Finding the ground states of symmetric infinite-dimensional Hamiltonians: explicit constrained optimizations of tensor networks
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Understanding extreme non-locality in many-body quantum systems can help resolve questions in thermostatistics and laser physics. The existence of symmetry selection rules for Hamiltonians with non-decaying terms on infinite-size lattices can lead to finite energies per site, which deserves attention. Here, we present a tensor network approach to construct the ground states of nontrivial symmetric infinite-dimensional spin Hamiltonians based on constrained optimizations of their infinite matrix product states description, which contains no truncation step (offering a very simple mathematical structure) at the cost of slightly higher polynomial complexity in comparison to existing methods. Our proposed algorithm is in part equivalent to the more generic and well-established solvers of infinite density-matrix renormalization-group and variational uniform matrix product states, which are, in principle, capable of precisely representing the ground states of such infinite-range-interacting many-body systems. However, we employ some mathematical simplifications that only allow for efficient brute-force optimizations of tensor-network matrices for the specific cases of highly-symmetric infinite-size infinite-range models. As a toy-model example, we showcase the effectiveness and explain some features of our method by finding the ground state of the U(1)-symmetric infinite-dimensional antiferromagnetic XX Heisenberg model.

I. INTRODUCTION

Understanding the physics of many-body systems exhibiting extreme non-local infinite-range interactions\textsuperscript{7–10} (equal couplings between all subsystems with the coordination number $Z \to \infty$) in infinite dimensions is of great importance. Such Hamiltonians often appear in the thermodynamical studies of a wide range of contrived and engineered systems from classical Heisenberg ferromagnets (see in particular Ref.\textsuperscript{7}) to quantum Dicke superradiance models (see in particular Ref.\textsuperscript{3}). Yet, there exists only a single, and perhaps understudied, family of numerical methods capable of efficiently finding the phase diagrams of such Hamiltonians for nontrivial scenarios as we discuss further below.

Let us first consider long-range Hamiltonians of the general form $\sum_{i>j} a=, y, z J_{ij} S_{ij}^{a} S_{ij}^{a}$, where $r_{ij}$ denotes the distance between spins (or some other form of subsystems) $i$ and $j$, and $\alpha$ identifies the range of interactions. In the last four decades, such models have been consistently in the center of the attention due to exhibiting rich phase diagrams\textsuperscript{7,10–23}, relevance to experimental cavity-mediated Bose-Einstein condensates\textsuperscript{7,15,24,25}, or trapped ions\textsuperscript{26,27} quantum simulators, and the emergence of nonextensive thermostatistics\textsuperscript{3,4,14,28–35} — see\textsuperscript{34} for an extended review. The extreme case of infinite (global) range interactions corresponds to $\alpha = 0$ and, also, receives a great amount of attention as evident from Refs.\textsuperscript{1–10}. One can think of this limit as the opposite case of highly local nearest-neighbor (NN) interactions having $\alpha \to \infty$, or the limit where the lattice dimensionality and geometry become irrelevant.

In general, the energy per site for an infinite-dimensional Hamiltonian with $\alpha = 0$ non-decaying terms is diverging. However, based on the numerical evidence and intuition, we suggest the existence of some symmetries and resultant selection rules can lead to finite ground-state energies per site when higher-than-first-order cumulants of the Hamiltonian’s local operators are exactly zero (due to symmetry requirements for each sector with an unique symmetry quantum number — see below and also\textsuperscript{36}).

Efficiently finding the phase diagrams and spectral degeneracy patterns of highly-symmetric infinite-range models can be regarded as an essential task of modern optics and thermostatistics due to their appearance in some realistic and/or fundamentally important scenarios. In the following, we briefly list few such examples. Most notably, quite recently it was realized that the optical coherence of a continuous-beam laser can be regarded as an infinite-dimensional effective Hamiltonian and has been studied\textsuperscript{12} directly by employing the method we present below. Moreover, it is known that out-of-equilibrium initial conditions in planar classical $N$-spin ferromagnets, which interact via an infinite-range potential, and are collectively known as planar infinite-range Heisenberg mean field (HMF) model, lead to nonextensive thermodynamic\textsuperscript{3,4,14} (i.e. these systems would not relax toward the conventional Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon equilibrium distribution). Importantly for such models, the case of $\alpha = 0$ covers more than just constant-coupling Hamiltonians: it is proven that the ground-state problem of HMF models on a $D$-dimensional lattice having $0 < \alpha < D$ can be exactly reduced\textsuperscript{28,30,38} to an equivalent problem with $\alpha = 0$. Another interesting example in the family of global-range-interacting systems are ultracold quantum gas systems fabricated to exhibit cavity-assisted infinite-range interactions. In one breakthrough work, a Dicke Hamiltonian was engineered and a superradiant phase transition was observed experimentally\textsuperscript{7}. (In another closely-related study, finite-size numerical sim-
ulations also elucidated the phase diagram of the two-dimensional infinite-range Bose-Hubbard model\[18.\]

Generally speaking, excluding some exactly-solvable cases (in particular, the Haldane-Shastry model\[19,40 — see also\[22.\]) finding the ground states of translation-invariant long-range Hamiltonians with arbitrary $\alpha$ is a challenging task even in low dimensions and for unfrustrated systems. Highly-precise numerical methods, in principle, can tackle such problems but have varied levels of applicability. In the forefront are some well-established variational tensor network approaches, which are based on matrix product states\[41–45.\] (MPS) ansatz and the representation of $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}$ in terms of sum of a finite number of decaying exponentials (Padé extrapolations), which are conventionally only applied to $\alpha > 1$ cases. One such powerful tensor-network solver is infinite density-matrix renormalization-group (iDMRG) method, based on the infinite MPS\[46.\] (iMPS) and matrix product operator\[43,46,47.\] (MPO) representations, which has been employed to scrutinize the ground states of a maximally frustrated two-dimensional long-range Heisenberg model\[21,23.\] Notice another MPO-based algorithm was proposed\[19,48.\] prior to the two-dimensional iDMRG studies, where the authors investigated some one-dimensional long-range Hamiltonians. However, such approaches are, in practice, equivalent to the iDMRG treatment\[21,46.\] Another generic tensor-network solver in this group is variational matrix product states (VUMPS)\[19.\] based on the MPS tangent space concept, which can be employed to find the phase diagrams of long-range Hamiltonians as efficient as (or more efficiently in some cases) the iDMRG method.

In addition to tensor network approaches, exact diagonalization\[1,5,6.\] (ED) and quantum Monte Carlo\[2,10,15,17,20.\] (QMC) simulations have been widely employed to study long-range models as well; however, indeed only for finite sizes (notice, as it is well-known, ED heavily suffers from the exponential growth in the Hilbert space size, while QMC faces the negative sign problem for such calculations). Mean-field theory approaches\[6,13,19,26.\] could also provide valuable information on the phase diagrams of long-range-interacting systems, specially because many infinite-dimensional models have exact mean-field solutions\[4.\] but often considered to have low validity due to the presence of inherently strong interactions for nontrivial cases.

Surprisingly, for the special case of infinite-range interactions, $\alpha = 0$, highly-precise tensor network methods were never applied to infinite-dimensional (thermodynamic-limit) systems to our knowledge. However, these numerical routines can be prepared in a straightforward manner, although possibly in different ways for different tensor network approaches, to efficiently capture such cases as well, as we demonstrate below for the case of the IMPS. (Notably, the slightly more-efficient iDMRG method can be also employed\[36,46.\] to construct ground states comparable to what we report below; we have left our iDMRG results on infinite-dimensional Hamiltonians to a detailed future work.)

It is also noteworthy that the exact ground states are known for certain infinite-range models, most notably, the classical $N$-rotors HMF Hamiltonians\[3,4,14,28,30,38.\] In addition, let us reiterate that insightful mean-field\[6,19.\] and ED\[1,8.\] studies already exist for the case of finite-size global-range Hamiltonians. More importantly, one can still perform the conventional variational finite-size DMRG\[43,45,50–52.\] simulations to scrutinize phases of global-range models. In particular, the variational finite-size SU(2)-invariant MPS methods presented in Refs.\[51,53.\] are in spirit similar to the infinite-size approach we present below (in a sense that these references also directly diagonalizes and optimizes symmetric and sparse MPS matrices to converge to the ground state). However, to scale up such finite-size tensor network results, compensating for boundary effects, and reaching to accurate ground-state energies would require very large bond dimensions and extreme system sizes. Overall, the above finite-size algorithms are either imprecise or difficult to be applied to infinite-size systems, and currently, there seems to be a void in the existence of highly-precise numerical approaches, which are independent from renormalization routines and target infinite-dimensional spin Hamiltonians.

In this paper, we demonstrate that the iMPS framework, independent from iDMRG, can be equipped with some mathematical simplifications to capture the ground states of infinite-dimensional models (by which we strictly mean both coordination number and lattice dimension diverge). Precisely speaking, our method is based on direct and highly-scalable constrained interior-point optimizations of the parameters involved in the iMPS representation\[37.\] of the physical states (see Refs.\[55–57.\] for the interior-point optimization algorithm). Our independently-developed approach differs from generic iDMRG and VUMPS solvers due to the existence and absence of some key features that makes it suitable only for capturing the physics of infinite-range models as detailed below. While in principle, efficient iDMRG and VUMPS programs can be also prepared to represent infinite-range Hamiltonian terms, here we are presenting a new brute-force algorithm potentially offering simpler implementation at the cost of slightly higher complexity. In our approach, it is needed to explicitly optimize a potentially large number of free parameters of the iMPS representation. However, at the same time, we provide an exact solution for the involved fixed-point equation, employ highly-scalable optimization steps, and most importantly, discuss the built-in construction of Hamiltonian symmetries in this framework, which reduces the number of free parameters to optimize for significantly. Overall, in this manner, we succeeded to provide a polynomial-cost tensor network algorithm, where the energy-per-site appears to rapidly converge to the true ground state as indicated below for an example.

We explain some major features and showcase the effectiveness of our method by precisely finding the ground
state for the working example of the U(1)-symmetric infinite-dimensional antiferromagnetic XX Heisenberg model. We expect that the extension of our approach to other infinite-range models and Hamiltonian symmetries is straightforward.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we review some basic concepts of the iMPS description and introduce our notation. The main expectation value of the energy per site for the infinite-range XX Heisenberg model is derived in Sec. III. The details of the constrained interior-point optimizations of the iMPS ansatz for this example are provided in Sec. IV. Next, in the same section, we discuss the connections and some key differences of this algorithm with the well-established tensor-network solvers of iDMRG and VUMPS. Finally, we benchmark the energies from our tensor network approach against an exact reference value in Sec. V, and end with a conclusion.

II. THE iMPS REPRESENTATION BASICS

In this section, we briefly review the iMPS representation of one-dimensional translation-invariant states. The iMPS ansatz is indeed a suitable choice for the representation of eigenstates of infinite-dimensional Hamiltonians as it shall become clear below. We will only focus on the details that are particularly relevant to our goal here; for a full review of the iMPS formalism see refs. 37,44–46.

Generally speaking, the iMPS ansatz offers an approximate representation for translation-invariant physical states. For one-site unit-cell sizes (the extension to many-site unit-cells is straightforward through coarse-graining), this representation can be written as

\[ |\Psi_{\text{iMPS}}\rangle = \sum_{j} \text{Tr} \left( \cdots A^{[j-1]}A^{[j]}A^{[j+1]}\cdots \right) \]

\[ \mid\ldots, j, \ldots \rangle = \mid\ldots, j_0, j_1, \ldots \rangle , \quad (1) \]

where \( A^{[j]} \) denotes the usual \( D \times D \) MPS A-matrices (having \( D \)-dimensional virtual bonds) and \( j = 1, \ldots, d \) goes through the \( d \)-dimensional physical space of constituent particles. The representation is essentially exact for any quantum state when \( D \to \infty \), therefore \( D^{-1} \) can be considered as a precision control parameters — the complexity of tensor network algorithms often remain polynomial against \( D \), and therefore, such ansätze are considered tractable, virtually exact, and can be handled on classical machines (note, however, the relevant energy errors can blow up exponentially against \( D^{-1} \) for some implementations). There are remaining degrees of freedom in the above representation; therefore, without loss of generality, we can assume that the orthogonormality relation of \( \sum_{j} A^{[j]} A^{[j]} = I_D \) always holds, where \( I_m \) denotes the \( m \times m \) identity matrix. Furthermore, A-matrices must satisfy the fixed-point relation of \( \sum_{j} A^{[j]} A^{[j]} = \rho \), where \( \rho \) is the diagonal right (reduced) density matrix — more details below. In other words, we are assuming that the iMPS is already placed in the left-orthonormal/canonical form.\(^{37,44}\)

We intend to evaluate thermodynamic-limit expectation values (in particular the energy per site) using the well-established method of MPS transfer operators/matrices; sec.\(^{37,44–46,49,58,59}\) for an introduction and useful graphical notations of MPS transfer operators. Let \( T_X \) denote a transfer operator equipped with the local physical operator \( X \). (Note that \( T \)-matrices are, in fact, superoperators themselves acting on \( D \times D \)-size MPS operators.) Most significant in this superoperator family is the identity transfer operator, which will be shown as \( T_\mathbf{1} \equiv T \). The actions of \( T \) on two left- and right-hand-side MPS operators can be then written as

\[ T(E)_{\text{left}} = \sum_{j} A^{[j]} \hat{E} A^{[j]} \]

\[ T(\hat{F})_{\text{right}} = \sum_{j} A^{[j]} \hat{F} A^{[j]} \quad \text{.} \quad (2) \]

While working in this framework, it is more convenient to employ the so-called flattened space notation (see for example Refs.\(^{37,44}\)). One can always reshape a \( D \times D \)-size operator into a flattened \( D^2 \times 1 \)-dimensional vector form as \( E_{m,n} \to (E)_{(m,n)} \) and \( 1 \times D^2 \)-dimensional vector form of \( F_{m,n} \to (F)_{(m,n)} \), where \((m,n)\) stands for a collective index and \( m, n = 1, \ldots, D \). In this flattened space, the transfer-type operators become large \( D^2 \times D^2 \) matrices and MPS operators are represented by \( D^2 \)-size vectors. Therefore, one can use a bra- and ket-like notation to write the left- and right-hand-side acting vectors in the flattened space language:

\[ ((E)T)_{ll} = \sum_{j,m,n} (E)_{(m,n)} (A^{[j]}_l)_{m,n} (F)^{\dagger}_{n,l} \]

\[ ((T)F)_{ll} = \sum_{j,m,n} (A^{[j]}_l)_{m,n} (F)_{n,l} \quad . \quad (3) \]

In the flattened space, the transfer matrix can be constructed as \( T = \sum_{j} \hat{A}^{[j]}_l \otimes A^{[j]}_l \). We restrict ourselves to (perhaps physically more interesting) injective \( T \)-operators; therefore, \( T \) has a unique pair of nonnegative left and right leading eigenvectors, \( (|\lambda_1 = 1\rangle, \lambda_1 = 1) \) and the spectral radius of 1 (refer to the quantum version of the Perron-Frobenius theorem\(^{60,61}\) — notice \( T \) is generally speaking a non-Hermitian matrix). In addition, due to the orthonormality condition above, the left leading eigenvector (or eigenmatrix) is the identity operator \( I_D \otimes \langle 1 | \) i.e. \((1)T = (1)|\lambda_1 = 1\rangle\) in the flattened space language. Finally, due to the fixed-point equation above, the corresponding right eigenmatrix is the familiar reduced density matrix, \( \rho \leftrightarrow |1\rangle \), i.e. \( T|1\rangle = \lambda_1 |1\rangle \).

If the spectrum or even leading eigenvalues of a well-converged (e.g. to the ground state of a physical model) iMPS transfer operator are known, all thermodynamic-limit expectation values can be found exactly or precisely—in particular, the second largest eigen-
value the principal correlation length of the system (see \textsuperscript{45,46} for details). However, the full, or even subspace, diagonalization of a $\mathcal{T}$-matrix explicitly is a difficult numerical task in general; instead, one can employ some mathematical simplifications to make direct optimization (and effectively subspace diagonalization) of $\mathcal{T}$ significantly more efficient, which forms the essence of the current work. Here, we detail a transfer operator approach that does not require the direct calculation of the spectrum of $\mathcal{T}$ and is specifically useful to find the expectation values of symmetric infinite-range Hamiltonians. In a sense, our method optimizes the element of the $\mathcal{T}$-matrix conditioned to the existence of some Hamiltonian rules and involves many interior-point optimization iterations as detailed further below.

III. WRITING DOWN THE ENERGY PER SITE FOR THE REPRESENTATIVE EXAMPLE

From this point onward, it is useful to present the remainder of the technical details using the working toy-model example of the spin-1 antiferromagnetic infinite-dimensional XX Heisenberg model in a zero field. However, the following formalism can be easily extended to other nontrivial, but highly-symmetric, infinite-range-interacting infinite-size systems. The Hamiltonian for the XX model of our interest can be written as

$$H_{XX} = J \sum_{i<j} (\hat{S}_i^+ \hat{S}_j^- + \text{h.c.})$$

(4)

where $i$ and $j$ go over all spins and we set $J = 1$ as the unit of energy. Variants of the XX model were previously carefully investigated due to their foundational importance and connections to some experiments; however, to our knowledge, the ground state of Eq. (4) was not constructed in the past and is relatively challenging to be found using conventional numerical methods in the thermodynamic limit.

We start by looking for the Hamiltonian symmetries: the $A$-matrices that would represent the eigenstates of $H_{XX}$ have a highly reduced number of free parameters due to the presence of the Abelian $U(1)$-symmetry (note the Hamiltonian in Eq. (4) commutes with $\hat{S}_{\text{total}}^z$-operator). Importantly, we observe and confirmed numerically that due to the presence of the symmetry, the second and higher-order cumulants of the $H_{XX}$-operators are zero by structure in the ground state symmetry sector, which results in a finite ground state energy per site in the thermodynamic limit. Working with an irreducible iMPS representation, having built-in $U(1)$-symmetry, is indeed a very efficient way to find the ground state of the model. We argue this $U(1)$-symmetric implementation is also suitable for pedagogical reasons and will prove the robustness of our scheme in finding the ground state in the case of choosing/realizing the symmetry in the model appropriately. (We reiterate that this built-in implementation of the symmetry can be extended to non-$U(1)$ cases — see \textsuperscript{45,47}.)

It is well-known\textsuperscript{45,47} that the $U(1)$-symmetry limits the number of elements in $A$-matrices allowed to be nonzero leading to a block diagonal structure in $\mathcal{T}$-operators that we exploit below. We arbitrarily choose the symmetry convention as $A_{mn}^{ij} \neq 0$ if $m+j = n$, where $j$ corresponds to the $S^z$ quantum number. Therefore, the three $D \times D$ iMPS $A$-matrices of a translation-invariant spin-1 system can be shown as

$$A^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \bullet & \cdots & \bullet \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5)
$$

$$A^{0} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \bullet & \cdots & \bullet \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6)
$$

$$A^{1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \bullet \\ 0 & \cdots & \cdots & \bullet \\ \cdots & \cdots & \bullet & \cdots \\ 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (7)
$$

where bullets indicate the only elements allowed to be nonzero. Also, we choose all real-valued $A$-matrices to represent the ground state due to the time-reversal symmetry of $H_{XX}$. Note also the left-handed orthogonal-symmetry condition implies that the absolute value of all $A$-matrices’ elements are bounded from above by unity, $|A_{mn}^{ij}| \leq 1 \forall\{j, m, n\}$. Furthermore, the ground state must belong to the $S^z_{\text{unit-cell}} = 0$ symmetry sector, which further implies

$$|A_{m+1,m}^{-1}| = |A_{m-1,m}^{+1}| \forall m . \quad (8)
$$

Using the left-orthogonality and fixed-point equations it is straightforward to derive the following exact recursive solution for the right reduced density matrices of an iMPS of the form in Eq. (7):

$$\rho_m = \left( \frac{A_{m,m-1}^{-1}}{A_{m-1,m}^{+1}} \right)^2 \rho_{m-1} , \quad 0 < m < D. \quad (9)
$$

In other words, if the $A$-matrices are known, the above will fully determine $\rho$ (or equivalently $|1\rangle$ — the first diagonal element of the density matrix can be found by assuming a normalization for it). To this end, there are overall $3D-2$ free parameters in the $A$-matrices and non-negative $\rho$ to be optimized alongside strictly satisfying the constraints as we list below.
Now consider the important quantity of the energy per site for the Hamiltonian of Eq. (4), which can be expressed as \( \varepsilon = 2 \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \langle \hat{S}_r^+ \hat{S}_r^- + \text{h.c.} \rangle \). This can be written in the language of \( \mathcal{T} \)-operators discussed above as follows

\[
\varepsilon = 2 \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} (1|\mathcal{T}_{S+}^r \mathcal{T}_{S-}^r + \mathcal{T}_{S-}^r \mathcal{T}_{S+}^r|1) .
\]

Eq. (12) has no unity eigenvalue. Therefore, the inverse expression using either Moore-Penrose inverse or regular inversion (as in Eq. (1)) can be summarized as follows:

\[
\mathcal{Q} = I_{D^2} - |1\rangle\langle 1| ,
\]

which implies \( \mathcal{T} = \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{T} \mathcal{Q} + |1\rangle\langle 1| \). Replacing \( \mathcal{T} \) with this expression in Eq. (10) leads to

\[
\varepsilon = 2 \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \{ (1|\mathcal{T}_{S+}^r (\mathcal{Q} \mathcal{T} \mathcal{Q})^r \mathcal{T}_{S-}^r|1) + (1|\mathcal{T}_{S-}^r (\mathcal{Q} \mathcal{T} \mathcal{Q})^r \mathcal{T}_{S+}^r|1) \} ,
\]

where we used \( (1|\mathcal{T}_{S+}^r |1) = (1|\mathcal{T}_{S-}^r |1) = 0 \).

Now, the superoperator \( \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{T} \mathcal{Q} \) in the first term of Eq. (12) has no unity eigenvalue. Therefore, the inverse of the object \( I_{D^2} - \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{T} \mathcal{Q} \) will be well-defined. The infinite sums appearing in the first terms of Eq. (12) can be replaced using geometric-series-type identities leading to

\[
\varepsilon = 2 \{ (S^+|\mathcal{T}^{-1}|S^-) + (S^-|\mathcal{T}^{-1}|S^+) \} ,
\]

where we have employed the shorthand notations of \( \mathcal{T} \) and \( \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{T} \mathcal{Q} \) as \( \langle X \rangle \equiv (1|\mathcal{T} X|1) \), and \( \mathcal{T} \equiv I_{D^2} - \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{T} \mathcal{Q} \). (Note that \( \mathcal{T} \) represents the right-hand side term in the first term of Eq. (10); additionally, \( \mathcal{T} \) is the projector on the left-hand side term of Eq. (10), and \( \mathcal{T} \) is the projector on the right-hand side term of Eq. (10).) Equation (13) is our main recipe to calculate the expectation values of thermodynamic-limit energy-per-sites for infinite-range models, which we use for explicit numerical optimizations. Furthermore, this can be easily extended to other thermodynamic-limit quantities of interest.

IV. CONSTRAINED OPTIMIZATIONS OF THE iMPS

To this end, for a given (possibly large) \( D \)-value, we require to efficiently find \( A \)-matrices elements that minimizes Eq. (13) subject to the following set of constraints for \( 3D - 2 \) free parameters:

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) & \text{ All the forms prescribed in Eq. (7)} , \\
(2) & \sum_j A^{[j]}|A^{[j]}\rangle = I_{D} , \\
(3) & |A^{[j]}_{m+1, m}| = |A^{[j]}_{m+1, m}| \forall m , \\
(4) & \rho_m^S = \left( \frac{|A_{m+1, m}^{[j]}|^2}{\sum_{m=1}^{D^2} |A_{m+1, m}^{[j]}|^2} \right) \rho_{m-1}^S , \ 0 < m < D .
\end{align*}
\]

We argue (and demonstrate below for the example of \( H_{X \cdot X} \)) that the ground state can be accurately found by minimization of the suitable cost function, e.g. the expectation value in Eq. (13), constrained to Eq. (14) by employing conventional highly-scalable constrained numerical optimization tools based on finite difference methods. We choose the interior-point optimization method as we found out that it works increasingly well when adding more degrees of freedom to the set of \( A \)-matrices (i.e. resulting in lower energies in Eq. (4) when increasing \( D \) — more details below). We also find that it is often required that the interior-point optimizations to be performed inside global minimum finder routines and by setting a small enough step size tolerance and fixing a desired constraint tolerance, since a caveat of our method is that the optimizer stops prematurely in numerous possible local minima or converges to unphysical solutions.

Overall, the required steps in our iterative algorithm can be summarized as follows.

1. (Initialization) For a given \( D \)-value, initialize by constructing a set of \( \{ A \} \) to form a trial wave function, as in Eq. (1), by generating elements randomly. Then set Eq. (14) as the constraints for the optimizer.

2. (Interior-point iteration) Run one iteration of the interior-point algorithm (or similar) that minimizes an expectation value of the form Eq. (13) strictly subject to the constraints of Eq. (14) leading to a final set of optimized matrices, \( \{ A^* \} \). The run-time complexity of the finite difference part scales at worst as \( O(D^3) \); additionally, \( \mathcal{T}^{-1} \) should be estimated here using the conventional memory-efficient method of banded LU-decomposition to form and solve a linear system of equations at each iteration, which has the complexity of \( O(D^{3/2}) \). This leads to the overall cost of \( O(D^{3/2}) \) per this iteration step.

3. (Checking a stopping criteria) Stop the iterations if the step size of the interior-point algorithm drops below a desired tolerance, otherwise return to the previous step.

In practice, the final step above can be replaced by checking for an energy convergence criterion, e.g. \( |\varepsilon^* - \varepsilon| < \text{tol} \), or other more robust criteria. Furthermore, although no multiple sweeping of the unit-cell sites is necessary above to reach to a fixed point (unlike iDMRG), the real cost is that the second step must be generally repeated for the
total number of iterations of $O(D)$ (or even higher orders because of the repetitions required by the global minimum finder) to reach an acceptable accuracy in practice; this is while, in every step of iDMRG and VUMPS algorithms, the optimizers often only requires few iterations to diagonalize Hamiltonians in their MPO forms.

In the end, we also explicitly summarize below the connections, differences, and potential advantages of the presented method in comparison to iDMRG and VUMPS solvers concerning our specific purpose.

- (No explicit orthogonalization, truncation, or MPOs involved) As in VUMPS, the interior-point iMPS does not require an explicit orthogonalization of the tensor network if enough accuracy is reached in satisfying the constraints (although, we suspect a badly-converged interior-point iMPS may benefit from some explicit orthogonalization routines). This is while iDMRG requires an extra step of explicit orthogonalization after sweeps\(^36\). Furthermore, both iDMRG and VUMPS solvers (usually scaling slightly better than interior-point iMPS as $O(D^3)$ per iteration) involve truncating the eigenspace of the density matrix and diagonalizing the Hamiltonian in its MPO representation, which are not required in our method. Therefore, our algorithm stands as a proof-of-principle that tensor network optimizations can be efficiently performed free from any truncation step; this could offer more simplicity in the implementation of the algorithm and become useful for pedagogical purposes.

- (Uniqueness of Eq. (9)) iDMRG and VUMPS original works were not concerned with the specific iMPS forms that always satisfy the orthonormality and fixed-point equations as above. Therefore, Eq. (9) is unique to our work, and numerical investigations suggest is essential for efficient and stable optimizations leading to reliable $A$-matrices.

- (Geometric series infinite-sum relations) Only the VUMPS algorithm is known to exploit geometric series infinite-sum relations for reduced eigen-space of $T$-type matrices, equivalent to the ones used in Eq. (13), to efficiently calculate some bounding eigenvectors. However, the authors in Ref.\(^49\) were not concerned with calculating the full energy-per-site expectation values and direct optimizations of such forms for the infinite-range-interacting case, which forms the essence of the present work.

V. ENERGY RESULTS

In this section, we present the results of a proof-of-concept small-scale interior-point iMPS simulation for the Hamiltonian in Eq. (4). We systematically followed the steps discussed above to find the global minimum of the energy-per-site for $H_{XX}$, i.e. employing Eq. (13), for some initially-randomized $A$-matrices’ elements always subjected to Eq. (14), while keeping small enough step size and fixing the constraint tolerance to $1e-8$ for all $D$-values. We have intentionally performed the calculations on a modern-day personal computer to exemplify the energies one can derive using such a limiting resource — for some very large-scale interior-point iMPS simulations performed using state-of-the-art parallelization methods on supercomputers see Ref.\(^37\), where the behaviors of a continuous-beam laser are consistently modelled. Notice also that the memory cost of our optimizations remained highly manageable as we always exploit efficient methods to save and manipulate matrices as sparse-type inputs. Overall, these allowed us to efficiently find well-converged iMPS ground states of $H_{XX}$ for bond dimensions up to $D_{\text{max}} = 25$, i.e. precisely optimizing maximally 72 free parameters.

![FIG. 1. (a) The relative error, $|e_{(D=20)}^* - e_{\text{exact}}|$, in calculating the ground-state energy per site of $H_{XX}$, Eq. (4), from our proposed interior-point iMPS algorithm, $e^*$, (D), and the exact lower energy-per-site bound, $e_{\text{exact}} = -4$, based on the argument presented in the text. Error bars are smaller than the symbol size. (b) The iMPS ground state energies for $H_{XX}$ versus iteration number for a selected series of interior point calculations with $D = 20$ (notice each iteration of the interior-point algorithm itself typically contains few hundreds of function evaluations).](image-url)
\[ \sum_i (\hat{S}_i^+ \hat{S}_i^-) \] and essentially satisfies \(\hat{S}_\text{total}^+ |\text{ground}\rangle = 0\) and \(\hat{S}_\text{total}^- |\text{ground}\rangle = 0\), in principle, it would set the lower bound on the energy per site of \(H_{XX}\). Consequently, the true ground state should be perturbatively (ignoring the normalization) as

\[ |\text{ground}\rangle_{\text{exact}} \propto |\cdots, 0, 0, 0, \cdots\rangle + \sum_{\text{perm. of } \pm 1 \text{ and } 0s} |\cdots, 0, 1, \cdots, 0, \cdots, -1, 0, \cdots\rangle + \sum_{\text{perm. of } \pm 1 \text{ and } 0s} |\cdots, 0, 1, 1, \cdots, 0, \cdots, -1, -1, 0, \cdots\rangle + \cdots, \] (15)

which guarantees that the expectation values of \(\hat{S}_\text{total}^+\) and \(\hat{S}_\text{total}^-\) vanish and lead to maximum energy per site value of 4 for the expectation value of \(\sum_i (\hat{S}_i^+ \hat{S}_i^- + \text{h.c.})\) for spin-1 particles.

It is clear from Fig. (1)(a) that the iMPS wave function’s energy per site consistently decreases toward the true ground state as \(D\) increases as required. In addition, Fig. (1)(b) demonstrates that such interior-point iMPS optimization is systematically converging toward a true energy minimum as more iterations are performed for an exemplary series of calculations with \(D = 20\). Overall, the interior-point iMPS method seems to successfully produce paramagnetic ground states with energies increasingly closer to \(\varepsilon_{\text{exact}}\) as the bond dimension increases. We argue these results provide strong support for the effectiveness and functionality of the interior-point iMPS optimization approach. (Let us also note that some patterns in the structure of the \(A\)-matrices’ elements may be physically irrelevant in practice; in particular, while the ratios between magnitudes is physically significant, some other values have been observed to become insignificant and small due to the fact that the algorithm has to stop after some finite number of iterations\(^{37}\).

VI. CONCLUSION

We have presented an efficient iterative tensor network approach to systematically find the ground states of infinite-dimensional spin Hamiltonians based on explicit constrained optimizations of their iMPS description. We exemplified how to greatly reduce the number of free parameters in the optimizations by employing built-in symmetries for the iMPS ansatz. Previously, the phase diagram of such Hamiltonians have been only found in the thermodynamic limit for a number of exactly-solvable cases to our knowledge. We therefore offered a new tensor network algorithm specialized for studying extreme non-locality of infinite-size systems exhibiting infinite-range interactions.

Precisely speaking, the presented algorithm sits next to the slightly more efficient generic tensor-network solvers of iDMRG and VUMPS, which can be employed to find ground states of non-decaying Hamiltonians in the thermodynamic limit as well. However, our results show one can derive such ground states by directly optimizing iMPS operators’ elements, while relying on no density matrix truncation and extra explicit orthogonalization steps (as claimed previously in Ref.\(^{53}\)) neither any MPO representation, which could offer a simpler structure for implementation and useful for pedagogical purposes. We expect that the phase diagrams of a wide range of infinite-range models of experimental or foundational importance (perhaps most notably variants of quantum Dicke-Bose-Hubbard-type models as in cavity-mediated bosonic experiments) can be now elucidated using the presented algorithm to guide the direction of the future experiments.
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