Feynman’s solution of the quintessential problem in solid state physics
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Two of the most influential ideas developed by Richard Feynman are the Feynman diagram technique [1] and his variational approach [2]. The former provides a powerful tool to construct a systematic expansion for a generic interacting system, while the latter allows optimization of a perturbation theory using a variational principle. Here we show that combining a variational approach with a new diagrammatic quantum Monte Carlo method [3–10], both based on the Feynman’s original ideas, results in a powerful and accurate solver to the generic solid state problem, in which a macroscopic number of electrons interact by the long range Coulomb repulsion. We apply the solver to the quintessential problem of solid state, the uniform electron gas (UEG) [11], which is at the heart of the density functional theory (DFT) success in describing real materials, yet it has not been adequately solved for over 90 years. While some wave-function properties, like the ground state energy, have been very accurately calculated by the diffusion Monte Carlo method (DMC) [12], the static and dynamic response functions, which are directly accessed by the experiment, remain poorly understood. Our method allows us to calculate the momentum-frequency resolved spin response functions for the first time, and to improve on the precision of the charge response function. The accuracy of both response functions is sufficiently high, so as to uncover previously missed fine structure in these responses. This method can be straightforwardly applied to a large number of moderately interacting electron systems in the thermodynamic limit, including realistic models of metallic and semiconducting solids.

The success of the Feynman’s diagram technique rests on two pillars, the quality of the chosen starting point, and one’s ability to compute the contributions of high-enough order, so that the sum ultimately can be extrapolated to the infinite order. We will address the former by introducing the variationally optimized starting point, as discussed below, and we will solve the latter by developing a powerful Monte Carlo method which can sum factorially large number of diagrams while massively reducing the fermionic sign problem by organizing Feynman diagrams into “sign-blessed” groups.

In the Feynman diagrammatic approach, one splits the Lagrangian of a system, \( L \), into a solvable part \( L_0 \) and the interaction \( \Delta L = L - L_0 \). The effects of the interaction is included with a power expansion in \( \Delta L \), constructed using the Feynman diagrams. Such diagrammatic series achieves the most rapid convergence when the leading term \( L_0 \) captures the emergent collective behavior of the system, which can be very different from the non-interacting problem [13]. In the metallic state, which is of special interest in this paper, the low temperature physics is described by the emergent quasiparticles interacting with a screened Coulomb interaction. We build an effective Feynman diagrammatic approach by explicitly encoding such physics in \( L_0 \). We screen the interaction in \( L_0 \) with a screening parameter \( \lambda \), rendering the Coulomb interaction short-ranged \( V(r) \propto \exp(-r\sqrt{\lambda})/r \). Correspondingly, a \( \lambda \) counter-term must be added to \( \Delta L \) to capture the non-local effects of the Coulomb interaction with high order diagrams (see the Methods section). Similarly, we introduce an electron potential \( \phi \) which properly renormalizes the electron dispersion and also fixes the Fermi surface of \( L_0 \) to the exact physical volume, which is enforced by the Luttinger’s theorem [14] (see the Methods section). In our simulations, such choice shows the most rapid and uniform convergence of the response functions for both small and large momenta.

Motivated by Feynman’s variational approach [2], we take the screening parameter \( \lambda \) as variational parameters which should be optimized to accelerate the rate of convergence. It was shown in the development of optimized perturbation theory [15] and variational perturbation theory [16–17] that the best choice of a variational parameter is the value at which the targeted observable is least sensitive to the change of the parameter. This technique is called the principle of minimal sensitivity (PMS). In Refs. [17–20], it was shown that the perturbative expansion optimized with the PMS can succeed even when interaction is strong, and regular perturbation theory fails. In this work, we optimize the screening parameter \( \lambda \) with PMS and observe a vast improvement to the convergence of the targeted response functions with expansion order.

While our setup of the expansion (with the static screening and the physical Fermi surface) is not entirely new [21–24], its evaluation to high enough order until ultimate convergence, has not been achieved before in any realistic model containing long-range Coulomb interaction, as relevant for realistic solids. Our solution employs a recently developed diagrammatic Monte Carlo algorithm [3–5, 8, 9], which is here optimized to take a maximal advantage of the sign blessing in fermionic sys-
We evaluate diagrams in the momentum and imaginary-time representation, and for each configuration of random momenta \((k_0, k_1, k_2, \cdots, k_N)\) and times \((\tau_1, \tau_2, \cdots, \tau_2N)\) generated by the Markov chain, we sum the contribution of all diagrams at a given order \(N\), which have the same number of momenta and time variables [25]. For example, when computing the polarization at order \(N = 6\), the sector without counter-terms contains 14593 Feynman diagrams (see Fig. 1). These are regrouped into a much smaller number of “sign-blessed” groups to boost the efficiency of the MC sampling. For example, motivated by the crossing symmetry, at the lowest order in the crossing exchange, we get from standard Feynman diagrams to so-called Hugenholtz diagrams [26] where the direct and exchange interactions are combined into an antisymmetrized four point vertex (see Fig. 1 green box). That exchange operation keeps the diagram exactly the same, except for a change of the overall sign and a change of momentum on a single interaction line, hence the pairs of such diagrams largely cancel. After this operation, there are only 877 Hugenholtz diagrams at order 6. To further reduce the number of diagrams, we then combine the polarization diagrams that can be derived from the same free energy diagram by attaching two external vertices to propagators. Mathematically, adding external vertices to a free energy diagram corresponds to taking its functional derivative with respect to the inverse propagator. Therefore, the above step groups the polarization diagrams into a conserving group in the Baym-Kadanoff sense [1], and the sign cancellation is guaranteed by the Ward identities (See the supplementary material). For example, at order \(N = 6\) there are only 41 such free-energy groups (see Fig. 1). We thus managed to reduce the complexity from 14593 individual diagrams to 41 groups. The diagrams in the same group are very similar, and hence can share the identical momentum/time variables (except the external vertices). This not only ensures the massive sign cancellation between different diagrams, but also reduces the cost of computing the total weight of Feynman diagrams in Monte Carlo updates.

Finally, beyond variationally optimizing the zeroth order term \((L_0)\) we can also look for improvement of the high-order vertex functions. One of our choices is to sum up all ladder diagrams dressing the vertices (see the Method and Fig.3 in the supplementary material). We will call this scheme the Vertex Corrected Constant Fermi Surface (VCCFS). The original diagrammatic expansion is here called Constant Fermi Surface (CFS) scheme. The name originates in the above described principle that electron potential \(\varepsilon_k\) is determined in such a way that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feynman</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>14593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugenholtz</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free energy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIG. 1: The grouping of Feynman diagrams is achieved by leveraging the fermionic crossing symmetry and the free-energy generating functional. Orange top box shows the number of Feynman/Hugenholtz/Free-energy Hugenholtz diagrams at orders 3-6, excluding the Hartree-Fock subdiagrams (see supplementary material). The green panel on the left and the right shows an example of the free-energy Hugenholtz diagram, and how is the Hugenholtz vertex related to the standard Feynman diagram. Note that a single Hugenholtz diagram with \(N\) vertices (black dots) represents up to \(2^N\) standard Feynman diagrams with alternating signs. By attaching two external vertices to different propagators in the Hugenholtz free energy diagram in the green box, one generates four topologically distinct groups of standard Feynman diagrams for the polarization function. Two of them are shown in the blue and orange box below. By the process of attaching external vertices to a single Hugenholtz free energy diagram, we generate 10 out of 11 standard Feynman diagrams for the polarization at the third order. The color lines represent our choice for momentum loops, which are uniquely determined by the choice of the loops in the free energy Hugenholtz diagram. The external momentum is added through the shortest path connecting two external vertices. Note that such grouping of diagrams allows us to calculate the weight of all diagrams in this figure with only 8 different electron propagators, instead of expected 36. The above protocol can generate multiple copies of the same Feynman diagram (but with different choice of time and momenta), which we weight with a proper symmetry factor.
$L$ and $L_0$ share the same physical Fermi surface volume.

All results in this work are obtained at temperature $T = 0.04E_F$, which is much lower than any other scale in the problem, hence results are the zero temperature equivalent. We want to point out that finite temperature calculations are very hard in the Diffusion Monte Carlo (DMC), while our method is very well suited for finite temperature calculations, and converges even faster with the increasing order. While wave-function properties, such as energy and pair distribution function, are very precisely computed by DMC, and some of them are also amenable to approximations such as GW [28, 29], the response functions are more challenging to evaluate with the existing techniques. The strength of our approach is that it can be used to compute both the static and the dynamic, the single and the multiparticle correlation functions. In Figs. 2 and 3, we show the momentum-dependent (Pauli) spin susceptibility at zero frequency, which has never been precisely calculated before to our knowledge even though its overall shape is crucial for the design of appropriate exchange-correlation functionals of the DFT to predict magnetic order in real materials. In panels (a) and (b) we show how the convergence properties of the susceptibility $\chi_s$ depends on the screening parameter $\lambda$ in the theory. Note that the static screening in $L_0$ is always compensated by the counter-term in $\Delta L$, so that for any value of $\lambda$ the UEG model is recovered at infinite order limit. The observable $\chi_s(q = 0)$ develops a broad plateau as a function of $\lambda$ (Fig. 2b) and a) at the point $\lambda^*_N$, which is slightly increasing with the increasing order. This shows that if expansion is carried out to high enough order, the physics becomes more and more local and allows one to use very short range form of the interaction, which greatly improves the efficiency of the method. We note that this property will be very beneficial in the realistic material applications, where the converged result is extremely difficult to obtain due to the long range nature of the bare Coulomb interaction. Fig. 2c shows the value of $\chi_s(q = 0)$ at the optimized $\lambda^*_N$ versus perturbation orders. When the PMS is used, such that the variational parameter $\lambda$ is optimized by order, the convergence is very rapid, even when the bare interaction is strong. The value $\chi_s(q = 0)$ at the optimized $\lambda^*_N$ is monotonically increasing with the increasing order in the CFS scheme, and beyond the second order is oscillating around the converged value in VCCFS scheme. Both schemes converge towards the same value, and the systematic error bar at a given truncation order can be estimated from comparison between the two methods, allowing one to extract very precise value of $\chi_s(q = 0)$ even at a moderate expansion order (see Fig. 2 and Table I).

Fig. 2 shows the momentum dependence of spin-susceptibility $\chi_s(q)$ at $\lambda^*/E_F = 0.75$, optimized at the highest order ($N = 6$) and its comparison to the non-interacting (RPA) result, which underestimates $\chi_s$ up to 57%.

In Figs. 3a we show the same spin-susceptibility as in Fig. 2a, but for other values of density parameter $r_s = 1 - 4$. VC corresponds to VCCFS scheme, and the rest to CFS scheme. The statistical error-bars are displayed for each computed point, and each point is computed statistically independently. In VCCFS scheme the statistical error-bars are larger than in CFS scheme, but agree with each other within the error-bar. (b) The local field correction for the same $r_s = 1 - 4$, and its deviation from quadratic approximation (see the color envelope). For clarity the curves for $r_s = 1.2$ and 3 are shifted up for 0.75, 0.5, and 0.25.

FIG. 2: Spin susceptibility of UEG at $r_s = 4$ (i.e., density $n = 3/(4\pi r_s^3)$). The optimization of $\chi_s(q = 0, \omega = 0)$ versus the screening parameter $\lambda$ within (a) CFS and (b) VCCFS scheme. Susceptibility $\chi$ and $\lambda$ are scaled by the density of states at the Fermi level $N_F = (\frac{1}{2\pi})^{3/2} / (2\pi r_s)$, and the Fermi energy $E_F$, respectively. The shaded region shows the estimated total error-bar of our calculation. A single extremum at the optimized $\lambda^*$ appears, which is however order dependent ($\lambda^*_N$). (c) The value of the optimized $\chi(q = 0, \omega = 0)|\lambda^*_N$ versus diagram order in both schemes. (d) The momentum dependent $\chi(q, \omega = 0)$ at the converged order $N = 6$ and optimized $\lambda^*_N = 0.75$ in CFS scheme, along with comparison to Random phase approximation (RPA), which is exact when interaction is ignored. The statistical errors are displayed in panels (a), (b) and (d), and in (d) are smaller than the width of the curve.

FIG. 3: Spin susceptibility: (a) $\chi_s(q, \omega = 0)$ at optimized $\lambda^*$ for $r_s = 1 - 4$. VC corresponds to VCCFS scheme, and the rest to CFS scheme. The statistical error-bars are displayed for each computed point, and each point is computed statistically independently. In VCCFS scheme the statistical error-bars are larger than in CFS scheme, but agree with each other within the error-bar. (b) The local field correction for the same $r_s = 1 - 4$, and its deviation from quadratic approximation (see the color envelope). For clarity the curves for $r_s = 1.2$ and 3 are shifted up for 0.75, 0.5, and 0.25.
note that this spin susceptibility plays a central role in construction of the DFT exchange-correlation kernel for magnetically ordered systems. Finally, Fig. 3 displays the static local-field correction, which measures the deviation from the non-interacting electron gas ($\chi_{RFPA}$), $G(q) = \frac{1}{2\pi} (\chi_{RFPA}^{-1}(q, \omega = 0) - \chi^{-1}(q, \omega = 0))$. It is a very sensitive measure of electron correlations. It has been suggested in the literature that the possible peak near $k \sim 2k_F$ is of great importance for understanding the quasiparticle properties [30]. Within the local density approximation, the function $G(q)$ is approximated by the quadratic parabola depicted in Fig. 3 [31], which is an excellent approximation at small $q \lesssim k_F$, but its deviation from the quadratic function is very pronounced near $2k_F$. Note that within RPA $G(q)$ vanishes, as RPA does not take into account the exchange-correlation kernel. We note that our calculation clearly shows that in the exact solution, the local field correction displays a non-trivial maximum just above $2k_F$, which is obtained here for the first time.

![FIG. 4: The inverse dielectric function (1/ε) for $r_s = 1−4$ at $\lambda_N^\text{lit.}(\frac{N}{F})$, optimized for order 5, but we show 1/ε for all orders up to 5 and its extrapolated value. We also display error-bars for extrapolated curve, which contains both the statistical error, and the estimated extrapolation error. Here we use more rapidly converging VCCFS scheme. The comparison to DMC and RPA is shown. The DMC data are from Ref. 31 32.](image)

Finally, in Table I we give our best estimates for the static spin and charge response with estimation of the error-bar. Within our method the spin response shows faster convergence with increasing order, hence it allows us to compute the spin response more precisely than the charge response, therefore our values for $\chi_s/N_F$ are more precise than currently available literature (compare columns one and two). Note that the previous estimate for the spin susceptibility relied on an uncontrolled ansatz for the spin dependence of the susceptibility, hence large uncertainty.

Contrary to the spin response, or finite momentum charge response, the static uniform charge response $P(q = 0, \omega = 0)$ can be obtained from the ground state energy of the system, without explicitly introducing a modulated external potential, and hence it can be extracted very precisely from the existing DMC calculations. We compare it with our results, and find excellent agreement. We note that static $P(q = 0, \omega = 0)$ at $r_s = 4$ convergences very slowly in our method, due to proximity to the well known charge instability at $r_s \approx 5.2$, hence we can not reliably extrapolate its value to infinite order at $r_s \geq 4$.

The prospects of combining the Variational diagramatic Monte Carlo with DFT to obtain theoretically controlled results in real solids are particularly exciting, as the DFT potential is semi-local and can be added to $v_k$, so that it will play a role of a counter-term in the expansion. The complexity would be modest, because no expensive self-consistency is required, and because the interaction is statically screened even at the lowest order, hence the scaling of this method should be similar to the complexity of screened hybrids [36] rather than the self-consistent GW approximation [37].
Method The UEG model describes electrons in a solid where the positive charges, which are the atomic nuclei, are assumed to be uniformly distributed in space. The electrons interact with the other charges through a long-range Coulomb interaction. The second-quantized Hamiltonian is:

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{\kappa \sigma} (\vec{k}^2 - \mu) \hat{\psi}^\dagger_{\kappa \sigma} \hat{\psi}_{\kappa \sigma} + \frac{1}{2V} \sum_{\kappa \k' \sigma \sigma'} \frac{8\pi}{q^2} \hat{\psi}^\dagger_{\kappa q} \hat{\psi}^\dagger_{\k' q} \hat{\psi}_{\k' q' - q} \hat{\psi}_{\k \sigma'} \hat{\psi}_{\k \sigma},$$

where $\hat{\psi} / \hat{\psi}^\dagger$ are the annihilation/creation operator of an electron, $\mu$ is the chemical potential controlling the density of the electron in the system. We measure the energy in units of Rydbergs, and the wave number $k, q$ in units of inverse Bohr radius.

In the path integral representation, using the standard Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation, the Lagrangian of the uniform electron gas can be cast into the form in which the Coulomb interaction is mediated by an auxiliary bosonic field $\phi_q$. Motivated by the well known fact that the long-range Coulomb interaction is screened in the solid, and that the effective potential of emerging quasiparticles differs from the bare potential, we introduce the screening parameter $\lambda_q$ and an electron potential $v_k$ into $L_0$, which then takes the form

$$L_0 = \sum_{\kappa \sigma} \Psi^\dagger_{\kappa \sigma} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} - \mu + k^2 + v_k(\xi = 1) \right) \Psi_{\kappa \sigma} + \sum_{q \neq 0} \phi_q \frac{q^2 + \lambda_q}{8\pi} \phi_q,$$

and represents well the low-energy degrees of freedom in the problem when parameters $\lambda_q$ and $v_k$ are properly optimized. To compensate for this choice of $L_0$, we have to add the following interaction

$$\Delta L = -\sum_{\kappa \sigma} \psi^\dagger_{\kappa \sigma} v_k(\xi) \psi_{\kappa \sigma} - \xi \sum_{q \neq 0} \phi_q \frac{\lambda_q}{8\pi} \phi_q$$

$$+ \sqrt{\xi} \frac{i}{\sqrt{2V}} \sum_{q \neq 0} (\phi_q \rho_{\sigma} - \rho_{\sigma} \phi_q).$$

so that, when the number $\xi$ is set to unity, $L = L_0 + \Delta L(\xi)$ is exactly the UEG Lagrangian. The density $\rho$ is $\rho_k = \sum_{\kappa \sigma} \psi^\dagger_{\kappa \sigma} \psi_{\kappa \sigma}$. Note that the first two terms in $\Delta L$ are the counterterms [24] which exactly cancel the two terms we added to $L_0$ above. We use the number $\xi$ to track the order of the Feynman diagrams, so that order $N$ contribution sums up all diagrams carrying the factor $\xi^N$. We set $\xi = 1$ at the end of the calculation. Note also that this arrangement bears similarity with the well-established methods, such as G0W0 [37], which computes the self-energy at the lowest order ($\xi^0$) and sets $v_k$ to the DFT Kohn-Sham potential, and $\lambda_q$ to the bubble diagram ($\lambda_q = g^q g^q$ with $g^q_{kk'}^{-1} = (i\omega_n - \mu - k^2/2m - v_k)$). The so-called skeleton Feynman diagram technique is recovered when $v_k$ and $\lambda_q$ are equated with the self-consistently determined self-energy and polarization. However, note that such diagram expansion can be dangerous, as it can lead to false convergence to the wrong solution [38].

In optimizing the screening parameter $\lambda_q$ by the principle of minimal sensitivity, we found it is sufficient to take a constant $\lambda_q = \lambda$. Furthermore, we found that the uniform convergence for all momenta is best achieved when the electron potential $v_k$ preserves the Fermi surface volume of $g_{kk}^0$, therefore we expand $v_k = (\Sigma_{kk}^\xi - \Sigma_{kk}) + \xi^2 s_2 + \xi^3 s_3 + \cdots$, and we determine $s_N$ so that all contributions at order $N$ do not alter the physical volume of the Fermi surface. In other words, we ensure the density, which can be calculated with the identity $n = -P_q(\tau = 0)$ where $|q| \gg k_F$, remains fixed order by order. Since the exchange $(\Sigma_{kk})$ is static, and is typically large, we accommodate it at the first order into the effective potential, so that at the first order we recover the screened Hartree-Fock approximation, i.e., interaction screened to $\sim \exp(-r\sqrt{\lambda})/r$ and optimized $\lambda$.

We also introduce a vertex correction scheme (VC-CCS) to further improve the convergence of the series. In practice, within the VC-CCS scheme, we precompute the three-point ladder vertex, and attach it to both sides of a polarization Feynman diagram, and at the same time, we eliminate all ladder-type diagrams from the sampling, to avoid double-counting of diagrams (see the Suplementary Material).

Finally, we discuss the advantages and limitations of the proposed method. The current variational approach is very effective at weak to intermediate correlation strength (spin/charge response up to $r_s \approx 4$), but to extend it to the regime with stronger correlations, one would needs to introduce more sophisticated counter terms, such as the three and the four point vertex renormalization, to capture the emergent charge instability around $r_s \approx 5.2$. Beyond the variational approach, we also want to point out that our developed Monte Carlo algorithm is a very generic Feynman diagram calculator for many-electron systems with long range Coulomb repulsion, and is more efficient and simpler that the existing conventional diagrammatic Monte Carlo of Refs [38]. For example, the new Monte Carlo algorithm requires only three updates, while the conventional approach needs about dozen updates. More importantly, this algorithm utilizes the “sign-blessed” grouping technique to dramatically improve the sampling efficiency. Comparing to the recently proposed Determinant Diagrammatic Monte Carlo algorithm [39], our method is more generic in the sense that the algorithm can directly work in any representation (momentum/frequency, space/time) and can handle any vertex renormalization without sacrificing the efficiency.

Code Availability: The code is available at https://github.com/haulek/VDMC
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1. Conserving Diagrammatic Expansion

This section introduces two conserving diagrammatic techniques, which are called CFS and VCCFS in the main text, to calculate the polarization $P$ (or susceptibility $\chi$). Both schemes preserve the exact crossing symmetry and conservation laws (particle number, momentum, energy, etc.) order by order. We note that the particle-number conservation law of the polarization $P(q \to 0, \tau) \to \text{const}$ is essential for the Coulomb electron gas, in order to properly describe the plasmon physics.

The conserving diagrammatic expansions for the polarization can be constructed with the Baym-Kadanoff approach \[1,2\], which is briefly reviewed below, before presenting the computational schemes used in the main text. In the Baym-Kadanoff approach one first introduces an external potential coupled to the density operator of the system,

$$S[\psi^\dagger, \psi; U] = S[\psi^\dagger, \psi] - \int d1 d2 \psi^\dagger (1) U (1, 2) \psi (2),$$

where $\psi$ are a Grassmann field for the electrons; the indexes represent spatial, temporal and spin variables. The generating functional for the connected correlation functions is defined as $\ln Z[U]$ with,

$$Z[U] = \int D\psi^\dagger D\psi e^{-S[\psi^\dagger, \psi; U]},$$

For a given approximation to $\ln Z[U]$, one can derive a conserving approximation for the one-particle Green’s function by making sure that

$$G(1, 1') = \frac{\delta \ln Z[U]}{\delta U(1', 1)} \bigg|_{U \to 0},$$

while the two particle correlation function (charge, or spin correlation function if spin indexes are not summed), should satisfy

$$\chi(1, 2) = \frac{\delta G(2, 2'; U)}{\delta U(1^+, 1)} \bigg|_{U \to 0},$$

where the notation $1^+$ and $2^+$ indicates the time ordering of the field operators. The polarization, for which we will develop a diagrammatic expansion, is related to the correlation function $\chi$ by

$$\chi(1, 2) = -P(1, 2) + \int d3 d3' P(1, 3) v_{\text{bare}}(3, 3') \chi(3', 2),$$

where $v_{\text{bare}}$ is the unscreened Coulomb interaction. Note that the second term vanishes for the spin correlation function $\chi_{zz}$ in the unpolarized electron gas.

We will apply the above algorithm to the uniform electron gas model defined by the Lagrangian $L = L_0 + \Delta L$, where the solvable part is

$$L_0 = \sum_{k\sigma} \psi_{k\sigma}^\dagger \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} - \mu + k^2 + v_k (\xi = 1) \right) \psi_{k\sigma} + \sum_{q \neq 0} \phi_{-q} \phi_q + \lambda q \phi_q,$$

and the correction is

$$\Delta L = -\sum_{k\sigma} \psi^\dagger_{k\sigma} v_k (\xi) \psi_{k\sigma} - \xi \sum_{q \neq 0} \phi_{-q} \phi_q + \sqrt{\xi} \sum_{q \neq 0} (\phi_{q} \phi_{-q} + \rho_q \phi_{-q}).$$

This Lagrangian was introduced in the main part of the text. Here the density $\rho$ is $\rho_q = \sum_{k\sigma} \psi^\dagger_{k\sigma} \psi_{k+q\sigma}$. Note that the effective potential $v_k$ and the inverse screening length $\lambda$ in $L_0$ are compensated by the counter-terms in the correction $\Delta L$. The parameter $\xi$ is set to unity at the end of the calculation.

In the Baym-Kadanoff approach the external potential term $U(1, 2)$ should be added to the solvable part $L_0$, and then the perturbative expansion for the generating functional $\ln Z[U]$ should be carried out using the standard Feynman diagrammatic expansion with building blocks shown in Fig. 5. Note that the diagrammatic series constructed in this way only implicitly depends on the external potential $U$ through the bare electron propagator $g(U)^{-1} = -\frac{\delta}{\delta g} + \mu - k^2 - v_k + U$.

![FIG. 5: Feynman diagram building blocks](image-url)

The bare electron propagator $g$ describes an electron propagating in an effective potential $v_k$, the interaction line $\delta g/\delta U$ represents a bosonic propagator with an effective mass $-\lambda$, which makes the Coulomb repulsion short ranged. The counter terms, which compensate for our choice of the effective $L_0$, are proportional to $v_k (\xi)$ (the single-particle counter term) and $\xi \lambda$ (the interaction counter term), and are depicted in the last two diagrams.

Now we are ready to discuss the Feynman diagrammatic expansion used in our work. We will first discuss the CFS scheme. To do this, we generate all free energy diagrams of order $N - 1$, for example the diagram in Fig. 1 of the main text, where the effective potential $v_k$ is regarded as an arbitrary function, independent of $U$. We then calculate the two-particle correlation function with the second derivatives with respect to external potential $U$,

$$\chi(1, 2) = \left. \left[ \frac{\delta^2 \ln Z[U]}{\delta U(1^+, 1) \delta U(2^+, 2)} \right] \right|_{v_k = \Sigma^* + \ldots, U = 0}.$$ 

Note that the $U$ derivative is taken by the chain rule, i.e., $\delta/\delta U = (\delta g/\delta U)(\delta/\delta g)$, where the $U$-derivative
of the propagator is simple: it just splits the propagator into two by inserting an external vertex,\[ \frac{\delta g(1, 2; U)}{\delta U(3^+, 3)} = -g(1, 3)g(3, 2). \] (14)

This relation is derived by taking the derivative of the identity \( g^{-1}g = 1 \), which is \( g^{-1}dg/dU + (dg^{-1}/dU)g = 0 \), therefore \( dg/dU = -g(dg^{-1}/dU)g \) and \( dg^{-1}/dU = 1 \), provided \( v_k \) is independent of \( U \). Diagrammatically, a derivative \( \delta / \delta U \) removes a single-particle propagator from the Feynman diagram \( \delta g / \delta g \), and we then replace it with an external vertex and the two propagators, i.e., \( \delta g / \delta U = -gg \). In other words, it inserts an external vertex on an existing bare electron propagator. Note that this operation increases the diagram order by one. Finally, after the derivative is taken, we substitute \( v_k \) with its expression in terms of the exchange self-energy,\[ v_k = \xi (\Sigma_k - \Sigma_{k_F}) + \xi^2 s_2 + \xi^3 s_3 \cdots . \] (15)

With the above described algorithm, we obtain the conserving expansion for the two particle correlation function \( \chi \), however, the convergence for the dielectric function is even faster when the expansion is carried out for the polarization function defined by Eq. 10. In the momentum and frequency space, the two are related by\[ \chi(q) = -\frac{P_q}{1 - P_q q^2} \] or \[ \chi(q) = -[P_q + P_{q2} \frac{8\pi}{q^2} P_q + P_{q3} \frac{8\pi}{q^2} P_q \frac{8\pi}{q^2} P_q + \cdots ] \], meaning that \( P_q \) is the irreducible part of \( \chi(q) \) with respect to cutting the interaction propagator \( \frac{8\pi}{q^2} \). Similarly, when working with the screened interaction \( \frac{8\pi}{q^2 + \lambda} \), we can rewrite\[ \frac{8\pi}{q^2} = \frac{8\pi}{q^2 + \lambda} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{\lambda}{8\pi} \frac{8\pi}{q^2 + \lambda} \right)^n \] and therefore\[ \chi(q) = -\frac{P_q}{1 - P_q \frac{8\pi}{q^2 + \lambda} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{\lambda}{8\pi} \frac{8\pi}{q^2 + \lambda} \right)^n}, \] which shows that \( P_q \) is now the irreducible part of \( \chi(q) \) with respect to cutting the interaction propagator \( \frac{8\pi}{q^2 + \lambda} \) or any combination of interaction with counter terms of arbitrary order, i.e., \( \frac{8\pi}{q^2 + \lambda} \left( \frac{8\pi}{q^2 + \lambda} \right)^n \). The resulting polarization diagrammatic expansion is shown in Fig. 6.

In practice, we find that the electric charge renormalization, which corresponds to the three-leg-vertex correction in diagrams, becomes increasingly more important at the low density limit (with \( r_s \geq 2 \)). Therefore, we introduce a vertex corrected scheme (VCCS scheme), where we resume all the ladder-type diagrams.

The dressed ladder-type vertex correction can be calculated with a Bethe-Salpeter self-consistent equation, which is depicted in Fig. 7. In each polarization diagram, we then replace the two bare external vertices with the dressed vertices (the three-leg-vertex). To avoid the double counting of the diagrams, we also eliminate all polarization diagrams which contains a ladder-type vertex correction on either side of the diagram. This operation can be represented by Fig. 8 in which the power expansion in powers of \( \xi \) automatically removes all diagrams with ladder-type vertex corrections on either end.

We emphasize here that all polarization diagrams in both schemes only involve the statically screened Coulomb interaction \( \frac{8\pi}{q^2 + \lambda} \). This is a nontrivial result, given that the definition of the polarization in Eq. 10 explicitly depends on the bare Coulomb interaction. Combing this feature with the fact that screened Coulomb interaction does not diverge in the long-wavelength limit, all polarization diagrams are now automatically regularized, making the Monte Carlo simulations much more efficient.
with its expression in terms of the exchange self-energy,
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Similarly, when work-
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Taking the derivative with respect to the absolute value of the integrand
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This operation then gives the diagrammatic expansion
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the perturbative expansion for the polarization can be improved using the ladder resummation. The ladder vertex correction is attached to both sides (the left and right external vertex) and to all polarization diagrams. The double-counted diagrams are properly subtracted.
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\[ W \]

All diagrams in the same order share the same set of internal variables. Due to the Fermi statistics, the sign of the integrand \( W([\tau], \{k\}) \) alternates as the topology and internal variables change. However, a Monte Carlo algorithm can only handle positively defined weight functions. A straightforward choice is to sample the absolute value of the integrand \( |W([\tau], \{k\})| \), namely working with the sum,

\[ F_3^N = \int [d\tau]^2 N \sum_{\text{topology}} |W([\tau], \{k\})| \]

However, as pointed out by the previous studies \[8\], the sign cancellation between diagrams causes \( F_1^N \ll F_3^N \). More specifically, although \( F_3^N \) always diverge factorially with the number of diagrams, the series \( F_1^N \) is much better behaved (diverging slowly, or even convergent if the series is within the convergence radius). This phenomenon is termed the “sign blessing” in Ref. \[8\]. As a result, the straightforward Monte Carlo scheme sampling \( F_3^N \) to evaluate \( F_1^N \) suffers from the notorious sign problem, and is very inefficient. In this work, we propose a Monte Carlo algorithm, which samples the following weight function,

\[ F_2^N = \int [d\tau]^{2N} \sum_{\text{topology}} W([\tau], \{k\}) \]

Thanks to the inequality \( F_1^N \leq F_2^N \leq F_3^N \), a method sampling \( F_2^N \) is guaranteed to suffer less sign problem, thus is more efficient than the straightforward approach. Of course, the efficiency of this approach relies on how small is \( F_1^N \), and how close is \( F_2^N \) to \( F_3^N \). The minimization of \( F_2^N \) can be achieved by optimizing the arrangement of interval variables of different diagrams, so that the sum of their weights with the same set of variables strongly cancel with each other. We will discuss this in more detail in the next section.

Now we summarize the main steps of the new diagrammatic Monte Carlo algorithm used in this work.

i) Write a script to generate all Feynman diagrams up to the desired truncation order (say order 6 in this work), including all necessary symmetry factors and counter-terms.

ii) Design an algorithm to properly assign interval variables to minimize the weight function \( F_2^N \) (choice of basis). This algorithm will be described in the next section.

iii) Use the standard Metropolis algorithm to sample \( F_3^N \) in order to calculate the high dimensional integral \( F_3^N \). To properly normalize the integral \( F_1^N \), we design an ansatz for a function, which can be integrated deterministically, and has parameters that can be adapted to the landscape of \( F_2^N \).

Note that the Monte Carlo updates only need to randomly generate internal variables \( k \) and \( \tau \), but do not need to change the diagram topology, so that the algorithm is extremely simple.

3. “Sign-blessed” Group of Diagrams

In this section we explain the details of our algorithm to organize diagrams, so that an efficient diagrammatic Monte Carlo method can be implemented. We will show how the diagrams of a given order can be divided into groups, where the diagrams in the same group are guaranteed to massively cancel with each other. The “sign-blessed” group may be obtained by grouping: i) diagrams that share the same set of internal variables, and those diagrams in which ii) the integrand \( W([\tau], \{k\}) \) massively compensate with each other. The first requirement is automatically satisfied for the connected diagrams of the same order \( N \), as all order-\( N \) connected diagram requires \( N + 1 \) independent momentum/frequency variables or \( 2N \) space/time variables. The second requirement is much more challenging and can only be achieved by carefully examining the sign structure of the diagrams.

We identify two useful generic rules for the occurrence of the sign-blessing in fermionic systems with momentum-imaginary-time representation. One generic mechanism which is particularly important for fermions is the crossing symmetry, as depicted in Fig. \[9\] namely permuting arbitrary two fermionic propagators causes an overall sign change to the diagram. If two fermionic
producers being exchanged carry similar momentum, which occurs near the Fermi surface, the direct and exchange diagrams strongly compensate with each other. It is therefore important to optimally arrange the internal variables so that the diagram integrand $W_{\text{group}}$ keeps the exact crossing symmetry.

![Permutation using the crossing symmetry](image)

**FIG. 9: Permutation using the crossing symmetry:** A permutation of a two fermionic propagators, as shown in the unshaded region of the figure, creates a new diagram with the opposite sign. If the incoming momentums/frequencies are similar, the two diagrams have almost the same absolute value and opposite sign, hence the sum of the two diagrams leads to “sign blessing”. Under this operation, the rest of the diagram, together with the shaded regions, remains the same. In order to achieve the cancellation of the integrand (not just the resulting integral), the two diagrams have to be consistently labeled, and therefore the momentum/frequency labeling of the entire diagram outside the unshaded region has to be identical on the two diagrams.

Another generic mechanism is the conservation laws (or Ward identities). For example, the conserving diagrammatic expansions for the polarization proposed in the previous section satisfy $P(q \rightarrow 0, r) \rightarrow 0$ when approaching the zero temperature. However, this is an emergent property satisfied only by the sum of a conserving group of diagrams. In fact, all individual polarization diagrams (except the bubble diagram) break the conservation law and fluctuate around zero. Therefore, we observe a strong sign cancellation between the diagrams in the same conserving group. According to the Baym-Kadanoff approach in Eq. (9), there is one-to-one correspondence between the minimal conserving groups for the polarization diagrams of the order $N$ and the ln $Z$ diagrams of the order $N - 1$ [4]. Indeed, for an arbitrary ln $Z$ diagram, one can simply attach two external vertices to two of the bare electron propagators $g$ in all possible ways, and generate a conserving group for the polarization function. Strictly speaking, the sign blessing of the conserving groups is only guaranteed after integrating out all internal variables. However, provided that the internal variables of the polarization diagrams are inherited from the same free energy diagram, the operation of inserting two external vertices generates different time-ordered polarization diagrams, and leads to sign alternation within the conserving groups, implicitly encoding the sign blessing of the conservation law.

Now we are ready to propose the algorithm to group the diagrams and properly arrange internal variables. The algorithm is applicable to an arbitrary combination of momentum/frequency or space/time variables. To be consistent with the main text, we describe the algorithm with momentum/time representation. The main steps of the algorithm are:

i) Pick an arbitrary order-$N$ connected ln $Z$ diagram, label all $2N$ time variables and choose $N + 1$ independent momentum loops. Keep momentum loops as short as possible.

ii) Generate a new connected ln $Z$ diagram by permuting two electron propagators, rearrange the momentum loops as described in Fig. 9 so that they automatically form a complete and independent loop basis for the new diagram. Thanks to the crossing symmetry, the new diagram has the opposite sign to the starting diagram. This step is repeated until all ln $Z$ diagrams are exhausted.

iii) For each ln $Z$ diagram, attach two external vertices to two of the electron propagators in all possible ways, to generate a conserving group of polarization diagrams.

The arrangement of the internal variables of the original ln $Z$ should not be modified in this step, so that the generated polarization diagrams share common parts of the diagram (many equal propagators).

It is also possible to apply the above algorithm to Hugenholtz diagrams, which form a particular subset generated by the algorithm in Fig. 9 (when the top and the bottom bosonic propagators are connected to each other). These diagrams combine the direct and exchange interaction into an antisymmetric four-point vertex. They are particularly convenient if one works with momentum/frequency, or momentum/time representation, and the interaction is instantaneous, as in our model Eq. (11) and Eq. (12).

Finally, we briefly discuss the benefits of grouping the diagrams in the diagrammatic Monte Carlo algorithm. There are two improvements in terms of the Monte Carlo efficiency. First, the total weight function $F_N^\text{MC}$ sampled by the Markov chain is much smaller than $F_3^N$. This indicates the variance of the integrand is dramatically reduced, which improves the statistical error. Second, the diagrams in the same group typically share many common objects (propagators and interactions). This simplifies the total diagram weight calculations in each Monte Carlo update. For example, all Feynman diagrams (up to $2^N$ diagrams at order $N$) that belong to the same Hugenholtz diagram, share the same set of propagators, thus they only need to be evaluated once. Indeed, all Feynman diagrams that belong to the same Hugenholtz diagram can be choosen to have all fermionic propagators identical. Those are computed once, and not $2^N$ times. Furthermore, the interaction lines are not identical, however, they contain a lot of common products. One can show that a binary tree can be constructed, with the depth equal to the number of Hugenholtz interaction propagators, in which each vertex of the binary tree adds either the direct or the exchange interaction to the Hugenholtz diagram. The leaves of such a binary tree contain exactly $2^N$ terms, corresponding to the products we need to evaluate the sum of $2^N$ Feynman diagrams,
while the number of operations to evaluate such a tree grows as $O(N)$.

[4] To make the statement rigorous, all $\ln Z$ diagrams containing Hartree terms should be excluded from this correspondence since the polarization diagrams are one-interaction-irreducible.