

N.L. Harshman

One-Dimensional Traps, Two-Body Interactions, Few-Body Symmetries

I. One, Two, and Three Particles

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract This is the first in a pair of articles that classify the configuration space and kinematic symmetry groups for N identical particles in one-dimensional traps experiencing Galilean-invariant two-body interactions. These symmetries explain degeneracies in the few-body spectrum and demonstrate how tuning the trap shape and the particle interactions can manipulate these degeneracies. The additional symmetries that emerge in the non-interacting limit and in the unitary limit of an infinitely strong contact interaction are sufficient to algebraically solve for the spectrum and degeneracy in terms of the one-particle observables. Symmetry also determines the degree to which the algebraic expressions for energy level shifts by weak interactions or nearly-unitary interactions are universal, i.e. independent of trap shape and details of the interaction. Identical fermions and bosons with and without spin are considered. This article sequentially analyzes the symmetries of one, two and three particles in asymmetric, symmetric, and harmonic traps; the sequel article treats the N particle case.

N.L. Harshman

Department of Physics

American University

4400 Massachusetts Ave. NW

Washington, DC 20016-8058 USA

Tel.: +1-202-885-3479

Fax: +1-202-885-2723

E-mail: harshman@american.edu

Keywords One-dimensional traps · Few-body symmetries · Unitary limit of contact interaction

1 Introduction to Part I

The focus of this pair of articles is the non-relativistic, one-dimensional, few-body Hamiltonian with the following characteristics: (1) Each particle has the same mass and experiences the same trapping potential. (2) There is a two-body interaction term for each pair that depends only on the distance between particles. (3) Each particle has a finite number of internal levels that do not participate directly in the trap or two-body interactions. The particles could be distinguishable, or they could be identical bosons or fermions. The total Hamiltonian for the system can be expressed as

$$\hat{H}^N = \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{H}_i^1 + \sum_{i<j}^N \hat{V}_{ij}. \quad (1a)$$

Denoting each canonical pair of particle observables by $[\hat{Q}_j, \hat{P}_k] = i\delta_{jk}$ and choosing natural units, the one-body Hamiltonian for particle i is

$$\hat{H}_i^1 = \frac{1}{2} \hat{P}_i^2 + V^1(\hat{Q}_i). \quad (1b)$$

The two-body interaction term has the Galilean invariance property $\hat{V}_{ij} = V^2(|\hat{Q}_i - \hat{Q}_j|)$. Particular attention is focused on the contact interaction, expressed in particle coordinates $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_N)$ as

$$V^2(|q_i - q_j|) = g\delta(q_i - q_j). \quad (1c)$$

The goal of this pair of articles is to classify the symmetries of the few-body Hamiltonian \hat{H}^N for the cases of no interaction, general interaction, and unitary limit of contact interaction and then to demonstrate how these symmetries can be used to calculate spectral properties and understand universal features. Two classes of symmetries are considered: configuration space symmetries and kinematics symmetries. By configuration space symmetry, I mean the group of orthogonal transformations of configuration space $\mathcal{Q}^N \sim \mathbb{R}^N$ that are represented as unitary operators that commute with \hat{H}^N . Configuration space symmetry includes the permutation group of identical particles, but it also can include parity or emergent symmetries depending on the trap V^1 and interaction V^2 potentials. Kinematic symmetry is realized by the group of *all* unitary operators that commute with \hat{H}^N . The kinematic

symmetry group necessarily contains the configuration space symmetry as a subgroup. A key insight is that the dimensions of the irreducible representations of the kinematic symmetry group (if properly identified) explain the degeneracies in the spectrum of \hat{H}^N .

This first article analyzes the symmetries of one, two, and three particles. The configuration space symmetries and kinematics symmetries are developed incrementally, and the ways in which the trap shape and the two-body interaction effect the symmetry are explained with examples. For systems with few degrees of freedom, the order of the finite symmetry groups is small and some explicit calculations and applications are included. Additionally, the symmetries of one, two and three particles can be visualized using familiar geometrical methods and analogies. The sequel article treats the general case of N particles. In that case, the formal, algebraic machinery of group representation theory demonstrates its power. However, the price is a higher degree of abstraction and the necessity of computer-based algebraic methods.

1.1 Motivation

The model Hamiltonian (1) has a long history inspired by applications to atomic, molecular, nuclear and condensed matter physics. Going back to the beginnings of quantum mechanics, various subfields have given different names (e.g. Stoner Hamiltonian, Tonks-Girardeau gas, Lieb-Liniger model, no-core shell model) to particular instances of the model and its higher dimensional generalizations. There is a large mathematical physics literature on the one-dimensional model, and certain cases of \hat{H}^N are exemplars of solvability in few-body and many-body systems [1; 2; 3; 4]. The increasingly precise preparation, control and measurement of ultracold trapped atomic systems in effectively one-dimensional traps [5] is driving another surge of theoretical interest in this model, e.g. [6; 7; 8; 9; 10; 11; 12; 13; 14; 15; 16; 17; 18; 19; 20; 21; 22; 23; 24; 25; 26; 27; 28; 29; 30; 31; 32; 33; 34; 35; 36; 37; 38]. Few body properties can drive the dynamics of many-body cold atom trapped systems, like trap loss and equilibration, and few-body observables may be more directly accessed by tunneling rates and spectroscopic methods.

Although group theory has a long history of being productive in quantum mechanics, the “Gruppenpest”¹ can be so frustrating that it is customary to begin with an explanation of why all this

¹ See the Introduction to [39] for a discussion of the Gruppenpest.

mathematical apparatus is worth the effort. The essential claim is that the symmetry classifications provided in this article can be exploited for qualitative, analytic and numeric studies of few-body systems trapped in one dimension and provide a unifying framework for this recent wave of analysis. These methods solve or simplify numerous questions about the spectrum, degeneracy and dynamics, including the following:

- identical particle symmetrization,
- perturbation theory from the non-interacting to the weak interaction limit,
- perturbation theory from the unitary limit of the contact interaction to the nearly-unitary limit,
- methods of exact diagonalization in truncated Hilbert spaces,
- perturbation theory for not-quite identical particles,
- adiabatic or non-adiabatic particle dynamics under variation of interaction parameters or trap shape, and
- trial wave functions for variational or Monte Carlo methods.

As a preview of the kind of results that symmetry classification and calculations provide, see Fig. 1. It depicts how level splitting in the near-unitary limit of the contact interaction depends on trap shape for four particles. Depending on whether the particles are fermions or bosons, with or without spin, only certain energy levels can be populated. The method of calculation is developed later in the paper, but the main idea is that near unitarity, level splitting is determined by the tunneling amplitudes of adjacent particles and these tunneling amplitudes depend on the shape of the trap. The energy eigenstates can be found by diagonalizing a tunneling operator, and these eigenstates carry irreducible representations of the symmetric group for four particles S_4 and for the parity symmetry.

Many applications of the representation theory of the symmetric group already exist in the recent literature; a few examples relevant to these articles are [11; 12; 13; 18; 22; 31; 33]. Parity is also widely exploited, and the special symmetries of harmonic traps are often explicitly or implicitly invoked. The focus of this article is to see how much more solvability is provided by additional configuration space and kinematic symmetries inherited from the trap shape and the Galilean invariance of the interactions. We know that in the case of the infinite square well and contact interactions of any strength, there is enough symmetry to provide integrability, i.e. the Bethe ansatz solutions (c.f. [4; 7]).




Fig. 1 Approximate level splitting diagram for four particles in three symmetric traps: (a) double well; (b) infinite square well; (c) V-shaped or cusped well, i.e. softer than harmonic. The thick band on the right in each figure is the 24-fold degenerate ground state energy level for four distinguishable particles in the unitary limit of the contact interaction. This level carries two representations of S_4 simultaneously; one copy corresponds to particle permutation symmetry and the other to ordering permutation symmetry. In the near unitary limit, ordering permutation symmetry is broken by tunneling and the energy levels split into irreducible representations of S_4 with either even or odd parity. The thickness of the line indicates the degeneracy of these levels for distinguishable identical particles without spin. For example, the irrep labeled $[4]^+$ is the non-degenerate, positive parity, totally symmetric spatial state. It can be occupied by bosons with any number of internal levels, or fermions with at least four internal levels. The three trap shapes are distinguished by the ratio of tunneling amplitudes t/u , where t is the tunneling amplitude for the left-most or right-most particle to exchange with the adjacent inner particle and u is the tunneling amplitude for the two inner particles to exchange. The following ratios have been chosen to illustrate the trap dependence of these amplitudes: (a) $t/u = 2.9$; (b) $t/u = 1$; (c) $t/u = 0.3$. The idea is that (a) for double wells tunneling in the middle is suppressed so $t > u$; (b) for infinite square well the potential is uniform inside the trap and so (for low particle density) t and u are approximately the same; (c) for softer wells, there is more phase space in the middle of the well so $u > t$. For harmonic wells, an estimate based on phase space analysis is $t/u = \cos^{-1}(1/\sqrt{3})/\cos^{-1}(1/3) \approx 0.78$. In subfigure (c) a more extreme ratio is depicted, corresponding to a V-shaped or cusped trap.

The experimental tunability of few-body symmetries and the close connection between finite groups and integrability [41; 42] suggest novel possibilities for embodying mathematical structures in ultracold atomic systems.

Symmetry also aids the study of “universal” few body phenomena, a term used (with some local variation) to describe dynamical effects that do not depend strongly on the particular details of the constituent few body systems or on the nature of their interactions. See [2; 43; 44] for discussions

of universality in one-dimension. Universal properties established in atomic systems could also reveal themselves in few-body systems at the chemical or nuclear scale. Universality can also drive the dynamics of coherence, entanglement and equilibration in certain many-body systems. One approach to universality is to figure out how much about the few-body system can be inferred from the symmetries of \hat{H}^N without specific knowledge of the trap or the interaction. The relationships among trap shape, interaction, and permutation symmetry determine which properties of the system can be algebraically solved for in terms of one-particle observables. The degree to which a few-body system possesses this kind of ‘algebraic solvability’ is at least some component of universality. The best example is provided by the unitary limit of the contact interaction, which has enough symmetry to be exactly solved for any N given the one-particle spectrum [8; 9; 11; 12; 13; 15; 16; 17; 18; 31; 33]. The question of how level splitting in the weak interaction limit and near-unitary limit depends on traps shape is a theme that runs throughout this pair of articles.

Symmetry methods also provide geometrical insight into the highly-abstract interplay of trap shape, interaction, spin and particle symmetrization. Especially for low particle numbers, symmetries can be pictured and manipulated in the mind. To a large extent, the geometrical constructions and geometrical methods applied in the works [12; 19; 24; 27; 34; 37; 45] motivated this article. In this first article, I argue that by analyzing the cases of two and three particles geometrically, we get insights that can guide us for higher particle numbers where more abstract methods are required.

1.2 Outline of the Articles

The next section of this article explains what configuration space and kinematic symmetries are possible for one particle in asymmetric and symmetric traps, and explains the extra kinematic symmetry that occurs for the harmonic trap. It also sets up notation for the one-particle trap eigenstates that is useful for the rest of the articles. The third and fourth sections develop symmetry classifications and techniques for two and three particles. In each scenario, the non-interacting case is considered first, then the interacting case including weak interactions, and finally the unitary limit of the contact interaction including the near-unitary limit. For three particles, state permutation symmetry and ordering permutation symmetry are introduced as useful concepts complimentary to the more familiar

particle permutation symmetry. Along the way, a variety of applications, diagrams and figures are included that attempt to make the symmetry methods more concrete and less abstract. This article ends with a conclusion that reflects on what this symmetry analysis says about universality in this model.

The second article in this series derives the general form of the symmetry classifications for N particles. It is necessarily more technical (and has fewer pictures). After an introduction that gives the expressions for the minimal configuration space and kinematic symmetries inherited by the construction of the few-body system from the one-body systems with two-body interactions, the next section gives an overview of the symmetric group S_N and its representations. Definitions, notation and conventions necessary to extend these methods for $N > 3$ are briefly reviewed. In particular, a kind of S_N representation space called a permutation module is shown to be especially useful for the analysis of N identical particles. The third section establishes the symmetries for N non-interacting particles and describes the geometric realization of particle permutations and other symmetries in configuration space. The irreducible representations for the minimal kinematic symmetry group are derived and state permutation symmetry is used to construct a complete set of commuting observables that facilitates identical particle symmetrization. A final result of this section establishes the isomorphism between the bosonic non-interacting spectrum and the fermionic spectrum (which remains invariant under contact interactions). The fourth section classifies the symmetries for N particles interacting via two-body Galilean invariant potentials. The symmetries of two-body matrix elements are derived and state permutation symmetry makes another appearance, this time as a property of the contact interaction. The two body matrix elements are used to analyze level splitting in the weak interaction limit. I conjecture that algebraic solvability is lost for more than five multicomponent particles. The fifth section treats the unitary limit of the contact interaction. Ordering permutation symmetry emerges as new symmetry of the system, and the near-unitary limit can be understood in terms of symmetry breaking of ordering permutation symmetry by tunneling among different sectors of configuration space. The final and concluding section of both articles summarizes how the main results relate to the question of universality and describes some possible further extensions and applications of this work.

2 One-Particle Symmetries

Denote the configuration space symmetry group by C_1 and the kinematic symmetry group by K_1 . This section describes these groups for asymmetric, symmetric and harmonic traps. The symmetries C_1 and K_1 are built from basic groups that have only one dimensional representations. These one-particle symmetry groups are the building blocks of the multi-particle analysis and this section establishes notation and conventions necessary for later applications.

Consider one particle in a one-dimensional trap and denote its spatial Hilbert space \mathcal{K} . The total Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{S}$ is the tensor product of the spatial Hilbert space and the spin Hilbert space (discussed at the end of this section). Assume the energy spectrum $\sigma^1 = \{\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, \dots\}$ of the one-particle Hamiltonian \hat{H}^1 is discrete, countably-infinite and non-degenerate so that

$$\mathcal{K} = \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{K}_n. \quad (2)$$

Each summand \mathcal{K}_n is a one-dimensional subspace where time evolution is represented as $\hat{U}(t) = \exp(-i\epsilon_n t)$. An energy spectrum σ^1 with this simple form excludes the important case of infinite lattices², it is only approximate for wells with finite depth because it does not have a continuous piece, and there are probably other interesting pathological cases not covered. However, this kind of spectrum includes double-wells, multiple-wells and all the greatest hits of one-dimensional solvability like the harmonic well, infinite square well, Pölsch-Teller potential, Morse potential, etc.

Eigenstates of \hat{H}^1 are denoted by kets containing the spectral index

$$\hat{H}^1|n\rangle = \epsilon_n|n\rangle. \quad (3)$$

and the corresponding wave functions are

$$\phi_n(q) = \langle q|n\rangle. \quad (4)$$

No functional dependence of ϵ_n on n is implied, although algebraic or transcendental expressions certainly exist for specific solvable potentials. One convenience of this notation is that for symmetric one-dimensional wells the quantum number n also determines the parity

$$\hat{H}|n\rangle = (-1)^n|n\rangle. \quad (5)$$

² See [46] for a discussion of symmetries and partial symmetries of lattice-like multi-well potentials.

For convenience, sometimes the one-particle eigenstates will be denoted by state labels $|\alpha\rangle$, $|\beta\rangle$, $|\gamma\rangle$, etc. with wave functions $\phi_\alpha(q)$ and (for symmetric traps) parities π_α .

For one particle in one dimension the configuration space is $\mathcal{Q}^1 \sim \mathbb{R}^1$. The configuration space symmetry C_1 is the group of all linear transformations of \mathcal{Q}^1 realized by operators that commute with the one-particle Hamiltonian \hat{H}^1 . For an asymmetric trap, no such operators exist and $C_1 \sim Z_1$ is the trivial group of just the identity. For a symmetric trap, there is a single point about which reflections are a symmetry and $C_1 \sim O(1)$ is the parity group³.

The one-particle kinematic symmetry group K_1 is the group of *all* unitary symmetry operators that commute with \hat{H}^1 , and therefore necessarily contains C_1 . Consider the three cases:

- For asymmetric traps, $K_1 = T_t$, where $T_t \sim \mathbb{R}^1$ is the time translation group generated by exponentiation of \hat{H}^1 . This gives nothing new: the irreps are one-dimensional and labeled by ϵ_n or n .
- For symmetric traps, the kinematic group is $K_1 = O(1) \times T_t$. Parity is a good quantum number, and the spatial Hilbert space \mathcal{K} has a decomposition into sectors of fixed parity $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_+ \oplus \mathcal{K}_-$ where

$$\mathcal{K}_+ = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{K}_{2k} \text{ and } \mathcal{K}_- = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{K}_{2k+1}.$$

- For harmonic traps $K_1 = U(1) \times T_t$. Here $U(1)$ is the group of transformations that changes the phase of the ladder operators \hat{a} and \hat{a}^\dagger . Define a unitary representation of $U(1)$ by operators $\hat{U}(\phi)$ for $\phi \in [0, 2\pi)$ such that

$$\hat{b} = \hat{U}(\phi)\hat{a}\hat{U}^\dagger(\phi) = \exp(i\phi)\hat{a}.$$

This transformation leaves $\hat{H}^1 = \hat{a}^\dagger\hat{a} + 1/2$ invariant and can be thought of as rotations in two-dimensional phase space.

Note that for all three kind of traps, C_1 and K_1 are abelian groups. For abelian groups, irreducible representations are one-dimensional, and this is consistent with the assumption of a non-degenerate, discrete one-particle spectrum σ^1 . More generally, the true kinematic group for a Hamiltonian should

³ Although not a trap, for a constant potential (e.g. no potential) the group C_1 is the Euclidean group in one dimension $E_1 = O(1) \times T_q$, where $T_q \sim \mathbb{R}^1$ is the group of spatial translations in \mathcal{Q} and \times denotes the semidirect product.

have irreps with the same dimension as the degeneracy of the spectrum. If it does not, then some symmetry has been missed.

Finally, if the single-particle Hamiltonian \hat{H}^1 is spin independent and there are J spin components, then there is also a factor group of $U(J)$ to the kinematic symmetry. The total Hilbert space for the one particle system is the tensor product of the spin Hilbert space and the spatial Hilbert space.

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{K} \sim \mathbb{C}^J \otimes L^2(\mathbb{R}). \quad (6)$$

Any unitary operator that acts only on $\mathcal{S} \sim \mathbb{C}^J$ certainly commutes with \hat{H}^1 . Further, if the internal components really are spin components of a particle with spin s , then $J = 2s + 1$ and the spin operators \hat{S}^2 and \hat{S}_z form a complete set of commuting operators for \mathcal{S} that commute with the Hamiltonian.

3 Two-Particle Systems

The purpose of this section is to classify the types of symmetries found for two trapped particles in the case of no interaction, a general two-body interaction, and the contact interaction. In some sense, symmetry analysis does not provide anything remarkable or new for two particles. However, it provides a training ground for intuition about symmetries in a familiar setting and it is useful for contrast with more complex scenarios. Also, techniques and notation are introduced here that are to be extended to the three particle case in the next section, and then to the N -particle case in the sequel article.

3.1 Two Non-Interacting Particles

Consider the total non-interacting Hamiltonian constructed from the sum of one particle Hamiltonians

$$\hat{H}_0^2 = \hat{H}_1^1 + \hat{H}_2^1 = \frac{1}{2m} (\hat{P}_1^2 + \hat{P}_2^2) + V^1(\hat{Q}_1) + V^1(\hat{Q}_2). \quad (7)$$

The two-particle, non-interacting spectrum, denoted σ_0^2 , remains discrete and countably-infinite, but unlike the one particle spectrum σ^1 it is necessarily degenerate. The spectrum σ_0^2 is completely determined by composing two copies of σ^1 : every energy $E_{(\alpha\beta)} \in \sigma_0^2$ is associated to (at least) one composition $(\alpha\beta)$ of two energies $\epsilon_\alpha, \epsilon_\beta \in \sigma^1$. Unless the specific values of one-particle energies are known, only a partial ordering of σ_0^2 is possible. The lowest two energies in σ_0^2 are unambiguous:




Fig. 2 On the left, each composition of two one-particle quantum numbers numbers $(\alpha\beta)$ corresponds to an energy $E_{(\alpha\beta)}$ in the two-particle non-interacting spectrum σ_0^2 . The superscript denotes whether the compositions are non-degenerate $\alpha = \beta \rightarrow (\alpha^2)$ or two-fold degenerate like $\alpha \neq \beta \rightarrow (\alpha\beta)$. There is a totally symmetric spatial state in both shapes of compositions (α^2) and $(\alpha\beta)$, but only compositions like $(\alpha\beta)$ contain totally antisymmetric states. Note that there is a one-to-one map (depicted with dotted arrows) from all compositions levels in σ_0^2 (on left) to all mixed compositions $(\alpha\beta)$ (on right), and the map preserves the partial ordering. This is one way to depict the famous boson-fermion mapping for two strongly-interacting particles in one dimension.

$E_{(00)} = 2\epsilon_0$ and $E_{(01)} = \epsilon_0 + \epsilon_1$. However, the comparison of $E_{(11)}$ and $E_{(02)}$ is not possible without specific knowledge of the values for ϵ_0 , ϵ_1 and ϵ_2 . For example, consider the potential $V^1(q) = |q|^z$. For $z = 2$ the spectrum is harmonic with $E_{(11)} = E_{(02)}$, for $0 < z < 2$ the spectrum is softer than harmonic with $E_{(11)} > E_{(02)}$, and for $z > 2$ the spectrum is harder than harmonic with $E_{(11)} < E_{(02)}$. See Fig. 2 for a depiction of the partial ordering that can be put on σ_0^2 without specific knowledge of σ^1 .

The degeneracies of σ_0^2 fall into three types:

1. There are always two-fold degeneracies resulting from the tensor product construction of identical non-interacting systems in different states. In other words, the two-particle states $|\alpha\beta\rangle \equiv |\alpha\rangle \otimes |\beta\rangle$ and $|\beta\alpha\rangle \equiv |\beta\rangle \otimes |\alpha\rangle$ are degenerate eigenstates of \hat{H}_0^2 with the energy $E_{(\alpha\beta)} = \epsilon_\alpha + \epsilon_\beta$. As discussed below, this degeneracy can be seen a manifestation of the $S_2 \times T_t^{\times 2}$ kinematic symmetry of any two-particle Hamiltonian (7) constructed from the sum of identical one-particle Hamiltonians.
2. There can be additional degeneracies that result from emergent global symmetries of the combined system for specific external potentials. The harmonic oscillator trap is the salient example here: there are $X + 1$ states with energy $E = \hbar\omega(X + 1)$. As also discussed below, this degeneracy is explained by the $U(2)$ kinematic symmetry of \hat{H}_0^2 .

3. There can also be so-called accidental degeneracies, whose explanation eludes description in terms of a global two-particle symmetry represented as an operator on the entire Hilbert space. An example here is the infinite square well, or hard wall potential, which has the well-known Pythagorean degeneracies.

3.1.1 Configuration Space Symmetries for Two Non-Interacting Particles

The configuration space for a system of two particles is $\mathcal{Q}^2 \sim \mathbb{R}^2$. Fig. 3 depicts equipotentials for six traps, and without interactions this two-particle system is equivalent to one particle navigating these two-dimensional potentials. At a minimum, the configuration space symmetry group C_0^2 for two identical, non-interacting particles must contain as subgroups two copies of the one particle symmetry group C_1 , i.e one for each particle. The permutation group S_2 must also be a subgroup.

The case with the absolutely minimum symmetry possible is when $C_1 \sim Z_1$. Then C_0^2 is just S_2 , the symmetric group with two elements e (identity) and (12) (particle exchange). Particle exchange acts on \mathcal{Q}^2 by mapping (q_1, q_2) to (q_2, q_1) . This is isomorphic two-dimensional point group denoted D_1 , the dihedral group generated by single reflection along the line $q_1 = q_2$.

The Hilbert space representation of particle exchange is represented on the particle basis by the unitary operator $\hat{p}_{(12)}$:

$$\hat{p}_{(12)}|\alpha\beta\rangle = |\beta\alpha\rangle. \quad (8)$$

Basis vectors with $\alpha = \beta$, carry an irreducible, one-dimensional symmetric representation of S_2 . When $\alpha \neq \beta$ the space of states $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha\beta)}$ spanned by $|\alpha\beta\rangle$ and $|\beta\alpha\rangle$ carries a reducible representation of S_2 . The energy eigenspace $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha\beta)}$ can be decomposed into two one-dimensional irrep spaces, one symmetric and one antisymmetric. The basis vectors for the irreps spaces can be denoted by tableaux:

$$\begin{aligned} |\overline{\alpha\alpha}\rangle &\equiv |\alpha\alpha\rangle \\ |\overline{\alpha\beta}\rangle &\equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\alpha\beta\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\beta\alpha\rangle \\ |\underline{\alpha\beta}\rangle &\equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\alpha\beta\rangle - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\beta\alpha\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$




Fig. 3 These are the equipotentials for two particles in a one-dimensional trap with (a) $V(q) = |q|^{1/2}$ (cusped); (b) $V(q) = |q|$ (V-shaped); (c) $V(q) = q^2$ (harmonic); (d) $V(q) = q^{10}$ (approximately hard wall); (e) $V(q) = q^4 - 2q^2$ (symmetric double well); and (f) $V(q) = q^4 - 1/3q^3 - 2q^2$ (asymmetric double well). The horizontal axis is the q_1 axis and the vertical axis is q_2 . These figures all have particle exchange symmetry, which is realized in configuration space as a reflection across the line $q_1 = q_2$. Antisymmetric spatial states must have a node on this line. Potentials (a)-(e) are also symmetric under spatial inversion of each particle individually, corresponding to horizontal and vertical reflections. For (a), (b), (d) and (e), the total symmetry group, combining parity and particle exchange is isomorphic to the non-abelian, two-dimensional point group D_4 . This order 8 group is the symmetries of a square and includes the identity, rotation by $\pm\pi/2$, rotation by π , and reflection across three axes. The equipotentials of the harmonic well have the maximal point symmetry in two-dimensions: $O(2)$, i.e. rotations by any angle and reflections across any axis.

These vectors are simultaneous eigenvectors of \hat{H}_0^2 and \hat{p}_{12} which satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{p}_{(12)} |\alpha\beta\rangle &= |\alpha\beta\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{p}_{(12)} \begin{vmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{vmatrix} = - \begin{vmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{vmatrix}; \\ \hat{H}_0^2 |\alpha\beta\rangle &= E_{(\alpha\beta)} |\alpha\beta\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{H}_0^2 \begin{vmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{vmatrix} = E_{(\alpha\beta)} \begin{vmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{vmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

for any α and β . Because $\hat{p}_{(12)}$ commutes with \hat{H}_0^2 , the spatial Hilbert space can be decomposed into subspaces corresponding to the irreducible representations of S_2 :

$$\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}^{[2]} \oplus \mathcal{K}^{[1^2]}. \quad (11)$$

The symmetric spatial subspace $\mathcal{K}^{[2]}$ contains states $|\alpha\alpha\rangle \in \mathcal{K}_{(\alpha^2)}$ and states $|\alpha\beta\rangle \in \mathcal{K}_{(\alpha\beta)}$ and the antisymmetric spatial subspace $\mathcal{K}^{[1^2]}$ contains states $\begin{vmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{vmatrix} \in \mathcal{K}_{(\alpha\beta)}$.

For a spatially symmetric trap, the one-particle configuration space group is parity $C_1 = O(1)$. Without interactions, each particle can be independently spatially inverted. Denote each particle's inversion operator on \mathcal{Q}^2 by Π_i such that $\Pi_1(q_1, q_2) = (-q_1, q_2)$ and $\Pi_2(q_1, q_2) = (q_1, -q_2)$. These symmetries are represented in the Hilbert space on the particle basis as

$$\hat{\Pi}_1|n_1 n_2\rangle = (-1)^{n_1}|n_1 n_2\rangle \text{ and } \hat{\Pi}_2|n_1 n_2\rangle = (-1)^{n_2}|n_1 n_2\rangle. \quad (12)$$

Including these two operations, the symmetry group C_0^2 for a symmetric trap has eight distinct elements:

$$e, (12), \Pi_1, \Pi_2, (12)\Pi_1, (12)\Pi_2, \Pi \equiv \Pi_1\Pi_2, \text{ and } (12)\Pi_1\Pi_2. \quad (13)$$

This group is isomorphic to the point group of a square, denoted D_4 , with corresponding transformations on \mathcal{Q}^2

$$R(0), \Sigma(\pi/4), \Sigma(\pi/2), \Sigma(0), R(\pi/2), R(-\pi/2), R(\pi), \text{ and } \Sigma(-\pi/4), \quad (14)$$

where $R(\phi)$ is a rotation about the origin by ϕ and $\Sigma(\phi)$ is a reflection across the line making an angle ϕ with the q_1 axis. The group D_4 can be generated by two elements, for example (12) and Π_1 . See Fig. 3 and contrast the first five subfigures, which all have at least D_4 symmetry⁴. For contrast, the last subfigure which depicts the equipotentials of an asymmetric trap only has $S_2 \sim D_1$ symmetry.

Note that $(12)\Pi_1 = \Pi_2(12)$ so the group D_4 is not abelian and it is not isomorphic to the direct product $S_2 \times O(1) \times O(1)$ as one might expect. Instead it is isomorphic to

$$D_4 \sim S_2 \times (O(1) \times O(1)) \equiv S_2 \times O(1)^{\times 2}. \quad (15)$$

The notation \times stands for the semi-direct product and captures the fact that the particle exchange $(12) \in S_2$ conjugates elements Π_1 and Π_2 and therefore acts as an automorphism of the normal, abelian subgroup $O(1)^{\times 2}$.

⁴ By D_4 , here I mean the two-dimensional point group, i.e. the dihedral group with four reflection axes that is the symmetry group of a square. Coxeter notation for this pure reflection group is BC_2 or $[4]$. The same symbol D_4 is also Schönflies notation for the three-dimensional point group with Coxeter notation $[4, 2]^+$. These two groups are isomorphic, but have different geometrical realizations. In the three-dimensional sense, the group D_4 is an order eight group consisting of only rotations and no reflections. It can be visualized as the symmetries of a square parallelepiped with sides two-color checkered by an even number of checks. The Schönflies notation for the three-dimensional version of the reflection group D_4 is C_{4v} and it is the symmetry of a square parallelepiped with the two square sides painted different colors.

The group D_4 has five irreducible representations [47]. States that are simultaneous eigenvectors of \hat{H}_0^2 , \hat{p}_{12} , and \hat{I} can be sorted into five categories:

$$\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_{\boxplus\boxplus} \oplus \mathcal{K}_{\boxminus\boxminus} \oplus \mathcal{K}_{\boxplus\boxminus} \oplus \mathcal{K}_{\boxminus\boxplus} \oplus \mathcal{K}_{\boxtimes} \quad (16)$$

States in the first four subspaces of (16) have positive total parity. For $\pi_\alpha = \pi_\beta = 1$ these states are

$$|\boxplus\boxplus\rangle \in \mathcal{K}_{\boxplus\boxplus} \text{ and } |\boxtimes\rangle \in \mathcal{K}_{\boxtimes}$$

and for $\pi_\alpha = \pi_\beta = -1$ they are

$$|\boxminus\boxminus\rangle \in \mathcal{K}_{\boxminus\boxminus} \text{ and } |\boxtimes\rangle \in \mathcal{K}_{\boxtimes}.$$

The positive total parity states are simultaneous eigenvectors of all eight operators in D_4 , or in other words, they are elements of one-dimensional irreducible representations. However, the states $|\boxplus\boxminus\rangle$ and $|\boxminus\boxplus\rangle$ with $\pi_\alpha = -\pi_\beta$ have negative total parity. They span the fifth, two-dimensional irreducible representation space of D_4 in which the single-particle parities \hat{I}_1 and \hat{I}_2 are not simultaneously diagonalizable with \hat{p}_{12} and \hat{I} . As an example, the energy levels included in Fig. 2 are categorized into irrep spaces of C_0^2 in Table 1.

The largest point symmetry possible in \mathcal{Q}^2 is $O(2)$, all orthogonal transformations of the plane, i.e. reflections through and rotations about the origin. This is the configuration space symmetry for the harmonic potential. The irreducible representations of $O(2)$ are labeled by non-negative integer m and they are one-dimensional for $m = 0$ and two-dimensional for $m > 0$. One can think about this as the ‘angular momentum’ in configuration space and construct an observable $\hat{L}_{12} \sim i(\hat{a}_1\hat{a}_2^\dagger - \hat{a}_2\hat{a}_1^\dagger)$ out of ladder operators that commutes with \hat{H}_0^2 . However, the dimensions of the irreps of $O(2)$ are insufficient to explain the degeneracies of σ_0^2 for the harmonic trap. Explaining the total degeneracy requires considering the full kinematic symmetry of \hat{H}_0^2 .

3.1.2 Kinematic Symmetry of Two Non-Interacting Particles

The previous section established that the following expression relates the one-particle configuration space symmetry C_1 to the two-particle non-interacting configuration space symmetry of \hat{H}_0^2 for both symmetric and asymmetric traps:

$$C_0^2 \geq S_2 \times C_1^{\times 2}. \quad (17)$$

Table 1 This table categorizes the energy levels in the two-particle, non-interacting spectrum σ_0^2 for a general symmetric trap into irreps of the non-interacting configuration space symmetry group $C_0^2 = S_2 \times O(1)^{\times 2}$, the kinematic symmetry group $K_0^2 = S_2 \times (O(1) \times T_t)^{\times 2}$, and the interacting symmetry group $K^2 = S_2 \times O(1) \times T_t$. Non-interacting energy levels are labeled by their one-particle compositions. See text for notation for irreps, and see Fig. 2 for the partial ordering of these energy levels if the specific values of the one-particle spectrum are unknown. Note that because $K_0^2 \geq C_0^2$ and $K_0^2 \geq K^2$, generally the K_0^2 irreps are reducible with respect to C_0^2 and K^2 .

Composition	Degeneracy	C_0^2 irreps	K_0^2 irreps	K^2 irreps
(00)	1	$\boxplus\boxplus$	(α_+^2)	$[2]^+$
(01)	2	$\boxplus\boxminus$	$(\alpha_+\beta_-)$	$[2]^- \oplus [1^2]^-$
(1 ²)	1	$\boxminus\boxminus$	(α_-^2)	$[2]^+$
(02)	2	$\boxplus\boxplus \oplus \boxplus\boxminus$	$(\alpha_+\beta_+)$	$[2]^+ \oplus [1^2]^+$
(12)	2	$\boxplus\boxminus$	$(\alpha_+\beta_-)$	$[2]^- \oplus [1^2]^-$
(03)	2	$\boxplus\boxminus$	$(\alpha_+\beta_-)$	$[2]^- \oplus [1^2]^-$
(2 ²)	1	$\boxminus\boxminus$	(α_+^2)	$[2]^+$
(13)	2	$\boxminus\boxminus \oplus \boxminus\boxplus$	$(\alpha_-\beta_-)$	$[2]^+ \oplus [1^2]^+$
(04)	2	$\boxplus\boxplus \oplus \boxplus\boxminus$	$(\alpha_+\beta_+)$	$[2]^+ \oplus [1^2]^+$

However, harmonic traps have an emergent symmetry $C_0^2 \sim O(2)$ and the construction (17) is only a subgroup of the total symmetry. A similar situation holds for the kinematic symmetry of \hat{H}_0^2 . For general symmetric and asymmetric traps, the minimal kinematic symmetry is

$$K_0^2 \geq S_2 \times K_1^{\times 2}. \quad (18)$$

For asymmetric traps, K_1 is just T_t and the minimal kinematic symmetry group is $S_2 \times T_t^{\times 2}$. Each factor of T_t is the time translation generated by each particle's Hamiltonian $\hat{U}_j(t) = \exp(-i\hat{H}_j^1 t)$. Since the particles are non-interacting, their clocks are not linked and their timelines are independent. Note that the exchange operator does not commute with the one-particle time-translations; instead one finds $\hat{p}_{(12)}\hat{U}_1(t) = \hat{U}_2(t)\hat{p}_{(12)}$. This means K_0^2 is not abelian and so its irreps are not necessarily one-dimensional.

As one might expect from the degeneracy analysis, the irreps of the minimal kinematic symmetry group $K_0^2 = S_2 \times T_t^{\times 2}$ are labeled by the state composition $(\alpha\beta)$. Compositions with $\alpha = \beta$ are just the one-dimensional representation spaces $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha^2)}$ spanned by $|\boxplus\boxplus\rangle$ and compositions with $\alpha \neq \beta$ are

the two-dimensional representation spaces $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha\beta)}$ spanned by $|\underline{\alpha\beta}\rangle$ and $|\frac{\alpha}{\beta}\rangle$. The states $|\underline{\alpha\beta}\rangle$ and $|\frac{\alpha}{\beta}\rangle$ are degenerate in energy, and that is the only kind of degeneracy in the case of minimal symmetry for two non-interacting particles.

The inclusion of parity symmetry does not entail any increase in degeneracy beyond this minimal two-fold degeneracy, but now there are five irreps. There are two positive-parity one-dimensional irreps $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha_+^2)}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha_-^2)}$ with $\pi_\alpha = \pm 1$, there are two positive-parity two dimensional irreps $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha+\beta_+)}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha-\beta_-)}$ for $\pi_\alpha = \pi_\beta = \pm 1$ and there is a single negative-parity two dimensional irrep $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha+\beta_-)}$ for $\pi_\alpha = -\pi_\beta$. Since the kinematic symmetry group contains the configuration space symmetry group, these \mathcal{K}_0^2 irreps are not necessarily irreducible with respect to \mathcal{C}_0^2 ; see Table 1.

If any energy levels in the two-particle non-interacting spectrum σ_0^2 have more than two-fold degeneracy, that signals an emergent two-particle symmetry. For the harmonic oscillator provides, a representation of $\underline{u} \in \text{U}(2)$ is defined by operators $\hat{U}(\underline{u})$ that act on the array of one-particle annihilation operators $\hat{\mathbf{a}} = (\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2)$ as

$$\hat{U}(\underline{u})\hat{\mathbf{a}}\hat{U}^\dagger(\underline{u}) = \underline{u}\hat{\mathbf{a}}. \quad (19)$$

These transformations leave the non-interacting Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_0^2 = \hbar\omega(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^\dagger\hat{\mathbf{a}} + 1)$ invariant and can be thought of as all symplectic, orthogonal transformations of four-dimensional phase space. The irreducible representations of $\text{U}(2)$ are the same as the more familiar $\text{SU}(2)$. They are finite-dimensional and labeled by a non-negative integer X . This quantum number is the same as the total excitation $X = n_1 + n_2$ of a pair of oscillators. The dimension of the irreducible representation is $d(X) = X + 1$. As a consequence, for a harmonic well and $X > 1$ there must be multiple compositions $(\alpha\beta)$ with the same energy, not just the two-fold degeneracy inherited from the one-particle symmetry via the subgroup $\text{S}_2 \times \text{T}_t^{\times 2}$. These degeneracies imply the existence of other operators that commute with H_0^2 . Several inequivalent complete sets of commuting operators can be chosen and these correspond to the different coordinate systems in which the two-dimensional isotropic harmonic oscillator separate, i.e. cartesian, polar and elliptic [48]. Much more has been said or could be said on this topic, but it will not be included here.

Another kind of emergent two-particle kinematic symmetry results from ‘accidental’ degeneracies. The most famous of these are the Pythagorean degeneracies that occur for the infinite square well (see

for example, [49]). These are not always interpreted as symmetries, but technically one can construct operators that commute with the Hamiltonian which exploit the accidental degeneracy as a symmetry. For example, the square well states⁵ with $(n_1, n_2) = (0, 6), (6, 0)$ and $(4, 4)$ span a three-dimensional subspace $\mathcal{K}_{50} = \mathcal{K}_{(06)} \oplus \mathcal{K}_{(44)}$ with energy $50\epsilon_0$. One can define an operator that acts unitarily on the three-dimensional energy eigenspace \mathcal{K}_{50} and acts as the identity on the rest of the spatial Hilbert space $\mathcal{K} \ominus \mathcal{K}_{50}$. That operator would realize the accidental degeneracy as a kinematic symmetry operator. However, the construction of such an operator requires prior knowledge of the degeneracy instead of actually explaining how the degeneracy arises from the kinematic symmetry of the Hamiltonian, and is therefore not as useful as a true kinematic symmetry.

In summary, excluding accidental and emergent degeneracies, the spectral problem for two non-interacting particles can be entirely solved without specific knowledge of the one-particle spectrum up to a partial ordering of energies. All states have energies of either the form $2\epsilon_\alpha$ or $\epsilon_\alpha + \epsilon_\beta$ and basis vectors of the form (9). Including parity symmetry allows further reduction and provides additional compatible quantum numbers for even parity states, but does not change the degeneracy of the spectrum. Emergent symmetries can increase the degeneracy of energy levels, but also provide additional quantum numbers with which to decompose them.

3.2 Two Particles: General Two-Body Interactions

Now we add a two-body interaction to the Hamiltonian:

$$\hat{H}^2 = \hat{H}_0^2 + \hat{V}^2 = \frac{1}{2m} (\hat{P}_1^2 + \hat{P}_2^2) + V^1(\hat{Q}_1) + V^1(\hat{Q}_2) + \hat{V}_{12}. \quad (20)$$

Only Galilean-invariant two-particle potentials \hat{V}_{12} are considered. The requirement of Galilean invariance can be summarized algebraically in terms of commutation relations:

$$\begin{aligned} [\hat{H}, \hat{V}_{12}] &= [\hat{Q}_1, \hat{V}_{12}] = [\hat{Q}_2, \hat{V}_{12}] = [\hat{p}_{(12)}, \hat{V}_{12}] = 0 \\ \text{and } [\hat{P}_1, \hat{V}_{12}] &= -[\hat{P}_2, \hat{V}_{12}]. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

⁵ With the convention that the ground state has $n = 0$, the energy of infinite square well is $\epsilon_i = \epsilon_0(n_i + 1)^2$.

The second line of (21) is equivalent to saying that the two-body interaction commutes with the center-of-mass motion. Combined with the first line of (21), this implies that the interaction can be written as $\hat{V}_{12} = V^2(|\hat{R}|)$, where $\hat{R} = 1/\sqrt{2}(\hat{Q}_1 - \hat{Q}_2)$ is the normalized relative position coordinate.

The condition $[\hat{p}_{(12)}, \hat{V}_{12}] = 0$ also implies the two-particle matrix elements of the interaction $\langle \alpha\beta | \hat{V}_{12} | \gamma\delta \rangle$ have the property

$$\langle \alpha\beta | \hat{V}_{12} | \gamma\delta \rangle = \langle \beta\alpha | \hat{V}_{12} | \delta\gamma \rangle \equiv v_{(\alpha\gamma)(\beta\delta)}. \quad (22)$$

This notation for the matrix elements emphasizes that this amplitude is relevant for the state transitions $\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ and $\beta \rightarrow \delta$. The one-particle basis can be chosen so that these matrix elements are all real. The group S_2 is a symmetry group for both \hat{H}_0^2 and \hat{V}_{12} , so it remains a symmetry of the total interacting Hamiltonian \hat{H}^2 . Therefore there are only matrix elements between states carrying the same irreducible representation of S_2 , i.e.

$$\langle \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha & \beta \end{smallmatrix} | \hat{V}_{12} | \begin{smallmatrix} \gamma & \delta \end{smallmatrix} \rangle = \langle \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha & \beta \end{smallmatrix} | \hat{H}^2 | \begin{smallmatrix} \gamma & \delta \end{smallmatrix} \rangle = 0 \quad (23)$$

for any states α, β, γ and δ .

First order perturbation theory gives the level splitting of the non-interacting states in the limit of weak interactions. In terms of the interaction matrix elements for the symmetrized states (9), the level splittings are

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha & \beta \end{smallmatrix} | \hat{V}_{12} | \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha & \beta \end{smallmatrix} \rangle &= v_{(\alpha^2)(\beta^2)} + v_{(\alpha\beta)^2} \\ \langle \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha & \beta \end{smallmatrix} | \hat{V}_{12} | \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha & \beta \end{smallmatrix} \rangle &= v_{(\alpha^2)(\beta^2)} - v_{(\alpha\beta)^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where $v_{(\alpha^2)(\beta^2)} = v_{(\alpha\alpha)(\beta\beta)}$ and $v_{(\alpha\beta)^2} = v_{(\alpha\beta)(\alpha\beta)}$. This implies the familiar result that for any repulsive two-particle interaction the symmetrized state of a doubly-degenerate energy level will always have a larger energy shift than the antisymmetric state due to interference between the direct channel and the exchange channel.

The minimal non-interacting symmetry $S_2 \times K_1^{\times 2}$ that is automatically inherited from the one-particle kinematic symmetries is broken by \hat{V}_{12} . However, the exchange symmetry is preserved, as well as time translation generated by the total interacting Hamiltonian \hat{H}^2 , so the minimal total kinematic symmetry of the interacting system in an asymmetric trap is $S_2 \times T_t$. In this minimal case, the spatial Hilbert space can be reduced no further than $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}^{[2]} \oplus \mathcal{K}^{[1^2]}$ and every energy level in the two-particle

interacting spectrum σ^2 is singly degenerate unless the interacting system has emergent symmetries, e.g. the contact interaction in the unitary limit, or accidental symmetries.

More generally, the kinematic symmetry of the interacting two particle system K^2 always contains a subgroup isomorphic to the one-particle kinematic symmetry K_1 as well as the exchange symmetry:

$$K^2 \geq S_2 \times K_1. \quad (25)$$

For example, if the trap respects parity then $K_1 = O(1) \times T_t$. There are four irreps of this group: $[2]^+$, $[2]^-$, $[1^2]^+$, and $[1^2]^-$. The total parity operator \hat{H} commutes with \hat{V}_{12} and parity remains a good quantum number even when interactions are turned on. Therefore in addition to selection rules against transitions between states with different exchange symmetries (23), matrix elements of \hat{V}_{12} between two-particle states with different parity must be also be zero. See Table 1 for the reduction of K_0^2 irreps into K^2 irreps.

For the harmonic trap $K^2 = S_2 \times U(1) \times T_t$ and the extra $U(1)$ symmetry provides an additional good quantum number (i.e. the center-of-mass excitation) and additional selection rules. These selection rules are relevant for calculating higher-order terms in a perturbation series or for making exact diagonalization in truncated Hilbert spaces more efficient.

Note however that the one-particle parities \hat{H}_i do not commute with \hat{V}_{12} and the configuration space symmetry is reduced from $C_0^2 \sim D_4$ (with order eight and five irreps) to only $C^2 \sim D_2$ (with order four and four one-dimensional irreps). For two particles, the permutation operator \hat{p}_{12} can also be interpreted as the relative parity: reflection across the line $q_1 = q_2$ reverses relative position $\hat{p}_{(12)}\hat{R} = -\hat{R}\hat{p}_{(12)}$. The operator $\hat{p}_{(12)}\hat{H}$ is a reflection across the line $q_1 = -q_2$ that reverses the normalized center-of-mass position $\hat{Q} = 1/\sqrt{2}(\hat{Q}_1 + \hat{Q}_2)$ and leaves the relative position \hat{R} invariant.

In summary, the minimal kinematic symmetry K^2 of the two-particle interacting Hamiltonian \hat{H}^2 is $S_2 \times K_1$. This group has only one-dimensional irreps, and so unless there is an accidental or emergent symmetries⁶, there are no degeneracies in the interacting spectrum σ^2 . The symmetry K^2 is enough to completely specify the qualitative features of level splitting for weak interactions. To calculate the

⁶ Another example of emergent symmetries is the case of harmonic interactions $V^2(\sqrt{2}\hat{R}) \sim \hat{R}^2$ in a harmonic trap. This system has interacting kinematic symmetry $K^2 = (U(1) \times T_t)^{\times 2}$ because both the center-of-mass and relative coordinate act like a one-dimensional harmonic oscillator.

specific energy shift requires the two-particle interaction matrix elements of the form $v_{(\alpha^2)(\beta^2)}$ and $v_{(\alpha\beta)^2}$, but the splitting is universal.

3.3 Two Particles: Two-Body Contact Interaction

Now, specify \hat{V}_{12} to be the contact interaction, which in the position representation is

$$V^2(|q_1 - q_2|) = g\delta(q_1 - q_2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}g\delta(r), \quad (26)$$

where $r = 1/\sqrt{2}(q_1 - q_2)$ is the normalized relative position coordinate. This potential satisfies the Galilean invariance requirements (21) and therefore the kinematic symmetry group contains at least the minimal symmetry $S_2 \times K_1$. The goal of this section is to find results that are trap-independent using symmetry methods alone. Note that the case of the contact interaction is analytically solvable for two-bodies for any value of g in one-dimensional harmonic trap [51; 52] or for infinite square well [7; 53]. Finding the energy for general g requires solving a transcendental equation, but the system is integrable.

For the contact interaction, the two-particle matrix elements $\langle\alpha\beta|\hat{V}_{12}|\gamma\delta\rangle = v_{(\alpha\gamma)(\beta\delta)}$ are invariant under permutations of the four states α , β , γ and δ . This is shown by going to the position representation where⁷

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\alpha\beta|\hat{V}_{12}|\gamma\delta\rangle &= \int dx_1 dx_2 \psi_\alpha^*(x_1) \psi_\beta^*(x_2) g\delta(x_1 - x_2) \psi_\gamma(x_1) \psi_\delta(x_2) \\ &= g \int dx \psi_\alpha(x) \psi_\beta(x) \psi_\gamma(x) \psi_\delta(x) \\ &\equiv v_{(\alpha\beta\gamma\delta)}. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

This ‘state permutation symmetry’ of the contact interaction matrix elements means that in addition to zero matrix elements between states in different irreducible representation spaces of S_2 as in (23), the matrix element between totally antisymmetric states is necessarily zero

$$\left\langle \begin{array}{c} \alpha \\ \beta \end{array} \middle| \hat{V}_{12} \middle| \begin{array}{c} \gamma \\ \delta \end{array} \right\rangle = 0 \quad (28)$$

as one shows by inserting $v_{(\alpha^2)(\beta^2)} = v_{(\alpha\beta)^2} = v_{(\alpha^2\beta^2)}$ in (24). The consequence, as expected, is that the fermionic states do not ‘feel’ the contact interaction and remain stationary states of the Hamiltonian for all values of the interaction strength g .

⁷ Remember that wave functions of the one-particle Hamiltonian can be chosen as real without loss of generality.

In the unitary limit $g \rightarrow \infty$, the contact interaction is like a sword through configuration space, severing the two halves with a nodal line that no probability current can penetrate. Each sector in configuration space acts as a disjoint domain for wave functions. The particles are either in the specific left-to-right order $q_1 < q_2$ or in the order $q_2 < q_1$. The spectrum in the unitary limit σ_∞^2 is therefore the same as the spectrum of totally-antisymmetric non-interacting states $|\frac{\alpha}{\beta}\rangle$. There is a two-fold degenerate level σ_∞^2 for every state pair $\alpha \neq \beta$ (see the right side of Fig. 2). As in the non-interacting case, only a partial ordering of the spectrum σ_∞^2 can be determined without specific additional knowledge about σ^1 .

Define the ‘snippet’ basis wave functions [9; 18] for each pair $\alpha \neq \beta$ and each order $q_i < q_j$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{q} | \frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \{12\} \rangle &= \begin{cases} \sqrt{2} \langle \mathbf{q} | \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \rangle = \phi_\alpha(q_1)\phi_\beta(q_2) - \phi_\alpha(q_2)\phi_\beta(q_1) & \text{for } q_1 < q_2 \\ 0 & \text{for } q_2 < q_1 \end{cases} \\ \langle \mathbf{q} | \frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \{21\} \rangle &= \begin{cases} -\sqrt{2} \langle \mathbf{q} | \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \rangle = \phi_\alpha(q_2)\phi_\beta(q_1) - \phi_\alpha(q_1)\phi_\beta(q_2) & \text{for } q_2 < q_1 \\ 0 & \text{for } q_1 < q_2 \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

The two vectors $|\frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \{12\}\rangle$ and $|\frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \{21\}\rangle$ form a basis for the energy eigenspaces of the unitary-limit Hamiltonian \hat{H}_∞^2 with energy $\epsilon_\alpha + \epsilon_\beta$. From (29) they transform under particle exchange like

$$\hat{p}_{(12)} |\frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \{12\}\rangle = |\frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \{21\}\rangle. \quad (30)$$

The states that are symmetric and antisymmetric under particle exchange are

$$\begin{aligned} |\frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \overline{12}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |\frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \{12\}\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |\frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \{21\}\rangle \\ |\frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \underline{12}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |\frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \{12\}\rangle - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |\frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \{21\}\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

The state $|\frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \underline{12}\rangle$ is in fact just the original non-interacting, antisymmetric basis vector $|\frac{\alpha}{\beta}\rangle$ and the state $|\frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \overline{12}\rangle$ is its symmetrized version. Although these two states have the same position probability density, they will have different momentum distributions because of the cusp in $\langle \mathbf{q} | \frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \overline{12}\rangle$.

When the trap is parity symmetric and the one-particle states $|\alpha\rangle$ and $|\beta\rangle$ have parities π_α and π_β , then one infers from (29) that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H} |\frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \overline{12}\rangle &= -\pi_\alpha \pi_\beta |\frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \overline{12}\rangle \\ \hat{H} |\frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \underline{12}\rangle &= \pi_\alpha \pi_\beta |\frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \underline{12}\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

In other words, at unitarity the symmetric state always has opposite parity to the antisymmetric state from which it is constructed.

What about the not-quite-unitary limit? Consider a weak perturbation \hat{T} of \hat{H}_∞^2 that mimics the effect of not having an infinite barrier. Such operator would allow tunneling between the two sectors of configuration space while simultaneously decreasing the energy due to the less dramatic cusp at the nodal line $q_1 = q_2$. It also must have zero matrix elements between antisymmetric states because those states do not feel the contact interaction. An operator \hat{T} that satisfies those requirements has uniform matrix elements in the snippet basis:

$$\langle \frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \{12\} | \hat{T} | \frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \{21\} \rangle = \langle \frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \{21\} | \hat{T} | \frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \{12\} \rangle = \langle \frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \{12\} | \hat{T} | \frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \{12\} \rangle = \langle \frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \{21\} | \hat{T} | \frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \{21\} \rangle = -t, \quad (33)$$

where t is a positive constant. As expected, the eigenstates of $\hat{H}_\infty^2 + \hat{T}$ are also the symmetrized $|\frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \{12\}\rangle$ and antisymmetrized $|\frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \{21\}\rangle$ states, now with eigenvalues $\epsilon_\alpha + \epsilon_\beta - 2t$ and $\epsilon_\alpha + \epsilon_\beta$, respectively.

As another application of this section, by combining the results for weak splitting from σ_0^2 and for not-quite-unitary splitting from σ_∞^2 , a one-to-one adiabatic mapping from not interacting states to unitary states can be determined that is the simplest case of the famous Fermi-Bose mapping [50]. The non-interacting symmetric state $|\alpha\alpha\rangle$ is mapped to $|\frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \{12\}\rangle$ where $\beta = \alpha + 1$ while the non-interacting symmetric state $|\alpha\beta\rangle$ with $\alpha < \beta$ is mapped to $|\frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \{12\}\rangle$ where $\gamma = \beta + 1$. This amounts to adding one nodal line to each of the symmetric states at the location of the contact interaction. Of course the states $|\frac{\alpha}{\beta}\rangle = |\frac{\alpha}{\beta}; \{12}\rangle$ are unchanged under the adiabatic mapping because they already align with the nodal line at $q_1 = q_2$.

3.4 Spin and Symmetrization for Two Particles

Before moving on from two particles, let us finally consider the incorporation of identical particle symmetrization and spin degrees of freedom and state some well-known results. When there are $J > 1$ spin components accessible, then the total Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{S}$ is the direct product of the spatial Hilbert space $\mathcal{K} \sim L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and the spin Hilbert space $\mathcal{S} \sim \mathbb{C}^{J^2}$. The S_2 symmetry implies that the total Hilbert space can be decomposed into symmetrized sectors

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}^{[2]} \oplus \mathcal{H}^{[1^2]}.$$

If there are no spin degrees of freedom, then \mathcal{S} is one-dimensional and the symmetric sector of the spatial Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{[2]} \sim \mathcal{K}^{[2]}$ is available for population by identical bosons and the antisymmetric sector $\mathcal{H}^{[1^2]} \sim \mathcal{K}^{[1^2]}$ by fermions. If there are spin degrees of freedom, then \mathcal{S} can also be decomposed into symmetric and antisymmetric sectors $\mathcal{S}^{[2]}$ and $\mathcal{S}^{[1^2]}$. For example, for two particles with spin 1/2, the triplet states are in $\mathcal{S}^{[2]}$ and the singlet state is in $\mathcal{S}^{[1^2]}$. The spin Hilbert spaces and spatial Hilbert spaces are then combined as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}^{[2]} &= (\mathcal{K}^{[2]} \otimes \mathcal{S}^{[2]}) \oplus (\mathcal{K}^{[1^2]} \otimes \mathcal{S}^{[1^2]}) \text{ and} \\ \mathcal{H}^{[1^2]} &= (\mathcal{K}^{[2]} \otimes \mathcal{S}^{[1^2]}) \oplus (\mathcal{K}^{[1^2]} \otimes \mathcal{S}^{[2]}).\end{aligned}\tag{34}$$

Note that the total spin operator $\hat{S} = (\hat{\mathbf{S}}_1 + \hat{\mathbf{S}}_2)^2$ and total spin component operator $\hat{S}_z = \hat{S}_{1z} + \hat{S}_{2z}$ commute with the permutation operator $\hat{p}_{(12)}$, as well as with all one-particle and two-particle spatial observables. Therefore, total spin and spin component are good quantum numbers for the symmetrized states for any interaction as long as the trap is spin-independent. However, that does not mean they are uncorrelated to energy because of the construction (34).

4 Three Particles

The kinematic symmetry of the Hamiltonian \hat{H}^3 (whether interacting or non-interacting) includes particle permutation symmetry S_3 . This order six group has three two-cycles (12), (23) and (13); two three-cycles (123) and (132); and the identity $() = e$. It is generated by any two transpositions, for example (12) and (23). Unlike like S_2 , the group S_3 is not abelian, and so now the irreducible representations of particle exchange symmetry are more complicated. One implication is that the spatial Hilbert space \mathcal{K} , the spin Hilbert space \mathcal{S} and the total Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{S}$ can each be broken into sectors with the three types of symmetry that three particle states can have, e.g. for the spatial Hilbert space

$$\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}^{[3]} \oplus \mathcal{K}^{[21]} \oplus \mathcal{K}^{[1^3]},\tag{35}$$

where the irrep [3] with Ferrers diagram $\square\square\square$ corresponds to a sector that is totally symmetric under particle exchange, the irrep $[1^3]$ with Ferrers diagram $\begin{smallmatrix} \square \\ \square \\ \square \end{smallmatrix}$ is totally antisymmetric under pairwise exchange, and the irrep [21] with Ferrers diagram $\begin{smallmatrix} \square & \square \\ \square \end{smallmatrix}$ has mixed symmetry. Each of these sectors $\mathcal{K}^{[\mu]}$ in

(35) are a tower of irrep spaces of S_3 , i.e. the spatial Hilbert space sector $\mathcal{K}^{[\mu]}$ is the direct sum of an infinite number of copies of a vector space $M^{[\mu]}$ that carries the irrep $[\mu]$:

$$\mathcal{K}^{[\mu]} = \bigoplus_i \mathcal{K}_i^{[\mu]}. \quad (36)$$

Each $\mathcal{K}_i^{[\mu]} \sim M^{[\mu]}$ in the tower $\mathcal{K}^{[\mu]}$ is labeled by its energy rank, i.e. $i = 0$ is the lowest energy subspace with symmetry $[\mu]$ in $\mathcal{K}^{[\mu]}$, $i = 1$ is the next lowest, etc.

Similar to the previous section, the following subsections treat the cases of non-interacting, interacting, and contact interactions in the unitary limit. The usefulness of state permutation symmetry becomes more evident as the limits of particle permutation symmetry become more acute, and in the unitary limit of the contact interaction a new kinematic symmetry emerges called ordering permutation symmetry.

4.1 Non-Interacting Particles

The spectrum of three non-interacting particles σ_0^3 is constructed from all possible compositions of the single particle energies. As with two particles, the spectrum σ_0^3 can be only partially ordered without specific knowledge of σ_1 (see Fig. 4). If there are no emergent or accidental symmetries, then there are three kinds of energy levels: singly-degenerate levels derived from compositions of identical states like $(\alpha\alpha\alpha) = (\alpha^3)$, three-fold degenerate levels from compositions of two different states like $(\alpha\alpha\beta) = (\alpha^2\beta)$, and six-fold degenerate levels from compositions of three different states like $(\alpha\beta\gamma)$. Since S_3 has two one-dimensional irreducible representations [3] and $[1^3]$ and one two-dimensional irreducible representation [21], it is clear that S_3 symmetry alone cannot explain the degeneracies of σ_0^3 .

The configuration space and kinematic symmetries of three non-interacting particles must at least contain the following subgroups:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{C}_0^3 &\geq S_3 \times (\mathbb{C}_1)^{\times 3} \\ \mathbb{K}_0^3 &\geq S_3 \times (\mathbb{K}_1)^{\times 3}. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Postponing the proof until the sequel, the group $S_3 \times (\mathbb{K}_1)^{\times 3}$ always has irreducible representations that are one, three and six dimensional. These irreps are labeled by the the three energies in the




Fig. 4 Each sequence of three numbers determines a composition (ν). The superscript denotes the number of sequences with that composition, or equivalently the dimension of $\mathcal{K}_{(\nu)}$. Unless the specific values of $\epsilon_i \in \sigma_1$ are known, only the partial ordering of composition energies $E_{(\nu)}$ that is given by the arrows is defined. The boxed sequences have compositions with the shape $[1^3]$. Therefore their composition subspaces $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}$ carry the regular representation of S_3 and have state permutation symmetry $\mathfrak{S}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)} \sim S_3$. There is a one-component bosonic state in every composition space $\mathcal{K}_{(\nu)}$, but there are only one-component fermionic states in spaces with the boxed compositions $[\nu] = [1^3]$. Note that if the sequence $\langle 012 \rangle$ is added element-wise to each of the original sequences (e.g. $\langle 002 \rangle + \langle 012 \rangle = \langle 014 \rangle$) the chart will have the same form, giving a one-to-one mapping from bosonic states to fermionic states, as in Fig. 2.

composition, i.e. the three characters of the time translation subgroup $T_t^{\times 3}$. Therefore, the minimal kinematic symmetry is sufficient to explain the degeneracy of the non-interacting energy levels in σ_0^3 . For the case of the harmonic trap, a state with total energy $E = \hbar\omega(X + 3/2)$ has a degeneracy $(X + 1)(X + 2)/2$. These additional coincidences in σ_0^3 are explained by the emergent $U(3)$ kinematic symmetry [54; 55].

The minimal configuration space symmetry occurs when $C_1 \sim Z_1$. Then C_0^3 is isomorphic to S_3 and is realized as the group of point transformations in three dimensions with Schönflies notation C_{3v} . The permutations of three particles are realized in configuration space by reflections and rotations. Each of the three two-cycles (ij) is a reflection across the plane defined by $q_i = q_j$ and the two three-cycles (123) and (132) are rotations by $\pm 2\pi/3$ about the line $q_1 = q_2 = q_3$. See Fig. 5 for some examples of equipotential surfaces for three non-interacting particles.




Fig. 5 These figures depict a representative equipotential for three particles in a one-dimensional trap with (a) $V(q) = |q|^{1/2}$; (b) $V(q) = |q|$; (c) $V(q) = q^2$ (harmonic); (d) $V(q) = q^{10}$; (e) $V(q) = |q|$ for $q < 0$ and $V(q) = q^{10}$ for $q > 0$. The transparent planes are the surfaces in configuration space where two particles coincide, i.e. $q_1 = q_2$, $q_2 = q_3$ and $q_1 = q_3$. All subfigures all have particle exchange symmetry S_3 : two-cycles like (12) are reflections across the corresponding coincidence plane and three-cycles like (123) are rotations by $2\pi/3$ about the axis where all three planes intersect. Potentials (a)-(d) are also parity symmetric and have the full octahedral symmetry O_h . Note that only (c) the harmonic potential (which has the maximal point symmetry $O(3)$) is symmetric under relative parity inversion, corresponding to rotation of π about the bold axis where the three coincidence planes intersect.

When the trap is parity symmetric, each particles' parity operator remains a symmetry of the system. Then $C_1 \sim O(1)$ and the configuration space symmetry is

$$C_0^3 \geq S_3 \times O(1)^{\times 3} \sim O_h, \quad (38)$$

where O_h is the full cubic symmetry in three-dimensions with order 48 and ten irreducible representations [56], five with even parity and five with odd. See Table 2 for a categorization of some low-level non-interacting three particle states using the standard notation for the O_h irreps A_{1g} , A_{2g} , E_g , etc.

The spatial Hilbert subspace for a particular composition carries an irreducible representation of $S_3 \times (K_1)^{\times 3}$, but it can be decomposed into irreducible representation spaces of its S_3 subgroup as

Table 2 This table categorizes the energy levels in the three-particle, non-interacting spectrum σ_0^3 for a general symmetric trap into irreps of the non-interacting configuration space symmetry group $C_0^3 = S_3 \times O(1)^{\times 3} \sim O_h$, the kinematic symmetry group $K_0^3 = S_3 \times (O(1) \times T_t)^{\times 3}$, and the interacting symmetry group $K^3 \sim S_3 \times O(1) \times T_t$. Non-interacting energy levels are labeled by their one-particle compositions. The notation for O_h irreps is standard, c.f. [56], and the notation for the irreps of K_0^3 is the composition with subscripts denoting each state's parity. See Fig. 4 for the partial ordering of these energy levels if the specific values of the one-particle spectrum are unknown. One C_0^3 irrep does not appear in this table; the lowest energy composition that carries a copy of the irrep E_u is $(1^2 3) \rightarrow A_{2u} \oplus E_u$. Two K_0^3 irreps do not appear in this table; the lowest energy compositions that carry those irreps are $(024) \rightarrow (\alpha_+ \beta_+ \gamma_+)$ and $(135) \rightarrow (\alpha_- \beta_- \gamma_-)$.

Composition	Degeneracy	C_0^3 irreps	K_0^3 irreps	K^3 irreps
(0^3)	1	A_{1g}	(α_+^3)	$[3]^+$
$(0^2 1)$	3	T_{1u}	$(\alpha_+^2 \beta_-)$	$[3]^- \oplus [21]^-$
(01^2)	3	T_{2g}	$(\alpha_-^2 \beta_+)$	$[3]^+ \oplus [21]^+$
$(0^2 2)$	3	$A_{1g} \oplus E_g$	$(\alpha_+^2 \beta_+)$	$[3]^+ \oplus [21]^+$
(1^3)	1	A_{2u}	(α_-^3)	$[1^3]^-$
(012)	6	$T_{1u} \oplus T_{2u}$	$(\alpha_+ \beta_+ \gamma_-)$	$[3]^- \oplus 2[21]^- \oplus [1^3]^-$
$(0^2 3)$	3	T_{1u}	$(\alpha_+^2 \beta_-)$	$[3]^- \oplus [21]^-$
$(1^2 2)$	3	T_{2g}	$(\alpha_-^2 \beta_+)$	$[3]^+ \oplus [21]^+$
(02^2)	3	$A_{1g} \oplus E_g$	$(\alpha_+^2 \beta_+)$	$[3]^+ \oplus [21]^+$
(013)	6	$T_{1g} \oplus T_{2g}$	$(\alpha_+ \beta_- \gamma_-)$	$[3]^+ \oplus 2[21]^+ \oplus [1^3]^+$
$(0^2 4)$	3	$A_{1g} \oplus E_g$	$(\alpha_+^2 \beta_+)$	$[3]^+ \oplus [21]^+$

follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha^3)} &= \mathcal{K}_{\overline{[\alpha\alpha\alpha]}} \sim M^{[3]} \\
\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha^2\beta)} &= \mathcal{K}_{\overline{[\alpha\alpha\beta]}} \oplus \mathcal{K}_{\overline{[\alpha\alpha] \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{smallmatrix}}} \sim M^{[3]} \oplus M^{[21]} \\
\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)} &= \mathcal{K}_{\overline{[\alpha\beta\gamma]}} \oplus \mathcal{K}_{\overline{[\alpha\beta] \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \gamma \end{smallmatrix}}} \oplus \mathcal{K}_{\overline{[\alpha\gamma] \begin{smallmatrix} \beta \\ \gamma \end{smallmatrix}}} \oplus \mathcal{K}_{\overline{[\alpha] \begin{smallmatrix} \beta \\ \gamma \end{smallmatrix}}} \sim M^{[3]} \oplus 2M^{[21]} \oplus M^{[1^3]}.
\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

The first types of these spaces $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha^3)}$ carries the trivial, totally symmetric representation and has the single basis vector $|\alpha\alpha\alpha\rangle \equiv \overline{[\alpha\alpha\alpha]}$. The composition (α^3) has shape $[3]$ and the composition space $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha^3)}$ is a proper subspace of $\mathcal{K}^{[3]}$.

The second type of space $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha^2\beta)}$ corresponds to compositions of two states and has shape $[21]$. It carries what is called the defining representation of S_3 . This representation is reducible into a totally symmetric sector $\mathcal{K}_{\overline{[\alpha\alpha\beta]}}$ isomorphic to the irrep space $M^{[3]}$ and a sector with mixed symmetry $\mathcal{K}_{\overline{[\alpha\alpha] \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{smallmatrix}}}$

isomorphic to the irrep space $M^{[21]}$. The three basis vectors of $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha^2\beta)}$ can be chosen as

$$\begin{aligned} |\overline{\alpha\alpha\beta}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} (|\alpha\alpha\beta\rangle + |\alpha\beta\alpha\rangle + |\beta\alpha\alpha\rangle) \\ |\overline{\alpha\alpha} \overline{12} \overline{3}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} (2|\alpha\alpha\beta\rangle - |\alpha\beta\alpha\rangle - |\beta\alpha\alpha\rangle) \\ |\overline{\alpha\alpha} \overline{13} \overline{2}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\alpha\beta\alpha\rangle - |\beta\alpha\alpha\rangle). \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

The vector $|\overline{\alpha\alpha\beta}\rangle$ is invariant under S_3 . For the other two vectors, the tableaux $\overline{12} \overline{3}$ and $\overline{13} \overline{2}$ label basis vectors for the irrep space $M^{[21]}$ that mix under particle permutations, e.g.

$$\hat{p}_{(23)} |\overline{\alpha\alpha} \overline{12} \overline{3}\rangle = -\frac{1}{2} |\overline{\alpha\alpha} \overline{12} \overline{3}\rangle + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} |\overline{\alpha\alpha} \overline{13} \overline{2}\rangle.$$

A complete set of commuting observables that distinguishes (40) are the 2-cycle class operators [39] for S_3 and the S_2 subgroup generated by $\hat{p}_{(12)}$

$$\hat{C}_3 = \hat{p}_{(12)} + \hat{p}_{(23)} + \hat{p}_{(13)} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{C}_2 = \hat{p}_{(12)} \quad (41)$$

which act like

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{C}_3 |\overline{\alpha\alpha\beta}\rangle &= 3 |\overline{\alpha\alpha\beta}\rangle, \quad \hat{C}_2 |\overline{\alpha\alpha\beta}\rangle = |\overline{\alpha\alpha\beta}\rangle, \\ \hat{C}_3 |\overline{\alpha\alpha} \overline{12} \overline{3}\rangle &= 0, \quad \hat{C}_2 |\overline{\alpha\alpha} \overline{12} \overline{3}\rangle = |\overline{\alpha\alpha} \overline{12} \overline{3}\rangle, \\ \hat{C}_3 |\overline{\alpha\alpha} \overline{13} \overline{2}\rangle &= 0, \quad \hat{C}_2 |\overline{\alpha\alpha} \overline{13} \overline{2}\rangle = -|\overline{\alpha\alpha} \overline{13} \overline{2}\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The third type of composition space $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}$ is six-dimensional and spanned by particle basis vectors composed of three different states. It carries the regular representation of S_3 , i.e. each representation appears as many times as its dimension. Only compositions with shape $[1^3]$ have composition spaces that contain a copy the totally antisymmetric representation $M^{[1^3]}$. Following the conventions of [39], I choose the basis vectors:

$$\begin{aligned} |\overline{\alpha\beta\gamma}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} (|\alpha\beta\gamma\rangle + |\beta\alpha\gamma\rangle + |\gamma\beta\alpha\rangle + |\alpha\gamma\beta\rangle + |\gamma\alpha\beta\rangle + |\beta\gamma\alpha\rangle) \\ |\overline{\alpha\beta} \overline{12} \overline{3}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{12}} (2|\alpha\beta\gamma\rangle + 2|\beta\alpha\gamma\rangle - |\gamma\beta\alpha\rangle - |\alpha\gamma\beta\rangle - |\gamma\alpha\beta\rangle - |\beta\gamma\alpha\rangle) \\ |\overline{\alpha\beta} \overline{13} \overline{2}\rangle &= \frac{1}{2} (-|\gamma\beta\alpha\rangle + |\alpha\gamma\beta\rangle - |\gamma\alpha\beta\rangle + |\beta\gamma\alpha\rangle) \\ |\overline{\alpha\gamma} \overline{12} \overline{3}\rangle &= \frac{1}{2} (-|\gamma\beta\alpha\rangle + |\alpha\gamma\beta\rangle + |\gamma\alpha\beta\rangle - |\beta\gamma\alpha\rangle) \\ |\overline{\alpha\gamma} \overline{13} \overline{2}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{12}} (2|\alpha\beta\gamma\rangle - 2|\beta\alpha\gamma\rangle + |\gamma\beta\alpha\rangle + |\alpha\gamma\beta\rangle - |\gamma\alpha\beta\rangle - |\beta\gamma\alpha\rangle) \\ |\overline{\alpha} \overline{\beta} \overline{\gamma}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} (|\alpha\beta\gamma\rangle - |\beta\alpha\gamma\rangle - |\gamma\beta\alpha\rangle - |\alpha\gamma\beta\rangle + |\gamma\alpha\beta\rangle + |\beta\gamma\alpha\rangle). \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

As before, the the shape of the tableaux denote the irreducible representation of S_3 . The tableaux filled with state labels denote the specific irrep space $M^{[\mu]}$ of the particle permutation symmetry and the tableaux filled with particle numbers identify a basis for the irrep spaces. The two copies of $M^{[21]}$ are distinguished by different state label patterns in the first tableau.

The particular basis in (42) is chosen to exploit the state permutation symmetry $\mathfrak{S}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}$ of the subspace $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}$. The group of state permutations $\mathfrak{S}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}$ has six elements and is generated by two state transpositions, e.g. $\mathfrak{p}_{(\alpha\beta)}$ and $\mathfrak{p}_{(\beta\gamma)}$. Therefore state permutations form a symmetry of the subspace $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}$ that is isomorphic to S_3 , but it is distinct from the particle permutation symmetry. For example, note the following comparisons:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{p}_{(123)}|\alpha\beta\gamma\rangle &= |\gamma\alpha\beta\rangle, \text{ but } \mathfrak{p}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}|\alpha\beta\gamma\rangle = |\beta\gamma\alpha\rangle; \\ \hat{p}_{(123)}|\gamma\alpha\beta\rangle &= |\beta\gamma\alpha\rangle, \text{ but } \mathfrak{p}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}|\gamma\alpha\beta\rangle = |\alpha\beta\gamma\rangle.\end{aligned}\tag{43}$$

The subspace $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}$ also carries the regular representation of the state permutation symmetry. Conversely to the particle permutation symmetry, the basis vectors in (42) are chosen so that the tableaux filled with particle numbers denote irreducible representations of $\mathfrak{S}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}$ and the tableaux filled with state labels denote basis vectors within irreducible representation spaces of $\mathfrak{S}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}$. Using state permutation symmetry, the complete set of commuting observables for the basis (42) of $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}$ comprises the 2-cycle class operators (41) for the S_3 group and S_2 subgroup with two additional 2-cycle class operators for $\mathfrak{S}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}$ and its subgroup $\mathfrak{S}_{(\alpha\beta)}$:

$$\hat{\mathfrak{C}}_3 = \mathfrak{p}_{(\alpha\beta)} + \mathfrak{p}_{(\beta\gamma)} + \mathfrak{p}_{(\alpha\gamma)} \text{ and } \hat{\mathfrak{C}}_2 = \mathfrak{p}_{(\alpha\beta)}.\tag{44}$$

Note that state permutation symmetry is not a global symmetry of \hat{H}_0^3 . It is only a symmetry of the spatial subspaces $\mathcal{K}_{(\nu)}$ with composition shapes $[\nu] = [1^3]$. In the sequel article, the method for exploiting the state permutation symmetry of non-interacting energy eigenspaces is formalized using the machinery of permutation modules.

Restating the previous results more generally, a basis for non-interacting states with a given composition (ν) are provided by the vectors $|W; Y\rangle$, where W is a semi-standard Weyl tableau filled with

state labels and Y is a standard Young tableau filled with particle numbers⁸. The Young tableaux Y must have the same shape as W because the shape labels the irrep of S_3 . The particle permutation operators mix states with the same W and different Y 's and the state permutation operators (only relevant for subspaces with compositions of three distinct states like $(\alpha\beta\gamma)$) mix states with different W 's and the same Y . In Chapter 3 of [39], an explicit method for constructing a complete set of commuting operators that correspond to the W and Y is described, and this is extended to the general case of N particles in the next article.

The spectrum and degeneracy for non-interacting spinless particles is now effectively solved in terms of one-particle observables (excluding emergent or accidental symmetries). Since for this case $\mathcal{H}^{[\nu]} \sim \mathcal{K}^{[\nu]}$, spinless distinguishable particles can populate every energy level in σ_0^3 . Identical spinless bosons are restricted to the sector $\mathcal{H}^{[3]} \sim \mathcal{K}^{[3]}$, where $\mathcal{K}^{[3]}$ is the tower composed of the single, spatially-symmetric state that exists in every composition space $\mathcal{K}_{(\nu)}$. Spinless fermions are restricted to the sector $\mathcal{H}^{[1^3]} \sim \mathcal{K}^{[1^3]}$; a single spatially-antisymmetric state exists only in composition spaces with composition shapes $[1^3]$. There is a one-to-one mapping between the set of all composition spaces and the set of composition spaces with shape $[1^3]$; see Fig. 4.

If there are internal components, there are two methods for symmetrization often used. One method fixes the spin components of specific particles, e.g. “particle 1 and particle 2 are spin up and particle 3 is spin down”, and then the spatial wave functions are symmetrized within particles with like spin components. Examples of this approach include [10; 11; 14; 22; 24; 32; 34; 36; 37]. The alternate method pursued here is the combined, simultaneous symmetrization of spin and spatial states, cf. [40; 57]. Following that approach, the spin Hilbert space $\mathcal{S} \sim \mathbb{C}^{J^N}$ can be decomposed into subspaces with definite symmetry

$$\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}^{[3]} \oplus \mathcal{S}^{[21]} \oplus \mathcal{S}^{[1^3]}.$$

Then the bosonic sector of \mathcal{H} is

$$\mathcal{H}^{[3]} = (\mathcal{S}^{[3]} \otimes \mathcal{K}^{[3]}) \oplus (\mathcal{S}^{[21]} \otimes \mathcal{K}^{[21]}) \Big|_{[3]} \oplus (\mathcal{S}^{[1^3]} \otimes \mathcal{K}^{[1^3]}), \quad (45)$$

⁸ The rules for filling the Ferrers diagrams for the different tableaux are as follows. For semi-standard Weyl tableaux, the state labels must stay the same or increase to the right and must increase to the bottom. For Young tableaux, the particle numbers must increase to the right and to the bottom.

where $|_{[3]}$ means the symmetric subspace of $\mathcal{S}^{[21]} \otimes \mathcal{K}^{[21]}$. Bases for this subspace can be explicitly constructed using Clebsch-Gordan coefficients for S_3 , c.f. [47]. A similar expression for the fermionic sector is

$$\mathcal{H}^{[1^3]} = (\mathcal{S}^{[3]} \otimes \mathcal{K}^{[1^3]}) \oplus (\mathcal{S}^{[21]} \otimes \mathcal{K}^{[21]}) \Big|_{[1^3]} \oplus (\mathcal{S}^{[1^3]} \otimes \mathcal{K}^{[3]}). \quad (46)$$

Note that $\mathcal{S}^{[1^3]}$ is non-empty only if $J \geq 3$; there must be at least three spin components in order for the spin state to carry the required antisymmetry to balance a totally symmetric spatial state.

Explicit state construction requires additional algebra, but for counting degeneracies this is sufficient. As an example, consider three fermionic spin-1/2 particles with state labels \uparrow and \downarrow corresponding to the eigenvectors of the z -component of each particle's spin $\hat{S}_{i,z}$. The four states with total spin $s = 3/2$ correspond to the totally symmetric spin vectors that span $\mathcal{S}^{[3]}$

$$|\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\rangle, |\uparrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle, |\downarrow\uparrow\downarrow\rangle, |\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle.$$

In other words, for three spin-1/2 particles the space $\mathcal{S}^{[3]}$ carries one copy of the four dimensional SU(2) representation $D^{3/2}$. The four states with $s = 1/2$ that span $\mathcal{S}^{[21]}$ can be chosen as simultaneous eigenvectors of \hat{S}^2 , \hat{S}_z , and $\hat{p}_{(12)}$:

$$\left| \begin{array}{c} \uparrow\uparrow \\ \downarrow \end{array} \right| \left| \begin{array}{c} 12 \\ 3 \end{array} \right\rangle, \left| \begin{array}{c} \uparrow\uparrow \\ \downarrow \end{array} \right| \left| \begin{array}{c} 13 \\ 2 \end{array} \right\rangle, \left| \begin{array}{c} \uparrow\downarrow \\ \downarrow \end{array} \right| \left| \begin{array}{c} 12 \\ 3 \end{array} \right\rangle, \left| \begin{array}{c} \uparrow\downarrow \\ \downarrow \end{array} \right| \left| \begin{array}{c} 13 \\ 2 \end{array} \right\rangle.$$

The space $\mathcal{S}^{[21]}$ carries two copies of the SU(2) irrep $D^{1/2}$. These two copies are distinguished by how they transform under $\hat{p}_{(12)}$, as indicated by the Young tableau $\begin{array}{c} 12 \\ 3 \end{array}$ or $\begin{array}{c} 13 \\ 2 \end{array}$.

Combining these results with the spatial symmetries, for every composition space $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}$, there are four $s = 3/2$ fermionic states from the product $\mathcal{S}^{[3]} \otimes \mathcal{K}_{\begin{array}{c} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{array}}$ and four $s = 1/2$ fermionic states from the reduction of the product $\mathcal{S}^{[21]} \otimes (\mathcal{K}_{\begin{array}{c} \alpha\beta \\ \gamma \end{array}} \oplus \mathcal{K}_{\begin{array}{c} \alpha\gamma \\ \beta \end{array}})$. For every subspace $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha^2\beta)}$ there are two $s = 1/2$ fermionic states in the reduction of $\mathcal{S}^{[21]} \otimes \mathcal{K}_{\begin{array}{c} \alpha\alpha \\ \beta \end{array}}$. Three spin-1/2 fermions cannot populate energy levels $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha^3)}$ because the spin Hilbert space cannot 'carry' enough asymmetry to balance the symmetric state.

4.2 Three particles: General Interactions

Now we add the pairwise interactions

$$\hat{H}^3 = \hat{H}_0^3 + \hat{V}^3, \quad (47)$$

where

$$\hat{V}^3 = \hat{V}_{12} + \hat{V}_{23} + \hat{V}_{31}. \quad (48)$$

In principle, there could also be an intrinsic three-body interaction that satisfies Galilean invariance and cluster decomposability, but here I only consider three-body interactions that result from pairwise interactions.

By construction, the operator \hat{V}^3 has S_3 symmetry. It also inherits all the consequences of Galilean invariance from the two-particle interaction. Specifically, it commutes with the (normalized) center-of-mass position operator $\hat{Q} = 1/\sqrt{3}(\hat{Q}_1 + \hat{Q}_2 + \hat{Q}_3)$ and momentum operator $\hat{P} = 1/\sqrt{3}(\hat{P}_1 + \hat{P}_2 + \hat{P}_3)$, as well as the total parity operator $\hat{\Pi} = \hat{\Pi}_1 \hat{\Pi}_2 \hat{\Pi}_3$. It also commutes with the relative parity operator $\hat{\Pi}_r$. For two particles, the relative parity operator acts identically to the permutation operator $\hat{p}_{(12)}$, but for three particles relative parity is not an element of the particle permutation group S_3 . For example, for three particles one can choose a particular set of Jacobi coordinates, e.g.

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Q} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(\hat{Q}_1 + \hat{Q}_2 + \hat{Q}_3) \\ \hat{R}_1 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{Q}_1 - \hat{Q}_2) \\ \hat{R}_2 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(\hat{Q}_1 + \hat{Q}_2 - 2\hat{Q}_3). \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Total parity inverts all three coordinates

$$\hat{\Pi}\hat{Q} = -\hat{Q}\hat{\Pi}, \hat{\Pi}\hat{R}_1 = -\hat{R}_1\hat{\Pi}, \hat{\Pi}\hat{R}_2 = -\hat{R}_2\hat{\Pi}$$

whereas relative parity commutes with \hat{Q} but inverts the relative positions

$$\hat{\Pi}_r\hat{Q} = \hat{Q}\hat{\Pi}_r, \hat{\Pi}_r\hat{R}_1 = -\hat{R}_1\hat{\Pi}_r, \hat{\Pi}_r\hat{R}_2 = -\hat{R}_2\hat{\Pi}_r.$$

In three-particle configuration space, $\hat{\Pi}_r$ is realized as a rotation by π around the line $q_1 = q_2 = q_3$.

4.2.1 Configuration Space Symmetry for Three Interacting Particles

Putting this together, the operator \hat{V}^3 has the configuration space symmetry group $S_3 \times O(1) \times (O(1) \times T_Q)$. The first factor is particle permutation symmetry, the second is total parity, and the third is translations and reflections along the center-of-mass axis. The trap will certainly break the translational symmetry of \hat{V}^3 , and may break other symmetries. The three cases are

-
- For an general asymmetric trap, the configuration space symmetry remaining after two-body interactions are included is only $C^3 \sim S_3$; all parity symmetries are lost. The Schönflies notation for this three-dimensional point group is C_{3v} , Coxeter notation is [3], and this is the symmetry of a regular hexagonal prism with painted ends.
 - For a general symmetric trap, the total parity is still a good symmetry so $C^3 \sim S_3 \times O(1)$. The Schönflies notation for this three-dimensional point group with order twelve is D_{3d} , Coxeter notation is [[3]], and this is the symmetry of regular hexagonal prism with even-checked sides.
 - For a harmonic trap, then relative parity provides another independent quantum number⁹. The configuration space symmetry $C^3 = S_3 \times O(1) \times O(1)$ is isomorphic to the three-dimensional point group D_{6h} , Coxeter notation is [[3], 2], and these are the symmetries of a regular hexagonal prism.

4.2.2 Kinematic Symmetry for Three Interacting Particles

Unless there are emergent symmetries, the kinematic symmetry of \hat{H}^3 is $S_3 \times K_1$. The irreducible representations of this symmetry groups have the same dimensions as the irreducible representations of S_3 for any one-particle symmetries K_1 . Every energy level $E \in \sigma^3$ is associated to an S_3 irrep and the spatial Hilbert space is decomposable into singly-degenerate levels for the totally symmetric $\mathcal{K}^{[3]}$ and totally antisymmetric sectors $\mathcal{K}^{[1^3]}$ and doubly-degenerate energy levels for the sector with mixed symmetry $\mathcal{K}^{[21]}$:

$$\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}^{[3]} \oplus \mathcal{K}^{[21]} \oplus \mathcal{K}^{[1^3]}.$$

One application of this decomposition is facilitating exact diagonalization in the non-interacting basis. Only basis vectors from the same S_3 irreps with the same Young tableau will have non-zero interaction matrix elements:

$$\langle W Y | \hat{V}^3 | W' Y' \rangle = \langle W | | \hat{V}^3 | | W' \rangle \delta_{Y Y'}. \quad (50)$$

This allows the number of basis vectors that need to be included to achieve a certain accuracy to be reduced. For example, consider the 56 states that are depicted in Fig. 4. Of those, sixteen states are in $\mathcal{K}^{[3]}$ and only four states are in $\mathcal{K}^{[1^3]}$. The remaining 36 states are in $\mathcal{K}^{[21]}$, but since the

⁹ Relative parity is also a good quantum number for uniform and linear traps because for any quadratic trap the center-of-mass and relative coordinates separate.

interaction operator \hat{V}^3 acts like the identity within the irrep, only eighteen states are necessary for exact diagonalization.

If K_1 includes parity symmetry, this provides an additional quantum number. Although parity does not change the degeneracy of the spectrum σ^3 , it can be used to further decompose the spatial Hilbert space into two independent sectors for each S_3 irrep, one for each parity:

$$\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}^{[3]^+} \oplus \mathcal{K}^{[3]^-} \oplus \mathcal{K}^{[21]^+} \oplus \mathcal{K}^{[21]^-} \oplus \mathcal{K}^{[1^3]^+} \oplus \mathcal{K}^{[1^3]^-}. \quad (51)$$

Continuing the same example based on the states depicted in Fig. 4, the number of states needed to do exact diagonalization in each of these sectors is further reduced to 7, 9, 7, 11, 1, and 3, respectively. For harmonic traps, a further reduction is possible, because the center-of-mass excitation is still a good quantum number [22; 33].

4.2.3 Weak Interactions for Three Particles

For weak interactions, the energy of the single state in each space $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha^3)}$ shifts and the energy levels in the spaces $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha^2\beta)}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}$ split and shift. Unless the trap or interaction have additional symmetries (emergent or accidental), the degeneracy of the splitting is determined by the symmetry. Since $K_0^3 > K^3$, the irreps of K_0^3 are generally reducible with respect to K^3 . In Table 2, the reduction of composition spaces into K^3 is given. This reduction has a similar form as the reduction of K_0^3 irreps by S_3 described by (39). For $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha^3)}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha^2\beta)}$ the reductions are identical and no additional information about the nature of the two-body interaction or trap is required. However, for compositions like $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}$, the manner in which two copies of $M^{[21]}$ split requires specific knowledge of the two-body matrix elements.

Let us make this explicit for each of the three types of composition spaces. In the particle basis, the matrix elements of \hat{V}^3 can be expressed in terms of the two-particle matrix elements:

$$\langle \alpha\beta\gamma | \hat{V}^3 | \zeta\eta\theta \rangle = v_{(\alpha\zeta)(\beta\eta)} \delta_{\gamma\theta} + v_{(\beta\eta)(\gamma\theta)} \delta_{\alpha\zeta} + v_{(\alpha\zeta)(\gamma\theta)} \delta_{\beta\eta}. \quad (52)$$

Applying this, the trivial one-dimensional space $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha^3)}$ experiences an energy shift

$$\langle \overline{[\alpha\alpha\alpha]} | \hat{V}^3 | \overline{[\alpha\alpha\alpha]} \rangle = 3v_{(\alpha\alpha)(\alpha\alpha)} \equiv 3v_{(\alpha^2)^2}. \quad (53)$$

The factor of three represents the fact that for this totally symmetric state the pairwise interactions of the three particles interfere constructively.

In the three-dimensional space $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha^2\beta)}$ the only non-zero matrix elements in the basis (40) are

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \boxed{\alpha\alpha\beta} | \hat{V}^3 | \boxed{\alpha\alpha\beta} \rangle &= v_{(\alpha^2)^2} + 2v_{(\alpha^2)(\beta^2)} + 2v_{(\alpha\beta)^2} \\ \langle \boxed{\frac{\alpha}{\beta} \frac{1}{3} \frac{2}{3}} | \hat{V}^3 | \boxed{\frac{\alpha}{\beta} \frac{1}{3} \frac{2}{3}} \rangle &= \langle \boxed{\frac{\alpha}{\beta} \frac{1}{2} \frac{3}{3}} | \hat{V}^3 | \boxed{\frac{\alpha}{\beta} \frac{1}{2} \frac{3}{3}} \rangle = v_{(\alpha^2)^2} + 2v_{(\alpha^2)(\beta^2)} - v_{(\alpha\beta)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

Assuming repulsive interactions, the non-degenerate symmetric level experiences a greater shift than the doubly degenerate mixed-symmetry level. For contact interactions there is state permutation symmetry of the two-body matrix elements. Therefore we have $v_{(\alpha^2)(\beta^2)} = v_{(\alpha\beta)^2} \equiv v_{(\alpha^2\beta^2)}$ and these relations simplify further.

Can anything be considered universal in these expressions for weak perturbations of composition space $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha^2\beta)}$? Yes: the relation between the particle basis and the symmetrized perturbation eigenbasis, the higher energy shift of symmetric state compared to the partially symmetric state for repulsive interactions, and the algebraic expression for the energy shift in terms of two-particle interaction matrix elements are all universal features of $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha^2\beta)}$ subspaces. Although specific numerical values for the weak interaction energy shift depend on the specific two-body interactions, those properties do not.

However, for the $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}$ composition subspaces, one of these universal features is lost because such subspaces are not simply reducible by S_3 , although the reduction of K_0^3 irreps into K^3 irreps is still sufficient to determine the level shifts in the one-dimensional totally symmetric and totally antisymmetric spaces. The matrix elements of \hat{V}^3 in terms of the two-body matrix elements are:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \boxed{\alpha\beta\gamma} | \hat{V}^3 | \boxed{\alpha\beta\gamma} \rangle &= v_{(\alpha^2)(\beta^2)} + v_{(\alpha\beta)^2} + v_{(\beta^2)(\gamma^2)} + v_{(\beta\gamma)^2} + v_{(\alpha^2)(\gamma^2)} + v_{(\alpha\gamma)^2} \\ \langle \boxed{\frac{\alpha}{\beta} \frac{1}{\gamma}} | \hat{V}^3 | \boxed{\frac{\alpha}{\beta} \frac{1}{\gamma}} \rangle &= v_{(\alpha^2)(\beta^2)} - v_{(\alpha\beta)^2} + v_{(\beta^2)(\gamma^2)} - v_{(\beta\gamma)^2} + v_{(\alpha^2)(\gamma^2)} - v_{(\alpha\gamma)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

These are the first-order energy shifts, and the first-order energy eigenstates remain $|\boxed{\alpha\beta\gamma}\rangle$ and $|\boxed{\frac{\alpha}{\beta} \frac{1}{\gamma}}\rangle$. And as before, in the case of contact interaction the fermionic state will feel no energy shift at this (or any order) of perturbation theory. One way to think about this is destructive interference between the direct and exchange channels, and symmetry analysis gives another interpretation: because the interaction is symmetric under state permutation and the fermionic state is antisymmetric under state permutation, matrix elements between fermionic states are all identically zero.

However, when there are multiple copies of the same S_3 irrep space in the expansion of the composition space, then there are matrix elements of \hat{V}^3 between the two different irreducible representation spaces with the same mixed symmetry. The reduced matrix elements are

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \begin{array}{c} \alpha \beta \\ \gamma \end{array} \right\| \hat{V}^3 \left\| \begin{array}{c} \alpha \beta \\ \gamma \end{array} \right\rangle &= v_{(\alpha^2)(\beta^2)} + v_{(\alpha\beta)^2} + v_{(\beta^2)(\gamma^2)} - \frac{1}{2}v_{(\beta\gamma)^2} + v_{(\alpha^2)(\gamma^2)} - \frac{1}{2}v_{(\alpha\gamma)^2} \\ \left\langle \begin{array}{c} \alpha \gamma \\ \beta \end{array} \right\| \hat{V}^3 \left\| \begin{array}{c} \alpha \gamma \\ \beta \end{array} \right\rangle &= v_{(\alpha^2)(\beta^2)} - v_{(\alpha\beta)^2} + v_{(\beta^2)(\gamma^2)} + \frac{1}{2}v_{(\beta\gamma)^2} + v_{(\alpha^2)(\gamma^2)} + \frac{1}{2}v_{(\alpha\gamma)^2} \\ \left\langle \begin{array}{c} \alpha \beta \\ \gamma \end{array} \right\| \hat{V}^3 \left\| \begin{array}{c} \alpha \gamma \\ \beta \end{array} \right\rangle &= \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}(v_{(\alpha\gamma)^2} - v_{(\beta\gamma)^2}). \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

Note that the state permutation symmetry of $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}$ is broken by the interaction, so the state permutation class operator $\mathfrak{C}_2 = \mathfrak{p}_{(\alpha\beta)}$ is no longer provides a good quantum number and Weyl tableaux are not good basis labels¹⁰. The new split levels are superpositions of states with the same Young tableaux and the energy shifts for these levels are found by diagonalizing \hat{V}^3 in the mixed symmetry sector to find

$$\begin{aligned} v_{\pm} &= v_{(\alpha^2)(\beta^2)} + v_{(\beta^2)(\gamma^2)} + v_{(\alpha^2)(\gamma^2)} \\ &\pm \sqrt{(v_{(\alpha\beta)^2})^2 - v_{(\alpha\beta)^2}v_{(\beta\gamma)^2} + (v_{(\beta\gamma)^2})^2 - v_{(\beta\gamma)^2}v_{(\alpha\gamma)^2} + (v_{(\alpha\gamma)^2})^2 - v_{(\alpha\beta)^2}v_{(\alpha\gamma)^2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

The magnitudes of these shifts are intermediate between the shifts in the totally symmetric and totally antisymmetric sectors. The corresponding eigenvectors also on the two-body matrix elements, but the algebraic form of the eigenvalues and eigenvectors in terms of two-body matrix elements do not.

To summarize, for weak interactions, the six-fold degenerate composition subspace $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}$ breaks into four levels. The biggest energy shift takes place for the totally symmetric state $\left| \begin{array}{c} \alpha \beta \gamma \\ \gamma \end{array} \right\rangle$ and the smallest energy shift for the totally antisymmetric state $\left| \begin{array}{c} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{array} \right\rangle$. See Fig. 6 for an example comparing the level splitting of the lowest few energy levels of a harmonic well and a hard wall well under weak contact interactions. However, the states $\left| \begin{array}{c} \alpha \beta \\ \gamma \end{array} \right\rangle Y$ and $\left| \begin{array}{c} \alpha \gamma \\ \beta \end{array} \right\rangle Y$ mix under the interaction. There are universal algebraic expressions for the energy shifts (and similar ones for the superposition coefficients that give the corresponding states) that depend on the two-body matrix elements. However, unlike the other composition subspaces $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha^3)}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha^2\beta)}$ or the totally symmetric and antisymmetric sectors of this composition subspace $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}$, specific knowledge of the matrix elements is required to determine how

¹⁰ Also note that the first two equalities of (56) are not equivalent under exchange of β and γ because in the choice of basis (42), the state permutation subgroup generated by $\mathfrak{p}_{(\alpha\beta)}$ was diagonalized.




Fig. 6 This figure depicts the level splitting under weak contact interactions for a harmonic trap (left) and a hard wall trap (right). The energy scale for the two traps has been chosen so they have the same difference $\Delta E = E_{(012)} - E_{(0^3)}$ between the ground state with composition (0^3) and the energy level with composition (012) . The strength of the contact interaction is $g = \Delta E/30$. The thickness of lines depicts the degeneracy of the energy level, or equivalently the dimension of the corresponding S_3 irrep. For the highest non-interacting energy level, only the level corresponding to the unperturbed totally antisymmetric spatial state is depicted and the rest of the levels are cut off.

the states with mixed symmetry split. The algebraic expression (57) for the level splitting of the two partially symmetric subspaces (which are relevant for bosons and fermions with $J \geq 2$) is universal, but only in the weakest possible sense. In the sequel, it is hypothesized that for five particles and more, even this weakest kind of algebraic universality is broken because the diagonalizing the perturbation requires solving a quintic equation.

4.3 Three Particles: Two-Body Contact Interaction at Unitarity

To visualize the effect of contact interaction at the unitary limit, it is useful to visualize the coincidence manifold for three particles; see Fig. 5. This manifold is a structure in configuration space \mathcal{Q}^3 defined by the three planes $q_1 = q_2$, $q_2 = q_3$ and $q_1 = q_3$. These three planes intersect at the line $q_1 = q_2 = q_3$ at angles of $2\pi/3$. The point symmetry of the coincidence manifold is D_{6h} , which is the same as the configuration space symmetry C^3 for the harmonic trap.

The three coincidence planes divide configuration space into six sectors, one for each order of particles $q_i < q_j < q_k$. Denote these sectors \mathcal{Q}_p^3 , where p is an element of S_3 expressed in permutation notation $p = \{p_1, p_2, p_3\}$ and the order is $q_{p_1} < q_{p_2} < q_{p_3}$. In the unitary limit, these six sectors are completely independent. There is no tunneling between sectors and the coincidence manifold is a nodal surface in the wave function of every energy eigenstate.

A basis for each sector is again provided by the snippet basis, a restriction of the totally antisymmetric states $\left| \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{smallmatrix} \right\rangle$ to each sector \mathcal{Q}_p^3 :

$$\left\langle \mathbf{q} \left| \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{smallmatrix} \right\rangle; p \right\rangle = \begin{cases} \pi_p \sqrt{6} \left\langle \mathbf{q} \left| \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{smallmatrix} \right\rangle \right\rangle & \mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{Q}_p^3 \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}, \quad (58)$$

where π_p is the sign of the permutation p : for two-cycles $\pi_p = -1$ and for three-cycles and the identity $\pi_p = 1$. This means that for every composition $(\alpha\beta\gamma)$ of three distinct non-interacting energy eigenstates, there is a six-fold degenerate level with energy $E_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)} = \epsilon_\alpha + \epsilon_\beta + \epsilon_\gamma$ in the spectrum σ_∞^3 at unitarity limit of the contact interaction. See Fig. 7 for a depiction of the relative configuration space and lowest energy level $\left| \begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right\rangle$ for a harmonic trap.

Denote by $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}^\infty$ the space spanned by the snippet basis (58). This space carries the regular representation of S_3 . Just as the non-interacting space $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}$ carried an additional, independent copy of S_3 called state permutation symmetry $\mathfrak{S}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}$ that can be used to diagonalize the regular representation, $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}^\infty$ also carries an additional, independent copy of S_3 called ordering permutation symmetry \mathfrak{D}_3 . To compare these two symmetries, particle permutations exchange particles, no matter where the particles are in the order. They act on the snippet basis like

$$\hat{p}' \left| \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{smallmatrix} \right\rangle; p \rangle = \left| \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{smallmatrix} \right\rangle; p'p \rangle. \quad (59)$$




Fig. 7 This figure depicts the relative configuration space wave function for the lowest energy totally anti-symmetric spatial state of three particles in a harmonic well. The horizontal axis is the relative coordinate $r_1 = 1/\sqrt{2}(q_1 - q_2)$ and the vertical axis is the coordinate $r_2 = 1/\sqrt{6}(q_1 + q_2 - 2q_3)$. The permutation p in curly brackets denotes each sector. The center-of-mass degree of freedom is not depicted. The sectors are also labeled by lower-case letters for convenience; see Table 3.

However, ordering permutations exchange the order, no matter which particles are in that order. For example, the operator $\mathfrak{o}_{(AB)}$ exchanges the left-most particle ‘A’ with the middle particle ‘B’. This operator acts the same as $\hat{p}_{(12)}$ on the specific snippet basis vector $\left| \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{smallmatrix}; \{123\} \right\rangle$

$$\mathfrak{o}_{(AB)} \left| \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{smallmatrix}; \{123\} \right\rangle = \hat{p}_{(12)} \left| \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{smallmatrix}; \{123\} \right\rangle = \left| \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{smallmatrix}; \{213\} \right\rangle$$

but acts differently on a general vector, e.g.

$$\mathfrak{o}_{(AB)} \left| \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{smallmatrix}; \{312\} \right\rangle = \left| \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{smallmatrix}; \{132\} \right\rangle \neq \hat{p}_{(12)} \left| \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{smallmatrix}; \{312\} \right\rangle = \left| \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{smallmatrix}; \{321\} \right\rangle.$$

See Table 3 for more examples of the difference between particle permutations and ordering permutations. A little algebra shows that all elements of \mathfrak{D}_3 commute with all elements of S_3 , so every energy level $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}^\infty$ carries a symmetry isomorphic to $S_3 \times S_3 \equiv S_3^{\times 2}$. However, unlike state permutation symmetry, the group \mathfrak{D}_3 is a symmetry of the entire Hamiltonian \hat{H}_∞^3 , not just the subspace $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}^\infty$.

Ordering permutation symmetry can play the same role here symmetrizing the six-fold degenerate, unitary contact interacting energy eigenspace as state permutation symmetry played when symmetrizing the six-fold degenerate non-interacting subspace $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}$ as in (42). The six symmetrized snippet vectors are denoted

$$\left| \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{smallmatrix}; \overline{ABC} \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 \end{smallmatrix} \right\rangle, \left| \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{smallmatrix}; \overline{AC} \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ B & 3 \end{smallmatrix} \right\rangle, \left| \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{smallmatrix}; \overline{AC} \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 3 \\ B & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right\rangle, \left| \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{smallmatrix}; \overline{AB} \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ C & 3 \end{smallmatrix} \right\rangle, \left| \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{smallmatrix}; \overline{AB} \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 3 \\ C & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right\rangle, \left| \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{smallmatrix}; \overline{A} \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ B & 2 \\ C & 3 \end{smallmatrix} \right\rangle. \quad (60)$$

Table 3 This table compares the particle permutations $\hat{p}_{\{213\}} = \hat{p}_{(12)}$ and $\hat{p}_{\{312\}} = \hat{p}_{(123)}$ with the ordering permutations $\mathfrak{o}_{\{213\}} = \mathfrak{o}_{(AB)}$ and $\mathfrak{o}_{\{312\}} = \mathfrak{o}_{(ABC)}$. The sector notation is depicted in Fig. 7. Note that particle permutations have simple realizations in configuration space: two-cycles are reflections and three-cycles are rotations by $2\pi/3$. Ordering permutations do not have corresponding orthogonal transformations of configuration space, although they form an isomorphic group to S_3 and map sectors onto sectors.

Sector	Label	$\hat{p}_{(12)}$	$\mathfrak{o}_{(AB)}$	$\hat{p}_{(123)}$	$\mathfrak{o}_{(ABC)}$
{123}	a	b	b	e	c
{213}	b	a	a	f	f
{231}	c	f	d	a	e
{321}	d	e	c	b	b
{312}	e	d	f	c	a
{132}	f	c	e	d	d

Here the tableaux filled with A , B , and C label the basis for irreps of the ordering permutation symmetry and the tableaux filled with particle numbers label the basis for irreps of the particle permutation symmetry. The exact expression for these symmetrized vectors in terms of snippet bases vectors depends on the choice of subgroup chains for the complete set of commuting observables. For symmetric wells a good choice of observables is \hat{C}_3 , \hat{C}_2 and $\mathfrak{o}_{(AC)}$ because within a snippet subspace with composition $(\alpha\beta\gamma)$ total parity inversion \hat{H} is proportional to $\mathfrak{o}_{(AC)}$

$$\hat{H} \left| \begin{array}{c} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{array}; WY \right\rangle = -\pi_\alpha \pi_\beta \pi_\gamma \mathfrak{o}_{(AC)} \left| \begin{array}{c} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{array}; WY \right\rangle. \quad (61)$$

With this convention, the states $\left| \begin{array}{c} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{array}; \overline{ABC} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \end{array} \right\rangle$, $\left| \begin{array}{c} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{array}; \overline{AC} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 3 \end{array} \right\rangle$, and $\left| \begin{array}{c} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{array}; \overline{AC} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 3 \end{array} \right\rangle$ have the opposite parity from the totally antisymmetric state $\left| \begin{array}{c} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{array}; \overline{A} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \end{array} \right\rangle = \left| \begin{array}{c} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{array} \right\rangle$. See Fig. 8 for a depiction of the six states in $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}^\infty$ using this choice of observables for the lowest energy level in the harmonic well.

Note that one-component bosons can only populate the state $\left| \begin{array}{c} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{array}; \overline{ABC} \right\rangle$ and one-component fermions can only populate the state $\left| \begin{array}{c} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{array}; \overline{A} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \end{array} \right\rangle$. As an example, consider two-component distinguishable particles. Each energy level $\mathcal{K}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}^\infty \times \mathcal{S}$ is 48-fold degenerate because there are eight spin states for every spatial state. Following the method described for the non-interacting particles with spin, using the Clebsch-Gordan series for S_3 one can show that there are four two-component bosonic (fermionic) states with spatial symmetry [3] ($[1^3]$) and four with spatial symmetry [21].




Fig. 8 This figure depicts the relative configuration space wave function for the lowest degenerate states in the unitary limit of the contact interaction for three particles in a harmonic well. The horizontal axis is the relative coordinate $r_1 = 1/\sqrt{2}(q_1 - q_2)$ and the vertical axis is the coordinate $r_2 = 1/\sqrt{6}(q_1 + q_2 - 2q_3)$. The states are depicted in the same order as (60).

Another use for ordering permutation symmetry is looking at the near-unitary limit. In this limit there is tunneling between adjacent sectors. For an asymmetric well, the tunneling operator \hat{T} can be parameterized

$$\hat{T} = -t \sigma_{(AB)} - u \sigma_{(BC)} - (t + u) \hat{p}_e, \quad (62)$$

where t and u are the tunneling probability amplitudes for the first and second particle and the second and third particle, respectively. The coefficients t and u depend on trap shape, and for a symmetric trap $t = u$. The third term in (62) which is proportional to the identity renormalizes the energy shift such that the totally antisymmetric state undergoes no change in energy. The first order energy shifts are given by the eigenvalues of this matrix formed by the matrix elements $\left\langle \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{smallmatrix}; W Y \left| \hat{T} \right| \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{smallmatrix}; W' Y \right\rangle$. The eigenvalues and degeneracies are

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta E_{[3]} &= -2t - 2u \text{ (singly-degenerate),} \\ \Delta E_{[21]} &= -t - u - \sqrt{t^2 - tu + u^2} \text{ (doubly-degenerate),} \\ \Delta E_{[21]'} &= -t - u + \sqrt{t^2 - tu + u^2} \text{ (doubly-degenerate),} \\ \Delta E_{[1^3]} &= 0 \text{ (singly-degenerate).} \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

The first and last eigenvalues correspond to symmetric and antisymmetric states, and the middle two eigenvalues are for two different two-dimensional mixed-symmetry irreps. Since the ratio of t to u depends on trap shape, the first-order energy depends on trap shape for asymmetric traps. The symmetric [3] and antisymmetric states [1³] are universal for any trap, but energy eigenstates with mixed symmetry [21] are not, although there are universal algebraic expressions in terms of t and u .

However, for symmetric traps $t = u$ and the eigenvalues become

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Delta E_{[3]^\pm} &= -4t \text{ (singly-degenerate),} \\
 \Delta E_{[21]^\mp} &= -3t \text{ (doubly-degenerate),} \\
 \Delta E_{[21]^\pm} &= -t \text{ (doubly-degenerate),} \\
 \Delta E_{[1^3]^\mp} &= 0 \text{ (singly-degenerate).}
 \end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

With the addition of parity symmetry, we find that although the eigenvalues depend on the trap shape through t , the states do not. The ordering permutation observable $\mathfrak{o}_{(AC)} \sim \hat{I}$ is sufficient to distinguish the two copies of the [21] irreps. The energy shifts $-3t$ and 0 are for states with the same parity $\pi_\alpha\pi_\beta\pi_\gamma$ as the original fermionic state $\left| \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{smallmatrix} \right\rangle$ and the energy shifts $-4t$ and $-t$ are states with opposite parity $-\pi_\alpha\pi_\beta\pi_\gamma$.

5 Conclusion of Part I

What lessons have been learned from this analysis of the symmetries for one, two and three trapped particles? What methods can be extended to more particles, and what methods lose utility?

One set of observations is about how symmetries of the individual particles build into symmetries of the total system. Any system with a Hamiltonian that is a sum of identical sub-Hamiltonians, each with symmetry G_1 , must have at least the minimal the symmetry structure $S_N \times (G_1)^{\times N}$. In particular, the configuration space symmetry and the kinematic symmetries of two or three non-interacting particles satisfy

$$C_0^N \geq S_N \times (C_1)^{\times N} \text{ and } K_0^N \geq S_N \times (K_1)^{\times N}. \tag{65}$$

When these groups are greater than the minimal symmetry, then that signals the emergence of a true multiparticle symmetry. For two and three particle systems, the groups C_0^2 and C_0^3 are finite order

point groups in two and three dimensions, realized by orthogonal transformations of configuration space. Unless there are emergent symmetries or accidental degeneracies, the irreps of K_0^2 and K_0^3 are sufficient to explain the degeneracy pattern of the non-interacting energies. The main difference between the case of two and three particles is that for three particles there can be multiple irreps of the symmetric group S_3 with the same energy, even without emergent or accidental symmetries. State permutation symmetry is introduced to build the observables that distinguish these degenerate spaces. All of this is extended to more particles in the sequel article using the mathematics of permutation modules, and the minimal construction (65) is shown to be algebraically universal, i.e. a complete set of observables that is independent of trap shape can always be built out of single particle operators.

For systems with Galilean-invariant, spin-independent two-body interactions, then the symmetry (65) is broken and algebraic universality is lost. However, the symmetry that remains is always at least

$$C^N \geq S_N \times C_1 \text{ and } K^N \geq S_N \times K_1. \quad (66)$$

The configuration space symmetries again have geometrical realizations as point groups that preserve both the trap equipotentials and the coincidence manifold. The irreps of the kinematic symmetries are irreps of S_N with additional quantum numbers inherited from the single-particle trap, e.g. parity for symmetric traps and center-of-mass quantum number for harmonic traps. The energy eigenvalues and eigenstates are certainly not universal, but the symmetries can be used to decrease the computational scale of exact diagonalization or perturbation theory by using basis vectors from the non-interacting spatial Hilbert space reduced into irreps of K^N .

For weak interactions, two and three particles have different degrees of algebraic universality. The two-body matrix elements, which depend on the trap and the interaction, are required in order to find the specific energy shift at first order. However, the splitting pattern and the energy eigenstates are independent of interaction and trap shape for two particles and are therefore algebraically universal in a strong sense. because the two-body matrix elements are not required. For three particles, there is less universality under weak perturbations. Some splitting features also are independent of trap and interaction, but the full solution for some first-order eigenstates requires algebraic expressions involving the two-body matrix elements. In the sequel article even this very limited universal feature is hypothesized to fail for $N \geq 5$.

The contact interaction restores some algebraic universality, and this can be partially understood as a manifestation of the state permutation symmetry of the two-body matrix elements. Also, for the contact interaction the unitary limit is sensible because the delta interaction enforces nodal surfaces in configuration space. These surfaces prevent particles tunneling past each other, and break configuration space into sectors with a particular order. The combination of ordering permutation symmetry and particle permutation symmetry provides enough structure for complete algebraic solution of the Hamiltonian in the algebraic limit assuming knowledge of the single particle spectrum. The near unitary mapping is also algebraically universal for two particles, but for three particles in an asymmetric trap information about the trap shape (or equivalently the single particle wave functions) is required to solve for the level splitting. For symmetric traps, the extra information provided by parity is enough to restore algebraic universality.

Acknowledgements Many colleagues provided me insight and help with this research, but special thanks goes to the organizers and participants of the workshop “Universality in Few-Body Systems: Theoretical Challenges and New Directions” at the Institute for Nuclear Theory at the University of Washington where some of this work was done and much of it discussed in Spring 2014. Special thanks goes to D. Blume, K. Daily, N. Mehta, S. Tan, and A. Volosniev.

References

1. Albeverio S., Geuzinsky F., Høegh-Krohn R., Holden H.: Solvable Models in Quantum Mechanics, 2nd Ed. (AMS, Providence, 2004)
2. Cazalilla M.A., Citro R., Giamarchi T., Orignac E., Rigol M.: One dimensional bosons: from condensed matter systems to ultracold gases. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **83**, 1405-1466 (2011)
3. Guan X.-W., Batchelor M.T., and Lee C.: Fermi gases in one dimension: From Bethe ansatz to experiments. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **85**, 1633-1691 (2013)
4. Gaudin M.: The Bethe Wavefunction (Cambridge, 2014)
5. Olshanii M.: Atomic scattering in the presence of an external confinement and a gas of impenetrable bosons. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 938 (1998)
6. Girardeau, M.D., and Olshanii M.: Theory of spinor Fermi and Bose gases in tight atom waveguides. *Phys. Rev. A* **70**, 023608 (2004)
7. Oelkers N., Batchelor M.T., Bortz M., and Guan, X.-W.: Bethe ansatz study of one-dimensional Bose and Fermi gases with periodic and hard wall boundary conditions. *J. Phys. A* **39**, 1073-1098 (2006)

-
8. Girardeau M.D., Minguzzi A.: Solvable models of strongly interacting ultracold gas mixtures in tight waveguides. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 230402 (2007)
 9. Deuretzbacher F., Fredenhagen K., Becker D., Bongs K., Sengstock K., Pfannkuche D.: Exact solution of strongly interacting quasi-one dimensional spinor Bose gases. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 160408 (2008)
 10. Hao Y., Zhang Y., Guan X.-W., Chen S.: Ground-state properties of interacting two-component Bose gases in a hard-wall trap. *Phys. Rev. A* **79**, 033607 (2009)
 11. Guan L., Chen S., Wang Y., Ma Z.-Q.: Exact solutions for infinitely strongly interacting Fermi gases in tight waveguides. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 160402 (2009)
 12. Yang C.N.: Ground state of fermions in a 1D trap with δ function interaction. *Chin. Phys. Lett.* **26**, 120504 (2009)
 13. Ma Z.-Q., Chen S., Guan L., Wang Y.: Mathematical calculation for exact solutions of infinitely strongly interacting Fermi gases in tight waveguides. *J. Phys. A* **42**, 385210 (2009)
 14. Guan L., Chen S.: Super-Tonks-Girardeau gas of spin-1/2 interacting fermions. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 175301 (2010)
 15. Girardeau M.D., Astrakharchik G.E.: Wave functions of the super-Tonks-Girardeau gas and the trapped one-dimensional hard-sphere Bose gas. *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 061601(R) (2010)
 16. Girardeau M.D.: Two super-Tonks-Girardeau states of a trapped one-dimensional spinor Fermi gas. *Phys. Rev. A* **82**, 011607(R) (2010)
 17. Girardeau M.D.: Tonks-Girardeau and super-Tonks-Girardeau states of a trapped one-dimensional spinor Bose gas. *Phys. Rev. A* **83**, 011601(R) (2011)
 18. Fang B., Vignolo P., Gattobigio M., Miniatura C., Minguzzi A.: Exact solution for the degenerate ground-state of a strongly interacting one-dimensional Bose-Fermi mixture. *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 023626 (2011)
 19. Brouzos I., Schmelcher P.: Construction of analytical many-body wave functions for correlated bosons in a harmonic trap. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 045301 (2012)
 20. Kościk P.: Three strongly correlated charged bosons in a one-dimensional harmonic trap: natural orbital occupancies. *Eur. Phys. J. B* **85**, 173 (2012)
 21. Armstrong J.R., Zinner N.T., Fedorov D.V., Jensen A.S.: Many-particle systems in one dimension in the harmonic approximation. *Physica Scripta* **T151**, 014061 (2012)
 22. Harshman N.L.: Symmetries of three harmonically trapped particles in one dimension. *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 052122 (2012)
 23. Brouzos I., Diakonov F.K., Schmelcher P.: Trial functions for quantum Monte Carlo studies of bosons in one-dimensional harmonic traps and finite lattices. [arXiv:1210.7769](https://arxiv.org/abs/1210.7769) (2012)
 24. Gharashi S.E., Blume D.: Correlations of the upper branch of 1D harmonically trapped two-component Fermi gases. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 045302 (2013)

-
25. Bugnion P.O., Conduit G.J.: Ferromagnetic spin correlations in a few-fermion system. *Phys. Rev. A* **87**, 060502(R) (2013)
 26. Sowiński T., Grass T., Dutta O., Lewenstein M.: Few interacting fermions in one-dimensional harmonic trap. *Phys. Rev. A* **88**, 033607 (2013)
 27. Volosniev A.G., Fedorov D.V., Jensen A.S., Valiente M., Zinner N.T.: Strongly interacting confined quantum systems in one dimension. *Nat. Comm.* **5**, 5300 (2014).
 28. Wilson B., Foerster A., Kuhn C.C.N., Roditi I., Rubeni D.: A geometric wave function for a few interacting bosons in a harmonic trap. *Phys. Lett. A* **378**, pp. 1065-1070 (2014)
 29. Deuretzbacher F., Becker D., Bjerlin J., Reimann S.M., and Santos L.: Quantum magnetism without lattices in strongly interacting one-dimensional spinor gases. *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 013611 (2014)
 30. D'Amico P., Rontani M.: Three interacting atoms in a one-dimensional trap: A benchmark system for computational approaches. *J. Phys. B* **47**, 065303 (2014)
 31. Cui X., Ho T.-L.: Ground-state ferromagnetic transition in strongly repulsive one-dimensional Fermi gases. *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 023611 (2014)
 32. Lindgren E.J., Rotureau J., Forssén C., Volosniev A.G., Zinner N.T.: Fermionization of two-component few-fermion systems in a one-dimensional harmonic trap. *New J. Phys.* **16**, 063003 (2014)
 33. Harshman N.L.: Spectroscopy for a few atoms harmonically trapped in one dimension. *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 033633 (2014)
 34. García-March, M.A., Juliá-Díaz, B., Astrakharchik, G.E., Boronat, J. and Polls, A.: Distinguishability, degeneracy, and correlations in three harmonically trapped bosons in one dimension. *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 063605 (2014)
 35. Volosniev A.G., Fedorov D.V., Jensen A.S., Zinner N.T.: Hyperspherical treatment of strongly-interacting few-Fermion systems in one dimension. **1408.6058** (2014)
 36. Levinsen J., Massignan P., Bruun G.M., Parish M.M.: Strong-coupling ansatz for the one-dimensional Fermi gas in a harmonic potential. [arXiv:1408.7096](https://arxiv.org/abs/1408.7096) (2014)
 37. Loft N.J.S., Dehkharghani A.S., Mehta N.P., Volosniev A.G., Zinner N.T.: A variational approach to repulsively interacting three-fermion systems in a one-dimensional harmonic trap. [arXiv:1411.6544](https://arxiv.org/abs/1411.6544) (2014)
 38. Yang L., Guan L., Pu H.: Strongly interacting quantum gases in one-dimensional traps. [arXiv:1502.01706](https://arxiv.org/abs/1502.01706) (2015)
 39. Chen J.-Q., Ping J., Wang F.: *Group Representation Theory for Physicists*, 2nd Ed. (World Scientific, Singapore, 2002).
 40. Yurovsky V.A.: Permutation symmetry in spinor quantum gases: selection rules, conservation laws, and correlations. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 200406 (2014)
 41. Chanu C., Degiovanni L., Rastelli G.: Three and four-body systems in one dimension: integrability, super-integrability and discrete symmetries. *Regular and Chaotic Dynamics* **16**, pp. 496-503 (2011).

-
42. Batchelor M.: The importance of being integrable: out of the paper, into the lab. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **28** 1430010, (2014)
 43. Gangardt D.M.: Universal correlations of trapped one-dimensional impenetrable bosons. *J. Phys. A* **37**, 9335-9356 (2004)
 44. Farrell A., van Zyl B.P.: Universality of the energy spectrum for two-interacting harmonically trapped ultra-cold atoms in one and two dimensions. *J. Phys. A* **43**, 015302 (2010)
 45. Bao C.G.: Universal prohibited zones in the coordinate space of few-body systems. *Few-Body Syst.* **54**, 1957-1971 (2013)
 46. Kalozoumis P., Morfonios C., Diakonou F.K., Schmelcher P.: Invariants of broken discrete symmetries. [arXiv:1403.7149](https://arxiv.org/abs/1403.7149) (2014)
 47. Hamermesh M.: *Group Theory and Its Application to Physical Problems* (Dover, New York, 1989)
 48. Boyer C.P., Kalnins E.G., Miller Jr., W: Lie theory and separation of variables. 6. The equation $iU_t + \Delta_2 U = 0$. *J. Math. Phys.* **16**, 499-511 (1975)
 49. Leyvraz F., Frank A., Lemus R., : Accidental degeneracy in a simple quantum system: A new symmetry group for a particle in an impenetrable square-well potential. *Am. J. Phys.* **65**, 1087-1094 (1997).
 50. Girardeau, M.: Relationship between systems of impenetrable bosons and fermions in one dimension. *J. Math. Phys.* **1**, 516-523 (1960).
 51. Busch T., Englert B.-G., Rzȃzewski K., and Wilkens, M.: Two cold atoms in a harmonic trap. *Found. Physics.* **28** 549-559 (1998).
 52. Jonsell, S.: Interaction energy of two trapped bosons with long scattering length. *Few-Body Sys.* **31** 255-260 (2002).
 53. Gaudin, M.: Boundary Energy of a Bose Gas in One Dimension. *Phys. Rev. A* **4**, 386-394 (1971)
 54. Baker, G.A.: Degeneracy of the n-Dimensional, Isotropic, Harmonic Oscillator. *Phys. Rev.* **103**, 1119 (1956).
 55. Louck, J.D.: Group Theory of Harmonic Oscillators in n-Dimensional Space. *J. Math. Phys.* **6**, 1786 (1965).
 56. Fernández F.M.: On the symmetry of the quantum-mechanical particle in a box. [arXiv:1310.5136](https://arxiv.org/abs/1310.5136) (2013)
 57. Yurovsky, V.A.: Sum rules for spin-1/2 quantum gases in well-defined-spin states: spin-independent interactions and spin-dependent external fields. [arXiv:1501.06182](https://arxiv.org/abs/1501.06182) (2015)