Abstract

We show here that the Hamiltonian for an electronic system may be written exactly in terms of fluctuation operators that transition constituent fragments between internally correlated states, accounting rigorously for inter-fragment electron exchange and charge transfer. Familiar electronic structure approaches can be applied to the renormalized Hamiltonian. For efficiency, the basis for each fragment can be truncated, removing high-energy local arrangements of electrons from consideration, and effectively defining collective coordinates for the fragments. For a large number of problems, this has the potential to fold the majority of electron correlation into the effective Hamiltonian, and it should provide a robust approach to incorporating difficult electronic structure problems into large systems. The number of terms in the exactly transformed Hamiltonian formally scales quartically with system size, but this can be reduced to quadratic in the mesoscopic regime, to within an arbitrary error tolerance. Finally, all but a linear-scaling number of these terms may be efficiently decomposed in terms of electrostatic interactions between a linear-scaling number of pre-computed transition densities. In a companion article, this formalism is applied to an excitonic variant of coupled-cluster theory.
1 Introduction

A persistent pursuit of the electronic structure community is the elimination of unnatural barriers to efficient, detailed simulation. Formally, the amount of information needed to fully specify the quantum state of an electronic system in a basis grows exponentially with the number of electrons. But this is juxtaposed against the common intuition that makes possible the chemical language of atoms, molecules, and functional groups, which is that these entities do not forgo their individual properties upon interaction with others, though they may be heavily perturbed. The most straightforward approach to eliminating the unnecessary bulk of an exponentially large state space is to divide a super-system into sub-systems, or fragments.

One shortcoming of presently available fragment-based electronic structure methods, with regard to cost, is that electron correlation (if included) is introduced at the level of individual electrons. Reliance, at the global scope, on integrals describing interactions between individual electrons will render any high-order correlation scheme inefficient because the structures of local relaxations are essentially recomputed for each separate interaction between the electrostatically efficacious single-electron fluctuations.

An unexplored approach to fragment-based electronic structure calculations is to attempt to rewrite the super-system Hamiltonian exactly in terms of entangled fluctuations among internally correlated states of fragments, such that its form mimics the familiar field-operator expression for the \textit{ab initio} Hamiltonian. The degrees of freedom of the global computation are then fluctuations of entire subunits. By making truncations in this context, high-energy local arrangements of electrons are expunged from consideration, and an effective suppression of individual degrees of freedom results. Given the relative complexity of intra-fragment electron correlation, as compared to the simple picture of inter-fragment interactions (coupled dipolar, \textit{etc.}, fluctuations), it is reasonable to view the internal coordinates of fragments in terms of such collective motions.

For the sake of being concrete, let us first simply assert that the super-system Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$ may be expressed in the following manner

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{m} \sum_{i_m,j_m} H_{i_m,j_m}^{i_m,j_m} \hat{r}_{i_m} \hat{r}_{j_m} + \sum_{m_1 < m_2} \sum_{i_{m_1},j_{m_1}} \sum_{i_{m_2},j_{m_2}} H_{i_{m_1},j_{m_1}}^{i_{m_1},j_{m_1}} \hat{r}_{i_{m_1}} \hat{r}_{j_{m_1}} + \hat{r}_{i_{m_2}} \hat{r}_{j_{m_2}} + \cdots \quad (1)$$
Figure 1: An interaction between a pair of molecules can be thought of in terms of individual electrons fluctuating among local orbitals, whereby a “primary” excitation (denoted with an asterisk) is accompanied by a number of other connected relaxations (nominal excitations). The same interaction can also be conceived of in terms of fluctuations between electronically correlated states of the fragments, which inherently contain these relaxations. Given the relatively large energetic scale of intra-fragment correlation, the relaxations that accompany local fluctuations should be largely similar across interactions and need only be computed once for each fragment.

The two-index fluctuation operators are analogues of paired field operators; the action of $\hat{\tau}_{jm}$ is to induce a fluctuation of fragment $m$ only, from some state $|\psi_{jm}\rangle$ to another state $|\psi_{im}\rangle$. (The positioning of indices is addressed later.) This implies a basis of super-system states, denoted

$$|\Psi_I\rangle = |\psi_1\psi_2\cdots\rangle$$

which have tensor-product-like structure in terms of internally correlated fragment states $|\psi_{im}\rangle$. The collection of fragment state labels into a single ket implies global antisymmetry of the electronic wavefunction. These are the super-system states, between which the fluctuation operators $\hat{\tau}_{jm}$ induce transitions. The elements $H_{jm}^{im}$ build a Hamiltonian matrix for fragment $m$, and the higher-order terms are responsible for couplings between fragments ($m_1 < m_2$ under the summation runs over all unique pairs).

The internally correlated fragment states will be referred to as the excitonic basis, since fluctuations among these are the conceptual site basis from which Frenkel–Davydov excitons are built. If the Hamiltonian can indeed be represented exactly in terms of such renormalized fluctuations, then recourse to the primitive electronic degrees of freedom can be altogether avoided at the global scope. The intuition behind the expected efficiency of the proposed scheme is illustrated pictorially in Fig. 1. Local relaxations that accompany the primary motions of fluc-
tuating electrons are computed once for each fragment, and these are permanently folded into the effective Hamiltonian. Even as the fragment bases are truncated to reduce the dimensionality of the global calculation, strong intra-fragment correlations remain constant features of the retained state space that describes low-energy phenomena. The entire pantheon of traditional electronic structure approaches is available to then treat inter-fragment interactions. System-wide induction will already be captured at the mean-field level, but using polarizabilities from internally correlated fragments. The usual post-mean-field approaches (e.g., perturbation theory, coupled-cluster theory), can be used to handle inter-fragment electron correlation (i.e., Van der Waals forces). In principle, even the covalent bonding interaction can be represented by allowing correlated charge-state fluctuations.

The general concept of working with fragment states in an ab initio method is not new. Most notably, it is prominent in the formal development of symmetry-adapted perturbation theory. However, the computational implementation still generally proceeds in terms of a Hamiltonian described in the one-electron basis, and extension of the globally antisymmetrized working equations beyond dimers is also algebraically tedious. Other recent and compelling work on ab initio exciton theory has focused specifically on the excited-state regime; however, these approaches currently lack a clear and tractable scheme for systematic inclusion of ever higher levels of electron correlation, which the approach here provides. Solving for intra-fragment correlation first and then interacting the fragments in the transformed picture essentially inverts the traditional paradigm of using a fragment-based decomposition of a reference wavefunction as a starting point for handling global electron correlation.

The purpose of this article is to demonstrate rigorously that the Hamiltonian for a fragment-decomposed electronic system may indeed be written exactly in the form asserted in eq. (1). We furthermore require practicable recipes for building such resolutions, such that the algorithmic complexity of constructing them with acceptable accuracy is simple enough to render consequent methods viable.

The difficulty in developing rigorous and computationally tractable definitions for the super-system basis and associated fluctuation operators lies with inter-fragment electron-exchange antisymmetry. We start by next giving a conceptual outline of the loosely deductive process that leads to the resolution of the exchange problem pursued here. The bulk of the article is then spent making those concepts rigorous, in a bottom-up procedural manner. A final section
before the conclusion is dedicated to discussing the practical aspects of computing the necessary matrix elements efficiently, including the applicability of approximation schemes.

2 Approach to the Inter-fragment Exchange Problem

The root of the exchange problem is that the one-electron spaces describing each fragment cannot be orthogonalized against each other without damaging the descriptions of the correlations internal to the fragments (and in ill-defined ways that would depend on the orthogonalization scheme). We therefore take as a premise that the one-electron spaces available to each of the fragments are not to be redefined. Due to Pauli exclusion then, the available space on one fragment will be dynamically entangled with the fluctuating, internally correlated electronic structures of its neighbors. The fact that a fluctuation on one fragment then effectively changes the states of all of its neighbors initially casts doubt on whether the Hamiltonian can be expressed in terms of a low-order expansion of suitably defined single-fragment fluctuation operators.

From a more formal perspective, although it is trivial to assert a definition of an antisymmetrized tensor product of internally correlated fragment states |Ψ_I⟩, a basis of such super-system states is not generally orthonormal, a reflection of the overlap-driven exchange interaction. The lack of an orthonormal basis is naturally handled by the introduction of biorthogonal complements, denoted |Ψ'_I⟩. The unique association of each complement with precisely one of the original tensor-product states can be leveraged to construct operators effecting single-fragment fluctuations between the original basis states. Although this step is relatively straightforward, the matrix elements of the consequent Hamiltonian expansion depend critically on the nature of the states used to construct them. This moves the apparent difficulty of the electron-exchange problem into the construction of suitable definitions of the complements.

The biorthogonal complements are, in principle, described by the inverse of the matrix of overlaps ⟨Ψ_I|Ψ_J⟩. This is purely formal, however, since direct numerical inversion of such an exponentially large matrix is intractable, especially since it will not be sparse nor exactly factorizable. Let us consider more fundamental questions of structure, however, under the presumption that the biorthogonal basis is somehow available. First, the complements |Ψ'_I⟩
will not themselves have tensor-product-like structure in terms of the original fragment states. Furthermore, for a given truncation of the fragment bases, a different effective Hamiltonian may be obtained, depending on how the complements are defined. Such truncations are critical for the efficiency reasons outlined in the introduction. The ambiguity in the definition of the complements results because the projected inverse of a matrix is not the same as the inverse of a projected matrix. Insisting that the complements live in the post-truncation model space would be different than choosing them to be the corresponding members of the set of complements to the untruncated tensor-product set, or any other set. This unsettling ambiguity would likely be tolerable as an approximation for sufficiently large model spaces, but the choice of complements also affects the formal fragment order of the Hamiltonian expansion.

There is one particular choice of complements with simple structure, amenable to algebraic manipulation; these are, in fact, the full-space complements of the complete tensor-product set of fragment bases (which themselves span the complete Fock spaces of their respective fragments). Given a truncated model space, the complements therefore span a different subspace, but of the same dimensionality; they cannot formally be restricted to the model space without destroying their simple algebraic structure. The nature of their simplicity is that each, in fact, has tensor-product-like structure. Avoiding contradiction, this is only possible if they are tensor products of secondary sets of states associated with each fragment. Each of the members of the implied secondary fragment bases has unit overlap with exactly one of the original states of its associated fragment, and it is strictly orthogonal to all other fragment basis states, both on that same fragment or on any other fragment. This is the key to achieving both the biorthogonality needed to define the fluctuation operators and the fragment locality needed obtain a low-order Hamiltonian expansion.

The forthcoming procedure starts by systematically constructing definitions of biorthogonal one-electron, single-fragment, and super-system bases. Once the super-system bases are defined, the relatively straightforward definition of the fluctuation operators in terms of them is presented. Using the properties of the bases forwarded, the corresponding matrix elements in the excitonic Hamiltonian expansion may be deduced.
3 The Excitonic Hamiltonian for Electronic Systems

3.1 Notation and conventions

The scope of this work is limited to the non-relativistic electronic Hamiltonian, projected into a basis, for fixed nuclear positions. The system is divided into $N$ enumerated fragments, which are disjoint groups of atoms. For conceptual ease, we take it that the atoms of each fragment occupy the spatial positions that they have in the super-system, but the many-electron state space associated with each is defined as though it were in isolation at that location.

Lower-case latin letters will be used for integer indices, and upper-case latin letters will be used for ascending-ordered tuples of integers, for example, $I = (i_1, \cdots i_{\ell_I})$, where $\ell_I$ is the length of tuple $I$. The greek letters $\Psi$ and $\psi$ will be used to refer to general states of the super-system and fragments, respectively, and $\Phi$ and $\phi$ will refer to the respective single-determinant states from which these are built. We use $\chi$ for the one-electron orbitals.

On matrix-valued quantities, subscripts and superscripts will be used to index covariant and contravariant dimensions, respectively. If a matrix has both a covariant and a contravariant index, then, for purposes of matrix multiplication, the rows are enumerated by the contravariant (typically bra) index. Sets are abbreviated as $\{y_i\}$ to represent all $y_i$ corresponding to those values of $i$ that are defined for a mapping $y$. Summations implicitly run over all values of an index that are allowed by the mapping to which the index is attached in the summand.

3.2 The one-electron bases

We presume a set of linearly independent orbitals $\{|\chi_p\rangle\}$, where each orbital is associated with a specific fragment (e.g., atomic orbitals of constituent atoms, fragment molecular orbitals, etc.). The index that enumerates this set is taken to be “blocked” by fragment, such that the first block of consecutive values enumerates the orbitals on fragment 1, and so forth. For ease of discussion, we take the space spanned by the one-electron basis established for any given problem as our working definition of complete, with the consequence that this defines what is meant by completeness of a many-electron Hilbert space, and the direct sum for all electron numbers (up to the cardinality of $\{|\chi_p\rangle\}$) is what is meant by the complete Fock space.
We let the set of biorthogonal complement orbitals be denoted \( \{|\chi^p\rangle\} \), for which

\[
\text{span}(\{|\chi^p\rangle\}) = \text{span}(\{|\chi_p\rangle\}) \quad \langle \chi^p | \chi_q \rangle = \delta_{pq}
\]  

(3)

The existence of this set is guaranteed if the original set is linearly independent, and it is impossible otherwise. Should a linearly dependent set of functions be proposed, then some (circumventable) difficulty arises. The resolution of this (discussed later) maps the linearly dependent case onto a problem of the same structure; therefore, the remainder of this discussion is general.

Field-operator notation will be convenient for developing transparent rules for matrix elements. This requires some important modifications for biorthogonal bases,\(^{12}\) and we recount the most important aspects here. Let the members of the sets \( \{\hat{c}_p\} \) and \( \{\hat{c}^p\} \) have the following actions on a single-determinant state \(|\cdots\rangle\) built from arbitrary orbitals

\[
\hat{c}_p|\cdots\rangle = |\chi_p \cdots\rangle \quad \hat{c}^p|\cdots\rangle = |\chi^p \cdots\rangle
\]  

(4)

The result of this action may produce a state of lesser (or zero) norm, due to antisymmetry. Let \( \{\hat{a}_p\} \) and \( \{\hat{a}^p\} \) be the sets of Hermitian conjugates of \( \{\hat{c}_p\} \) and \( \{\hat{c}^p\} \), respectively, effectively defined as creation operators from the right onto bra states (again, prepending the internal orbital list). It is straightforward to show that the biorthogonal field operators satisfy modified anticommutation relationships

\[
[\hat{c}_p, \hat{a}^q]_+ = \delta_{pq} \quad [\hat{c}^p, \hat{a}_q]_+ = \delta_{pq}
\]  

(5)

by using the fact that their resolutions into any hypothetical orthonormal basis are generated by mutually inverse transformations. The anticommutation relationships can be used to then show that \( \hat{a}^p \) may be interpreted as an annihilation operator, removing an orbital \(|\chi_{p_i}\rangle\) from a determinant \(|\chi_{p_1} \cdots \chi_{p_n}\rangle\).
### 3.3 Many-electron bases

#### 3.3.1 Super-system determinant basis

The complete Fock space of the super-system is spanned by the set of configurations \( \{ |\Phi_P\rangle \} \) where

\[
|\Phi_P\rangle = |\chi_{p_1}\cdots\chi_{p_n}\rangle = \hat{c}_{p_1}\cdots\hat{c}_{p_n}|\rangle \tag{6}
\]

The index \( P = (p_1, \cdots, p_n) \) runs over all possible ordered tuples of all allowed lengths (from zero up to the cardinality of \( |\chi_p\rangle \)), where \( n_P \) is the number of electrons in configuration \( |\Phi_P\rangle \), and \(|\rangle\) is the vacuum state. For illustrative purposes, we note that \( |\Phi_P\rangle \) could also be written as

\[
|\Phi_P\rangle = \sqrt{n_P!} \hat{P}_A [ |\chi_{p_1}\rangle \otimes \cdots |\chi_{p_n}\rangle ] \tag{7}
\]

where \( \hat{P}_A \) is an orthogonal projector from the space of all raw (asymmetric) orbital-tensor-product states onto the subspace of all antisymmetric states for all numbers of electrons (i.e., the complete Fock space). Both of these definitions are furthermore coincident with that of a Slater determinant of orbitals, also when the orbitals are not orthonormal.

If the component indices of a tuple \( P \) are chosen such that they all identify orbitals on a single fragment, then the use of the lower case \( |\phi_P\rangle \) will emphasize this. The set \( \{ |\phi_P\rangle \} \), a strict subset of \( \{ |\Phi_P\rangle \} \), is then the set of all possible single-fragment determinant states on all possible fragments. If we wish to indicate the fragment to which a given such determinant belongs, then the notation \( |\phi_{P_m}\rangle \) is used; the subscript \( m \) is thought of as placing a restriction on the possible tuple values taken. The set \( \{ |\phi_{P_m}\rangle \} \) is then a complete basis for the Fock space of fragment \( m \), and a summation over the index \( P_m \) would run over only those determinant states of fragment \( m \).

Let us now make explicit the relationship between the set of all super-system determinants and tensor products of fragment determinants. Any tuple \( P \) may be subdivided into the (potentially empty) tuples \( P_1 \) through \( P_N \), each containing only the component orbital indices of \( P \) that belong to the fragment indicated by the subscript. (It is simply convenient that the indexing of the sub-tuples of \( P \) is coincident with the convention used to indicate fragment-based
restriction of a tuple.) Since all tuples in this work are taken to be ordered, and since the indexing of the orbitals is blocked by fragment, $P$ is always reconstructed by simple concatenation of the sub-tuples. This then allows us to write

$$|\Phi_P\rangle = |\phi_{P_1} \cdots \phi_{P_N}\rangle = \hat{\phi}_{P_1} \cdots \hat{\phi}_{P_N}|$$

$$= \sqrt{n_p!/(n_{P_1}! \cdots n_{P_N}!)} \hat{P}_A \left[|\phi_{P_1}\rangle \otimes \cdots |\phi_{P_N}\rangle\right]$$

(8)

where $\hat{\phi}_{P_m}$ collects (in ascending order) the creation operators of the orbitals in $P$ that belong to fragment $m$. We immediately note, however, that these apparent many-body creation operators do not obey canonical (anti)commutation relationships with their conjugates (consider especially the case of operators for differing particle number). The second line of eq. (8) is equal to $|\Phi_P\rangle$ by careful manipulation of the nested antisymmetrizations as defined in eq. (7), and this writing emphasizes the connection to a tensor product of fragment states.

In either notation for eq. (8), it is clearly meaningful to say that fragment $m$ is in fragment state $|\phi_{P_m}\rangle$ in the globally antisymmetric super-system state $|\Phi_P\rangle$. This is the first primitive step toward defining a decomposition of a valid super-system state by fragments. We now also have the intuitive result that the complete basis $\{|\Phi_P\rangle\}$ is described as the set of all antisymmetrized tensor products of determinants for the constituent fragments.

### 3.3.2 Biorthogonal complements of the determinant basis

Since the orbitals that construct the members of $\{|\Phi_P\rangle\}$ are not orthonormal, this set is also not orthonormal, but it is linearly independent as a consequence of each orbital contributing a unique component to the one-electron space. Using the same conventions as above, but applied to the orbitals $\{|\chi^P\rangle\}$, we can construct a set of candidate biorthogonal complements $\{|\Phi^P\rangle\}$ explicitly that satisfy

$$\langle \Phi^P | = \langle \phi^{P_1} \cdots \phi^{P_N} | = \langle |\hat{\phi}^{P_N} \cdots \hat{\phi}^{P_1}|$$

$$= \sqrt{n_p!/(n_{P_1}! \cdots n_{P_N}!)} \left[\langle \phi^{P_1}| \otimes \cdots |\phi^{P_N}\rangle\right] \hat{P}_A$$

(9)

where the operator $\hat{\phi}^{P_m}$ is built from annihilation operators (with indices in descending order). The set of all allowed indices for $\{|\Phi^P\rangle\}$ is the same as for $\{|\Phi_P\rangle\}$, but these are mapped to a different set of states in the same Fock space. We can most quickly verify that $\{|\Phi^P\rangle\}$ is indeed
the desired biorthogonal basis by using their field-operator descriptions and the aforementioned anticommutation relationships

$$\langle \Phi^P | \Phi_Q \rangle = \langle \chi^{p_1} \cdots \chi^{p_n} | \chi_{q_1} \cdots \chi_{q_n} \rangle = \langle \hat{a}^{p_1} \hat{a}^{p_1} \hat{\Phi}_1 \cdots \hat{\Phi}_n \rangle = \delta_{PQ} \quad (10)$$

where the angle brackets denote a vacuum expectation value. We recall here that, since we have insisted that the tuples are ordered, if $P \neq Q$, then they are different in composition. This result could also have been obtained by using the idempotency of $\hat{P}_A$ to project the raw tensor product underlying either the bra or ket onto the other state expressed as a Slater determinant, and then evaluating the determinant of the resulting matrix of scalar orbital overlaps.

### 3.3.3 General tensor-product basis and complements

We can now define a more general basis for the super-system Fock space, in terms of general fragment states. Let the set $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}$ collect all such basis states for all fragments. These are defined by introduction of an invertible matrix $z$ with elements $z_i^P$, such that

$$|\psi_{im}\rangle = \sum_{P_m} z_{im}^{P_m} |\phi_{P_m}\rangle = \left( \sum_{P_m} z_{im}^{P_m} \hat{\Phi}_{P_m} \right) |\rangle = \hat{\psi}_{im} |\langle \rangle \quad (11)$$

The square matrix $z$ has rows indexed by a tuple and columns indexed by an integer, referencing generic states. As we have done before, the subscript on $i_m$ restricts the index to refer to one of the states of fragment $m$. As an artifact of our notation for blocking indices by fragment, $z$ formally has elements that would mix determinants on separate fragments, but we insist that it is block-diagonal by fragment; as needed, we let the diagonal block of $z$ for fragment $m$ be denoted as $z^{(m)}$. For simplicity, we will also presume that $z$ does not mix determinants of different particle number, though some of the following does generalize beyond this.

Using the biorthogonality of the fragment-determinant bases, it is straightforward to show that $\langle \psi^i | \psi^j \rangle = \delta_{ij}$ for the set $\{|\psi^i\rangle\}$, which satisfy

$$\langle \psi^i | = \sum_{P_m} z_{im}^{P_m} \langle \phi^{P_m} | = \langle \left( \sum_{P_m} z_{im}^{P_m} \hat{\phi}^{P_m} \right) | \rangle = \hat{\psi}^i_{im} \quad (12)$$

where, for convenience, we use the notation $\tilde{z} = z^{-1}$, which has elements $\tilde{z}_P^i$. Since $z$ is block-diagonal by fragment and particle number, $\tilde{z}$ is also so blocked. Therefore, the notation $|\psi^i_{im}\rangle$
to refer to a state associated with fragment $m$ is logically sensical, regardless of ambiguous physical interpretation as such.

We now construct another pair of complete biorthogonal bases for the super-system Fock space, $\{ |\Psi_I \rangle \}$ and $\{ |\Psi^I \rangle \}$, where

$$
|\Psi_I \rangle = |\psi_{i_1} \cdots \psi_{i_N} \rangle = \hat{\psi}_{i_1} \cdots \hat{\psi}_{i_N} | \rangle = \sqrt{n_I!/(n_{i_1}! \cdots n_{i_N}!)} \hat{P}_A [ |\psi_{i_1} \rangle \otimes \cdots |\psi_{i_N} \rangle ]
$$

$$
\langle \Psi^I | = \langle \psi^{i_1} \cdots \psi^{i_N} | = \langle \hat{\psi}^{i_1} \cdots \hat{\psi}^{i_1} | = \sqrt{n_I!/(n_{i_1}! \cdots n_{i_N}!)} [ \langle \psi^{i_1} | \otimes \cdots \langle \psi^{i_N} | ] \hat{P}_A
$$

(13)

where $I = (i_1, \cdots i_N)$ gives the indices of the states of each of the sub-systems. The field-operator notation is an elegant manner to ensure global antisymmetry, whereas the tensor-product notation connects more directly to the state-space descriptions of the fragments. It is notable that the state-space definition of antisymmetrization for general states is the same as that applied to single-determinant states; although it does not rely on permutation operators or determinant arithmetic, it does rely on the fragment states having definite particle number, denoted $n_{i_m}$. From either approach to antisymmetrization, the following connections between the two pairs of biorthogonal bases are obtained

$$
|\Psi_I \rangle = \sum_P Z^P_I |\Phi_P \rangle ; \quad Z^P_I = \prod_m z_{i_m}^{P_m}
$$

$$
\langle \Psi^I | = \sum_P Z^P_I \langle \Phi_P | ; \quad Z^P_I = \prod_m \bar{z}_{i_m}^{P_m}
$$

(14a)  (14b)

where the index $m$ runs over all fragments in the products that define elements of $Z$ and $\bar{Z}$. It is easy to verify that $Z$ and $\bar{Z}$ are mutually inverse, yielding $\langle \Psi^I | \Psi_I \rangle = \delta_{IJ}$. Also, since $Z$ is invertible, the set $\{ |\Psi_I \rangle \}$ (and, therefore $\{ |\Psi^I \rangle \}$) is a complete basis.

In the most straightforward conceptualization, the orbitals on each fragment could be taken to be orthonormal among each other, giving an orthonormal set of determinants on each fragment, and $z$ could be chosen to be a (block-diagonal) unitary matrix, leading to general states on a given fragment that are orthonormal among each other. In particular, $|\psi_{i_m} \rangle$ might (theoretically) be a full configuration-interaction energy eigenstate of fragment $m$, or a close relative thereof. Overlaps between orbitals on different fragments would still require us to invoke the
biorthogonal machinery, however. Later, we will also suggest an approach in which $z$ is not unitary, opening the door to less computationally expensive fragment states. Independent of which level of theory is used for the fragment states, however, only a small fraction of $z$ and $\bar{z}$ will ever actually be computed in practice (even implicitly), due to the intention of truncating the fragment spaces.

3.4 Single-fragment fluctuation operators

The goal is now to construct explicit expressions for the fluctuation operators that effect transitions of single fragments from one electronically correlated state to another, regardless of the states of the other sub-systems. We require that the action of $\hat{\tau}_{jm}$ onto super-system basis state $|\Psi_K\rangle$ is as follows

$$\hat{\tau}_{jm} |\psi_{k_1} \cdots \psi_{k_m} \cdots \psi_{k_N}\rangle = \delta_{j,m,k} |\psi_{i_1} \cdots \psi_{i_m} \cdots \psi_{k_N}\rangle \quad (15)$$

This action is constructed to be reminiscent of a number-conserving pair of field operators onto a single-determinant electronic state, such that the null state results if the upper ("destruction") index corresponds to an "empty" fragment state. As shown, the lower and upper indices must refer to two (potentially identical) states of the same fragment. In addition to defining such operators, we will also show that they may be used to construct a complete basis for the space of all operators acting in the super-system Fock space.

Operators obeying the above requirement have the following commutation relation by definition

$$[\hat{\tau}_i^j, \hat{\tau}_k^l] = \delta_{jk} \hat{\tau}_i^l - \delta_{il} \hat{\tau}_k^j \quad (16)$$

This is shown from eq. (15) by noting, first, that operators on different fragments commute, and, second, that a string of two operators on the same fragment gives null if the upper index of the left operator does not match the lower index of the right operator. This is an important property concerning manipulation of fluctuation operators with techniques analogous to those familiar from field operators. We make use of this in the companion paper, which presents an excitonic coupled-cluster method.
3.4.1 Definitions

It may seem desirable to make use of the operators \( \hat{\psi}_{im} \) and \( \hat{\psi}^{im} \) directly to define state-to-state transition operators. However, these operators do not obey the requisite canonical (anti)commutation relationships that are necessary to generalize the notion of creation and annihilation operators, and they consequently do not transform as field operators with respect to changes of the many-electron basis. We therefore proceed in a state-space notation below. Although these apparent many-electron creation operators will be convenient later, reformulation of the coming fluctuation-operator definitions in terms of them would necessarily retain a reference to the absolute vacuum dyadic \(|\rangle\langle|\). In short, we cannot abandon the language of state dyadics for the fluctuations.

The following may be regarded as a definition of a sub-system fluctuation operator on fragment \( m \)

\[
\hat{\tau}^{jm}_{im} = \sum_{k_1} \cdots \sum_{k_{m-1}} \sum_{k_{m+1}} \cdots \sum_{k_N} |\psi_{k_1} \cdots \psi_{k_{m-1}} \psi_{im} \psi_{k_{m+1}} \cdots \psi_{k_N}\rangle\langle \psi_{k_1} \cdots \psi_{k_{m-1}} |\psi_{jm} \psi_{k_{m+1}} \cdots \psi_{k_N}|.
\]

(17)

On account of the biorthogonality of the bases \( \{|\Psi_I\rangle\} \) and \( \{|\Psi^I\rangle\} \), a basis state acted upon by this operator will have non-zero projection onto, at most, one bra in the summation, and that will only happen if fragment \( m \) is in state \( |\psi_{jm}\rangle\), which would then give unit coefficient to the super-system basis state that simply has \( |\psi_{jm}\rangle \) replaced by \( |\psi_{im}\rangle \), as required by eq. (15).

Clearly, the choice of basis states for the single-fragment Fock spaces does not change this discussion. We may therefore introduce an analogous set of operators defined with respect to the determinant bases, denoted for convenience as the set \( \{\hat{\sigma}^Q_P\} \)

\[
\hat{\sigma}^Q_{R_m} = \sum_{R_1} \cdots \sum_{R_{m-1}} \sum_{R_{m+1}} \cdots \sum_{R_N} |\phi_{R_1} \cdots \phi_{R_{m-1}} \phi_{R_m} \phi_{R_{m+1}} \cdots \phi_{R_N}\rangle\langle \phi_{R_1} \cdots \phi_{R_{m-1}} |\phi_{Q_m} \phi_{R_{m+1}} \cdots \phi_{R_N}|.
\]

(18)

3.4.2 Completeness of fluctuation operators

Let us now demonstrate that the action of an arbitrary operator \( \hat{O} \) in the super-system Fock space may be fully represented in terms of the set of all fluctuation operators \( \{\hat{\tau}^{ij}_{ik}\} \). The action of any operator \( \hat{O} \) in a space is fully determined by the collection of its matrix elements in a linearly
independent set that spans that space, or, equivalently, taken with respect to biorthogonal bases for that space. Therefore, we need only to obtain an expression for a general operator in terms of the \( \{ \hat{\tau}_i^j \} \), wherein each such matrix element is an independent degree of freedom. This is the same as asserting that we can use this set to construct an operator that has only a single, arbitrarily chosen non-zero matrix element, such that a weighted linear combination of these is sufficient to construct an arbitrary \( \hat{O} \). Choosing the \( IJ \)-th element to be non-zero, we define the operator \( \hat{o}_I^J \) such that

\[
\langle \Psi^K | \hat{o}_I^J | \Psi_L \rangle = \delta_{IK} \delta_{JL} = \prod_m \delta_{i_m,k_m} \delta_{j_m,l_m} \tag{19}
\]

This is easily accomplished by setting

\[
\hat{o}_I^J = |\Psi_I\rangle \langle \Psi_I| = \prod_m \hat{\tau}_i^j m
\]

which is readily verified by showing that its matrix elements are as demanded by eq. (19). Again, since the particular choice of fragment basis plays no role in this discussion, this conclusion applies equally well to the set \( \{ \hat{\sigma}_P^Q \} \).

Since both \( \{ \hat{\tau}_i^j \} \) and \( \{ \hat{\sigma}_P^Q \} \) can be used to build complete bases for the space of subsystem Fock-space operators, then, at an abstract level, we are assured that the Hamiltonian is expressible in terms of linear combinations of product strings of either set. Furthermore, any member of one set must be resolvable in terms of the other set. Concretely, the transformation is seen to be rather simple. Insertion of the resolutions the members of \( \{ |\psi_i\rangle \} \) and \( \{ |\psi^i\rangle \} \) in terms of the members of \( \{ |\phi_P\rangle \} \) and \( \{ |\phi^P\rangle \} \), or vice versa, into the definition of either \( \hat{\tau}_i^j m \) or \( \hat{\sigma}_P^Q m \) in eqs. (17) and (18) results in \( N-1 \) contractions of the diagonal blocks of \( z \) with \( \bar{z} \). Resolving the consequent \( N-1 \) Kronecker deltas results in the appearance of the definitions of the operators from the other set to obtain

\[
\hat{\tau}_i^j m = \sum_{P_m} \sum_{Q_m} \hat{z}_{i_m} P_m \hat{z}_{j_m} Q_m \hat{\sigma}^Q_{P_m} \hat{\sigma}_P^Q m
\]

\[
\hat{\sigma}_P^Q m = \sum_{i_m} \sum_{j_m} \hat{z}_{i_m} P_m \hat{z}_{j_m} Q_m \hat{\tau}_i^j m
\]

Effectively each index transforms separately, with one power of \( z \) or \( \bar{z} \). Inserting one of these
identities into the other results in a truism.

We now have a rather simple transformation between fluctuation operators in the determinant basis and in the basis of correlated fragment states. Therefore any operator which is conveniently written in one basis may be straightforwardly transformed to the other. Furthermore, the transformation preserves fragment rank (e.g., a single-fragment fluctuation in one basis is represented as a superposition of single-fragment fluctuations in any basis).

Eq. (20) essentially provides a recipe for constructing an arbitrary operator, one matrix element at a time. Although any given operator may be represented as such, it does not have a unique resolution as a linear combination of all products of fluctuation operators. The set of all products of \( N \) fluctuations (one for each fragment) is a complete and linearly independent basis for the space of all super-system Fock-space operators. Adding to this set all possible fluctuation products of lengths less than \( N \) then builds a linearly dependent set of operators. A product of less than \( N \) fluctuations has multiple non-zero matrix elements, and this is an important point as pertains to choosing compact representations of operators in terms of fluctuations. We intuitively expect the Hamiltonian to couple only small numbers of fragments simultaneously but also generate many non-zero matrix elements, analogous to its form as a linear combination of relatively short strings of field operators in the \textit{ab initio} representation.

3.5 The Hamiltonian in terms of fragment fluctuation operators

Having shown that we have sets of single-fragment fluctuation operators that each form a complete basis for super-system operators, we may proceed to resolve the Hamiltonian \( \hat{\mathcal{H}} \) in terms of these fluctuations. It will be most convenient to first resolve \( \hat{\mathcal{H}} \) as an expansion in terms of the fluctuation operators \( \{ \hat{\sigma}^Q_P \} \), since the rules for determining determinant-basis matrix elements are simple. The expansion can then be transformed in terms of the fluctuation operators \( \{ \hat{\tau}^j_i \} \) for the target basis. In order to resolve the requisite matrix elements \( \langle \Phi^P | \hat{\mathcal{H}} | \Phi^Q \rangle \) in the determinant basis, however, we will first decompose the \textit{ab initio} expression for \( \hat{\mathcal{H}} \) by fragment order.
3.5.1 Decomposition of the \textit{ab initio} Hamiltonian

The following expression of the \textit{ab initio} many-electron Hamiltonian is identical to its usual expansion in an orthonormal basis

\begin{align}
\hat{H} &= \sum_{p,q} h_{pq} \hat{c}_p \hat{a}_q + \sum_{p,q,r,s} v_{pqrs} \hat{c}_p \hat{c}_q \hat{a}_s \hat{a}_r \\
h_{pq} &= \langle \chi^p | \hat{h} | \chi_q \rangle \\
v_{pqrs} &= \frac{1}{4} \langle \chi^p \chi^q | \hat{v} | \chi^r \chi^s \rangle \tag{22}
\end{align}

where $\hat{h}$ is the combined kinetic energy and nuclear attraction operator, and $\hat{v}$ is the electron–electron repulsion operator. This can be shown readily by elimination of invertible transformations that reference some hypothetical orthonormal basis. The advantage of writing $\hat{H}$ in this manner is that, when any constituent term is acted on a determinant $|\Phi_P\rangle$ built from the nonorthogonal set \{|$\chi_p$\}\}, it simply induces index substitutions (or gives zero), in analogy to what is familiar from working in an orthonormal basis.

The \textit{ab initio} expansion of $\hat{H}$ may be decomposed into terms that act on different numbers of fragments as

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_1 + \hat{H}_2 + \hat{H}_3 + \hat{H}_4 \tag{23}$$

$\hat{H}_1$ collects together all terms from both the one-electron and two-electron parts of $\hat{H}$ that have all indices referring to orbitals of \textit{any} single fragment, and $\hat{H}_2$ similarly collects terms for all pairs of fragments (dimers). This decomposition truncates after $\hat{H}_4$, since there are a maximum of four orbital indices. Notably, all terms in $\hat{H}_3$ and $\hat{H}_4$ must induce an inter-fragment charge transfer somewhere in the system. In taking matrix elements, it will be useful to remember that each of the four $\hat{H}_M$ may be further decomposed by collecting together all the terms that act on a specific group of fragments, for example, for $\hat{H}_4$,

$$\hat{H}_4 = \sum_{m_1<m_2<m_3<m_4} \hat{H}^{(m_1,m_2,m_3,m_4)} \tag{24}$$

where $m_1<m_2<m_3<m_4$ under the summation runs over all unique tetramers.
3.5.2 Fragment-fluctuation expansion of the Hamiltonian

We may now build $\hat{H}$ in terms of the set $\{\hat{\sigma}^Q_P\}$, by handling each of the $\hat{H}_M$ separately. In parallel to standard practice for matrix elements of one- and two-electron operators, it will be convenient to frame the discussion in terms of the number of fragments that have changed state in the bra, relative to the ket (henceforth, the number of substitutions). To express this, the number of primes on a tuple index will be used to denote the number of substitutions relative to the unprimed index, and an overbar will denote a changed value of a sub-tuple therein. For example, for two substitutions, and identifying the fragments undergoing the substitution as $m'$ and $m''$, $P'' = (P_1, \cdots, \bar{P}_{m'} \cdots \bar{P}_{m''} \cdots P_N)$, where the unsubstituted tuple is $P = (P_1, \cdots, P_{m'} \cdots P_{m''} \cdots P_N)$. We will always assume $m' < m'' < \cdots$.

We know a priori, that a matrix element of a given $\hat{H}_M$ will be zero if the number of substitutions is greater than $M$. Also, the fact that any term of any $\hat{H}_M$ operates on a maximum of two electrons places further restrictions on non-zero elements. For example, $\hat{H}_4$ can have no non-zero matrix elements between states that differ by less than four substitutions; in order for a two-electron operator to have indices on four separate fragments, it must induce two disjoint charge transfers and must therefore change the states of no fewer than four fragments. Similarly, $\hat{H}_3$ only has non-zero matrix elements between states that differ by only two or three substitutions (doubly substituted matrix elements represent the effect of the average field of one fragment on a disjoint charge transfer).

As an illustration of the logic by which matrix elements are derived, let us consider the simplest case of a diagonal matrix element of $\hat{H}_1$

$$\langle \Phi^P | \hat{H}_1 | \Phi_P \rangle = \sum_m \langle \phi^{P_1} \cdots \phi^{P_N} | \hat{H}^{(m)} | \phi_{P_1} \cdots \phi_{P_N} \rangle$$

$$= \sum_m \langle \phi^{P_m} | \hat{H}_1 | \phi_{P_m} \rangle$$

(25)

The orbitals on fragments other than fragment $m$ contribute only factors of their biorthogonal overlaps to matrix elements of $\hat{H}^{(m)}$. In field-operator language, the creation and annihilation operators for orbitals on fragments other than $m$ commute with $\hat{H}^{(m)}$, and then “cancel.” The second line is written in terms of $\hat{H}_1$, instead of the $\hat{H}^{(m)}$, which is valid since the matrix element will be zero for any Hamiltonian term that does not act exclusively on the fragments whose states appear in the bra and ket; similar notation will declutter the higher-order terms.
The logic for obtaining these matrix elements is seen to closely mirror the rules for determinant matrix elements of one- and two-electron operators. Applying this further, we obtain the following expressions for the complete collection of non-zero matrix elements between states that have the same total number of electrons (zero if the number of electrons differs).

\[
\langle \Phi^P | \hat{H}_1 | \Phi_P \rangle = \sum_m \langle \phi^{P_m} | \hat{H}_1 | \phi_{P_m} \rangle
\]

\[
\langle \Phi^{P'} | \hat{H}_1 | \Phi_P \rangle = \langle \phi^{P_{m'}'} | \hat{H}_1 | \phi_{P_{m'}} \rangle
\]

\[
\langle \Phi^P | \hat{H}_2 | \Phi_P \rangle = \sum_{m_1 < m_2} \langle \phi^{P_{m_1} P_{m_2}} | \hat{H}_2 | \phi_{P_{m_1}} \phi_{P_{m_2}} \rangle
\]

\[
\langle \Phi^{P'} | \hat{H}_2 | \Phi_P \rangle = \sum_m \langle \phi^{P_{m'} P_m} | \hat{H}_2 | \phi_{P_{m'}} \phi_{P_m} \rangle
\]

\[
\langle \Phi^{P''} | \hat{H}_2 | \Phi_P \rangle = \langle \phi^{P_{m'} P_{m''}} | \hat{H}_2 | \phi_{P_{m'}} \phi_{P_{m''}} \rangle
\]

\[
\langle \Phi^{P'''} | \hat{H}_3 | \Phi_P \rangle = \sum_m (-1)^{\alpha_m''} \langle \phi^{P_{m'} P_{m''} P_m} | \hat{H}_3 | \phi_{P_{m'}} \phi_{P_{m''}} \phi_{P_m} \rangle
\]

\[
\langle \Phi^{P'''} | \hat{H}_3 | \Phi_P \rangle = \langle \phi^{P_{m'} P_{m''} P_{m'''} P_m} | \hat{H}_3 | \phi_{P_{m'}} \phi_{P_{m''}} \phi_{P_{m'''}} \phi_{P_m} \rangle
\]

\[
\langle \Phi^{P''''} | \hat{H}_4 | \Phi_P \rangle = \langle \phi^{P_{m'} P_{m''} P_{m'''} P_{m''''}} | \hat{H}_4 | \phi_{P_{m'}} \phi_{P_{m''}} \phi_{P_{m'''}} \phi_{P_{m''''}} \rangle
\]

For the sake of compact expressions, the summations sometimes admit two copies of the same fragment state into a determinant; clearly, this evaluates to zero due to antisymmetry and is inconsequential. Similarly, the summations also allow the states of the fragments to appear out of order. This does not contradict our established notation, which only insists that tuple components are ordered. Only in one case does the reordering lead to a sign change, and that is for a matrix element of \( \hat{H}_3 \) in which a charge has been transferred between fragments \( m' \) and \( m'' \), and when the summation index \( m \) is between \( m' \) and \( m'' \); the exponent \( \alpha_m'' \) is one in this case and zero otherwise.

It can now be verified that the following expressions for the \( \hat{H}_M \) have the same matrix
elements as above and are therefore identically the same operators

\[ \hat{H}_1 = \sum_{m} \sum_{P_m} \langle \phi^P_m | \hat{H}^{(m)} | \phi^{Q_m} \rangle \hat{\sigma}_P^m \]

\[ \hat{H}_2 = \sum_{m_1 < m_2} \sum_{P_{m_1}, P_{m_2}} \langle \phi^{P_{m_1}} \phi^{P_{m_2}} | \hat{H}^{(m_1, m_2)} | \phi^{Q_{m_1}} \phi^{Q_{m_2}} \rangle \hat{\sigma}_{P_{m_1}} \hat{\sigma}_{P_{m_2}} \]

\[ \hat{H}_3 = \sum_{m_1 < m_2 < m_3} \sum_{P=(P_{m_1}, P_{m_2}, P_{m_3})} \langle \Phi^P | \hat{H}_3 | \Phi_Q \rangle \hat{\sigma}_{P_{m_1}} \hat{\sigma}_{P_{m_2}} \hat{\sigma}_{P_{m_3}} \]

\[ \hat{H}_4 = \sum_{m_1 < m_2 < m_3 < m_4} \sum_{P=(P_{m_1}, P_{m_2}, P_{m_3}, P_{m_4})} \langle \Phi^P | \hat{H}_4 | \Phi_Q \rangle \hat{\sigma}_{P_{m_1}} \hat{\sigma}_{P_{m_2}} \hat{\sigma}_{P_{m_3}} \hat{\sigma}_{P_{m_4}} \] (27)

The shift in notation between the second and third lines is for the sake of clarity, serving both to shorten the latter expressions and to ensure their meanings are unambiguous by expanding the former. Inserting the transformations of the operators \{\hat{\sigma}_P^Q\} in terms of the set \{\hat{\tau}_i\}, and recognizing the definitions of the \{|\Psi_I\rangle\} and \{|\Psi^I\rangle\} in terms of \{|\Phi_P\rangle\} and \{|\Phi^P\rangle\}, we finally arrive at (in the most condensed notation)

\[ \hat{\mathcal{H}} = \sum_{m} \sum_{J=(j_m)} \langle \Psi^I | \hat{H}_1 | \Psi_J \rangle \hat{\tau}^{j_m}_{i_m} \]

\[ + \sum_{m_1 < m_2} \sum_{J=(j_{m_1}, j_{m_2})} \langle \Psi^I | \hat{H}_2 | \Psi_J \rangle \hat{\tau}^{j_{m_1}}_{i_{m_1}} \hat{\tau}^{j_{m_2}}_{i_{m_2}} \]

\[ + \sum_{m_1 < m_2 < m_3} \sum_{J=(j_{m_1}, j_{m_2}, j_{m_3})} \langle \Psi^I | \hat{H}_3 | \Psi_J \rangle \hat{\tau}^{j_{m_1}}_{i_{m_1}} \hat{\tau}^{j_{m_2}}_{i_{m_2}} \hat{\tau}^{j_{m_3}}_{i_{m_3}} \]

\[ + \sum_{m_1 < m_2 < m_3 < m_4} \sum_{J=(j_{m_1}, j_{m_2}, j_{m_3}, j_{m_4})} \langle \Psi^I | \hat{H}_4 | \Psi_J \rangle \hat{\tau}^{j_{m_1}}_{i_{m_1}} \hat{\tau}^{j_{m_2}}_{i_{m_2}} \hat{\tau}^{j_{m_3}}_{i_{m_3}} \hat{\tau}^{j_{m_4}}_{i_{m_4}} \] (28)

It is interesting to note that this result can also be obtained by starting directly with the fact that \hat{\psi}_{i_m} commutes with any term in \hat{\mathcal{H}} that does not act on fragment \(m\). Though this is conceptually important, the underlying detailed logic for dealing with the consequent many-electron overlaps is essentially the same.

As discussed, since the basis of all possible fluctuation products is overcomplete, the expression for the Hamiltonian here is not unique, but we conjecture that this is the most compact
expansion. The formally quartic scaling of the number of matrix elements in the excitonic Hamiltonian is simply a reflection of the quartic scaling of the two-electron integrals tensor. One advantage of breaking $\hat{H}$ into the $\hat{H}_M$ is simplification of the matrix element expressions; as written, the two-fragment components do not require us to subtract off any double-counted single-fragment energies, etc. The numerical evaluation of the matrix elements contained in these expressions now requires explicit insertion of terms from the ab initio expansion of the Hamiltonian, but, conveniently, for small numbers of fragments.

3.6 Handling linear dependencies

Since the framework proposed in this work depends so critically on both the ability to assign one-electron functions to specific fragments and on the linear independence of that basis, it behooves us to address the topic of what to do when a local function set $\{|\chi_p\rangle\}$ is linearly dependent. The linear dependent case is important, as it is certain to arise with large single-electron basis sets using diffuse functions.

The general problem is that the ambiguity in fragment location is complete for an electron in an orbital belonging to one fragment, if that orbital can be constructed as a linear combination of orbitals solely on other fragments. We must somehow “remove” this linear dependency while simultaneously preserving the local structure of the framework. The direct removal of null vectors (or nearly null vectors, in numerical algorithms) at the one-electron level produces a basis whose members are not generally conducive to being assigned to specific atoms or fragments. Yet, removal of individual fragment-local or atom-local functions to resolve a linear dependency can create artificial asymmetries. With modification, the derivation above can be applied to the linearly dependent case, and this is discussed in appendix A.

4 Calculation and Approximation of Matrix Elements

Given the formal framework now established, the remaining nontrivial practical matter is the computation of matrix elements that resolve excitonic Hamiltonians for real systems. We will show that these matrix elements may be computed efficiently, using only one- and two-electron integrals for small numbers of fragments ($\leq 4$) and low-electron-order ($\leq 2$) single-fragment data to represent the effects of intra-fragment correlation. The single-fragment quantities are
reusable and can be pre-computed in a single, linear-scaling step. Further simplifications can be made for these coupling elements when fragments fall outside of overlap radius and eventually reach the asymptotic regime. All of this is in spite of formally insisting on globally biorthogonalized one-electron bases. The applicability of approximation schemes will also briefly be addressed.

The matrix elements we need are of the general form

\[
\langle \Psi^I | \hat{H}_M | \Psi_J \rangle = \langle \psi^{i_1} \cdots \psi^{i_M} | \hat{H}^{(m_1, \cdots, m_M)} | \psi^{j_1} \cdots \psi^{j_M} \rangle
\]

for \( M \) up to 4. We recall that \( \hat{H}^{(m_1, \cdots, m_M)} \) collects all terms of the \textit{ab initio} expression for \( \hat{H} \), in the biorthogonal orbital resolution, where at least one field operator references an orbital on each of the fragments \( m_1 \) through \( m_M \), and no other fragments. This can be written as a generic term-by-term expansion

\[
\hat{H}^{(m_1, \cdots, m_M)} = \sum_l h_l^{(m_1, \cdots, m_M)} \hat{b}_l^{(m_1, \cdots, m_M)} \cdots \hat{b}_l^{(m_1, \cdots, m_M)}
\]

where \( l \) simply enumerates the terms. The operator \( \hat{b}_l^{(m_1, \cdots, m_M)} \) collects together those field operators of the \( l \)-th term of \( \hat{H}^{(m_1, \cdots, m_M)} \) that reference orbitals belonging to the fragment \( m_1 \), whose index bears the underline, and so forth for the other participating fragments. To within a phase of \( \pm 1 \) (to account for permutations of field operators), \( h_l^{(m_1, \cdots, m_M)} \) denotes the respective associated one- or two-electron integral from the \textit{ab initio} expansion.

Each matrix element of the excitonic Hamiltonian may now be decomposed as

\[
\langle \psi^{i_1} \cdots \psi^{i_M} | \hat{H}^{(m_1, \cdots, m_M)} | \psi^{j_1} \cdots \psi^{j_M} \rangle = \sum_l (-1)^{\beta_{I,J}} h_l^{(m_1, \cdots, m_M)} \langle \psi^{i_1} | \hat{b}_l^{(m_1, \cdots, m_M)} \psi^{j_1} \rangle \cdots \langle \psi^{i_M} | \hat{b}_l^{(m_1, \cdots, m_M)} \psi^{j_M} \rangle
\]

where an explanation of the phase factor therein is immediately forthcoming. To show that this is possible, we first consider generic matrix elements of the form

\[
\langle \phi^{P_1} \cdots \phi^{P_M} | \hat{b}^{(m_1)} \cdots \hat{b}^{(m_M)} | \phi^{Q_1} \cdots \phi^{Q_M} \rangle = (-1)^{\beta_{P,Q}} \langle [\phi^{P_1} \hat{b}^{(m_1)} \phi^{Q_1}] \cdots [\phi^{P_M} \hat{b}^{(m_M)} \phi^{Q_M}] \rangle
\]
where $\hat{b}^{(m)}$ can denote any string of field operators that pertain to fragment $m$ from the set $\{\hat{a}^p\} \cup \{\hat{c}^p\}$. All of the operators that need to be permuted to reach the arrangement shown on the right-hand side of eq. (32) either commute or anticommute. The accumulated phase exponent $\beta_{P,Q}^{P,Q}$ then depends on the number of electrons on each fragment in both the bra ($P$) and in the ket ($Q$), and on the number of field operators in each of the $\hat{b}^{(m)}$, which are collected into a dependency on the tuple $B$. (Actually, it only matters whether these numbers are even or odd.) Most importantly, using the given anticommutation relationships, the resulting vacuum expectation value factorizes into numbers that can each be computed individually, as vacuum expectation values of the operators for each fragment alone. By expanding the bra and ket on the left-hand side of eq. (31) in the determinant basis, manipulating each of the resulting terms after the insertion of eq. (30) as just described, and then contracting the factors again with the expansion coefficients for the correlated fragment states, the right-hand side of eq. (31) is obtained. The final step of this sequence does require that all fragment states involved have definite particle number, in order to factor out the phase for each $l$, but it need not be the same number in the bra and the ket (in the case of matrix elements for charge-transfer fluctuations).

We have now shown that, in the computation of any matrix element $\langle \Psi^I | \hat{H}_M | \Psi^J \rangle$, all information about the fragment states is encapsulated in factors of the generic form $\langle \psi^{i,m} | \hat{b}^{(m)} | \psi^{j,m} \rangle$. Importantly, the possible operators $\hat{b}^{(m)}$ that might occur do not depend on the identities of the other fragments involved. They are nothing more than strings of up to four field operators acting on fragment $m$, with particle rank of no more than two. These effectively trace out much of the detail of intra-fragment correlations. In advance of computing the excitonic Hamiltonian, they can be tabulated for each fragment, for every admissible combination of field operators and pair of states considered. These quantities can be considered as elements of generalized transition density matrices (general tensors). Conventional transition density matrices involve strings consisting of one creation and one annihilation operator. Interestingly, in the case of only one field operator, there is a connection to the concept of Dyson orbitals. Also, elements requiring four field operators do not contribute to couplings between fragments and need not be stored.

The remaining task is to show that these generalized single-fragment transition-density matrix elements are tractable and straightforwardly amenable to approximation schemes. For
this purpose, it is convenient to decompose such an element explicitly as

\[ \langle \psi_i^m \mid \hat{b}^{(m)} \mid \psi_j^m \rangle = \sum_{P_m, Q_m} z_{P_m}^{i_m} z_{Q_m}^{j_m} \left\langle \hat{\phi}_{P_m} \hat{b}^{(m)} \hat{\phi}_{Q_m} \right\rangle \]  (33)

As previously alluded to, the rules for evaluating matrix elements of this form using field-operator algebra are exactly the same as for an orthonormal basis for the fragment, without needing any information about the basis functions on surrounding fragments. The transition-density elements for one fragment may, in fact, be computed in complete ignorance of any other fragment or the super-system in which the fragment is embedded. This is in spite of the functions on neighbors technically entering into the definitions of the biorthogonalized annihilation operators involved. Though this is perhaps counterintuitive, we now recall that this biorthogonalization does also effect the values of the one- and two-electron integrals, with which these transition-tensor elements are eventually contracted; this is crucial to ultimately arriving at Hamiltonian matrix elements corresponding to a globally consistent set of monomer fluctuations. We hereby have the remarkable result that the entirety of the complexity of working with overlapping basis functions has been moved into the transformations of the one- and two-electron integrals, even though the states of the fragments are internally correlated. That stated, it is not strictly necessary to ever compute the globally biorthogonalized complement orbital basis. To the extent that the real-space resolutions of the kinetic and Coulombic operators are local, only orbitals in close proximity to a group under consideration need to be taken into account.

We finally turn our attention to the internally correlated fragment states themselves. It suffices to simply recall that that the matrices \( z^{(m)} \) for each fragment were only ever required to be invertible. Any existing method in electronic structure theory that can accomplish this and supply the necessary transition tensors can be applied (and the fragments are not required to all use the same method). Notably, this opens the door for using the robust and efficient equation-of-motion coupled-cluster theory\(^{17,18} \) for the fragment states. In practice, the intention is to only ever (implicitly or explicitly) compute a small number of columns and rows of each \( z^{(m)} \) and \( \tilde{z}^{(m)} \), respectively, in accord with the truncation scheme applied.

With the connection to the primitive one- and two-electron integrals elucidated, we may now also apply a familiar analysis to determine the computational complexity of obtaining the
excitonic Hamiltonian. The matrix elements for spatially localized fragments will inherit the coarse features of the \textit{ab initio} Hamiltonian in a local basis. For example, for the tetramer terms, which must involve two disjoint charge transfers, each acceptor fragment must be in the immediate vicinity of a donor fragment; however, the two donors may be quite far from each other before the overall interaction is negligible. A thorough such analysis reveals that there are a quadratically scaling number of non-negligible terms in the excitonic Hamiltonian at the mesoscopic scale (linear in the bulk limit), for any fixed error tolerance, consistent with expectations from classical mechanics. Furthermore, as with the primitive two-electron integrals, all but a linear-scaling number of matrix elements may be cast as an electrostatic interaction between charge distributions that are outside of overlap (exchange) range of each other. These can be expressed in terms of one-electron transition densities, which involve contractions of the one-electron transition-density tensors with orbital product distributions. Such densities are importantly amenable to multipole approximations in the far field. Although constructing such densities will sometimes involve orbitals on multiple fragments, there are nevertheless a linear-scaling number of them, due to the exponential decay of the norms of such densities with distance.

5 Conclusion

We have shown that it is possible to exactly write the electronic Hamiltonian for a super-system in terms of fluctuations of fragments between internally correlated states, rigorously accounting for inter-fragment electron exchange and charge transfer (also with a linearly dependent orbital basis). This has the potential to fold the vast majority of the complexity of a wide variety of electronic structure problems into the low-scaling step of obtaining an effective Hamiltonian. The full range of familiar ground- and excited-state electronic structure methods, and their associated approximations, are readily applied to this Hamiltonian.

Explicit recipes have been given for constructing all necessary matrix elements, of which there are only an asymptotically quadratically scaling number, for a given threshold. Constructing the Hamiltonian requires independent calculations on small groups of fragments ($\leq 4$), using one- and two-electron integrals that are transformed to reflect the presence of other fragments. All of these calculations may be cast in terms of an overall linear-scaling number of reusable
single-fragment tensors. Furthermore, all but a linear-scaling number of matrix elements may be efficiently decomposed in terms of electrostatic interactions between a linear-scaling number of transition densities, which are further amenable to multipole approximations in the far field.

There are many features of this framework that hold promise for building finely tunable and efficient methods to capture precise properties of systems interacting with a large number of other systems. First, it could potentially decouple the quality of the one-electron basis from the cost of the global calculation, to the extent that the quality and the number of fragment states may be separate considerations. Second, since the super-system framework is theoretically independent of the level of approximation used for the fragments, it is not inherently subject to the shortcomings of any given electron-correlation model. It is therefore immediately applicable to systems where current methods already perform well for the isolated fragments. This should then provide a robust approach for incorporating difficult electronic structure problems into calculations on large systems, perhaps using multi-reference methods for some small molecules undergoing reactions and less expensive methods for resolving the states of peripheral molecules, eventually giving way to force-fields or an embedding potential. Third, pressing further into unknown territory, it may be possible to parameterize or interpolate the excitonic Hamiltonian as a function of nuclear coordinates, or even generalize the framework to handle vibronic states of the fragments.

The Fock-space formulation of this work allows for inter-fragment charge resonance, potentially already represented sufficiently by dimer terms. This could even create covalent linkages between fragments, in principle. In cases where charge resonance is clearly unimportant, the excitonic Hamiltonian can be immediately truncated after dimer terms. Since all fragment fluctuations are described by orbitals local to a fragment, it will be interesting to explore the characteristics of this method with respect to basis-set superposition error, or possibly the lack thereof.

At a technical level, it is interesting that our approach to inter-fragment exchange has forced us to work with fragment Fock spaces, even when the model space is chosen to nominally conserve fragment charges. This requirement arises from the biorthogonalization of the one-electron bases, which implicitly introduces charge-transfer components into the super-system complement basis. This is a somewhat intuitive consequence, since, with overlapping orbitals, the fundamental ambiguity in fragment location of an electron is intimately related to the
concept of charge transfer. Although concrete algorithms are presently envisioned to work in overall number-conserving spaces, the ability of the formalism to handle open systems could be advantageous in the future.
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Appendix

A Handling Linear Dependencies

We present here an alternate framing of the derivation given in the text, which is at a level of abstraction that allows us to handle both the linearly independent and linearly dependent cases together. This allows us to show the path necessary to obtain working expressions for the linearly dependent case without explicitly rederiving all details.

For any set of many-electron states \( \{ |\Psi_I\rangle \} \), linear dependence notwithstanding, we may write a resolution of the identity in the following form

\[
1 = \sum_I |\Psi_I\rangle\langle \Psi_I |
\]  

for some (potentially non-unique) choice of the set \( \{ |\Psi_I\rangle \} \). By inserting this resolution of the identity into the time-independent Schrödinger equation solved by \( |\Psi_{eigen}\rangle \), we arrive at the matrix eigenvalue equation

\[
H |\Psi_{eigen}\rangle = E_{eigen} |\Psi_{eigen}\rangle
\]

where \( |\Psi_{eigen}\rangle \) is a column matrix with elements \( \Psi^I_{eigen} = \langle \Psi^I | \Psi_{eigen} \rangle \), and the matrix \( H \) has elements \( H^I_J = \langle \Psi^I | H | \Psi_J \rangle \). In the linearly dependent case, there are clearly some redundant degrees of freedom, and multiple choices of \( |\Psi_{eigen}\rangle \) can be used to represent the physical state \( |\Psi_{eigen}\rangle \); however, for a given choice of \( \{ |\Psi_I\rangle \} \), the matrix \( H \) is fixed. Assuming non-zero \( E_{eigen} \), the eigenvector of \( H \) with eigenvalue of \( E_{eigen} \) is unique. (This can be generalized in the case of degenerate states.) The physically redundant degrees of freedom are determined by the necessity that the projection of \( |\Psi_{eigen}\rangle \) into the null space of \( H \) is zero. \( H \) also has spurious eigenvectors with eigenvalue zero and no physical norm, corresponding to its null space, and, if the physical state \( |\Psi_{eigen}\rangle \) happened to have eigenvalue of zero, these spurious eigenvectors could mix with it. This could be easily remedied by a scalar Hamiltonian shift, but we are generally concerned with low-energy bound states in this work, which have manifestly negative energy eigenvalues.

In the case where \( \{ |\Psi_I\rangle \} \) is linearly independent, it is straightforward to show that the
members of the set \( \{ |\Psi^I \rangle \} \) are the biorthogonal components uniquely determined by

\[
\langle \Psi^I | = \sum_J \tilde{S}^{IJ} \langle \Psi_J |
\]

where the elements \( S^{IJ} \) belong to the matrix \( \mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}^{-1} \), where \( \mathbf{S} \) is the matrix of overlaps \( S_{IJ} = \langle \Psi_I | \Psi_J \rangle \). Recalling that both \( \mathbf{S} \) and \( \mathbf{S}^{-1} \) are self-adjoint matrices, we then straightforwardly arrive at the expected result that \( \mathbf{H} = \mathbf{S} \tilde{\mathbf{H}} \), where \( \tilde{\mathbf{H}} \) has matrix elements \( \tilde{H}_{IJ} = \langle \Psi_J | \tilde{\mathbf{H}} | \Psi_I \rangle \). The remainder of the work (already completed) can then be viewed as an exercise in constructing explicit forms of the members of \( \{ |\Psi^I \rangle \} \) in terms of the fragment basis and underlying orbitals, such that we may write \( \tilde{\mathbf{H}} \) in terms of fragment fluctuations with explicit formulas for the necessary scalar coefficients (matrix elements) of strings of those fluctuations.

In the linearly dependent case, we will find it convenient to define fluctuation operators directly in the auxiliary space of coefficients. Let the set of column matrices \( \{ \Psi_I \} \) represent the orthonormal basis vectors of this coefficient space, such that

\[
\Psi_{\text{eigen}} = \sum_I \Psi_I \Psi_{\text{eigen}}^I = \sum_{i_1} \cdots \sum_{i_N} \Psi_{(i_1, \cdots, i_N)} \Psi_{\text{eigen}}^{(i_1, \cdots, i_N)}
\]

where, in the second line, we remind ourselves of the structure of the index \( I \) as a tuple that is decomposable in terms of fragment-state labels. Let us now define a set of fluctuation matrices \( \{ \tau_I^j \} \) with the following action

\[
\tau_{i_m}^{j_m} \Psi_{(k_1, \cdots, k_m, \cdots, k_N)} = \delta_{j_m,k_m} \Psi_{(k_1, \cdots, i_m, \cdots, k_N)}
\]

where, as with the physical states, these fluctuation matrices may be defined as superpositions of appropriate dyads. Similarly, the proof that any matrix in the coefficient space may be written as a sum of products of fluctuation matrices proceeds along the same lines, assuring us that \( \mathbf{H} \) may be built from such fluctuations. The precise fragment-wise structure of this expansion of \( \mathbf{H} \) (and therefore \( \Psi_{\text{eigen}} \)) again depends on determining the the elements \( \langle \Psi^I | \tilde{\mathbf{H}} | \Psi_J \rangle \). The primary difference, relative to the linearly independent case, is that the choice of \( \{ |\Psi^I \rangle \} \) is not unique, and the null space of \( \mathbf{H} \) depends on this choice, consequently affecting its fluctuation-matrix expansion.
In spite of any linear dependencies, eq. (14a) still provides the definition of the antisymmetrized tensor-products of correlated fragment states in terms of the (potentially linearly dependent) set of orbital configurations. Therefore, in the linearly dependent case, eq. (14b) is still a suitable choice of the members of \( \{|\Psi^f\rangle\} \) that satisfy eq. (34), in terms of a suitable choice of \( \{|\Phi^f\rangle\} \) that satisfy

\[
1 = \sum_P |\Phi_P\rangle \langle \Phi_P|
\]

which is quickly verified by inserting these resolutions of \( |\Psi_I\rangle \) and \( |\Psi^f\rangle \) into eq. (34), and realizing that the invertibility of \( Z \) is independent of linear dependencies in the set of physical states. The important consequence of this is that, once formulas for the elements of a matrix \( H' \) (with elements \( H'_{PQ} = \langle \Phi_P | \hat{H} | \Phi_Q \rangle \)) are known for a given choice of \( \{|\Phi^f\rangle\} \), and their structure in terms of numbers of fragments coupled is analyzed, then the path to constructing \( H \) in terms of fluctuations \( \{\tau^f\}_i \) via application of fragment-local transformations is the same as presented in the main text for the linearly independent case.

As with the linearly independent case, the construction of explicit forms for the members of \( \{|\Phi^f\rangle\} \) can be straightforward, so long as the matrix \( s \), built from the one-electron overlaps \( s_{pq} = \langle \chi_p | \chi_q \rangle \), can be partially inverted. Let the matrix \( \bar{s} \) satisfy

\[
p_1 = p_1 \bar{s} s = s \bar{s} p_1
\]

\[
1 = p_0 + p_1
\]

where \( p_0 \) is the orthogonal projector onto the null space of \( s \), and \( p_1 \) is the orthogonal projector onto the range (null space complement) of \( s \). Notably, only the projection of \( \bar{s} \) onto the range of \( s \) is uniquely defined. Because of this, \( \bar{s} \) is not necessarily self adjoint for any choice, but we do have \( p_1 \bar{s} p_1 = (p_1 \bar{s} p_1)^\dagger \), which is equally valuable. For a given choice of \( \bar{s} \), a choice of the members of \( \{|\Phi^f\rangle\} \) may be specified again by eq. (9), but using a linearly dependent set of orbitals that satisfy

\[
\langle \chi^p | = \sum_q \bar{s}^{pq} \langle \chi_q |
\]

where \( \bar{s}^{pq} \) is an element of \( \bar{s} \).
We may, as before, define $\hat{c}_p$ and $\hat{c}^p$ as the creation operators associated with $|\chi_p\rangle$ and $|\chi^p\rangle$, respectively, and define $\hat{a}_p$ and $\hat{a}^p$ as their respective Hermitian conjugates. The Hamiltonian again takes exactly the same form as in eq. (22) in terms of these operators, shown in the same way as before. The difference is that there is now redundancy in the operator set, and the anticommutation rules do not follow. A given string in the field-operator resolution of the Hamiltonian will act not only on the fragments to which the indices in that string belong, but also on any fragments whose orbitals can be linearly combined to build the orbitals in question. If a given orbital is linearly independent of the rest of the basis (likely the majority), then only expected fragment is involved. Regardless, this does not increase the fragment order of the Hamiltonian, but it increases the number of fragments that could be associated with a given orbital index, which is an intuitive consequence of having a linear dependency arise due to overlaps of diffuse orbitals on different fragments.

A final comment is worthwhile to connect back to the abstract framework of resolutions of the identity. Similar to what we have done in the one-electron space, the matrices $\bar{S}$ and $\bar{S}'$ may be defined as satisfying

\[
P_1 \bar{S} \bar{S} = \bar{S} \bar{S} P_1 = P_1 = 1 - P_0
\]
\[
P'_1 \bar{S}' \bar{S}' = \bar{S}' \bar{S}' P'_1 = P'_1 = 1 - P'_0
\]

where $\bar{S}'$ has elements $S'_{PQ} = \langle \Phi_P | \Phi_Q \rangle$, and $P_0$ and $P'_0$ are the orthogonal projectors into the null spaces of $\bar{S}$ and $\bar{S}'$, respectively. For a given choice of $\bar{S}$ and $\bar{S}'$, the members of the sets $\{ |\Psi_I\rangle \}$ and $\{ |\Phi^P\rangle \}$ satisfy

\[
\langle \Psi_I | = \sum_J \bar{S}^{IJ} \langle \Psi_J |
\]
\[
\langle \Phi^P | = \sum_Q \bar{S}'^{PQ} \langle \Phi_Q |
\]

which coincides with the unique choice of biorthogonal complements in the linearly independent case, when $\bar{S} = S^{-1}$ and $\bar{S}' = S'^{-1}$. In the linearly dependent case, the use of these definitions in resolutions of the identity [eqs. (34) and (39)] correspond to additions of, and projections onto, null vectors. If we make the choice that the arbitrary part of $\bar{s}$ is zero, or equivalently that the arbitrary part of $\bar{S}'$ is zero, which is likely the most convenient and practical choice,
and we furthermore insist on eq. (14b) for our choice of the set \( \{ |\Psi^I\rangle \} \), then this is equivalent to choosing

\[
\bar{S} = \bar{Z} P'_1 \bar{S}' P'_1 \bar{Z}^\dagger
\]  

(44)

This is clearly a valid pseudo-inverse of \( S = Z^\dagger S' Z \), but it has non-zero components in the arbitrary part, due the fact that some eigenvectors of \( S' \) with non-zero eigenvalue transform to vectors that lie partly in the null space of \( S \), and vice versa. The result of this is that the Hamiltonian matrix is

\[
H = \bar{Z} H' Z
\]  

(45)

which is a similarity transformation of the Hamiltonian in the configuration basis, as expected, but where

\[
P_0 H \neq 0
\]  

(46)

meaning that \( H \) does not have the same null space as \( S \). It still has a null space of the same dimension, but it corresponds to a specific, non-intuitive (but implicit and innocuous) choice of representation of the state vectors in the basis of tensor products of correlated states.
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