internal coordinates. Since this will be performed for the prediction of scalar quantities only, and in a multi-body expansion framework, we will exploit the construction presented in Section V A. In particular, we will firstly derive a connection between the MTP formalism [11], and then we will conclude by discussing the JLP formalism [40].

The assumptions for both MTP and JLP are the same as those introduced in Section V A. However, there is a difference in the quantities expanded. In the MultiSHs expansion, we first expand over a general basis and then we project onto the scalar sub-space. When using internal coordinates, instead, we first select rotationally-invariant degrees of freedom, and then we perform the expansion. Given that any invariant constructed from the set of versors  $\{\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{ji}\}$  can be written in terms of linear combinations of powers of the scalar products,  $\{(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{ji} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{ki})\}$ , only [see reference [55] for a treatment on the fundamental theorem of invariant theory], then, from Eq. (115) we

can write

$$\varepsilon_i^{(\nu+1)} = \sum_j v_i^{(\nu+1)}(\mathbf{x}_{ji}) = \sum_j v_i^{(\nu+1)}(x_{ji}, s_{ji}). \quad (134)$$

Here, the  $s_{ji}$ 's describe the set of all scalar products that can be constructed from the atomic versors  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{ji}$ , namely

$$s_{ji} := ((\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{j_1 i} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{j_2 i}), (\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{j_1 i} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{j_3 i}), \dots, (\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{j_{\nu-1} i} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{j_\nu i})).$$

As clear by the fact that we can construct  $\nu(\nu+1)/2$  unique scalar products out of  $\nu$  versors, considering all these scalar products produces a strongly redundant description already for relatively small  $\nu$ . For this reason, employing a representation in terms of scalar products is unfeasible already for  $\nu \geq 6$ . However, for smaller values, such representation is a valid alternative to the MultiSHs one. Moreover, since the two descriptions span the same space, there must exist a unitary matrix connecting the two. In other words, the following methods are, fundamentally, a change of basis from the MultiSHs framework.

### 1. The Moments Tensor Potential

In the MTP formalism, the expansion of  $v_i^{(\nu+1)}$  is performed in terms of a polynomial expansion over the scalar products. Thus, essentially, this formalism is obtained by adopting the expansion

$$v_i^{(\nu+1)}(x_{ji}, s_{ji}) = \sum_{\mathbf{n}\alpha} a_{\mathbf{n}\alpha} \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{n}}(x_{ji}) \mathcal{M}_{\alpha}(s_{ji}),$$

where we introduce the polynomial basis

$$\mathcal{M}_{\alpha}(s_{ji}) := (\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{j_1 i} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{j_2 i})^{\alpha_{12}} (\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{j_1 i} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{j_3 i})^{\alpha_{13}} \\ \times \dots \times (\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{j_{\nu-1} i} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{j_\nu i})^{\alpha_{\nu-1, \nu}},$$

and where  $\alpha$  is the matrix containing the exponents of the polynomial expansion (note that the sum on  $\alpha$  runs over all the possible exponents of the expansion). It is worth to stress that in this context the radial and the angular part are disentangled. Following the same steps of Section V A, we can also cast the MTP into the simple form of Eq. (121) as

$$E_{\text{short}}^{\text{MTP}} = \sum_{\nu=0} E^{(\nu+1)}, \quad (135)$$

$$\text{with } E^{(\nu+1)} = \sum_{\mathbf{n}\alpha} a_{\nu, \mathbf{n}\alpha} \sum_i \sum_j \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{n}}(x_{ji}) \mathcal{M}_{\alpha}(s_{ji}).$$

We conclude this section by remarking again that, since the MultiSHs framework spans the entirety of the rotationally invariant space, then there must exist a connection between the MTP and a MultiSH-based one. In other words, it is possible to write

$$\mathcal{M}_{\alpha}(s_{ji}) = \sum_{\mathbf{L}} U_{\mathbf{L}}^{\alpha} \mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{L}}^{00}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{ji}), \quad (136)$$

with

$$U_{\mathbf{L}}^{\alpha} = \int d\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{ji} \mathcal{M}_{\alpha}(s_{ji}) \mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{L}}^{00*}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{ji}). \quad (137)$$

Note that, not only we know that the scalar space ( $\lambda = \mu = 0$ ) is enough to represent  $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha}$ , as expected when describing a scalar quantity, but also that the sum  $\Sigma(\mathbf{l})$  must be even (see Eq. (88)), since all the scalar products are invariant under inversion [See Section II D 5]. Indeed, an explicit evaluation of the integral above reveals that it is zero, whenever the sum  $\Sigma(\mathbf{l})$  is odd.

### 2. Jacobi-Legendre Potential

Our JLP [40] follows the same overall approach of the MTP, but with a larger emphasis on the choice of the radial basis, and with an expansion in terms of the Legendre polynomials,  $P_{\gamma}$  [see Ref. [56]], in place of the powers of scalar products (we use the unusual index  $\gamma$  to differentiate with the approach in terms of MultiSHs). Indeed, it is known that any power of scalar products, can be written as a linear combination of Legendre polynomials as

$$(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{j_1 i} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{k i})^{\alpha} = \sum_{l=\alpha, \alpha-2, \dots} d_{\alpha\gamma} P_{\gamma}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{j_1 i} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{k i}), \quad (138)$$

with the specific form of  $d_{\alpha\gamma}$  given in Reference [56]. This means that the expansion proposed for the MTP, can yet again be re-casted as

$$v_i^{(\nu+1)}(x_{ji}, s_{ji}) = \sum_{\mathbf{n}\gamma} a_{\mathbf{n}\gamma} \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{n}}(x_{ji}) \mathcal{P}_{\gamma}(s_{ji}), \quad (139)$$

where

$$\mathcal{P}_{\gamma}(s_{ji}) := P_{\gamma_{12}}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{j_1 i} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{j_2 i}) P_{\gamma_{13}}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{j_1 i} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{j_3 i}) \\ \times \dots \times P_{\gamma_{\nu-1, \nu}}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{j_{\nu-1} i} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{j_\nu i}).$$

Similarly the case of the matrix  $\alpha$ , the matrix  $\gamma$  is the collection of all the indexes of the Legendre polynomials.

As previously mentioned, a great focus of the JLP lies in the optimization of the radial basis. We will briefly investigate the property of this construction, since it is independent from the angular part of the expansion and, thus, can be used also in any other formalism of choice, including the MultiSHs framework.

As the name of the potential suggests, in the JLP the radial dependence is obtained by expanding over Jacobi polynomials,  $P^{(\alpha, \beta)}$  (note that the  $\alpha$  used here is different from the one used in relation to the MTP). In particular, for each fixed choice of  $\alpha, \beta > -1$ , the Jacobi polynomials form a complete and orthogonal set in the interval  $[-1, 1]$ , with respect to the weight function  $w^{\alpha\beta}(x) = (1-x)^{\alpha}(1+x)^{\beta}$ . This allows one to explicitly optimize the radial basis, by optimizing  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , without assuming any specific fixed form. The cosine map,

defined as

$$\sigma_{ji} = \sigma(r_{ji}; r_{\text{cut}}) := \cos\left(\pi \frac{r_{ji}}{r_{\text{cut}}}\right),$$

allows us to map each length  $r_{ji}$  onto the interval  $[-1, 1]$ , so that the expansion over the Jacobi polynomials can take place. An interesting property of this expansion is that, since the Legendre polynomials are obtained from the Jacobi polynomials by setting  $\alpha = \beta = 0$ , it retains a degree of homogeneity in the basis used. We can also draw similarities with the SNAP potential, where the radial dependence is mapped onto a 4-dimensional hyper-axis [see Section VB]. Indeed, we can see how using this map is almost identical to the  $\cos(\theta_0)$  term of the Riemann map of Eq. (123), but for a different scaling factor. Namely, we could interpret this approach as a projection on an hyper-axis. With this construction in place, we have that Eq. (139) becomes

$$v_i^{(\nu+1)}(x_{ji}, s_{ji}) = \sum_{n\gamma} a_{n\gamma} \mathcal{P}_{n\mathbf{j}i}^{(\alpha,\beta)} \mathcal{P}_\gamma(s_{ji}), \quad (140)$$

where we have used the short-hand notation

$$\mathcal{P}_{n\mathbf{j}i}^{(\alpha,\beta)} := P_{n_1}^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\sigma_{j_1 i}) \times \cdots \times P_{n_\nu}^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\sigma_{j_\nu i}), \quad (141)$$

for the product of  $\nu$  Jacobi polynomials.

Another result of the JLP is the development of a straightforward constraining procedure for the  $v_i^{(\nu+1)}$  terms, which impacts the properties of the basis and of the potentials itself. For example, contrary to most of the other methods that manually include a cut-off radius in the definition of the basis, the JLP is obtained by constraining directly the expansion coefficients  $a_{n\gamma}$ . A specific derivation of this constraining procedure is beyond the scope of this work. Nevertheless, it is worth to note that this treatment has the two advantages. Firstly, it does not assume any specific form of the cut-off function, and secondly it has of a strict separation of the expression of the  $v_i^{(\nu+1)}$ , for different  $\nu$ . However, this last observation also implies that significant care must be taken, when considering unrestricted sums over all the possible atomic labels  $\mathbf{j}$  since, in this case, self-interacting terms are not easily re-absorbed by the expansions at lower  $\nu$ . For a detailed treatment of the linearization procedure with this added constraints, we refer to the original work [40].

Now that the full basis has been defined, and following again the procedure outlined in Section VA, the JLP model takes the compact form

$$E_{\text{short}}^{\text{JLP}} = \sum_{\nu=0} E^{(\nu+1)}, \quad (142)$$

$$\text{with } E^{(\nu+1)} = \sum_{n\gamma} a_{\nu,n\gamma} \sum_i \sum_j \mathcal{P}_{n\mathbf{j}i}^{(\alpha,\beta)} \mathcal{P}_\gamma(s_{ji}).$$

We conclude this final sub-section by mentioning that the connection between the JLP formalism and the MultiSHs is even more pronounced, because of the addition

theorem for spherical harmonics [47]

$$\begin{aligned} P_\gamma(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2) &= \frac{4\pi}{2\gamma+1} \sum_{\mu=-\gamma}^{\gamma} (-1)^\mu Y_\gamma^\mu(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1) Y_\gamma^{-\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2) \\ &= (-1)^\gamma \frac{4\pi}{\sqrt{2\gamma+1}} \mathcal{Y}_{\gamma\gamma}^{00}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2). \end{aligned} \quad (143)$$

This expression shows the connection between the Legendre polynomials and the BipoSHs. By the same arguments presented in the MTP model, it is possible to express the Jacobi-Legendre basis in terms of the MultiSHs one by evaluating

$$\mathcal{P}_\gamma(s_{ji}) = \sum_{\mathbf{l}} V_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{l}}^\gamma \mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{l}}^{00}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{ji}), \quad (144)$$

where

$$V_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{l}}^\alpha = \int d\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{ji} \mathcal{P}_\gamma(s_{ji}) \mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{l}}^{00*}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{ji}). \quad (145)$$

From Eq. (143) we can deduce that the integral above can be casted as products of MultiSHs only, making its evaluation straightforward (although tedious). Moreover, since Eq. (138) determines the tensor connecting the JLP representation with the MTP one, we are also able to determine the tensor  $U_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{l}}^\alpha$  of Eq. (136), connecting the MTP with the MultiSHs formalism, by means of  $V_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{l}}^\alpha$ . This allows to obtain analytical expressions that bridge the gap between a representation in terms of MultiSHs, and the analogous one in terms of internal coordinates.

## VI. LINEAR MODELS FOR COVARIANT QUANTITIES

In the previous section we have discussed how to derive linear models for scalar quantities by means of multi-body expansion, with a focus on models for the short-ranged contribution to the energy,  $E_{\text{short}}$ . In doing so, we have constrained the expansion to admit only scalar coefficients. In this section we will investigate the consequences of abandoning such constraints. In other words, we will derive the general expression for linear models that target the harmonic components of a tensor  $\mathbf{T}$ . The assumption underlying this section will be, again, the short-ranged nature of the terms involved in this representation, the partitioning of the tensor in atomic contributions,  $\mathbf{T}_i$ , and the further partition on multi-body order terms  $\tau_i^{(\nu+1)}$ . Explicitly, we will assume that the harmonic components of the tensor  $\mathbf{T}$  can be written as

$$T_{\lambda\mu} = \sum_i^{\text{atoms}} T_{i,\lambda\mu} = \sum_i \sum_{\nu=0} \tau_{i,\lambda\mu}^{(\nu+1)}, \quad (146)$$

where  $\tau_{i,\lambda\mu}^{(\nu+1)}$  represents the local  $(\nu+1)$ -body term. Since the procedure is the same of the one of Section VA, we

can obtain an expression for these terms from Eq. (119). Indeed, the expansion in terms of MultiSHs is given by

$$\tau_{i,\lambda\mu}^{(\nu+1)} = \sum_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}} a_{\nu,\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}}^{\lambda} u_{i,\nu,\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}}^{\lambda\mu*}. \quad (147)$$

We can now make two observations. Firstly, similarly to the  $\lambda = \mu = 0$  constraint of the scalar case, here we consider only the  $(\lambda\mu)$  components of the MultiSHs expansion, since they are the ones that follow the required rotational properties. Moreover, because the correct rotational properties are already fully encoded into  $u_{i,\nu,\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}}^{\lambda\mu*}$ , then the coefficients  $a_{\nu,\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}}^{\lambda\mu}$  cannot participate in the mixing of the magnetic number  $\mu$ . Explicitly, this implies that these coefficients cannot depend on  $\mu$ , namely  $a_{\nu,\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}}^{\lambda\mu} = a_{\nu,\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}}^{\lambda}$ .

Finally, by defining  $\mathbf{T}^{(\nu+1)} := \sum_i \tau_i^{(\nu+1)}$ , we obtain the following general form of a linear model that targets the covariant components of the tensor  $\mathbf{T}$

$$T_{\lambda\mu} = \sum_{\nu=0} T_{\lambda\mu}^{(\nu+1)}, \quad (148)$$

with  $T_{\lambda\mu}^{(\nu+1)} = \sum_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}} a_{\nu,\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}}^{\lambda} \sum_i u_{i,\nu,\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}}^{\lambda\mu*}$ .

This model encompasses the same basis used in reference [46] for the NICE model. Indeed, an example is provided by using the explicit definition of the expansion coefficients  $u_{i,\nu,\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}}^{\lambda\mu*}$  of Eq. (113), and the  $\Gamma(\tau_1)$  tensor from Eq. (71). In this case ( $\nu = 2$ ), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i u_{i,2,n_1n_2l_1l_2}^{\lambda\mu*} &= \sum_i \sum_{j_1j_2} R_{n_1l_1}(r_{j_1i}) R_{n_2l_2}(r_{j_2i}) \\ &\times \sum_{m_1m_2} C_{l_1m_1l_2m_2}^{\lambda\mu} Y_{l_1}^{m_1}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{j_1i}) Y_{l_2}^{m_2}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{j_2i}). \end{aligned} \quad (149)$$

This is indeed the same contraction of the NICE basis for the  $|\rho^{\otimes 2}\rangle$  case (while the radial part is generally represented from the point of view of an expansion of Gaussians), with the covariant behaviour fully expressed by the contraction with the CG coefficient. Importantly, this model can be seen as a generalization of the scalar one of Eq. (121), since the former reduces to the latter when  $\lambda = \mu = 0$ .

We conclude this investigation by mentioning that we can impose further constraints on the general linear model introduced above by investigating the nature of the target tensor,  $\mathbf{T}$ . Indeed, following the discussion on the parity of the coefficients  $u_{\nu,\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}}^{\lambda\mu}$ , see Eq. (90), we have that, when the sum  $\Sigma(\mathbf{l}) + \lambda$  is even, the coefficients behave as the components of a tensor. Conversely, when  $\Sigma(\mathbf{l}) + \lambda$  is odd, the coefficients behave as the components of pseudo-tensors. Thus, whenever  $\mathbf{T}$  is a tensor or a pseudo-tensor, we can constraint the sum over  $\mathbf{l}$  to values for which  $\Sigma(\mathbf{l}) + \lambda$  is even or odd, respectively.

## 1. Symmetries reduction

In this conclusive section, we will investigate the consequences following the choice of different coupling schemes for the linear model of Eq. (148). Being the scalar model a particular case a tensorial one, it should be noted that what follows holds also for all the models examined in Sections (VA) and (VB). Here we will obtain results similar to the lexicographic ordering obtained in reference [38, 43], but generalized to the tensorial case. Moreover, the construction presented here will partially address the removal of the redundancies in linear models, investigated previously for the scalar [57] and tensorial [46] case.

Here, consistently with the message of this entire work, we will investigate the property of the basis only, with no reference to the explicit form of the function  $\rho^{\otimes\nu}(\mathbf{x})$  except for the fact that it is symmetric. Moreover, the results obtained in this section will show that a similar ordering is not valid only for scalar models, but can be adopted also when targeting tensors.

We have already discussed how MultiSHs can be constructed by means of different coupling schemes (or trees), and that each coupling scheme produces a valid MultiSHs basis. Therefore there must always exist a change of basis between coupling schemes. Let us consider a fixed coupling scheme,  $\tau_0$ . With this coupling, the density  $\rho^{\otimes\nu}$  is expanded as

$$\rho^{\otimes\nu}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\lambda\mu} \sum_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}} u_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l},\tau_0}^{\lambda\mu} \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}}(x) \mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{l},\tau_0}^{\lambda\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}). \quad (150)$$

Now, we assume that the density  $\rho^{\otimes\nu}$  is a symmetric function, which means that it is invariant under a permutation of its arguments. If we indicate with  $\hat{\sigma}$  a general permutation, then we have  $\rho^{\otimes\nu}(\hat{\sigma}\mathbf{x}) = \rho^{\otimes\nu}(\mathbf{x})$ . By expanding the function with permuted arguments, we write

$$\rho^{\otimes\nu}(\hat{\sigma}\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\lambda\mu} \sum_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}} u_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l},\tau_0}^{\lambda\mu} \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}}(\hat{\sigma}x) \mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{l},\tau_0}^{\lambda\mu}(\hat{\sigma}\hat{\mathbf{x}}). \quad (151)$$

Since the function  $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}}$  is a simple product of radial functions, the permutation can be passed over the indexes. Indeed, for example, if  $\hat{\sigma}$  swaps the first two arguments, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}}(\hat{\sigma}x) &= \mathcal{R}_{n_1n_2\dots n_\nu}(r_2, r_1, r_3, \dots, r_\nu) = \\ &= \mathcal{R}_{n_2n_1\dots n_\nu}(r_1, r_2, r_3, \dots, r_\nu) = \mathcal{R}_{\hat{\sigma}\mathbf{n},\hat{\sigma}\mathbf{l}}(x), \end{aligned}$$

where, in the last equality we have used the definition of Eq. (57) to swap the indexes.

The situation is different for the MultiSHs, since they are not obtained by mean of simple products. However, we can observe that permuting the arguments of a MultiSH is equivalent to *simultaneously* adopting a different coupling scheme and permuting the indexes of the  $l$  channels. This can be seen graphically. For example, if  $\hat{\sigma}$

swaps the first and third arguments, we have

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\begin{array}{c} \lambda\mu \\ \overline{L_2} \\ \overline{L_1} \quad l_3 \\ l_1 \quad l_2 \quad l_4 \\ \hat{\mathbf{r}}_1 \quad \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2 \quad \hat{\mathbf{r}}_3 \quad \hat{\mathbf{r}}_4 \end{array} & \xrightarrow{\hat{\sigma}_{13}} & \begin{array}{c} \lambda\mu \\ \overline{L_2} \\ \overline{L_1} \quad l_3 \\ l_1 \quad l_2 \quad l_4 \\ \hat{\mathbf{r}}_3 \quad \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2 \quad \hat{\mathbf{r}}_1 \quad \hat{\mathbf{r}}_4 \end{array} \\
= (-1)^{l_1+l_2+l_3-L_2} & & \begin{array}{c} \lambda\mu \\ \overline{L_2} \\ \overline{L_1} \quad l_3 \\ l_3 \quad l_2 \quad l_1 \\ \hat{\mathbf{r}}_1 \quad \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2 \quad \hat{\mathbf{r}}_3 \quad \hat{\mathbf{r}}_4 \end{array}
\end{array}$$

where, for graphical reasons, we consider the  $\nu = 4$  case and where we have adopted the same coupling scheme of Eq. (79). The prefactor is induced by the change of order of the labels in the graph and is caused by the fact that the CG coefficients are not symmetric, as we already observed in Section (II B). Importantly, we observe that the order of the versors  $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_4$ , has been restored to the one before the permutation. Since a similar construction can be done for any order and coupling scheme, then we have that a general permutation  $\hat{\sigma}$  always induces a change of coupling scheme and of label ordering, namely

$$\mathcal{Y}_{\hat{\mathbf{l}}\mathbf{L},\tau_0}^{\lambda\mu}(\hat{\sigma}\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = d_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}\mathcal{Y}_{\hat{\sigma}\hat{\mathbf{l}},\mathbf{L},\tau(\hat{\sigma})}^{\lambda\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}),$$

where the prefactor  $d_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}}$  takes the value  $+1$  or  $-1$ , and where  $\tau(\hat{\sigma})$  is the new coupling tree induced by the permutation  $\hat{\sigma}$ .

As we have already observed, two coupling schemes,  $\tau_1$  and  $\tau_2$  are always related to each other by a unitary matrix. We indicate with  $W(\tau_1, \tau_2)$  the matrix transforming from the coupling  $\tau_1$  to  $\tau_2$ . From this discussion, we deduce that there must exist a matrix  $W(\tau(\hat{\sigma}), \tau_0)$ , connecting the coupling scheme induced by the permutation  $\hat{\sigma}$ , here denoted with  $\tau(\hat{\sigma})$ , with the initial coupling scheme  $\tau_0$ . Therefore, we must have

$$\mathcal{Y}_{\hat{\sigma}\hat{\mathbf{l}},\mathbf{L},\tau(\hat{\sigma})}^{\lambda\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = \sum_{\mathbf{L}'} (W(\tau(\hat{\sigma}), \tau_0))_{\hat{\sigma}\hat{\mathbf{l}},\mathbf{L}\mathbf{L}'}^{\lambda\mu} \mathcal{Y}_{\hat{\sigma}\hat{\mathbf{l}},\mathbf{L}',\tau_0}^{\lambda\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}).$$

We will not investigate the explicit expression of this general matrix, since it is irrelevant to our discussion. Instead we to refer to [47] for the analytical form of the matrices that realize the connection between different coupling schemes. We just mention here that such matrices are proportional to  $3nj$ -Wigner symbols.

If we now insert these results back into  $\rho^{\otimes\nu}(\hat{\sigma}\mathbf{x})$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho^{\otimes\nu}(\hat{\sigma}\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{\lambda\mu} \sum_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{L}'} \left[ \sum_{\mathbf{L}} d_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}} W(\tau(\hat{\sigma}), \tau_0)_{\hat{\sigma}\hat{\mathbf{l}},\mathbf{L}\mathbf{L}'}^{\lambda\mu} u_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{L},\tau_0}^{\lambda\mu} \right] \\
&\quad \times \mathcal{R}_{\hat{\sigma}\mathbf{n},\hat{\sigma}\mathbf{l}}(x) \mathcal{Y}_{\hat{\sigma}\hat{\mathbf{l}},\mathbf{L}',\tau_0}^{\lambda\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}).
\end{aligned}$$

However, since  $\rho^{\otimes\nu}$  is symmetric, then this expression is equivalent to the standard expansion of  $\rho^{\otimes\nu}$ . Therefore,

it must hold that

$$u_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L},\tau_0}^{\lambda\mu} = \sum_{\mathbf{L}'} d_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}'} W(\tau(\hat{\sigma}), \tau_0)_{\mathbf{l},\mathbf{L}'\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu} u_{\hat{\sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{n},\hat{\sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{l},\mathbf{L}',\tau_0}^{\lambda\mu},$$

or, equivalently

$$u_{\hat{\sigma}\mathbf{n},\hat{\sigma}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L},\tau_0}^{\lambda\mu} = \sum_{\mathbf{L}'} d_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}'} W(\tau(\hat{\sigma}^{-1}), \tau_0)_{\mathbf{l},\mathbf{L}'\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu} u_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{L}',\tau_0}^{\lambda\mu}. \quad (152)$$

We have already seen examples of these relations in Eqs. (34) and (48), for the BipoSHs and TripoSHs, respectively.

Crucially, Eq. (152) shows that the coefficients obtained by applying a simultaneous permutation to the set of indexes  $\mathbf{n}$  and  $\mathbf{l}$  can be always written as a linear combination of the coefficients with un-permuted indexes. Moreover, the linear combination is realised by a summation over the intermediate channels,  $\mathbf{L}$ , only. In other words, the expansion coefficients obtained by permuting the indexes of known coefficients, do not carry any additional information. This observation has important consequences for the linear models of the form of Eq. (148). Indeed, given the linear relation of Eq. (152), the full information carried from the expansion coefficients is encoded in terms satisfying a lexicographic order of the indexes  $(n_\alpha, l_\alpha)$ . Thus, the linear model for tensors becomes

$$T_{\lambda\mu} = \sum_{\nu=0} T_{\lambda\mu}^{(\nu+1)}, \quad (153)$$

$$\text{with } T_{\lambda\mu}^{(\nu+1)} = \sum_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{l}}^{\text{ordered}} \sum_{\mathbf{L}} a_{\mathbf{l},\mathbf{n}\mathbf{L}}^\lambda \sum_i u_{i,\nu,\mathbf{n}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu*},$$

where the first sum runs over the lexicographically ordered pairs  $(n_1 l_1) \geq (n_2 l_2) \geq \dots \geq (n_\nu l_\nu)$ .

The derivation proposed here leads us to a few observations. Firstly, we note again that this results is an extension of the one introduced in reference [43] for the case of scalar functions, but adapted to encompass also the case of linear-covariant models. The difference between this approach and the one used in previous works is that here we never use the explicit form of the expansion coefficients  $u_{i,\nu,\mathbf{n}\mathbf{L}}^{\lambda\mu*}$ . Instead, our derivation is based on the property of the radial and MultiSHs basis only. With this in mind, we are able to appreciate that the only necessary requirement is the symmetry of the function  $\rho^{\otimes\nu}$ . Moreover, the results of this section aim to remove unnecessary redundancies in the expansion, in the same spirits of the observation done for the NICE framework [46], and in reference [57].

However, this general construction shows that it is not possible to have a general recipe to remove the redundancies over intermediate channels,  $\mathbf{L}$ , as clear from the summation of Eq. (152). In fact, the explicit form of such redundancies depends on the chosen coupling scheme. Luckily, from this derivation, we deduce that if  $\rho^{\otimes\nu}$  is not symmetric, namely it is not obtained by taking products of the same function  $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ , but instead it is derived from

products of  $\nu$  different atomic densities, then the permutational symmetry will be broken. This can be achieved by considering different radial functions only. Indeed, in Section IV we have already proved that for a  $\nu$ -points density, obtained from the product of densities of the form of Eq. (3), taking different localization functions affects only the radial basis and not the MultiSHs one. Since in such representation each pair of indexes  $(n_\alpha, l_\alpha)$  carries information, not only we naturally suppress the redundancies, but one could also argue that more information is incorporated in the fingerprints. We will refer to a study of such breaking of the symmetries in future works.

## VII. CONCLUSIONS

In this work we have carried out an in-depth investigation and analysis of the most successful and well-know ML descriptors from the vantage point provided by choosing the MultiSHs as a multi-points angular basis.

Typically, one approaches the investigation of the descriptors from the explicit construction of the expansion coefficients with respect to a radial basis and spherical harmonics. This leads to a bottom-up approach in deriving and enforcing the required transformation behavior under rotation or inversion of the atoms in the system. Instead, by following a top-down strategy that takes into account only the notion of the multi-point basis provided by the MultiSHs, here we have deduced all the required properties directly from the basis, with almost no notion of the nature of the expansion coefficients. In doing so, we have proved that one can deduce all the properties of interest by enforcing only two conditions, namely the orthogonality of the basis and its fixed behaviour under rotations. From these properties, and with no underlying assumption on the explicit form of the expansion coefficients, we have been able to obtain their behavior under rotation, under conjugation and under inversion. Regarding the inversion, we have obtained a full characterization of their behaviour as proper or pseudo objects.

As a main result, we have disentangled the nature of the coefficients from their transformation under these operations. On the one hand, this extends all the techniques and tools tailored on the atomic density to any other scalar function of choice, allowing for a straightforward applications to cases in which the underlying function is not necessarily the standard atomic density (for example, further applications could include our spin-powerspectrum [18]). On the other hand, we have shown how a basis-centric approach leads to a major simplification of the analytical calculations, such as for the case of the  $\lambda$ -SOAP kernel. Indeed, we have also shown that a compact and general inner product form of this kernel could be achieved by using only the orthogonality and the rotational behaviour of the MultiSHs, in no more than a few lines of elementary algebraic manipulations.

As a further example of a formulation constructed

around the MultiSHs, we have shown how the very definition of powerspectrum and bispectrum could be obtained directly from the MultiSHs formalism, with a built-in proof of their rotational invariance. In this derivation, we have pointed out that these properties (and their own definition) are linked only to the separability of the expanded function in products of single-center functions. This effectively unveils the real underlying hypothesis behind the definition of such descriptors.

With the full framework in place and thoroughly investigated, we have then been able to derive the entire ACE formalism (up to any body order), by imposing a Dirac-delta form of the atomic density. Remarkably, this is the only instance throughout this work, where we have investigated a specific form of the expansion coefficients, despite having already derived all their transformation rules. As another example of the vantage point provided by the MultiSHs, we have pointed out the shortcomings of the SNAP (with its inability to explore the entire rotationally invariant space), while investigating the advantages provided by its compactness. This has led us to explore the straightforward extension of the MultiSHs formalism to a linear model for (covariant) tensorial quantities.

Finally, we have concluded our investigations by analyzing the redundancies arising from descriptors based on symmetric functions. In particular, by exploiting the connection between different MultiSHs provided by the theory of re-coupling of angular momenta, we have provided a clear representation of these redundancies not only for the scalar case, but also for the descriptors of covariant quantities. Importantly, since we have identified the origin of these redundancies as associated to the symmetry of the expanded function, we have obtained another confirmation that a representation in terms of MultiSHs can be greatly informative. Furthermore, we have proved that the use of different atomic densities (obtained by employing different radial bases) can wash out these redundancies.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work has been supported by Science Foundation Ireland through the Advanced Materials and BioEngineering Research (AMBER) (Grant: 12/RC/2278\_P2).

## Appendix A: From spherical harmonics to BipoSHs

In this Appendix we will show how the property of Eq. (28) leads to the change of representation from products of spherical harmonics to BipoSHs. If we assume that the two-points function  $f(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2)$  can be expanded in terms of spherical harmonics, then it will hold that

$$f(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2) = \sum_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2} f_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2} Y_{l_1}^{m_1}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1) Y_{l_2}^{m_2}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2), \quad (\text{A1})$$

for some coefficients  $f_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}$ . If we now employ Eq. (28) for the orthogonality of two CG-coefficients, then we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
f(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2) &= \\
&= \sum_{\substack{l_1 m_1 m'_1 \\ l_2 m_2 m'_2}} f_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2} \delta_{m_1 m'_1} \delta_{m_2 m'_2} Y_{l_1}^{m'_1}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1) Y_{l_2}^{m'_2}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2) = \\
&= \sum_{l_1 l_2} \sum_{\lambda \mu} \left( \sum_{m_1 m_2} C_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}^{\lambda \mu} f_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2} \right) \\
&\quad \times \left( \sum_{m'_1 m'_2} C_{l_1 m'_1 l_2 m'_2}^{\lambda \mu} Y_{l_1}^{m'_1}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1) Y_{l_2}^{m'_2}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2) \right) = \\
&= \sum_{l_1 l_2} \sum_{\lambda \mu} u_{l_1 l_2}^{\lambda \mu} \mathcal{Y}_{l_1 l_2}^{\lambda \mu}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_2),
\end{aligned}$$

In the last step we have introduced the BipoSHs, which allows us to identify the expansion coefficients  $u_{l_1 l_2}^{\lambda \mu}$  as

$$u_{l_1 m_2 l_2 m_2}^{\lambda \mu} = \sum_{m_1 m_2} C_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}^{\lambda \mu} f_{l_1 m_1 l_2 m_2}. \quad (\text{A2})$$

This has the same structure of the BipoSHs themselves. Indeed, this derivation is a particular example of what stated in the more general Eq. (85), the relation between the expansion in terms of spherical harmonics and the one in terms of MultiSHs. Moreover we have shown that the completeness of the CG coefficients of Eq. (28) (generalized in Eq. (82) for the  $\Gamma$  tensors and failed by the  $H$  tensors of Eq. (127)) is crucial for performing the change of basis.

### Appendix B: $\lambda$ -SOAP Kernel for the group $O(3)$

In this Appendix, we will outline the derivation of a flavour of the  $\lambda$ -SOAP kernel suited to describe scalar and tensors, hence excluding objects behaving as pseudo-scalars and pseudo-tensors. The procedure is essentially the same of the one shown in Section IID 3, but with an extension of the Haar integration to any element of the  $O(3)$  group, namely by including also parity transformations. This is achieved by defining the kernel as

$$\begin{aligned}
(K^{(\nu)}(\rho, \rho'))_{\mu_1 \mu_2}^{\lambda} &:= \int d\mathbf{x} \rho^{\otimes \nu}(\mathbf{x}) \int d\hat{R} D_{\mu_1 \mu_2}^{\lambda}(\hat{R}) \\
&\quad \times \hat{R} \left[ (\rho')^{\otimes \nu}(\mathbf{x}) + (-1)^{\lambda} \hat{P}(\rho')^{\otimes \nu}(\mathbf{x}) \right],
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{B1})$$

where  $\hat{P}$  represents a parity transformation, as defined in Section IID 5. The exponent  $(-1)^{\lambda}$  include the representation of an inversion for the space of angular momentum  $\lambda$ . Explicitly, the first addend in the square brackets is rotated and then integrated against the appropriate representation of the same rotation, provided by the Wigner

$D$ -matrix. In the same way, the second addend is transformed under the action of  $\hat{R}\hat{P}$ , namely a roto-inversion. In this way, the full term in square brackets covers an integration over the whole  $O(3)$  group, including also inversions. As discussed in Sec. (IID 5), the parity of a proper tensor belonging to the space of angular momentum  $\lambda$ , is realized by a factor  $(-1)^{\lambda}$ . Therefore, this second term is integrated against the representation of the same  $\hat{R}\hat{P}$  roto-inversion onto this space, which is given by  $(-1)^{\lambda} D_{\mu_1 \mu_2}^{\lambda}(\hat{R})$ .

Note that here we define the kernel in terms of *active* rotations,  $\hat{R}$ , as described in Eq. (67). Following the same interpretation of the standard  $\lambda$ -SOAP kernel, this formulation compares the overlaps between the densities  $\rho^{\otimes \nu}$  and  $(\rho')^{\otimes \nu}$ , for any orientation and inversion of the latter.

We can now expand the  $(\rho')^{\otimes \nu}$  in terms of the basis  $\mathcal{R}_{nl}(x) \mathcal{Y}_{lL}^{\lambda \mu}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ , and apply the parity transformation of Eq. (87) to the MultiSHs. After this, we can follow the same calculation shown in Section IID 3 and eventually obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&(K^{(\nu)}(\rho, \rho'))_{\mu_1 \mu_2}^{\lambda} \\
&= \frac{8\pi^2}{2\lambda + 1} \sum_{nlL} \left( 1 + (-1)^{\Sigma(l)+\lambda} \right) u_{nlL}^{\lambda \mu_1} v_{nlL}^{\lambda \mu_2*}.
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{B2})$$

The formula above shows that the contributions vanish when  $\Sigma(l) + \lambda$  is odd, namely when the contraction is performed over the components that transform as pseudo-tensors. In other word, we can write the kernel as

$$(K^{(\nu)}(\rho, \rho'))_{\mu_1 \mu_2}^{\lambda} = \frac{16\pi^2}{2\lambda + 1} \sum_{nlL}^{\text{proper}} u_{nlL}^{\lambda \mu_1} v_{nlL}^{\lambda \mu_2*}, \quad (\text{B3})$$

where the restriction on the sum indicates that only the proper tensorial components are considered, namely the ones for even  $\Sigma(l) + \lambda$ .

### Appendix C: Expansion coefficients in terms of spherical harmonics

This Appendix is devoted to prove Eq. (110), namely to explicitly show that the angular dependence of the functions  $g_{nlm}(\mathbf{r}_{ji})$  is realized by spherical harmonics. In order to simplify the derivation, let us define the auxiliary function

$$f_{nl}(\mathbf{r}_{ji}, \hat{\mathbf{r}}) := \sum_m g_{nlm}(\mathbf{r}_{ji}) Y_l^m(\hat{\mathbf{r}}), \quad (\text{C1})$$

where the second argument is a unitary vector. As remarked in the main text, this function must behave as a scalar, since the density  $\rho(\mathbf{r})$  is a scalar field. Therefore, we can expand it over the scalar MultiSHs as

$$f_{nl}(\mathbf{r}_{ji}, \hat{\mathbf{r}}) = \sum_{l'} c_{nl, l'}(r_{ji}) \mathcal{Y}_{l' l'}^{00}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{ji}, \hat{\mathbf{r}}), \quad (\text{C2})$$

where the functions  $c_{nl,l'}(r_{ji})$  can be explicitly evaluated as

$$\begin{aligned} c_{nl,l'}(r_{ji}) &= \int d\hat{\mathbf{r}} d\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{ji} f_{nl}(\mathbf{r}_{ji}, \hat{\mathbf{r}}) \mathcal{Y}_{l'l'}^{00*}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{ji}, \hat{\mathbf{r}}) = \\ &= \delta_{ll'} \frac{(-1)^l}{\sqrt{2l+1}} \int d\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{ji} \sum_m g_{nlm}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{ji}) Y_l^m(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{ji}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C3})$$

obtained by means of the integral

$$\begin{aligned} \int d\hat{\mathbf{r}} \mathcal{Y}_{l'l'}^{00}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{ji}, \hat{\mathbf{r}}) Y_l^{m*}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) &= \delta_{ll'} C_{lm-l-m}^{00} Y_l^{-m}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{ji}) = \\ &= \delta_{ll'} \frac{(-1)^l}{\sqrt{2l+1}} Y_l^{m*}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{ji}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C4})$$

This result has been obtained by using the explicitly the definition of the BipoSHs from Eq. (24), the orthogonality of the spherical harmonics, the explicit value  $C_{lm-l-m}^{00} = (-1)^{l-m}/\sqrt{2l+1}$  for the CG coefficients and

the identity  $(-1)^m Y_l^{-m}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) = Y_l^{m*}(\hat{\mathbf{r}})$  for the complex conjugate of the spherical harmonics.

By exploiting again the orthogonality of the spherical harmonics, we can recover  $g_{nlm}(\mathbf{r}_{ji})$  from  $f_{nl}(\mathbf{r}_{ji}, \hat{\mathbf{r}})$  by means of the integral

$$\begin{aligned} g_{nlm}(\mathbf{r}_{ji}) &= \int d\hat{\mathbf{r}} f_{nl}(\mathbf{r}_{ji}, \hat{\mathbf{r}}) Y_l^{m*}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) \\ &= \frac{(-1)^l}{\sqrt{2l+1}} c_{nl,l}(r_{ji}) Y_l^{m*}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{ji}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C5})$$

where we have used the expansion of the auxiliary function  $f_{nl}(\mathbf{r}_{ji}, \hat{\mathbf{r}})$ . If we define  $q_{nl}(r_{ji}) := (-1)^l c_{nl,l}/\sqrt{2l+1}$  and use the explicitly evaluated expression for  $c_{nl,l}(r_{ji})$ , we finally obtain

$$q_{nl}(r_{ji}) = \frac{1}{2l+1} \int d\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{ji} \sum_m g_{nlm}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{ji}) Y_l^m(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{ji}), \quad (\text{C6})$$

as required.

- 
- [1] J. Behler, *Four Generations of High-Dimensional Neural Network Potentials*, Chem. Rev. **121**, 16, 10037-10072, (2021).
- [2] O. T. Unke, S. Chmiela, H. E. Sauceda, M. Gastegger, I. Poltavsky, K. T. Schütt, A. Tkatchenko and K.-R. Müller, *Machine Learning Force Fields*, Chem. Rev. **121**, 10142 (2021).
- [3] E. Kocer, T. W. Ko, J. Behler, *Neural Network Potentials: A Concise Overview of Methods*, Ann. Rev. Phys. Chem. **73**, 163-186, (2022).
- [4] F. Musil, A. Grisafi, A.P. Bartók, C. Ortner, G. Csányi and M. Ceriotti, *Physics-Inspired Structural Representations for Molecules and Materials*, Chem. Rev. **121**, 9759 (2021).
- [5] P. Hohenberg and W. Kohn, *Inhomogeneous Electron Gas*, Phys. Rev. **136**, B864 (1964).
- [6] W. Kohn and L. J. Sham, *Self-Consistent Equations Including Exchange and Correlation Effects*, Phys. Rev. **140**, A1133 (1965).
- [7] V. L. Deringer and G. Csányi, *Machine learning based interatomic potential for amorphous carbon*, Phys. Rev. B **95**, 094203 (2017).
- [8] P. Rowe, V. L. Deringer, P. Gasparotto, G. Csányi, A. Michaelides, *An accurate and transferable machine learning potential for carbon*, J. Chem. Phys. **153**, 034702 (2020).
- [9] A. P. Bartók, J. Kermode, N. Bernstein, and G. Csányi, *Machine Learning a General-Purpose Interatomic Potential for Silicon*, Phys. Rev. X **8**, 041048 (2018).
- [10] M. Qamar, M. Mrovec, Y. Lysogorskiy, A. Bochkarev, and R. Drautz, *Atomic Cluster Expansion for Quantum-Accurate Large-Scale Simulations of Carbon*, J. Chem. Theory, Comput. **19** 15, (2023).
- [11] A.V. Shapeev, *Moment tensor potentials: A class of systematically improvable interatomic potentials*, Multiscale Modeling & Simulation **14**, 1153 (2016).
- [12] Y. Zuo, C. Chen, X. Li, Z. Deng, Y. Chen, J. Behler, G. Csányi, A.V. Shapeev, A.P. Thompson, M.A. Wood and S.P. Ong, *Performance and Cost Assessment of Machine Learning Interatomic Potential*, J. Phys. Chem. A **124**, 731 (2020).
- [13] A. P. Bartók, M. C. Payne, R. Kondor, G. Csányi, *Gaussian Approximation Potentials: The Accuracy of Quantum Mechanics, without the Electrons*, Phys. Rev. Lett., **104**, 136403 (2010).
- [14] M. A. Cusentino, M. A. Wood, A. P. Thompson, *Explicit Multielement Extension of the Spectral Neighbor Analysis Potential for Chemically Complex Systems*, J. Chem. Phys. A **124**, 5456 (2020).
- [15] A. P. Bartók, R. Kondor, G. Csányi, *On representing chemical environments*, Phys. Rev. B, **87**, 184115 (2013).
- [16] S. De, A.P. Bartók, G. Csányi and M. Ceriotti, *Comparing molecules and solids across structural and alchemical space*, Phys. Chem. Phys. **18**, 13754 (2016).
- [17] R. Drautz, *Atomic cluster expansion of scalar, vectorial, and tensorial properties including magnetism and charge transfer*, Phys. Rev. B **102**, 024104 (2020).
- [18] M. Domina, M. Cobelli and S. Sanvito, *A spectral-neighbour representation for vector fields: machine-learning potentials including spin*, Phys. Rev. B **105**, 214439, (2022).
- [19] M.-To Suzuki, T. Nomoto, E. V. Morooka, Y. Yanagi, and H. Kusunose, *High-performance descriptor for magnetic materials: Accurate discrimination of magnetic structure*, Phys. Rev. B **108**, 014403 (2023).
- [20] A. Glielmo, P. Sollich, and A. De Vita, *Accurate interatomic force fields via machine learning with covariant kernels*, Phys. Rev. B **95**, 214302 (2017).
- [21] A. Lunghi and S. Sanvito, *A unified picture of the covalent bond within quantum-accurate force fields: from simple organic molecules to metallic complexes' reactivity*, Science Advances **5**, eaaw2210 (2019).
- [22] A. Lunghi and S. Sanvito, *Surfing multiple conformation-property landscapes via machine learning: Designing*

- magnetic anisotropy*, J. Chem. Phys. C **124**, 5802 (2019).
- [23] V. H. A. Nguyen and A. Lunghi, *Predicting tensorial molecular properties with equivariant machine learning models*, Phys. Rev. B **105**, 165131, (2022).
- [24] A. Grisafi, D. M. Wilkins, G. Csányi, and M. Ceriotti, *Symmetry-Adapted Machine Learning for Tensorial Properties of Atomistic Systems*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 036002 (2018).
- [25] A. Chandrasekaran, D. Kamal, R. Batra, C. Kim, L. Chen and R. Ramprasad, *Solving the electronic structure problem with machine learning*, npj Comp. Mater. **5**, 22 (2019).
- [26] A. M. Lewis, A. Grisafi, M. Ceriotti, and M. Rossi, *Learning Electron Densities in the Condensed Phase*, J. Chem. Theory Comput. **17**, 11, (2021).
- [27] J. A. Ellis, L. Fiedler, G. A. Popoola, N. A. Modine, J. A. Stephens, A. P. Thompson, A. Cangi, and S. Rajamanickam, *Accelerating finite-temperature Kohn-Sham density functional theory with deep neural networks*, Phys. Rev. B **104**, 035120 (2021).
- [28] B. Focassio, M. Domina, U. Patil, A. Fazzio and S. Sanvito, *Linear Jacobi-Legendre expansion of the charge density for machine learning-accelerated electronic structure calculations*, npj Comp. Mater. **9**, 87 (2023).
- [29] B. Focassio, M. Domina, U. Patil, A. Fazzio and S. Sanvito, *Covariant Jacobi-Legendre expansion for total energy calculations within the projector augmented wave formalism*, Phys. Rev. B **110**, 184106 (2024).
- [30] L. Zhang, B. Onat, G. Dusson, A. McSloy, G. Anand, R. J. Maurer, C. Ortner, and J. R. Kermode, *Equivariant analytical mapping of first principles Hamiltonians to accurate and transferable materials models*, npj Comp. Mater. **8**, 158 (2022).
- [31] J. Behler and M. Parrinello, *Generalized Neural-Network Representation of High-Dimensional Potential-Energy Surfaces*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 146401 (2007).
- [32] J. S. Smith, O. Isayev and A. E. Roitberg, *ANI-1: an extensible neural network potential with DFT accuracy at force field computational cost*, Chem. Sci. **8**, 3192 (2017).
- [33] H. Wang, L. Zhang, J. Han and E. Weinan, *DeepPMD-kit: A deep learning package for many-body potential energy representation and molecular dynamics*, Comput. Phys. Commun. **228**, 178 (2018).
- [34] C. Chen and S. P. Ong, *A universal graph deep learning interatomic potential for the periodic table*, Nat. Comput. Sci. **2**, 718 (2022).
- [35] E. E. Rasmussen and C. K. I. Williams, *Gaussian Processes for Machine Learning*, MIT Press (2005).
- [36] S. De, A.P. Bartók, G. Csányi and M. Ceriotti, *Comparing molecules and solids across structural and alchemical space*, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. **18**, 13754 (2016).
- [37] F. M. Paruzzo, A. Hofstetter, F. Musil, S. De, M. Ceriotti and L. Emsley, *Chemical shifts in molecular solids by machine learning. Chemical shifts in molecular solids by machine learning*, Nat Commun **9**, 4501 (2018).
- [38] R. Drautz, *Atomic cluster expansion for accurate and transferable interatomic potentials*, Phys. Rev. B **99**, 014104 (2019).
- [39] A. P. Thompson, L. P. Swiler, C. R. Trott, S. M. Foiles and G. J. Tucker, *Spectral neighbor analysis method for automated generation of quantum-accurate interatomic potentials*, J. Comp. Phys. **285**, 316 (2015).
- [40] M. Domina, U. Patil, M. Cobelli, S. Sanvito, *Cluster expansion constructed over Jacobi-Legendre polynomials for accurate force fields*, Phys.Rev. B. **108**, 094102 (2023).
- [41] I. Batatia, D. P. Kovács, G. N. C. Simm, C. Ortner and G. Csányi, *MACE: Higher Order Equivariant Message Passing Neural Networks for Fast and Accurate Force Fields*, NeurIPS (2022).
- [42] J. Nigam, S. Pozdnyakov, G. Fraux and M. Ceriotti, *Unified theory of atom-centered representations and message-passing machine-learning schemes*, J. Chem. Phys. **156**, 204115 (2022)
- [43] G. Dusson, M. Bachmayr, G. Csányi, R. Drautz, S. Etter, C. van der Oord and C. Ortner, *Atomic cluster expansion: Completeness, efficiency and stability*, J. Comp. Phys. **454**, 110946 (2022).
- [44] I. Batatia, S. Batzner, D. P. Kovács, A. Musaelian, G. N. C. Simm, R. Drautz, C. Ortner, B. Kozinsky and G. Csányi, arXiv:2205.06643v2
- [45] M. J. Willat, F. Musil and M. Ceriotti, *Atom-density representations for machine learning*, J. Chem. Phys. **150**, 154110 (2019).
- [46] J. Nigam, S. Pozdnyakov, M. Ceriotti, *Recursive evaluation and iterative contraction of N-body equivariant features*, J. Chem. Phys. **153**, 121101 (2020).
- [47] D. A. Varshalovich, A. N. Moskalev and V. K. Khersonskii, *Quantum Theory of Angular Momentum*, World Scientific (1988).
- [48] A. Hajian and T. Souradeep, *Measuring the Statistical Isotropy of the Cosmic Microwave Background Anisotropy*, ApJ **597**, L5, (2003).
- [49] N. Joshi, S. Jhingan, T. Souradeep and A. Hajian, *Bipolar Harmonic encoding of CMB correlation patterns*, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 083012 (2010).
- [50] R. N. Cahn and Z. Slepian, *Isotropic N-point basis functions and their properties*, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **56**, 325204 (2023).
- [51] A. Glielmo, S. Peter. and A. De Vita, *Accurate interatomic force fields via machine learning with covariant kernels*, Phys. Rev. B **95**, 214302 (2017).
- [52] M. Weissbluth, *Atoms and Molecules*, Academic Press (1978).
- [53] A. V. Meremianin, *Multipole expansions in four-dimensional hyperspherical harmonics*, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **39**, 3099 (2006).
- [54] J. E. Avery and J. Avery, *Hyperspherical Harmonics and Their Physical Applications*, World Scientific Publishing Company Pte Limited (2017).
- [55] H. Weyl, *The classical Groups: Their Invariants and Representations*, Princeton University Press, (1997).
- [56] M. Abramowitz and I. Stegun, *Handbook of Mathematical Functions*, Dover, Mineola, NY, (1972).
- [57] J. M. Goff, C. Sievers, M. A. Wood, A. P. Thompson, *Permutation-adapted complete and independent basis for atomic cluster expansion descriptors*, U.S. Department of Energy, Tech. Report (2022).