Extending the Gutzwiller approximation to intersite interactions

Garry Goldstein[1], Nicola Lanata[2], Gabriel Kotliar[1,3]
[1]*Physics and Astronomy Department, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ 08854, USA*
[2]*Department of physics and astronomy, Aarhus University, 800 Arhus C, Denmark and*
[3]*Condensed Matter Physics and Materials Science Division, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY 11973-5000, USA*

We develop an extension of the Gutzwiller Approximation (GA) formalism that includes the effects of Coulomb interactions of arbitrary range (including density density, exchange, pair hopping and Coulomb assisted hopping terms). This formalism reduces to the ordinary GA formalism for the multi-band Hubbard models in the presence of only local interactions. This is accomplished by combining the $1/z$ expansion —where z is the coordination number and only the leading order terms contribute in the limit of infinite dimensions— with a $P_R^\dagger P_R - I$ expansion, where P_R is the Gutzwiller projector on the site R. The method is conveniently formulated in terms of a Gutzwiller Lagrange function. We apply our theory to the extended single band Hubbard model. Similarly to the usual Brinkman-Rice mechanism we find a Mott transition. A valence skipping transition is observed, where the occupation of the empty and doubly occupied states for the Gutzwiller wavefunction is enhanced with respect to the uncorrelated Slater determinant wavefunction.

arXiv:2001.01353v3 [cond-mat.str-el] 1 Jun 2020

I. INTRODUCTION

Over the last three decades there has been renewed interest and substantial progress in the development of methods for treating strongly correlated electron systems. Various approximations to the Density Functional Theory (DFT) such as the Local Density Approximation (LDA) proved to be a good starting point for combinations with more advanced methodologies [1] to study strongly correlated systems. In this regard, of particular interest are quantum embedding methods, such as the Dynamical Mean Field Theory (DMFT) [2], Density Matrix Embedding Theory (DMET) [3], the GA [4–24] and the slave particles methods [7, 8, 25–27], which share many common elements [8, 9, 15, 19, 26, 28]. In this work we focus on the GA, which has been actively developed in recent years. Combining these embedding methods with density functional theory gives rise to (LDA+DMFT) [29, 30] and LDA in combination with the GA (LDA+GA) [15, 31–33]. Furthermore these methods can be cast in a framework of functionals of multiple observables, making them convenient for ab-initio numerical simulations [15, 34].

In many currently available theoretical frameworks to study strongly correlated systems, the non-local components of the Coulomb interaction have been treated at the mean field level. On the other hand, this may not be sufficient in many cases. For example, the non-local Coulomb interactions can be as important as the local contributions in organic materials, where even the electrons of s and p orbitals can induce strong-correlation effects [35]. More generally, in many materials the bare nearest neighbor Coulomb matrix elements are the same order of magnitude as the hopping matrix elements [13, 36], suggesting that it is necessary to take them into account more accurately.

Many techniques to treat short-ranged non-local interactions have been developed in the context of model Hamiltonians. For extensions of DMFT to treat this problem see [37–46]. In this work we will focus on extensions of the GA, that is computationally significantly less expensive than DMFT. A pioneering extension of the GA to treat the t-J model was introduced by Zhang et. al. [47]. Ogata et al. made calculations of higher order corrections for the t-J model within the GA [48]. The effects of different intersite interactions for the extended t-J model were studied by Sensarma et. al. within the GA [49]. An operatorial approach to the GA, where expectation values of Gutzwiller projected operators were calculated in a $1/z$ expansion, was proposed in [50]. Benchmark calculations for hydrogen like systems, including the effects of intersite interactions within the framework of the extended Hubbard model, were performed within the GA in Refs. [51, 52]. The so called "statistically consistent GA" for non-local interactions was studied in [53–56] and the so called "diagramattic expansion of the Gutzwiller wavefunction" with intersite interactions was developed in [57–59] for many models. However, GA methodologies able to account systematically for the effects of non-local interactions in realistic first-principle calculations, without empirical adjustments, are still not available. Here we propose a new generalization of the GA, that constitutes a step towards this ambitious goal. In fact we show that, combining the ideas underlying the $1/z$ expansion [16, 60, 61] with the $P_R^\dagger P_R - I$ expansion [53, 54, 57, 58, 62], it is possible to tackle systematically non-local two site interactions for general multi-orbital Hubbard models. Our work is an extension of the GA to intersite interactions, in the same spirit as the extended DMFT [39, 44, 45] and the dual boson method [63, 64] extend Dynamical Mean Field Theory [2]. To illustrate our method we present calculations for the extended single band Hubbard model, including nearest-neighbor hopping, density density, correlated hopping, pair hopping and exchange interactions. In particular, our calculations of the single band extended Hubbard model indicate that the nearest-neighbor Coulomb interactions can induce a phase transition where charge fluctuations are enhanced

rather than suppressed.

The setup of the paper is as follows. In Sec. II we present an application of our formalism to the single band extended Hubbard model. In Sec. III we present the main general Hamiltonian studied throughout the text. In Sec. IV we discuss the simplifications of GA formalism arising from retaining only the leading order in the $P_R^\dagger P_R - I$ expansion. In Sec. V we show that by combining the $P_R^\dagger P_R - I$ formalism with the $1/z$ expansion it is possible to express semi-analytically the variational energy (including the contribution of the non-local interaction terms) as function of the GA variational parameters. In Sec. VI we conveniently reformulate our theory in terms of a GA Lagrange function, which reduces to the result of Ref. [65] for the special case of only-local interactions. In Sec. VII we conclude. The more technical derivations are relegated to the appendices.

II. THE EXTENDED SINGLE-BAND HUBBARD MODEL

A. Hamiltonian and setup

As an example of our general formalism, that will be presented in the following sections, here we consider the single-band extended Hubbard model [37–46, 69–79]:

$$H = -t \sum_{\langle R,R'\rangle,\sigma=\pm} \left(c^\dagger_{R\sigma} c_{R'\sigma} + h.c. \right) + U \sum_R n_{R\uparrow} n_{R\downarrow} + V \sum_{\langle R,R'\rangle} n_R n_{R'} - \mu \sum_{R\sigma} n_{R\sigma}, \quad (1)$$

where $\langle R, R'\rangle$ denotes nearest neighbors R and R'.

As in the classic GA theory, our formalism is based on the following variational wave function for the ground state of the system:

$$|\Psi\rangle = \prod_R P_R |\Psi_0\rangle, \quad (2)$$

where P_R is a bosonic operator acting on a single site R and $|\Psi_0\rangle$ a single band Slater determinant wave-function. For simplicity, here we will focus on the normal phase, i.e. we will assume that $|\Psi\rangle$ does not break any symmetry of the Hamiltonian H. Following Refs. [15, 19, 60, 65–68] we aim to minimize the following energy function:

$$\mathcal{E} = \frac{\langle\Psi| H |\Psi\rangle}{\langle\Psi \mid \Psi\rangle}, \quad (3)$$

while fulfilling the following subsidiary conditions, known as the Gutzwiller constraints: [15, 60, 61, 65–68]:

$$\langle\Psi_0| P_R^\dagger P_R |\Psi_0\rangle = 1$$
$$\langle\Psi_0| P_R^\dagger P_R c^\dagger_{R\sigma} c_{R\sigma} |\Psi_0\rangle = \langle\Psi_0| c^\dagger_{R\sigma} c_{R\sigma} |\Psi_0\rangle. \quad (4)$$

Besides the GA, which is an approximation that becomes exact in the limit of infinite dimensions, our general theory, to include non-local interactions, will be based on the $P_R^\dagger P_R - I$ approximation (see Appendices A and B).




Figure 1. (A) Phase diagram of the single-band extended 2D Hubbard model for U and V. (B) Phase diagram of the single-band extended Hubbard model from Ref. [37] for U and V.

B. Gutzwiller Lagrange function

1. Hubbard model

Following Refs. [15, 65], the GA solution of the energy minimization in Eq. (3), for $V = 0$, can be determined by extremizing the following Lagrange function:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{L}_N \left(D, \mathcal{R}, \lambda, \lambda^c, \Delta, E^c, E, \mu, |\Psi_0\rangle, |\Phi\rangle\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}} \langle\Psi_0| H_{QP} |\Psi_0\rangle + E \left(1 - \langle\Psi_0 \mid \Psi_0\rangle\right) \\
&+ \langle\Phi| H_{Emb} |\Phi\rangle + E^c \left(1 - \langle\Phi \mid \Phi\rangle\right) \\
&+ \mathcal{L}_{Mix} \left(D, \mathcal{R}, \lambda, \lambda^c, \Delta\right) + \mu \frac{N}{\mathcal{N}},
\end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where:

$$H_{QP} = -t \sum_{\langle RR'\rangle\sigma} \left[\mathcal{R}\mathcal{R}^* f^\dagger_{R\sigma} f_{R'\sigma} + h.c. \right] + \sum_{R\sigma} \lambda f^\dagger_{R\sigma} f_{R\sigma} - \mu \sum_{R\sigma} f^\dagger_{R\sigma} f_{R\sigma} \quad (6)$$

$$H_{Emb} = U \hat{c}^\dagger_\uparrow \hat{c}_\uparrow \hat{c}^\dagger_\downarrow \hat{c}_\downarrow + \sum_\sigma \lambda^c \hat{f}_\sigma \hat{f}^\dagger_\sigma + \left[\sum_\sigma D \hat{c}^\dagger_\sigma \hat{f}_\sigma + h.c. \right], \quad (7)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{Mix} \left(D, \mathcal{R}, \lambda^c, \lambda, \Delta\right) = -2 \left(\lambda + \lambda^c\right) \Delta - 4D \left(\mathcal{R} \sqrt{(1 - \Delta)\, \Delta} \right). \quad (8)$$

Here $\mathcal{R}$ and λ are the renormalization coefficients in the quasiparticle Hamiltonian in Eq. (6), D and λ^c are parameters of the embedding Hamiltonian H_{Emb} in Eq. (7),

$|\Phi\rangle$ is a generic wave function in the Hilbert space of the embedding Hamiltonian H_{Emb}, E^c is a Lagrange multiplier enforcing the normalization of $|\Phi\rangle$, E is a Lagrange multiplier used to enforce the normalization of the Slater determinant $|\Psi_0\rangle$, Δ is the local density of quasiparticles of the quasiparticle Hamiltonian in Eq. (6), N is the total number of electrons and $\mathcal{N}$ is the total number of sites.

2. Hartree Fock Lagrange function

For later convenience, before introducing our extensions of the GA, here we outline the Hartree Fock formalism for $V \neq 0$. The Hartree Fock solution to Eq. (1) can be obtained by extremizing the following Lagrange function:

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{L}_N\left(\lambda,\lambda^{(n.n.)},\Delta,\Delta^{(n.n.)},E,\mu,|\Psi_0\rangle\right)\\&=\frac{1}{\mathcal{N}}\langle\Psi_0|H_{QP}|\Psi_0\rangle+E\left(1-\langle\Psi_0\mid\Psi_0\rangle\right)\\&+\mathcal{L}_{Mix}\left(\lambda,\lambda^{(n.n.)},\Delta,\Delta^{(n.n.)}\right)+\mu\frac{N}{\mathcal{N}},\end{aligned}\tag{9}$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned}H_{QP}=&-t\sum_{\langle RR'\rangle\sigma}\left[f^\dagger_{R\sigma}f_{R'\sigma}+h.c.\right]\\&+\sum_{\langle RR'\rangle\sigma}\lambda^{(n.n.)}f^\dagger_{R\sigma}f_{R'\sigma}+\sum_{R\sigma}\lambda f^\dagger_{R\sigma}f_{R\sigma}-\mu\sum_{R\sigma}f^\dagger_{R\sigma}f_{R\sigma},\end{aligned}\tag{10}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{L}_{Mix}\left(\lambda,\lambda^{(n.n.)},\Delta,\Delta^{(n.n.)}\right)\\&=-2\lambda\Delta-2\lambda^{(n.n.)}\Delta^{(n.n.)}+\\&+U\Delta^2+2zV\Delta^2-zV\left[\Delta^{(n.n.)}\right]^2.\end{aligned}\tag{11}$$

Here λ and $\lambda^{(n.n.)}$ are Lagrange multipliers used to enforce that Δ and $\Delta^{(n.n.)}$ are the local and nearest neighbor density of quasiparticles for the quasiparticle Hamiltonian in Eq. (10), E is a Lagrange multiplier used to enforce the normalization of the Slater determinant $|\Psi_0\rangle$ in Eq. (10). We note that, because of the non-local interaction in Eq. (1), H_{QP} includes the nonlocal term $\lambda^{(n.n.)}$.

3. The extended Hubbard model Gutzwiller Lagrange Function

Let us now consider the extended Hubbard model with $V \neq 0$ within the GA. As we are going to show below, it is possible to extend the classical GA Lagrange function as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{L}_N\left(D,F,\mathcal{R},\mathcal{T},E^c\right.\\&\left.\lambda,\lambda^{(n.n.)},\lambda^c,\lambda^b,\Delta,\Delta^{(n.n.)},o,E,\mu,|\Psi_0\rangle,|\Phi\rangle\right)\\&=\frac{1}{\mathcal{N}}\langle\Psi_0|H_{QP}|\Psi_0\rangle+E\left(1-\langle\Psi_0\mid\Psi_0\rangle\right)\\&+\langle\Phi|H_{Emb}|\Phi\rangle+E^c\left(1-\langle\Phi\mid\Phi\rangle\right)+\mu\frac{N}{\mathcal{N}}+\\&\mathcal{L}_{Mix}\left(D,F,\mathcal{R},\mathcal{T},\lambda,\lambda^{(n.n.)},\lambda^c,\lambda^b,\Delta,\Delta^{(n.n.)},o\right),\end{aligned}\tag{12}$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned}H_{QP}=&-t\sum_{\langle RR'\rangle\sigma}\left[\mathcal{R}\mathcal{R}^*f^\dagger_{R\sigma}f_{R'\sigma}+h.c.\right]\\&+\sum_{\langle RR'\rangle\sigma}\lambda^{(n.n.)}f^\dagger_{R\sigma}f_{R'\sigma}+\sum_{R\sigma}\lambda f^\dagger_{R\sigma}f_{R\sigma}-\mu\sum_{R\sigma}f^\dagger_{R\sigma}f_{R\sigma},\end{aligned}\tag{13}$$

$$\begin{aligned}H_{Emb}=&U\hat{c}^\dagger_\uparrow\hat{c}_\uparrow\hat{c}^\dagger_\downarrow\hat{c}_\downarrow+\sum_\sigma\lambda^c_\sigma\hat{f}_\sigma\hat{f}^\dagger_\sigma\\&+\left[\sum_\sigma D\hat{c}^\dagger_\sigma\hat{f}_\sigma+h.c.\right]+\\&-F\left(n_cn_f-2n_c\left(1-\Delta\right)\right)+\lambda^bn_c,\end{aligned}\tag{14}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{L}_{Mix}\left(D,F,\mathcal{R},\mathcal{T},\lambda,\lambda^{(n.n.)},\lambda^c,\lambda^b,\Delta,\Delta^{(n.n.)},o\right)\\&=-2\left(\lambda+\lambda^c\right)\Delta-2\lambda^{(n.n.)}\Delta^{(n.n.)}-2\lambda^bo-\\&-4\left[D\left(\mathcal{R}\sqrt{\left(1-\Delta\right)\Delta}\right)\right]\\&-2F\left(1-\Delta\right)\Delta\mathcal{T}+2zVo^2-zV\left[\Delta^{(n.n.)}\mathcal{T}\right]^2.\end{aligned}\tag{15}$$

The derivation of the Lagrange function in Eq. (12) is provided below for the general multi-orbital case. Here we focus on explaining the main physical meaning of the terms appearing in the Lagrange function in Eq. (12).

The main differences of the Lagrange function in Eq. (12) with respect to Eq. (5) are: (1) H_{QP} now contains a non-local term $\lambda^{(n.n.)}$, which is equal to Eq. (10) for the Hartree-Fock case, but also includes the renormalization factors $\mathcal{R}$. (2) the embedding Hamiltonian H_{Emb} —which is the reference system describing the coupling of the impurity to the environment— now also includes a density density interaction coupling between the impurity and the bath. (3) $\mathcal{L}_{Mix}$ contains the new Lagrange multipliers F and λ^b. Furthermore, it includes the factor $\mathcal{T}$, which is a correlation-induced correction with respect to the last term of Eq. (11). At the saddle point, the parameter o equals the local electron occupation per spin.

C. Benchmark calculations

Here we focus on the 2D Hubbard model on the square lattice. As shown in Appendix G, extremizing Eq. (12)

is equivalent to minimizing the following energy function of the local double occupancy η:

$$\mathcal{E}(\eta) = \eta^2 \left[32tz\chi - 16Vz\chi^2\right] + \eta\left[-16tz\chi + U\right], \quad (16)$$

where $0 \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $z = 4$ is the number of nearest neighbors per site and

$$\chi = 4\int_0^{\pi} \frac{dk_x}{2\pi} \int_0^{\pi-k_x} \frac{dk_y}{2\pi} \left(\cos(k_x) + \cos(k_y)\right) = \frac{4}{\pi^2}. \quad (17)$$

In Fig. 1(A) we show the phase diagram of this system.

It is insightful to compare our phase diagram with the DMFT+GW study of Ref. [37] (the relevant data is reproduced in Fig. 1(B)), where CDW and SDW symmetry breaking was allowed while we considered only the normal phase. Remarkably our solution, which is completely encoded in Eq. (16), is in good quantitative agreement with the numerical DMFT+GW data [37].

1. *Brinkman Rice phase*

Consistently with the fact that our theory reduces to the ordinary GA in the limit of vanishing intersite interactions, at $V = 0$ we recover the Brinkman Rice transition [12], where $\eta = 0$ (i.e., the charge fluctuations are frozen) for all $U \geq 16tz\chi$. More generally the Brinkman Rice phase occurs when $U > 16tz\chi$ and $V < \frac{U}{8tz\chi^2}$.

2. *Metallic phase: enhanced-valence crossover*

Minimizing the energy function [Eq. (16)] it can be readily shown that for $U < 16tz\chi$ and $V < V_c = \chi^{-1}\left(1 + \frac{U}{16tz\chi}\right)$ the system remains metallic and that, in this phase, the double occupancy is given by:

$$\eta = \frac{1 - \frac{U}{16tz\chi}}{4\left(1 - V\chi/2\right)}. \quad (18)$$

Eq. (18) shows that the intersite Coulomb interaction can enhance dramatically charge fluctuations. In particular, we note that η can even exceed $\frac{1}{4}$ for $V_c > V > \frac{U}{8tz\chi^2}$, which is impossible in the half-filled single-band Hubbard model with only local Hubbard repulsion. The points where $\eta = \frac{1}{4}$, which here we refer to as the "enhanced-valence crossover," are marked by a dotted line in Fig. (1).

3. *Valence-skipping phase*

The non-local Coulomb interaction can induce a phase transition into a phase with double occupancy $\eta = \frac{1}{2}$, which is stable for $V > \chi^{-1}\left(1 + \frac{U}{16tz\chi}\right)$ and $V > \frac{U}{8tz\chi^2}$. In this work we refer to this region as the "valence-skipping phase" as the single site expectation values are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\Psi \mid 0\rangle \langle 0 \mid \Psi\rangle = \langle\Psi \mid\uparrow\downarrow\rangle \langle\uparrow\downarrow\mid \Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{2} \\ \langle\Psi \mid\uparrow\rangle \langle\uparrow\mid \Psi\rangle = \langle\Psi \mid\downarrow\rangle \langle\downarrow\mid \Psi\rangle = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

For $V\chi > 2$ there is a first order phase transition between the Brinkman Rice phase [12] and the valence skipping phase while for $V\chi < 2$ there is a second order phase transition between the metallic phase and the valence skipping phase. The order of the phase transition can be inferred from the continuity or discontinuity of η across these phase transition line (obtained analytically in the metallic phase in Eq. (18)). The tricritical point is at $(U, V) = \left(16tz\chi, \frac{2}{\chi}\right)$.

III. EXTENDED MULTI-ORBITAL HUBBARD HAMILTONIAN

We consider a generic electronic Hamiltonian, which can be represented in second quantization notation as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
H = & \sum_{R} \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{N} E_{R}^{\alpha\beta} \left[c_{R\alpha}^{\dagger} c_{R\beta} \right] + \sum_{R_1 \neq R_2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{N} t_{R_1;R_2}^{\alpha;\beta} \left[c_{R_1\alpha}^{\dagger} \right] \left[c_{R_2\beta} \right] + \sum_{R} \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta=1}^{N} U_{R}^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \left[c_{R\alpha}^{\dagger} c_{R\beta}^{\dagger} c_{R\gamma} c_{R\delta} \right] \\
& + \sum_{R_1 \neq R_2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta=1}^{N} V_{R_1;R_2}^{\alpha\beta;\gamma\delta} \left[c_{R_1\alpha}^{\dagger} c_{R_1\beta} \right] \left[c_{R_2\gamma}^{\dagger} c_{R_2\delta} \right] + \sum_{R_1 \neq R_2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta=1}^{N} Y_{R_1;R_2}^{\alpha\beta;\gamma\delta} \left[c_{R_1\alpha}^{\dagger} c_{R_1\beta}^{\dagger} \right] \left[c_{R_2\gamma} c_{R_2\delta} \right] \\
& + \left(\sum_{R_1 \neq R_2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta=1}^{N} X_{R_1;R_2}^{\alpha\beta\gamma;\delta} \left[c_{R_1\alpha}^{\dagger} c_{R_1\beta}^{\dagger} c_{R_1\gamma} \right] \left[c_{R_2\delta} \right] + h.c. \right) + \sum_{R_1 \neq R_2 \neq R_3} \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta=1}^{N} \mathcal{V}_{R_1;R_2;R_3}^{\alpha\beta;\gamma;\delta} \left[c_{R_1\alpha}^{\dagger} c_{R_1\beta} \right] \left[c_{R_2\gamma}^{\dagger} \right] \left[c_{R_3\delta} \right] \\
& + \left(\sum_{R_1 \neq R_2 \neq R_3} \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta=1}^{N} \mathcal{Y}_{R_1;R_2;R_3}^{\alpha\beta;\gamma;\delta} \left[c_{R_1\alpha}^{\dagger} c_{R_1\beta}^{\dagger} \right] \left[c_{R_2\gamma} \right] \left[c_{R_3\delta} \right] + h.c. \right) \\
& + \sum_{R_1 \neq R_2 \neq R_3 \neq R_4} \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta=1}^{N} S_{R_1;R_2;R_3;R_4}^{\alpha;\beta;\gamma;\delta} \left[c_{R_1\alpha}^{\dagger} \right] \left[c_{R_2\beta}^{\dagger} \right] \left[c_{R_3\gamma} \right] \left[c_{R_4\delta} \right] .
\end{aligned}
\tag{20}
$$

Here $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$ represent both spin and orbital degrees of freedom per site, of which there are N in total. We note that this Hamiltonian represents all possible one and two particle terms that come from the kinetic energy and Coulomb interaction of a first principles Hamiltonian. In particular it includes the regular Hubbard Hamiltonian (the first three terms of the first line). The square brackets are used to mark explicitly the operators acting over the same site.

For later convenience, we formally express the Hamiltonian in [Eq. (20)] also as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
H = & \sum_{R} H_{R}^{loc} + \sum_{R_1 \neq R_2} \sum_{\mu,\nu=1}^{2^{2N}} J_{R_1;R_2}^{\mu;\nu} O_{R_1\mu} O_{R_2\nu} + \sum_{R_1 \neq R_2 \neq R_3} \sum_{\mu,\nu,\eta=1}^{2^{2N}} J_{R_1;R_1;R_3}^{\mu;\nu;\eta} O_{R_1\mu} O_{R_2\nu} O_{R_3\eta} + \\
& + \sum_{R_1 \neq R_2 \neq R_3 \neq R_4} \sum_{\mu,\nu,\eta,\rho=1}^{2^{2N}} J_{R_1;R_2;R_3;R_4}^{\mu;\nu;\eta;\rho} O_{R_1\mu} O_{R_2\nu} O_{R_3\eta} O_{R_4\rho} \, ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{21}
$$

where the $O_{R\mu}\left[\left\{c_{R\alpha}^{\dagger}, c_{R\beta}\right\}\right]$ are a basis of the linear space of local operators (which can be written in terms of the local creation and annihilation operators $\left\{c_{R\alpha}^{\dagger}, c_{R\beta}\right\}$) and the J are complex coefficients.

IV. GA + $P_R^{\dagger} P_R - I$ EXPANSION

As in the classic GA theory, we consider the following variational wave function:

$$
|\Psi\rangle = \prod_{R} P_R \, |\Psi_0\rangle \, , \tag{22}
$$

where P_R is the most general operator acting on a single site R and $|\Psi_0\rangle$ is any generic multi-band Slater determinant wave-function. For simplicity, here we consider the case of no superconductivity, so in particular the projector P_R satisfies $\left[P_R, \hat{N}\right] = 0$, where $\hat{N}$ is the number operator. We introduce the following subsidiary conditions, known as the Gutzwiller constraints [15, 60, 61, 65–68]:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\langle \Psi_0 | \, P_R^{\dagger} P_R \, | \Psi_0 \rangle &= 1 \\
\langle \Psi_0 | \, P_R^{\dagger} P_R c_{R\alpha}^{\dagger} c_{R\beta} \, | \Psi_0 \rangle &= \langle \Psi_0 | \, c_{R\alpha}^{\dagger} c_{R\beta} \, | \Psi_0 \rangle \, .
\end{aligned}
\tag{23}
$$

Our goal is to evaluate the expectation value of the Hamiltonian in Eq. (20) with respect to the Gutzwiller wavefunction in Eq. (22) subject to the Gutzwiller constraints.

The starting point of our approach consists in retaining only the leading order in the the $P_R^{\dagger} P_R - I$ expansion, which was previously introduced in Refs. [53, 56, 58] and is also summarized in Appendix A for completeness. Within this approximation we have:

$$
\frac{\langle \Psi | \, H \, | \Psi \rangle}{\langle \Psi \mid \Psi \rangle} \cong \langle \Psi_0 | \, H_P \, | \Psi_0 \rangle \, , \tag{24}
$$

where:

$$H_P = \sum_R P_R^\dagger H_R^{loc} P_R + \sum_{R_1 \neq R_2} \sum_{\mu\nu} J^{\mu;\nu}_{R_1;R_2} P^\dagger_{R_1} O_{R_1\mu} P_{R_1} P^\dagger_{R_2} O_{R_2\nu} P_{R_2} + \\ + \sum_{R_1 \neq R_2 \neq R_3} \sum_{\mu\nu\eta} J^{\mu;\nu;\eta}_{R_1;R_2;R_3} P^\dagger_{R_1} O_{R_1\mu} P_{R_1} P^\dagger_{R_2} O_{R_2\nu} P_{R_2} P^\dagger_{R_3} O_{R_3\eta} P_{R_3} + \\ + \sum_{R_1 \neq R_2 \neq R_3 \neq R_4} \sum_{\mu\nu\eta\rho} J^{\mu;\nu;\eta;\rho}_{R_1;R_2;R_3;R_4} P^\dagger_{R_1} O_{R_1\mu} P_{R_1} P^\dagger_{R_2} O_{R_2\nu} P_{R_2} P^\dagger_{R_3} O_{R_3\eta} P_{R_3} P^\dagger_{R_4} O_{R_4\rho} P_{R_4} \, . \tag{25}$$

Note that this is a key simplification, as in all terms of Eq (25) only the operators P_R acting over sites with operators O_R appear.

V. EQUIVALENCES

For simplicity, in the main text of this work we will explicitly account only for the two-site contributions to the Hamiltonian, corresponding to the following terms of Eq. (20) and the first line of Eq. (25):

$$\tilde{H} = \sum_R \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^N E_R^{\alpha\beta} \left[c^\dagger_{R\alpha} c_{R\beta} \right] + \sum_{R_1 \neq R_2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^N t^{\alpha;\beta}_{R_1;R_2} \left[c^\dagger_{R_1\alpha} \right] \left[c_{R_2\beta} \right] + \sum_R \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta=1}^N U_R^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \left[c^\dagger_{R\alpha} c^\dagger_{R\beta} c_{R\gamma} c_{R\delta} \right] \\ + \sum_{R_1 \neq R_2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta=1}^N V^{\alpha\beta;\gamma\delta}_{R_1;R_2} \left[c^\dagger_{R_1\alpha} c_{R_1\beta} \right] \left[c^\dagger_{R_2\gamma} c_{R_2\delta} \right] + \sum_{R_1 \neq R_2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta=1}^N Y^{\alpha\beta;\gamma\delta}_{R_1;R_2} \left[c^\dagger_{R_1\alpha} c^\dagger_{R_1\beta} \right] \left[c_{R_2\gamma} c_{R_2\delta} \right] \\ + \left(\sum_{R_1 \neq R_2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta=1}^N X^{\alpha\beta\gamma;\delta}_{R_1;R_2} \left[c^\dagger_{R_1\alpha} c^\dagger_{R_1\beta} c_{R_1\gamma} \right] \left[c_{R_2\delta} \right] + h.c. \right) . \tag{26}$$

Therefore, the effective Hamiltonian $\tilde{H}_P$ of Eq. (25) reduces to:

$$\tilde{H}_P = \sum_R P_R^\dagger H_R^{loc} P_R + \sum_{R_1 \neq R_2} \sum_{\mu\nu} J^{\mu;\nu}_{R_1;R_2} \left[P^\dagger_{R_1} O_{R_1\mu} P_{R_1} \right] \left[P^\dagger_{R_2} O_{R_2\nu} P_{R_2} \right] . \tag{27}$$

The treatment of the terms of Eq. (20) involving three and four sites will be discussed in Appendix C.

As we are going to demonstrate, at the leading order of the $1/z$ expansion the expression for the total energy simplifies as follows:

$$\langle \Psi_0 | \, \tilde{H}_P \, | \Psi_0 \rangle \cong \langle \Psi_0 | \, \tilde{H}_{Eff} \, | \Psi_0 \rangle \, , \tag{28}$$

where

$$\tilde{H}_{Eff} = \sum_R P_R^\dagger H_R^{loc} P_R + \sum_{R_1 \neq R_2} \sum_{\mu\nu} J^{\mu;\nu}_{R_1;R_2} \left[\sum_i \mathcal{Z}_{R_1\mu i} O_{R_1 i} \right] \left[\sum_j \mathcal{Z}_{R_2\nu j} O_{R_2 j} \right] , \tag{29}$$

and the $\mathcal{Z}_{R\mu i}$ are complex numbers that can be expressed as a function of the Gutzwiller variational parameters.

We note that, analogously to previous work [15, 60, 61, 65–67], this simplification amounts to formally replace the operators $P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R$ of Eq. (27) with $\sum_i \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu i} O_{Ri}$. From now on we are going to refer to these formal substitutions as "Gutzwiller equivalences". As shown in Appendix E, H_{Eff} is Hermitian (consistently with the fact that the total energy for the Hamiltonians in Eq. (28) is real).

A. Definitions

For completeness, here we summarize the definitions of the variational parameters previously introduced in Refs. [15, 65, 67], in terms of which it will be possible to express conveniently the total energy also for the non-local interactions at the core of the present theory.

We express the Gutzwiller operators in the so-called "mixed-basis representation" [15, 65, 67] defined as follows:

$$P_R = \sum_{\Gamma,n} [\Lambda_R]_{\Gamma n} \left|\Gamma_R\right\rangle \left\langle n_R\right| , \tag{30}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\Gamma_R\right\rangle &= \left(c^\dagger_{R1}\right)^{n_1(\Gamma,R)} ..... \left(c^\dagger_{RN}\right)^{n_N(\Gamma,R)} \left|0,R\right\rangle \\ \left|n_R\right\rangle &= \left(f^\dagger_{R1}\right)^{n_1(n,R)} ..... \left(f^\dagger_{RN}\right)^{n_N(n,R)} \left|0,R\right\rangle . \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

Here $n_\alpha(\Gamma,R)$, $n_a(n,R) \in \{0,1\}$ represent the occupation numbers of the states $\left|n_R\right\rangle$, $\left|\Gamma_R\right\rangle$ respectively and the operators f_{Ra} are the so-called "quasi-particle" fermionic operators, which are related to the operators $c_{R\alpha}$ through an arbitrary unitary transformation.

We conveniently express the local reduced density matrix of $\left|\Psi_0\right\rangle$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^0_R &\equiv Tr_{R'\neq R} \left|\Psi_0\right\rangle \left\langle\Psi_0\right| \\ &= \frac{1}{Z} \exp\left(- \sum_{ab} \left[\ln\left(\frac{\mathbb{I} - \Delta^T_{RR}}{\Delta^T_{RR}} \right) \right]_{ab} f^\dagger_{Ra} f_{Rb} \right) , \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

where

$$[\Delta_{R_1R_2}]_{ab} = \left\langle\Psi_0\right| f^\dagger_{R_1a} f_{R_2b} \left|\Psi_0\right\rangle \tag{33}$$

Z is a normalization constant insuring that $Tr\left[\rho^0_R\right] = 1$ and the superscript T indicates the transpose.

It is also convenient to introduce the so-called "matrix of slave-boson amplitudes", see [15, 28, 65, 67, 68], which is defined as follows:

$$\phi_R = \Lambda_R \sqrt{P^0_R} , \tag{34}$$

where

$$[P^0_R]_{nn'} = \left\langle n_R \mid \rho^0_R \mid n'_R \right\rangle . \tag{35}$$

Following Refs. [15, 67], we also introduce the so-called "embedding mapping", which relates the matrix ϕ_R to the states $\left|\Phi_R\right\rangle$ belonging to an auxiliary impurity model with a bath site of size equal to the size of the impurity. The definition of the embedding mapping is the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\Phi_R\right\rangle = \sum_{\Gamma,n} &\exp\left(i\frac{\pi}{2} N\left(\hat{n}_R\right) \left(N\left(\hat{n}_R\right) - 1 \right) \right) \times \\ &\times \left[\phi_R\right]_{\Gamma n} U_{PH} \left|\hat{\Gamma}_R\right\rangle \left|\hat{n}_R\right\rangle , \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\hat{\Gamma}_R\right\rangle &= \left(\hat{c}^\dagger_{R1}\right)^{n_1\left(\hat{\Gamma},R\right)} ..... \left(\hat{c}^\dagger_{RN}\right)^{n_N\left(\hat{\Gamma},R\right)} \left|0,R\right\rangle \\ \left|\hat{n}_R\right\rangle &= \left(\hat{f}^\dagger_{R1}\right)^{n_1(n,R)} ..... \left(\hat{f}^\dagger_{RN}\right)^{n_N(n,R)} \left|0,R\right\rangle . \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

Here $n_\alpha\left(\hat{\Gamma},R\right)$, $n_a\left(\hat{n},R\right) \in \{0,1\}$ represent the occupation numbers of the states $\left|\hat{n}_R\right\rangle$, $\left|\hat{\Gamma}_R\right\rangle$ respectively, and

$$N\left(\hat{n}_R\right) = \sum_{a=1}^{N} n_a\left(\hat{n},R\right) \tag{38}$$

is the sum of the occupation numbers of the single particle states for the bath. Furthermore U_{PH} is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} U^\dagger_{PH} \hat{c}^\dagger_{R\alpha} U_{PH} &= \hat{c}^\dagger_{R\alpha} \\ U^\dagger_{PH} \hat{c}_{R\alpha} U_{PH} &= \hat{c}_{R\alpha} \\ U^\dagger_{PH} \hat{f}^\dagger_{Ra} U_{PH} &= \hat{f}_{Ra} \\ U^\dagger_{PH} \hat{f}_{Ra} U_{PH} &= \hat{f}^\dagger_{Ra} . \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

$$U_{PH} \left|0\right\rangle = \prod_{a=1}^{N} \hat{f}^\dagger_{Ra} \left|0\right\rangle . \tag{40}$$

Here the fact that $\left[P_R, \hat{N}\right] = 0$ implies that the state $\left|\Phi_R\right\rangle$ is at half filling, i.e.:

$$\left[\sum_\alpha \hat{c}^\dagger_{R\alpha} \hat{c}_{R\alpha} + \sum_a \hat{f}^\dagger_{Ra} \hat{f}_{Ra} \right] = N \left|\Phi_R\right\rangle . \tag{41}$$

Note that, within the definitions above, the Gutzwiller constraints in Eq. (23) can be written as [15, 60, 61, 65–67]:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle\Phi_R \mid \Phi_R\right\rangle &= 1 \\ \left\langle\Phi_R\right| \hat{f}_{Rb} \hat{f}^\dagger_{Ra} \left|\Phi_R\right\rangle &= \left\langle\Psi_0\right| f^\dagger_{Ra} f_{Rb} \left|\Psi_0\right\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

B. Fermionic Equivalences

Let us derive the equivalence relations for all local operators in Eq. (26) that increase the number of electrons by one, i.e., $c^\dagger_{R\alpha}$ and $c^\dagger_{R\alpha} c^\dagger_{R\beta} c_{R\gamma}$.

As demonstrated in the Appendices B and D 3 a, at the leading order of the $1/z$ expansion the following Gutzwiller equivalences hold:

$$\begin{aligned} P^\dagger_R c^\dagger_{R\alpha} P_R &\sim \sum_a \mathcal{R}_{R\alpha a} f^\dagger_{Ra} , \\ P^\dagger_R c^\dagger_{R\alpha} c^\dagger_{R\beta} c_{R\gamma} P_R &\sim \sum_a \mathcal{S}_{R\alpha\beta\gamma a} f^\dagger_{Ra} . \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

Here $\mathcal{R}_R$ and $\mathcal{S}_R$ are examples of the coefficients $\mathcal{Z}_{R\mu i}$. The Hermitian conjugate of Eq. (43) also holds. Here the coefficients $\mathcal{R}_{R\alpha a}$, $\mathcal{S}_{R\alpha\beta\gamma a}$ are determined by the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle\Psi_0\right| P^\dagger_R c^\dagger_\alpha P_R f_{Ra} \left|\Psi_0\right\rangle &= \left\langle\Psi_0\right| \left[\sum_b \mathcal{R}_{R\alpha b} f^\dagger_{Rb} \right] f_{Ra} \left|\Psi_0\right\rangle \\ \left\langle\Psi_0\right| P^\dagger_R c^\dagger_\alpha c^\dagger_\beta c_\gamma P_R f_{Ra} \left|\Psi_0\right\rangle &= \left\langle\Psi_0\right| \left[\sum_b \mathcal{S}_{R\alpha\beta\gamma b} f^\dagger_{Rb} \right] f_{Ra} \left|\Psi_0\right\rangle . \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Furthermore in Appendix D 3 a we solve explicitly these equations and show that:

$$\mathcal{R}_{R\alpha a} = \sum_b \langle \Phi_R | \, \hat{c}^\dagger_{R\alpha} \hat{f}_{Rb} \, | \Phi_R \rangle \tag{45}$$

$$\mathcal{S}_{R\alpha\beta\gamma a} = \sum_b \langle \Phi_R | \, \hat{c}^\dagger_{R\alpha} \hat{c}^\dagger_{R\beta} \hat{c}_{R\gamma} \hat{f}_{Rb} \, | \Phi_R \rangle \times \\ \times \left[\frac{1}{(\mathbb{I} - \Delta_{RR}) \, \Delta_{RR}} \right]^{1/2}_{ba} . \tag{46}$$

In summary, at the leading order of the $1/z$ expansion we have that:

$$\frac{\langle \Psi | \, H^{Ferm} \, | \Psi \rangle}{\langle \Psi \mid \Psi \rangle} \cong \langle \Psi_0 | \, \tilde{H}^{Ferm}_{Eff} \, | \Psi_0 \rangle \ , \tag{47}$$

where:

$$H^{Ferm} = \sum_{R_1 \neq R_2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{N} t^{\alpha;\beta}_{R_1;R_2} \left[c^\dagger_{R_1\alpha} \right] \left[c_{R_2\beta} \right] + \left(\sum_{R_1 \neq R_2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta=1}^{N} X^{\alpha\beta\gamma;\delta}_{R_1;R_2} \left[c^\dagger_{R_1\alpha} c^\dagger_{R_1\beta} c_{R_1\gamma} \right] \left[c_{R_2\delta} \right] + h.c. \right) , \tag{48}$$

$$\tilde{H}^{Ferm}_{Eff} = \sum_{R_1 \neq R_2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{N} \sum_{a,b=1}^{N} t^{\alpha;\beta}_{R_1;R_2} [\mathcal{R}_{R\alpha a} f^\dagger_{R_1 a}] [\mathcal{R}^*_{R\alpha b} f_{R_2 b}] + \left(\sum_{R_1 \neq R_2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta=1}^{N} \sum_{a,d=1}^{N} X^{\alpha\beta\gamma;\delta}_{R_1;R_2} [\mathcal{S}_{R\alpha\beta\gamma a} f^\dagger_{R_1 a}] [\mathcal{R}^*_{R\delta d} f_{R_2 d}] + h.c. \right) . \tag{49}$$

Here the coefficients $\mathcal{R}_R$, $\mathcal{S}_R$ are explicitly expressed in terms of the Gutzwiller variational parameters in Eqs. (46) and (46).

In terms of the notation introduced in Eq. (21) all of the above equations can be schematically represented as follows:

$$P^\dagger_R O_{R\mu} P_R \sim \sum_a \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu a} f^\dagger_{Ra}. \tag{50}$$

Here $\mathcal{R}_R$ and $\mathcal{S}_R$ are specific instances of the coefficients $\mathcal{Z}_{R\mu a}$. Here the $\mathcal{Z}_{R\mu a}$ are determined by the equation:

$$\langle \Psi_0 | \, P^\dagger_R O_{R\mu} P_R f_{Ra} \, | \Psi_0 \rangle = \\ = \langle \Psi_0 | \left[\sum_b \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu b} f^\dagger_{Rb} \right] f_{Ra} \, | \Psi_0 \rangle . \tag{51}$$

The explicit solution of the equation above is the following, see Appendix D 3 a :

$$\mathcal{Z}_{R\mu a} = - \sum_b \langle \Phi_R | \, \hat{O}_{R\mu} \hat{f}_{Rb} \, | \Phi_R \rangle \left[\frac{1}{(\mathbb{I} - \Delta_{RR}) \, \Delta_{RR}} \right]^{1/2}_{ba} . \tag{52}$$

C. Bosonic Equivalences (fermion number conserving operators)

Let us derive the equivalence relations for all local operators of Eq. (26) that do not change the number of electrons, i.e., $c^\dagger_{R\alpha} c_{R\beta}$. We note that something similar can be done for the operators $c^\dagger_{R\alpha} c^\dagger_{R\beta} c_{R\gamma} c_{R\delta}$ though they do not appear as a single site term as a part of two site terms in the Hamiltonian in Eq. (20):

As demonstrated in the Appendices B, D 3 a and D 3 a, at the leading order of the $1/z$ expansion the following Gutzwiller equivalences hold:

$$P^\dagger_R c^\dagger_{R\alpha} c_{R\beta} P_R \sim \sum_{ab} \mathcal{T}_{R\alpha\beta ba} f^\dagger_{Ra} f_{Rb} + \mathcal{T}_{R\alpha\beta I} I \\ P^\dagger_R c^\dagger_{R\alpha} c^\dagger_{R\beta} c_{R\gamma} c_{R\delta} P_R \sim \sum_{ab} \mathcal{T}_{R\alpha\beta\gamma\delta ba} f^\dagger_{Ra} f_{Rb} + \mathcal{T}_{R\alpha\beta\gamma\delta I} I. \tag{53}$$

Here $\mathcal{T}_R$ is an example of the coefficients $\mathcal{Z}_{R\mu i}$. In this case we show in Appendix D 3 b that $\mathcal{T}_{R\alpha\beta cd}, \mathcal{T}_{R\alpha\beta I}$ are

determined by the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle\Psi_0|\, P_R^\dagger c_{R\alpha}^\dagger c_{R\beta} P_R f_{Ra}^\dagger f_{Rb}\,|\Psi_0\rangle = \\
&\langle\Psi_0|\left[\sum_{cd} \mathcal{T}_{R\alpha\beta dc} f_{Rc}^\dagger f_{Rd} + \mathcal{T}_{R\alpha\beta I} I\right] f_{Ra}^\dagger f_{Rb}\,|\Psi_0\rangle \\
&\langle\Psi_0|\, P_R^\dagger c_{R\alpha}^\dagger c_{R\beta} P_R \cdot I\,|\Psi_0\rangle = \\
&\langle\Psi_0|\left[\sum_{cd} \mathcal{T}_{R\alpha\beta dc} f_{Rc}^\dagger f_{Rd} + \mathcal{T}_{R\alpha\beta I} I\right] \cdot I\,|\Psi_0\rangle\,. \qquad (54)
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore in Appendix D 3 b we solve these equations explicitly and show that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{T}_{R\alpha\beta dc} = &\sum_{ab} \left[\frac{1}{(\mathbb{I}-\Delta_{RR})\,\Delta_{RR}}\right]_{da}^{1/2} \langle\Phi_R|\,\hat{c}_{R\alpha}^\dagger \hat{c}_{R\beta} \hat{f}_{Rb} \hat{f}_{Ra}^\dagger\,|\Phi_R\rangle \\
&\times \left[\frac{1}{(\mathbb{I}-\Delta_{RR})\,\Delta_{RR}}\right]_{bc}^{1/2} - \\
&- \langle\Phi_R|\,\hat{c}_{R\alpha}^\dagger \hat{c}_{R\beta}\,|\Phi_R\rangle \times \left[\frac{1}{(\mathbb{I}-\Delta_{RR})}\right]_{dc}, \qquad (55)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{\alpha\beta I} = \langle\Phi_R|\,\hat{c}_{R\alpha}^\dagger \hat{c}_{R\beta}\,|\Phi_R\rangle - \sum_{cd} \mathcal{R}_{R\alpha\beta c}^d \left[\Delta_{RR}\right]_{cd}. \qquad (56)$$

In summary, at the leading order of the $1/z$ expansion we have that:

$$\frac{\langle\Psi|\, H^{Con}\,|\Psi\rangle}{\langle\Psi\mid\Psi\rangle} \cong \langle\Psi_0|\,\tilde{H}_{Eff}^{Con}\,|\Psi_0\rangle \qquad (57)$$

where:

$$H^{Con} = \sum_{R_1\neq R_2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta=1}^{N} V_{R_1;R_2}^{\alpha\beta;\gamma\delta} \left[c_{R_1\alpha}^\dagger c_{R_1\beta}\right] \left[c_{R_2\gamma}^\dagger c_{R_2\delta}\right], \qquad (58)$$

$$\tilde{H}_{Eff}^{Con} = \sum_{R_1\neq R_2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta=1}^{N} V_{R_1;R_2}^{\alpha\beta;\gamma\delta} \left[\sum_{a,b=1}^{N} \mathcal{T}_{R\alpha\beta ab} f_{Ra}^\dagger f_{Rb} + \mathcal{T}_{R\alpha\beta I} I\right] \times \left[\sum_{c,d=1}^{N} \mathcal{T}_{R\gamma\delta cd} f_{Rc}^\dagger f_{Rd} + \mathcal{T}_{R\gamma\delta I} I\right]. \qquad (59)$$

Here the coefficients $\mathcal{T}_R$ are explicitly expressed in terms of the Gutzwiller variational parameters in Eqs. (55) and (56).

In terms of the notation introduced in Eq. (21) all of the above equations can be schematically represented as follows:

$$P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R \sim \sum_{ab} \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu ba} f_{Ra}^\dagger f_{Rb} + \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu I} I. \qquad (60)$$

Here $\mathcal{T}_R$ is a specific instance of the coefficients $\mathcal{Z}_{R\mu ba}$. Here the $\mathcal{Z}_{R\mu ba}$ are determined by the equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle\Psi_0|\, P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R f_{Ra}^\dagger f_{Rb}\,|\Psi_0\rangle = \\
&\langle\Psi_0|\left[\sum_{cd} \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu dc} f_{Rc}^\dagger f_{Rd} + \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu I} I\right] f_{Ra}^\dagger f_{Rb}\,|\Psi_0\rangle \\
&\langle\Psi_0|\, P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R \cdot I\,|\Psi_0\rangle = \\
&\langle\Psi_0|\left[\sum_{cd} \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu dc} f_{Rc}^\dagger f_{Rd} + \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu I} I\right] \cdot I\,|\Psi_0\rangle\,. \qquad (61)
\end{aligned}$$

The explicit solution of the equation above is the following, see Appendix D 3 b:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Z}_{R\mu dc} = &\sum_{ab} \left[\frac{1}{(\mathbb{I}-\Delta_{RR})\,\Delta_{RR}}\right]_{da}^{1/2} \langle\Phi_R|\,\hat{O}_{R\mu} \hat{f}_{Rb} \hat{f}_{Ra}^\dagger\,|\Phi_R\rangle \\
&\times \left[\frac{1}{(\mathbb{I}-\Delta_{RR})\,\Delta_{RR}}\right]_{bc}^{1/2} - \\
&- \langle\Phi_R|\,\hat{O}_{R\mu}\,|\Phi_R\rangle \times \left[\frac{1}{(\mathbb{I}-\Delta_{RR})}\right]_{dc}, \qquad (62)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\mathcal{Z}_{R\mu I} = \langle\Phi_R|\,\hat{O}_{R\mu}\,|\Phi_R\rangle - \sum_{cd} \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu dc} \left[\Delta_{RR}\right]_{cd}. \qquad (63)$$

D. Bosonic Equivalences (fermion number changing operators)

Let us derive the equivalence relations for all local operators of Eq. (26) that increase the number of electrons by two, i.e., $c_{R\alpha}^\dagger c_{R\beta}^\dagger$. We note that something similar can be done for the operators $c_{R\alpha}^\dagger c_{R\beta}^\dagger c_{R\gamma}^\dagger c_{R\delta}$ though they do not appear as any single site terms as a part of two site terms in the Hamiltonian in Eq. (20):

As demonstrated in the Appendices B, D 3 c and D 3 a, at the leading order of the $1/z$ expansion the following Gutzwiller equivalences hold:

$$P_R^\dagger c_{R\alpha}^\dagger c_{R\beta}^\dagger P_R \sim \sum_{ab} \mathcal{U}_{R\alpha\beta ab} f_{Ra}^\dagger f_{Rb}^\dagger$$
$$P_R^\dagger c_{R\alpha}^\dagger c_{R\beta}^\dagger c_{R\gamma}^\dagger c_{R\delta} P_R \sim \sum_{ab} \mathcal{U}_{R\alpha\beta\gamma\delta ab} f_{Ra}^\dagger f_{Rb}^\dagger. \quad (64)$$

Here $\mathcal{U}_R$ is an example of the coefficients $\mathcal{Z}_{R\mu i}$. The Hermitian conjugate of Eq. (64) also holds. We will not need to consider terms that change the electron number by more then two (though a similar treatment may be done for them) as they are not needed in the Hamiltonian in Eq. (20). In Appendix D 3 c we show that $\mathcal{U}_{R\alpha\beta cd}$ satisfy the following equations:

$$\langle \Psi_0 | P_R^\dagger c_{R\alpha}^\dagger c_{R\beta}^\dagger P_R f_{Ra} f_{Rb} | \Psi_0 \rangle =$$
$$= \langle \Psi_0 | \left[\sum_{cd} \mathcal{U}_{R\alpha\beta cd} f_{Rc}^\dagger f_{Rd}^\dagger \right] f_{Ra} f_{Rb} | \Psi_0 \rangle . \quad (65)$$

Furthermore in Appendix D 3 c we solve these equations explicitly and show that:

$$\mathcal{U}_{\alpha\beta ab} = -\sum_{\gamma\delta} \left[\frac{1}{\left(\mathbb{I} - \Delta_{RR}^T\right) \Delta_{RR}^T} \right]_{ac}^{1/2} \times$$
$$\times \langle \Phi_R | \hat{c}_{R\alpha}^\dagger \hat{c}_{R\beta}^\dagger \hat{f}_{Rc} \hat{f}_{Rd} | \Phi_R \rangle \times \left[\frac{1}{(\mathbb{I} - \Delta) \Delta} \right]_{db}^{1/2} . \quad (66)$$

In summary, at the leading order of the $1/z$ expansion we have that:

$$\frac{\langle \Psi | H^{Chan} | \Psi \rangle}{\langle \Psi \mid \Psi \rangle} \cong \langle \Psi_0 | \tilde{H}_{Eff}^{Chan} | \Psi_0 \rangle , \quad (67)$$

where:

$$H^{Chan} = \sum_{R_1 \neq R_2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta=1}^{N} Y_{R_1;R_2}^{\alpha\beta;\gamma\delta} \left[c_{R_1\alpha}^\dagger c_{R_1\beta}^\dagger \right] \left[c_{R_2\gamma} c_{R_2\delta} \right], \quad (68)$$

$$\tilde{H}_{Eff}^{Chan} = \sum_{R_1 \neq R_2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta=1}^{N} Y_{R_1;R_2}^{\alpha\beta;\gamma\delta} \left[\sum_{a,b=1}^{N} \mathcal{U}_{R\alpha\beta ab} f_{Ra}^\dagger f_{Rb}^\dagger \right] \times \left[\sum_{c,d=1}^{N} \mathcal{U}_{R\gamma\delta dc}^* f_{Rc} f_{Rd} \right] . \quad (69)$$

Here the coefficients $\mathcal{U}_R$ are explicitly expressed in terms of the Gutzwiller variational parameters in Eqs. (66).

In terms of the notation introduced in Eq. (21) all of the above equations can be schematically represented as follows:

$$P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R \sim \sum_{ab} \bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu ab} f_{Ra}^\dagger f_{Rb}^\dagger. \quad (70)$$

Here $\mathcal{U}_R$ is a specific instance of the coefficients $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu ab}$. Here the $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu ab}$ are determined by the equations:

$$\langle \Psi_0 | P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R f_{Ra} f_{Rb} | \Psi_0 \rangle =$$
$$= \langle \Psi_0 | \left[\sum_{cd} \bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu cd} f_{Rc}^\dagger f_{Rd}^\dagger \right] f_{Ra} f_{Rb} | \Psi_0 \rangle . \quad (71)$$

The explicit solution of the equation above is the following, see Appendix D 3 c:

$$\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mu ab} = -\sum_{\gamma\delta} \left[\frac{1}{\left(\mathbb{I} - \Delta_{RR}^T\right) \Delta_{RR}^T} \right]_{ac}^{1/2} \times$$
$$\times \langle \Phi_R | \hat{O}_{R\mu} \hat{f}_{Rc} \hat{f}_{Rd} | \Phi_R \rangle \times \left[\frac{1}{(\mathbb{I} - \Delta) \Delta} \right]_{db}^{1/2} . \quad (72)$$

VI. GUTZWILLER LAGRANGE FUNCTION

In Section V we have expressed explicitly the total energy as a function of the variational parameters at the leading order of the $1/z$ and the $P_R^\dagger P_R - I$ expansions.

Here we consider the problem of minimizing the variational energy with respect to the variational parameters $|\Psi_0\rangle$ and $\{|\Phi_R\rangle\}$. To achieve this goal we need to take into account that: (1) the energy has to be minimized satisfying the constraints, (2) the renormalization coefficients $\{\mathcal{R}_R, \mathcal{S}_R, \mathcal{T}_R, \mathcal{U}_R\}$ depend on the variational parameters non-linearly, see Eqs. (52), (55), (56) and (66)).

Following Refs. [15, 65, 67], these problems can tackled introducing Lagrange multipliers both for enforcing the Gutzwiller constraints (Eq. 42) as well as for promoting the coefficients $\{\mathcal{R}_R, \mathcal{S}_R, \mathcal{T}_R, \mathcal{U}_R\}$ in Eqs. (52), (55), (56) and (66)) and $[\Delta_{R_1R_2}]_{ab}$ to independent variables. Furthermore, we promote to independent variable the coefficients $o_{R\alpha\beta} = \langle\Phi_R| \hat{c}^\dagger_{R\alpha}\hat{c}_{R\beta} |\Phi_R\rangle$.

Within this strategy, the energy minimization problem amounts to calculate the saddle points of the following Lagrange function:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{L}_N\left(\{D_R, E_R, F_R, G_R\}, \{D^*_R, E^*_R, F^*_R, G^*_R\}, \{\mathcal{R}_R, \mathcal{S}_R, \mathcal{T}_R, \mathcal{U}_R\}, \{\mathcal{R}^*_R, \mathcal{S}^*_R, \mathcal{T}^*_R, \mathcal{U}^*_R\},\right.\\
&\left.[\lambda_{R_1R_2}]_{ab}, [\lambda^c_R]_{ab}, \lambda^b_{R\alpha\beta}, o_{R\alpha\beta}, E^c_R, E, [\Delta_{R_1R_2}]_{ab}, \mu, |\Phi_R\rangle, |\Psi_0\rangle\right)\\
&= \mathcal{L}_{QP}\left(\{\mathcal{R}_R, \mathcal{S}_R\}, \{\mathcal{R}^*_R, \mathcal{S}^*_R\}, [\lambda_{R_1R_2}]_{ab}, E, |\Psi_0\rangle\right) +\\
&+ \mathcal{L}_{Embed}\left(\{D_R, E_R, F_R, G_R\}, \{D^*_R, E^*_R, F^*_R, G^*_R\}, [\Delta_{R_1R_2}]_{ab}, \lambda^b_{R\alpha\beta}, E^c_R, |\Phi_R\rangle\right) +\\
&+ \mathcal{L}_{Mix}\left(\{D_R, E_R, F_R, G_R\}, \{D^*_R, E^*_R, F^*_R, G^*_R\}, \{\mathcal{R}_R, \mathcal{S}_R, \mathcal{T}_R, \mathcal{U}_R\},\right.\\
&\left.\{\mathcal{R}^*_R, \mathcal{S}^*_R, \mathcal{T}^*_R, \mathcal{U}^*_R\}, [\lambda_{R_1R_2}]_{ab}, [\lambda^c_R]_{ab}, \lambda^b_{R\alpha\beta}, [\Delta_{R_1R_2}]_{ab}, o_{R\alpha\beta}\right)\\
&+ \mathcal{L}_{HF}\left(\{\mathcal{T}_R, \mathcal{U}_R\}, \{\mathcal{T}^*_R, \mathcal{U}^*_R\}, [\Delta_{R_1R_2}]_{ab}, o_{R\alpha\beta}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{L}_{QP}\left(\{\mathcal{R}_R, \mathcal{S}_R\}, \{\mathcal{R}^*_R, \mathcal{S}^*_R\}, [\lambda_{R_1R_2}]_{ab}, E, \mu, |\Psi_0\rangle\right) =\\
&= \langle\Psi_0| - \sum_{R_1R_2\alpha\beta} t^{\alpha;\beta}_{R_1;R_2} \mathcal{R}_{R_1\alpha c}\mathcal{R}^*_{R_2\beta d} f^\dagger_{R_1c} f_{R_2d} + \left[\sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma;\delta=1}^{N}\sum_{c,d=1}^{N} X^{\alpha\beta\gamma;\delta}_{R_1;R_2}\mathcal{S}^\gamma_{R_1\alpha\beta;c}\mathcal{R}^*_{R_2\delta d} f^\dagger_{R_1c} f_{R_2d} + h.c.\right] +\\
&+ \sum_{R_1R_2}\sum_{a,b=1}^{N} [\lambda_{R_1R_2}]_{ab} f^\dagger_{R_1a} f_{R_2b} - \mu\sum_{Ra} f^\dagger_{Ra} f_{Ra} |\Psi_0\rangle + E\left(1 - \langle\Psi_0 \mid \Psi_0\rangle\right) + \mu\mathcal{N},
\end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{Embed}\left(\{D_R, E_R, F_R, G_R\}, \{D^*_R, E^*_R, F^*_R, G^*_R\}, E^c_R, \lambda^b_{R\alpha\beta}, [\Delta_{RR}]_{ab}, |\Phi_R\rangle\right) = \sum_R \langle\Phi_R| H^R_{Embed} |\Phi_R\rangle + E^c_R\left(1 - \langle\Phi_R \mid \Phi_R\rangle\right), \tag{75}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
H^R_{embed} &= \sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} U^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}_R \hat{c}^\dagger_{R\alpha}\hat{c}^\dagger_{R\beta}\hat{c}_{R\gamma}\hat{c}_{R\delta} + \sum_{\alpha\beta} E^{\alpha\beta}_R \hat{c}^\dagger_{R\alpha}\hat{c}_{R\beta} + \sum_{ab} [\lambda^c_R]_{ab}\hat{f}_{Rb}\hat{f}^\dagger_{Ra} + \left[\sum_{\alpha b} [D_{R\alpha}]_b \hat{c}^\dagger_{R\alpha}\hat{f}_{Rb} + h.c.\right]\\
&+ \left[\sum_{\alpha\beta cd}\left[E^\gamma_{R\alpha\beta}\right]_d \hat{c}^\dagger_{R\alpha}\hat{c}^\dagger_{R\beta}\hat{c}_{R\gamma}\hat{f}_{Rd} + h.c.\right] + \sum_{\alpha\beta cd}[F_{R\alpha\beta}]_{cd}\left(\hat{c}^\dagger_{R\alpha}\hat{c}_{R\beta}\hat{f}_{Rd}\hat{f}^\dagger_{Rc} - \hat{c}^\dagger_{R\alpha}\hat{c}_{R\beta}[\Delta]_{cd}\right)\\
&- \left[\sum_{\alpha>\beta;c>d}[G_{R\alpha\beta}]_{cd}\hat{c}^\dagger_{R\alpha}\hat{c}^\dagger_{R\beta}\hat{f}_{Rd}\hat{f}_{Rc} + h.c.\right] + \sum_{\alpha\beta}\lambda^b_{R\alpha\beta}\hat{c}^\dagger_{R\alpha}\hat{c}_{R\beta},
\end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{L}_{Mix}\left(\{D_R, E_R, F_R, G_R\}, \{D^*_R, E^*_R, F^*_R, G^*_R\}, \{\mathcal{R}_R, \mathcal{S}_R, \mathcal{T}_R, \mathcal{U}_R\}, \{\mathcal{R}^*_R, \mathcal{S}^*_R, \mathcal{T}^*_R, \mathcal{U}^*_R\}, [\lambda_{R_1R_2}]_{ab}, [\lambda^c_R]_{ab}, \lambda^b_{R\alpha\beta}, [\Delta_{R_1R_2}]_{ab}, o_{R\alpha\beta}\right)\\
&= -\sum_{Rab}[\lambda_{RR} + \lambda^c_R]_{ab}[\Delta_{RR}]_{ab} - \sum_{R_1\neq R_2 ab}[\lambda_{R_1R_2}]_{ab}[\Delta_{R_1R_2}]_{ab} - \sum_{R\alpha\beta}\lambda^b_{R\alpha\beta}o_{R\alpha\beta} -\\
&- \sum_{R\beta a}\left[[D_{R\beta}]_a\left[\mathcal{R}_{R\beta}\sqrt{(\mathbb{I} - \Delta_{RR})\Delta_{RR}}\right]_a + c.c.\right] - \sum_{R\alpha\beta\gamma d}\left[\left[E^\gamma_{R\alpha\beta}\right]_d\left[\mathcal{S}^\gamma_{R\alpha\beta}\sqrt{(\mathbb{I} - \Delta_{RR})\Delta_{RR}}\right]_d + c.c.\right]\\
&- \sum_{R\alpha\beta ab}[F_{R\alpha\beta}]_{ab}\left(\sqrt{(\mathbb{I} - \Delta_{RR})\Delta_{RR}}\mathcal{T}^\alpha_{R\beta}\sqrt{(\mathbb{I} - \Delta_{RR})\Delta_{RR}}\right)_{ab}\\
&- \sum_{R\alpha>\beta ab}\left[[G_{R\alpha\beta}]_{ab}\left[\sqrt{(\mathbb{I} - \Delta_{RR})\Delta_{RR}}\mathcal{U}_{R\alpha\beta}\sqrt{\left(\mathbb{I} - \Delta^T_{RR}\right)\Delta^T_{RR}}\right]_{ab} + c.c.\right],
\end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{HF}\left(\{\mathcal{T}_R,\mathcal{U}_R\},\{\mathcal{T}_R^*,\mathcal{U}_R^*\},[\Delta_{R_1R_2}]_{ab},o_{R\alpha\beta}\right)=$$
$$=\sum_{R_1R_2\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}V^{\alpha\beta;\gamma\delta}_{R_1;R_2}o_{R_1\alpha\beta}o_{R_2\gamma\delta}-\sum_{R_1\neq R_2}\sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}\sum_{abcd}V^{\alpha\beta;\gamma\delta}_{R_1;R_2}\left[\Delta_{R_1R_2}\right]_{ac}\left[\Delta_{R_2R_1}\right]_{db}\left[\mathcal{T}^{\beta}_{R_1\alpha}\right]_{ba}\left[\mathcal{T}^{\delta}_{R_2\gamma}\right]_{dc}+$$
$$+\sum_{R_1\neq R_2}\sum_{a>b;c>d}\left[Y^{\alpha\beta;\gamma\delta}_{R_1;R_2}\sum_{a>b}\sum_{c>d}\left(\left[\Delta_{R_1R_2}\right]_{ad}\left[\Delta_{R_1R_2}\right]_{bc}-\left[\Delta_{R_1R_2}\right]_{ac}\left[\Delta_{R_1R_2}\right]_{bd}\right)\left[\mathcal{U}_{R_1\alpha\beta}\right]_{ab}\left[\mathcal{U}^*_{R_2\gamma\delta}\right]_{cd}\right]. \quad (78)$$

Here $[E^{\beta}_{R\alpha}]_{cd}$, $[F_{R\alpha\beta}]_{cd}$, $[G^{\gamma}_{R\alpha\beta}]_d$ and $[\mathcal{T}^{\beta}_{R\alpha}]_{cd}$, $[\mathcal{U}_{R\alpha\beta}]_{cd}$, $[\mathcal{S}^{\gamma}_{R\alpha\beta}]_d$ represent tensors of the size $N\times N\times N\times N$. Furthermore $[D_{R\alpha}]_b$ and $[\mathcal{R}_{R\alpha}]_b$ and $o_{R\alpha\beta},[\lambda^c_R]_{ab},\lambda^b_{R\alpha\beta}$ represent matrices of size $N\times N$ for each site R. Further $[\Delta_{R_1R_2}]_{ab},[\lambda_{R_1R_2}]_{ab}$ represent matrices of size $N\times N$ indexed by all the pairs of sites R_1,R_2. Here E and E^c_R are single numbers indexed by nothing or the site R respectively. We point out that these tensors satisfy the relations:

$$[F_{R\alpha\beta}]_{cd}=\left[F^*_{R\beta\alpha}\right]_{cd} \quad (79)$$
$$[\mathcal{U}_{R\alpha\beta}]_{cd}=-[\mathcal{U}_{R\alpha\beta}]_{dc} \quad (80)$$
$$[\lambda_{R_1R_2}]_{ab}=\left[\lambda^*_{R_1R_2}\right]_{ba} \quad (81)$$
$$[\Delta_{R_1R_2}]_{ab}=\left[\Delta^*_{R_2R_1}\right]_{ba} \quad (82)$$
$$\lambda^b_{R\alpha\beta}=\lambda^{b*}_{R\beta\alpha} \quad (83)$$
$$o_{R\alpha\beta}=o^*_{R\beta\alpha}. \quad (84)$$

Note that, if we delete the terms V,X,Y and the Lagrange multipliers relevant to them (in particular delete the Hartree-Fock part of the Lagrangian), we reduce our problem to known results [15, 60, 66, 67]. Extensions to Ghost Gutzwiller construction is straightforward though cumbersome [68].

VII. CONCLUSIONS

In this work we have introduced a new method to study the GA for a broad class of multi-band extended Hubbard Hamiltonians with two site interactions by combing the large z and the $P^\dagger_RP_R-I$ expansions. We have presented the final result in terms of a Gutzwiller Lagrange function valid for multi-band Hubbard models. Using this formalism, we have studied the single band extended Hubbard model, showing that this method is highly practical and leads to new qualitative results. In particular, we have recovered a Brinkman-Rice transition [12] for the extended Hubbard model and observed that a valence skipping phase emerges for large intersite interactions. Our work can enable a more refined treatment of intersite interactions in the ab-initio calculations. In the future this may lead to parameter free theories of realistic solids and molecules.

Acknowledgements: This work was supported by the Computational Materials Sciences Program funded by the US Department of Energy, Office of Science, Basic Energy Sciences, Materials Sciences and Engineering Division. N. L. was supported by the VILLUM FONDEN via the Centre of Excellence for Dirac Materials (Grant No. 11744).

Appendix A: $P^\dagger_RP_R-I$ expansion

In this Appendix we will describe the $P^\dagger_RP_R-I$ expansion used in Section IV and use it to derive Eq. (24) at leading order in the $P^\dagger_RP_R-I$ expansion. We will focus on the case of the two point operator, though higher point operators may be handled similarly. Corrections to Eq. (24) appear as higher order terms in the $P^\dagger_RP_R-I$ expansion parameter x, which we now introduce through the following relation:

$$P^\dagger_RP_R\equiv I+x\left(P^\dagger_RP_R-I\right)\equiv I+x\Theta_R. \quad (A1)$$

The correct value of x is given by $x=1$, but we will treat x as a small parameter; which stems from the physical assumption that all the eigenvalues of $\Theta_R\ll 1$. As such we will drop all terms proportional to any positive power of x.

1. The case with two sites

Consider the simplest case where the system is composed of just two sites R and R'. In this case we have that:

$$\frac{\langle\Psi|O_RO_{R'}|\Psi\rangle}{\langle\Psi\mid\Psi\rangle}=\frac{\langle\Psi_0|P^\dagger_RO_RP_RP^\dagger_{R'}O_{R'}P_{R'}|\Psi_0\rangle}{\langle\Psi_0|P^\dagger_RP_RP^\dagger_{R'}P_{R'}|\Psi_0\rangle}=\frac{\langle\Psi_0|P^\dagger_RO_RP_RP^\dagger_{R'}O_{R'}P_{R'}|\Psi_0\rangle}{\mathscr{D}}, \quad (A2)$$

where

$$\mathscr{D}=1+x\langle\Psi_0|\Theta_R|\Psi_0\rangle+x\langle\Psi_0|\Theta_{R'}|\Psi_0\rangle+x^2\langle\Psi_0|\Theta_R\Theta_{R'}|\Psi_0\rangle \quad (A3)$$

We see that

$$\frac{\langle\Psi|O_RO_{R'}|\Psi\rangle}{\langle\Psi\mid\Psi\rangle}\cong\langle\Psi_0|P^\dagger_RO_RP_RP^\dagger_{R'}O_{R'}P_{R'}|\Psi_0\rangle \quad (A4)$$

with corrections being order x or higher. It is not too hard to see that this is still true in the general case of many sites. Indeed any terms not in the form of the right hand side of Eq. (A4) in the expansion of $\frac{\langle\Psi|O_R O_{R'}|\Psi\rangle}{\langle\Psi|\Psi\rangle}$, both in the denominator and the numerator, come with positive powers of x, and therefore are neglected in the $P_R^\dagger P_R - I$ approximation.

Appendix B: $1/z$ scaling

1. $1/z$ Scaling for a single particle

As a first step to understand the various terms that enter the Gutzwiller energy function in Eq. (21), we will consider the single particle Hamiltonian in the limit of large dimensions. We will follow closely [16]. We will show that:

$$\begin{aligned} t_n^{\alpha;\beta} &\sim \frac{1}{z^{n/2}} \\ \langle\Psi_0| f_{Ra}^\dagger f_{R'b} |\Psi_0\rangle &\sim \frac{1}{z^{n/2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{B1}$$

For simplicity we assume a hypercubic lattice. Here n is the Manhattan distance between R and R'. Where the Manhattan distance, $D(R,R')$, is the shortest distance between two points R and R' that can be travelled by a particle that can only move on the edges of the hypercubic lattice.

For simplicity we will consider a spinless, single band, tight binding Hamiltonian on the hypercubic lattice (orbital and spin degrees may be added straightforwardly):

$$H = -\sum_{RR'} t_{RR'} c_R^\dagger c_{R'} + h.c. \tag{B2}$$

Lets decompose the Hamiltonian into pieces with equal Manhattan distance:

$$H = -\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{D(R,R')=n} t_n c_R^\dagger c_{R'} + h.c. \equiv H_n \tag{B3}$$

The eigenvalues of the Hamiltonian H_n are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} &E_n(k_1, k_2, ...k_d) \\ &= -t_n \sum_{P_n} \left[\exp\left(i\vec{P}_n \cdot \vec{k}\right) + \exp\left(-i\vec{P}_n \cdot \vec{k}\right)\right] \\ &= -t_n \sum_{P_n} E_{P_n}\left(\vec{k}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{B4}$$

Here the P_n are all the Manhattan paths of total length n with distinct endpoints (we choose only one path for each endpoint) and $\vec{P}_n$ is the vector displacement of the Manhattan path (note we are grouping path $\vec{P}_n$ and $-\vec{P}_n$ together to obtain a real value for the energy). It is not too hard to see that there are:

$$2^{n-1}\begin{pmatrix} d+n-1 \\ n \end{pmatrix} \equiv \mathcal{N}(n) \sim z^n \tag{B5}$$

such paths. We now have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} E_{P_n}\left(\vec{k}\right) &= 0 \\ \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} E_{P_n}\left(\vec{k}\right) E_{P'_n}\left(\vec{k}\right) &= 2\delta_{P_n P'_n} \end{aligned} \tag{B6}$$

Therefore by the central limit theorem we have that the energy has a distribution given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{P}_n(E) &\equiv \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \delta\left(-t_n \sum_{P_n} E_{P_n}\left(\vec{k}\right) - E\right) \\ &\cong \frac{1}{\mathscr{Z}} \exp\left(-t_n^2 \cdot \mathcal{N}(n) \cdot E^2\right) \end{aligned} \tag{B7}$$

Here $\mathscr{Z}$ is a normalization constant. We now demand that $\mathscr{P}_n(E)$ be independent of z in which case we must have that:

$$t_n \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}(n)}} \sim \frac{1}{z^{n/2}} \tag{B8}$$

We now have that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{0} E \cdot \mathscr{P}_n(E) = \langle H_n\rangle \sim 1 \tag{B9}$$

We further have that

$$\langle H_n\rangle = -t_n \cdot 2 \cdot \mathcal{N}(n) \cdot \langle\Psi_0| c_R^\dagger c_{R'} |\Psi_0\rangle \sim 1 \tag{B10}$$

This means that:

$$\langle\Psi_0| c_R^\dagger c_{R'} |\Psi_0\rangle \sim \frac{1}{z^{n/2}} \tag{B11}$$

from which Eq. (B1) follows. Below we use these results to show how the various terms in the main Hamiltonian in Eq. (21) scale.

2. Scaling of operator expectation values

We will consider the large co-ordination number, large z, approximation. As a first step towards towards obtaining the results in Appendices B 3 and C 1 (which present key results needed in the main text in Section V) we calculate the scaling of various operators in the large $z$limit. We will also only take the leading order in the $P_R^\dagger P_R - I$ expansion.

a. Scaling fermionic operators

We now used Wick's theorem to obtain the scaling for the expectation values of various terms in Eq. (21). Lets assume that the Hamiltonian contains $J^{\mu;\nu}_{R;R'} O_{R\mu} O_{R'\nu}$,

with $O_{R\mu}$ and $O_{R'\nu}$ fermionic, then we know that the lowest order contribution to $J^{\mu;\nu}_{RR'}\langle\Psi|O_{R\mu}O_{R'\nu}|\Psi\rangle/\langle\Psi\mid\Psi\rangle$ may be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}&J^{\mu;\nu}_{R;R'}\langle\Psi|O_{R\mu}O_{R'\nu}|\Psi\rangle/\langle\Psi\mid\Psi\rangle\\&\sim J^{\mu;\nu}_{R;R'}\sum_{ab=1}^{N}\mathcal{Z}^{*}_{\mu a}\mathcal{Z}_{\nu b}\langle\Psi_0|f^{\dagger}_{Ra}f_{R'b}|\Psi_0\rangle\\&\sim J^{\mu;\nu}_{R;R'}\cdot\frac{1}{z^{n/2}}.\end{aligned}\tag{B12}$$

Here we have used the operator equivalences in Section V. Now there $\mathcal{N}(n)\sim z^n$ such terms (see Appendix B 1) so we have the total contribution for such terms scales as:

$$\sim J^{\mu;\nu}_{R;R'}\cdot\frac{1}{z^{n/2}}\cdot z^n\sim 1.\tag{B13}$$

In which case we have that:

$$J^{\mu;\nu}_{R;R'}\sim\frac{1}{z^{n/2}}.\tag{B14}$$

b. Scaling Bosonic operator that changes fermion number by two

Lets assume that the Hamiltonian contains $J^{\mu;\nu}_{R;R'}O_{R\mu}O_{R'\nu}$, with $O_{R\mu}$ and $O_{R'\nu}$ bosonic and changing fermion number by two, then we know that the lowest order contribution to $J^{\mu;\nu}_{R;R'}\langle\Psi|O_{R\mu}O_{R'\nu}|\Psi\rangle/\langle\Psi\mid\Psi\rangle$ may be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}&J^{\mu;\nu}_{R;R'}\langle\Psi|O_{R\mu}O_{R'\nu}|\Psi\rangle/\langle\Psi\mid\Psi\rangle\\&\sim J^{\mu;\nu}_{R;R'}\sum_{a,b,c,d=1}^{N}\bar{\mathcal{Z}}^{*}_{\mu ac}\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{\nu bc}\langle\Psi_0|f^{\dagger}_{Ra}f_{R'b}|\Psi_0\rangle\times\\&\times\langle\Psi_0|f^{\dagger}_{Rc}f_{R'd}|\Psi_0\rangle\\&\sim J^{\mu;\nu}_{R;R'}\cdot\frac{1}{z^{n}}.\end{aligned}\tag{B15}$$

Now there $N(n)\sim z^n$ such terms, so we have the total contribution for such terms scales as:

$$\sim J^{\mu;\nu}_{R;R'}\cdot\frac{1}{z^n}\cdot z^n\sim 1.\tag{B16}$$

In which case we have that:

$$J^{\mu;\nu}_{R;R'}\sim 1.\tag{B17}$$

c. Scaling Bosonic operator that does not change fermion number

Hartree Term Lets assume that the Hamiltonian contains $J^{\mu;\nu}_{R;R'}O_{R\mu}O_{R'\nu}$, , with $O_{R\mu}$ and $O_{R'\nu}$ bosonic and fermion number conserving, then we know that the lowest order, Hartree, term for $J^{\mu;\nu}_{R;R'}\langle\Psi|O_{R\mu}O_{R'\nu}|\Psi\rangle/\langle\Psi\mid\Psi\rangle$ may be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}&J^{\mu;\nu}_{R;R'}\langle\Psi|O_{R\mu}O_{R'\nu}|\Psi\rangle/\langle\Psi\mid\Psi\rangle\\&\sim J^{\mu;\nu}_{R;R'}\langle\Psi_0|P^{\dagger}_{R}O_{R\mu}P_{R}|\Psi_0\rangle\langle\Psi_0|P^{\dagger}_{R'}O_{R'\nu}P_{R'}|\Psi_0\rangle\\&\sim J^{\mu;\nu}_{R;R'}\end{aligned}\tag{B18}$$

Now there $\mathcal{N}(n)\sim z^n$ such terms so we have the total contribution for such terms is:

$$\sim J^{\mu;\nu}_{R;R'}\cdot z^n\sim 1\tag{B19}$$

In which case we have that:

$$J^{\mu;\nu}_{R;R'}\sim\frac{1}{z^n}\tag{B20}$$

Fock term The scaling of the Fock term may be given by:

$$\begin{aligned}&J^{\mu;\nu}_{R;R'}\langle\Psi|O_{R\mu}O_{R'\nu}|\Psi\rangle/\langle\Psi\mid\Psi\rangle\\&\sim J^{\mu;\nu}_{R;R'}\sum_{a,b,c,d=1}^{N}\mathcal{Z}^{*}_{\mu ac}\mathcal{Z}_{\nu bd}\langle\Psi_0|f^{\dagger}_{Ra}f_{R'd}|\Psi_0\rangle\times\\&\times\langle\Psi_0|f^{\dagger}_{R'c}f_{Ra}|\Psi_0\rangle\\&\sim J^{\mu;\nu}_{R;R'}\cdot\frac{1}{z^n}\sim\frac{1}{z^{2n}}.\end{aligned}\tag{B21}$$

Now there $\mathcal{N}(n)\sim z^n$ such terms so we have the total contribution for such terms is:

$$\sim J^{\mu;\nu}_{R;R'}\cdot\frac{1}{z^n}\cdot z^n\sim\frac{1}{z^n}\to 0\tag{B22}$$

This means that the Fock term is highly suppressed, however we still are able to keep its effects in the Gutzwiller Lagrange function in Eq. (73).

d. Discussion

We would like to note that these scaling arguments are very interesting from a formal and theoretical point of view, but need to be significantly modified for the case of realistic extended Hubbard model Hamiltonians. For example, the coefficients in $V^{\alpha\beta;\gamma\delta}_{R_1;R_2}$ which are proportional to a Coulomb mediated density density interaction scale as $\sim 1/\sqrt{n}$ which is not z dependent, which is markedly different then Eq. (B20). We note that the reason for the square root in the previous formula is that for $z\gg n$ the typical Manhattan path makes $n-1$ turns in different directions. Furthermore our scaling analysis shows that the order of magnitude of the density density terms is the same as those for spin spin interactions, all $V^{\alpha\beta;\gamma\delta}_{R_1;R_2}$ scale the same way with z. However because one term involves the overlap between electron wavefunctions on different sites while the other doesn't; as such the spin spin interaction is exponentially suppressed with distance while the density density is not. This is true even though the

exponent has nothing to do with the co-ordination number z but with the exponentially decaying tails of the Wannier functions used to generate the Hubbard model [81–86]. Furthermore it is almost impossible to have the pair hopping matrix elements $Y^{\alpha\beta;\gamma\delta}_{R_1;R_2}$ to be distance independent (see Eq. (B17)) as these are exponentially decaying with the decay length being given by the overlap of various Wannier functions. As such, realistic Hamiltonians do not scale exactly as in the limit that $z \to \infty$. More precisely, as the various terms in $J^{\mu;\nu}_{R_1;R_2}$, $J^{\mu;\nu;\eta}_{R_1;R_2;R_3}$ and $J^{\mu;\nu;\eta;\rho}_{R_1;R_2;R_3;R_4}$ do not follow the scaling needed for a rigorous $1/z$ expansion in realistic materials. As such we will scale each different type of term separately and maintain only leading order term or terms in the $1/z$ expansion for each type of interaction. More explicitly the terms we keep in the equivalences in Eqs. (50), (55), (56) and (66) are leading order for each individual term in the Hamiltonian in Eq. (20). We note that in Eqs. (55), (56) we keep both the Hartree and the Fock terms, despite the fact that the Fock terms are subleading. This is done because the bosonic fermion number conserving terms in the Hamiltonian in Eq. (20) are usually the biggest terms as in many cases they do not involve overlaps of Wannier functions on different sites and as such must be handled as carefully as possible. Furthermore the Hartree term is handled exactly by our formalism (see Appendix D 3 b) so no corrections to the Hartree term effect the precision to which the Fock terms may be handled.

3. Leading order in $1/z$ terms for Gutzwiller (failure of Eq. (24) without additional assumptions besides large co-ordination number)

a. *Manhattan path example*

In this section we will motivate the need for the $P^\dagger_R P_R - I$ expansion used in Section IV. We show that already at leading order Eq. (24) fails without additional assumptions, besides the Gutzwiller constraints and the $1/z$ expansion, for the extended GA presented in the main text. In particular, the usual arguments [15, 60, 61, 66**?** , 67] about the validity Eq. (24) based on the Gutzwiller constraints in Eq. (23) and the large co-ordination limit, which work for the regular Hubbard model, fails without additional assumptions, such as the $P^\dagger_R P_R - I$ expansion. We now we consider the pair hopping terms − those that change the particle number by two. We show that already at leading order for those terms Eq. (24) fails without additional assumptions, as we need terms where we insert projectors of the form $P^\dagger_{R_i} P_{R_i}$ at various sites to obtain the correct expectation value for the left hand side of Eq. (24) to make the equality true even at leading order. Indeed, if we take the pair hopping operator $J^{\mu;\nu}_{R_1;R_2} O_{R_1\mu} O_{R_2\nu}$ and consider any Manhattan path between R_1 and R_2: $P_{R_1R_2}$. Then for every Manhattan path $P_{R_1R_2}$ we may insert an arbitrary number of operators $P^\dagger_{R_i} P_{R_i}$ at any set of sites (with at most one insertion per site) along this path with and obtain an operator:




Figure 2. Manhattan path showing order one term, not considered on the right hand side of Eq. (24). Lines indicate Wick's theorem contractions.

$$J^{\mu;\nu}_{R_1R_2}[P^\dagger_{R_1} O_{R_1\mu} P_{R_1}][\prod_i P^\dagger_{R_i} P_{R_i}][P^\dagger_{R_2} O_{R_2\nu} P_{R_2}]. \quad \text{(B23)}$$

We now contract the operators along the Manhattan path with nearest neighbors being contracted with each other (two contractions per neighbor) and obtain a term on the left hand side of Eq. (24) which is of the same order of magnitude as the terms on the right hand side in Eq. (24), but not included on the right hand side (as such the equation fails). This is pictured in Fig. (2). We see that Eq. (24) fails even in the large coordination limit without additional assumptions. In Section IV we make such an assumption: the $P^\dagger_R P_R - I$ expansion.

b. *Tadpole example*

We notice that the example presented in Section B 3 a does not apply for nearest neighbor sites. Here we will show that, using just the $1/z$ expansion, the Fock terms in Eq. ((59)) have the same scaling in $1/z$ as additional multisite terms not considered on the right hand side in Eq. (24) but needed for the left hand side, making an additional assumption, such as the $P^\dagger_R P_R - I$ expansion, necessary for Eq. (24) to be true for them. We now assume that $P^\dagger_{R_1} O_{R_1} P_{R_1}$ and $P^\dagger_{R_2} O_{R_2} P_{R_2}$ are operators on nearest neighbor sites which conserve fermion number. We again consider Eq. (24) for these operators. We now consider site R_3 which is a nearest neighbor of site R_1 where there are four contractions between $P^\dagger_{R_1} O_{R_1} P_{R_1}$ and $P^\dagger_{R_3} P_{R_3}$ on the right hand side of Eq. (24). This term scales as $\sim 1/z^2$ and there are $\sim z$ such terms which means that that the total scaling of such terms is $\sim z \times 1/z^2 \sim 1/z$ which means that it has the same scaling as any Fock term on the right hand side of Eq. (24). This is true for both for bosonic fermion number




Figure 3. One site tadpole contraction (involving $P_R^\dagger P_R - I$ terms) that has the same scaling with $1/z$ as the Fock terms.




Figure 4. Two diagrams for three sites as described in the main text with a different number of contractions but the same $1/z$ scaling. Lines indicate Wick's theorem contractions.

conserving operators and bosonic fermion number changing operators (in the case of superconductivity, not considered in this work). As such an additional assumption such as the $P_R^\dagger P_R - I$ expansion is mandatory for those terms even for nearest neighbors. This is illustrated in Fig. (3).

Appendix C: Towards ab initio research

In order to perform true ab initio research one needs to deal with all of the terms in Eq. (20), not just the one and two site terms as in Eq. (26) studied in the main text. In this Appendix we outline a method to do just that.

1. The need for three Wick's contractions for calculating expectation values with three and four point operators

As a first step towards handling three and four site terms, we will describe why the treatment presented in the main text fails for them.

a. *Three site terms*

Fock contribution We would like to show an example of the need for three fermion contractions to evaluate the expectation value of the Hamiltonian in Eq. (20) for three point operators, even in leading order in the $1/z$ expansion and the $P_R^\dagger P_R - I$ expansion. Consider two single fermion operators and one bosonic operator on three neighbor sites such that R_2 (fermionic site) is the nearest neighbor of both R_1 (fermionic site) and R_3 (bosonic site). We will consider the terms $\sum_{R_1\neq R_2\neq R_3} \mathcal{V}^{\alpha\beta;\gamma;\delta}_{R_3;R_2;R_1}[c^\dagger_{R_3\alpha}c_{R_3\beta}][c^\dagger_{R_2\gamma}][c_{R_1\delta}]$ in Eq. (20) (one can check that the terms of the form $\left[\sum_{R_1\neq R_2\neq R_3} \mathcal{Y}^{\alpha\beta;\gamma;\delta}_{R_3;R_2;R_1}[c^\dagger_{R_3\alpha}c^\dagger_{R_3\beta}][c_{R_2\gamma}][c_{R_1\delta}] + h.c.\right]$ have a similar scaling problem). We now consider the Fock terms (those with atleast one contraction between each site). We now consider possible contractions relevant to this scenario. Both diagrams shown in figure 4 contribute to order $\sim \frac{1}{z^{3/2}}$ (which is leading order for the Fock term). Here we are ignoring the scaling for the prefactor for this diagram as well as the number of similar diagrams (see Appendix B 2) which is the same for both sets of contractions. However the first diagram has three contractions on the central site and therefore is higher order then we considered until now (as such we need the terms described in Section C 3 below).

Hartree terms One can check that the Hartree contribution to the terms $\sum_{R_1\neq R_2\neq R_3} \mathcal{V}^{\alpha\beta;\gamma;\delta}_{R_3;R_2;R_1}[c^\dagger_{R_3\alpha}c_{R_3\beta}][c^\dagger_{R_2\gamma}][c_{R_1\delta}]$ in Eq. (20) (the one with no contractions between the bosonic site and the two fermionic sites) does not have an inconsistency in scaling (there are no terms of the same magnitude). As such it is possible to consistently keep only the Hartree contribution for these terms. Again, one cannot keep the Fock contribution for the terms $\left[\sum_{R_1\neq R_2\neq R_3} \mathcal{Y}^{\alpha\beta;\gamma;\delta}_{R_3;R_2;R_1}[c^\dagger_{R_3\alpha}c^\dagger_{R_3\beta}][c_{R_2\gamma}][c_{R_3\delta}] + h.c.\right]$ and there is no Hartree piece. To see this clearly, note that the Hartree contribution for the example in Fig. 4 scales as $\sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{z}}$ while the Fock and the three contractions diagram scale as $\frac{1}{z^{3/2}}$ meaning that the Hartree is dominant. To keep this term, one needs only modify the Lagrange function in Section VI by changing $\mathcal{L}_{HF}$ to:

$$\mathcal{L}_{HF}\left(\{\mathcal{R}_R,\mathcal{T}_R,\mathcal{U}_R\},\{\mathcal{R}^*_R,\mathcal{T}^*_R,\mathcal{U}^*_R\},[\Delta_{R_1R_2}]_{ab},o_{R\alpha\beta}\right)=$$
$$=\sum_{R_1R_2\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}V^{\alpha\beta;\gamma\delta}_{R_1;R_2}o_{R\alpha\beta}o_{R\gamma\delta}-\sum_{R_1\neq R_2}\sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}\sum_{abcd}V^{\alpha\beta;\gamma\delta}_{R_1;R_2}\left[\Delta_{R_1R_2}\right]_{ac}\left[\Delta_{R_2R_1}\right]_{db}\left[\mathcal{T}^{\beta}_{R_1\alpha}\right]_{ba}\left[\mathcal{T}^{\delta}_{R_2\gamma}\right]_{dc}+$$
$$+\sum_{R_1\neq R_2}\sum_{\alpha>\beta\gamma>\delta}\left[Y^{\alpha\beta;\gamma\delta}_{R_1;R_2}\sum_{a>b}\sum_{c>d}\left(\left[\Delta_{R_1R_2}\right]_{ad}\left[\Delta_{R_1R_2}\right]_{bc}-\left[\Delta_{R_1R_2}\right]_{ac}\left[\Delta_{R_1R_2}\right]_{bd}\right)\left[\mathcal{U}_{R\alpha\beta}\right]_{ab}\left[\mathcal{U}^*_{R\gamma\delta}\right]_{cd}\right]+$$
$$+\sum_{R_1\neq R_2\neq R_3}\sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}\sum_{ab}\mathcal{V}^{\alpha\beta;\gamma;\delta}_{R_1;R_2,R_3}\left[\Delta_{R_2R_3}\right]_{ab}\left[\mathcal{R}_{R_2\gamma}\right]_a\left[\mathcal{R}^*_{R_3\delta}\right]_b o_{R_1\alpha\beta}. \tag{C1}$$

As compared to Eq. (78). Below we will see the problem gets worse for four site terms as there are no Hartree terms and there is no way to keep the Fock piece consistently.




Figure 5. Two diagrams for four sites as described in the main text with a different number of contractions but the same $1/z$ scaling. Lines indicate Wick's theorem contractions.

b. *Four site terms*

We would like to present an example where, despite making both the large coordination number assumption and the leading order in $P^\dagger_R P_R - I$ expansion assumption, one needs three fermion contractions to obtain the leading order term for four site operators. Consider four single fermion operators on four neighbor sites such that R_2 is nearest neighbor to R_1, R_3 and R_4 (which are all next nearest neighbors to each other). We now consider the two possible sets of contractions shown in Figure 5, both sets of contractions contribute to order $\sim \frac{1}{z^{3/2}}$ (which is leading order for this diagram). Here we are ignoring the scaling for the prefactor for this diagram as well as the number of similar diagrams, so that the total scaling for both terms can be made order ~ 1 (see Appendix B 2). However the first diagram has three contractions on the central site and therefore is higher order then we considered so far. As such we need to add three contraction terms to the site R_2 as is described in Section C 3.

2. Approximate approach

The procedure, to properly account for the terms considered in Appendix C 1, described in Appendix C 3 below, is rather cumbersome. In this Appendix in order to perform crude ab-initio research we present a simplified method to treat multisite interactions to deal with all terms in Eq. (20). To do this very quickly but crudely one needs an effective Hamiltonian much like Eq. (29) but for the generalized model given by the Hamiltonian in Eq. (20). One natural guess for such an effective Hamiltonian is that:

$$\langle\Psi_0|H_P|\Psi_0\rangle\cong\langle\Psi_0|H_{Eff}|\Psi_0\rangle. \tag{C2}$$

Where H_{Eff} is given by:

$$H_{Eff}=\sum_R P^\dagger_R H^{loc}_R P_R+\sum_{R_1\neq R_2}\sum_{\mu\nu}J^{\mu;\nu}_{R_1;R_2}\left[\sum_i\mathcal{Z}_{R_1\mu i}O_{Ri}\right]\left[\sum_j\mathcal{Z}_{R_2\nu j}O_{R'j}\right]+$$
$$+\sum_{R_1\neq R_2\neq R_3}\sum_{\mu\nu\eta}J^{\mu;\nu;\eta}_{R_1;R_2;R_3}\left[\sum_i\mathcal{Z}_{R_1\mu i}O_{Ri}\right]\left[\sum_j\mathcal{Z}_{R_2\nu j}O_{R'j}\right]\left[\sum_k\mathcal{Z}_{R_3\mu k}O_{R_3k}\right]+$$
$$+\sum_{R_1\neq R_2\neq R_3\neq R_4}\sum_{\mu\nu\eta\rho}J^{\mu;\nu;\eta;\rho}_{R_1;R_2;R_3;R_4}\left[\sum_i\mathcal{Z}_{R_1\mu i}O_{R_1i}\right]\left[\sum_j\mathcal{Z}_{R_2\nu j}O_{R_2j}\right]\left[\sum_k\mathcal{Z}_{R_3\mu k}O_{R_3k}\right]\left[\sum_l\mathcal{Z}_{R_4\rho l}O_{R_4l}\right] \tag{C3}$$

We again note that as explained in Appendices C 1 a and C 1 b this is not completely satisfactory, even for the leading order in the $P^\dagger_R P_R - I$ expansion and the leading order in the $1/z$ expansion. There are terms of the same order of

magnitude in the $1/z$ expansion as the terms in the Hamiltonian in Eq. (C3) which are missed by the Hamiltonian in Eq. (C3). However using the effective Hamiltonian in Eq. (C3) is a very simple approach and may be good enough for preliminary calculations. If this approximate approach is chosen, then the Lagrange function in Section VI need only be modified by changing $\mathcal{L}_{HF}$, which now should be given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{L}_{HF}\left(\{\mathcal{R}_R,\mathcal{T}_R,\mathcal{U}_R\},\{\mathcal{R}^*_R,\mathcal{T}^*_R,\mathcal{U}^*_R\},[\Delta_{R_1R_2}]_{ab},o_{R\alpha\beta}\right)=\\
&=\sum_{R_1R_2\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}V^{\alpha\beta;\gamma\delta}_{R_1;R_2}o_{R\alpha\beta}o_{R\gamma\delta}-\sum_{R_1\neq R_2}\sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}\sum_{abcd}V^{\alpha\beta;\gamma\delta}_{R_1;R_2}\left[\Delta_{R_1R_2}\right]_{ac}\left[\Delta_{R_2R_1}\right]_{db}\left[\mathcal{T}^{\beta}_{R_1\alpha}\right]_{ba}\left[\mathcal{T}^{\delta}_{R_2\gamma}\right]_{dc}+\\
&+\sum_{R_1\neq R_2}\sum_{\alpha>\beta\gamma>\delta}\left[Y^{\alpha\beta;\gamma\delta}_{R_1;R_2}\sum_{a>b}\sum_{c>d}\left(\left[\Delta_{R_1R_2}\right]_{ad}\left[\Delta_{R_1R_2}\right]_{bc}-\left[\Delta_{R_1R_2}\right]_{ac}\left[\Delta_{R_1R_2}\right]_{bd}\right)\left[\mathcal{U}_{R\alpha\beta}\right]_{ab}\left[\mathcal{U}^*_{R\gamma\delta}\right]_{cd}\right]+\\
&+\sum_{R_1\neq R_2\neq R_3}\sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}\sum_{ab}\mathcal{V}^{\alpha\beta;\gamma;\delta}_{R_1;R_2,R_3}\left[\Delta_{R_2R_3}\right]_{ab}\left[\mathcal{R}_{R_2\gamma}\right]_a\left[\mathcal{R}^*_{R_3\delta}\right]_b o_{R_1\alpha\beta}-\\
&-\sum_{R_1\neq R_2\neq R_3}\sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}\sum_{abcd}\mathcal{V}^{\alpha\beta;\gamma;\delta}_{R;R';R"}\left[\Delta_{R_2R_1}\right]_{cb}\left[\Delta_{R_1R_3}\right]_{ad}\left[\mathcal{R}_{R\gamma}\right]_c\left[\mathcal{R}^*_{R\delta}\right]_d\left[\mathcal{T}^{\beta}_{R\alpha}\right]_{ba}+\\
&+\sum_{R_1\neq R_2\neq R_3}\sum_{\alpha>\beta\gamma\delta}\sum_{abcd}\left[\mathcal{Y}^{\alpha\beta;\gamma;\delta}_{R;R';R"}\left(\left[\Delta_{R_1R_3}\right]_{ad}\left[\Delta_{R_1R_2}\right]_{bc}-\left[\Delta_{R_1R_2}\right]_{ac}\left[\Delta_{R_1R_3}\right]_{bd}\right)\left[\mathcal{R}_{R_2\gamma}\right]_c\left[\mathcal{R}^*_{R_3\delta}\right]_d\left[\mathcal{U}_{R\alpha\beta}\right]_{ab}+c.c.\right]+\\
&+\sum_{R_1\neq R_2\neq R_3\neq R_4}\sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}\sum_{abcd}S^{\alpha;\beta;\gamma;\delta}_{R_1;R_2;R_3;R_4}\left(\left[\Delta_{R_1R_4}\right]_{ad}\left[\Delta_{R_2R_3}\right]_{bc}-\left[\Delta_{R_1R_3}\right]_{ac}\left[\Delta_{R_2R_4}\right]_{bd}\right)\left[\mathcal{R}^*_{R_3\gamma}\right]_c\left[\mathcal{R}^*_{R_4\delta}\right]_d\left[\mathcal{R}_{R_1\alpha}\right]_a\left[\mathcal{R}_{R_2\beta}\right]_b.
\end{aligned}\tag{C4}$$

As compared to Eq. (78). With this modification the Lagrange function can be minimized directly.

3. Extended approach

A rigorous approach to the problem of three contractions outlined in Section C 1 is to replace some of the terms of the form $P^{\dagger}_R O_R P_R$ on various sites sites in our Hamiltonian (the precise sites to be chosen are explained in Section C 1) with three and four fermion terms instead of the one and two fermion terms found in the equivalences in Eqs. (50), (62), (63) and (72). This allows one to reproduce the three and four contraction terms shown in Section C 1. This approach is needed only for some of the three and four site terms in Eq. (20) and the two site analysis done previously is unaffected. One then uses the generalized equivalences which will be given below for these sites and proceeds much like in the main text. We now describe the more general equivalences needed for these three and four fermion equivalences.

a. Fermionic Equivalences

We consider fermionic single site operators $O_{R\mu}$. In Appendix D 4 a we will show that there is an equivalence :

$$P^{\dagger}_R O_{R\mu} P_R \sim \sum_a \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu a} f^{\dagger}_{Ra}+\sum_a \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^c_{R\mu ab} f^{\dagger}_{Ra} f^{\dagger}_{Rb} f_{Rc} \tag{C5}$$

and similarly for its Hermitian conjugate. In Appendix D 4 a we show that the coefficients $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^c_{R\mu ab}, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu a}$ are determined by the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle\Psi_0|\, P^{\dagger}_R O_{R\mu} P_R f_{Rd}\,|\Psi_0\rangle\\
&=\langle\Psi_0|\left[\sum_b \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu b} f^{\dagger}_{Rb}+\sum_a \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^c_{R\mu ab} f^{\dagger}_{Ra} f^{\dagger}_{Rb} f_{Rc}\right] f_{Rd}\,|\Psi_0\rangle\,;\\
&\langle\Psi_0|\, P^{\dagger}_R O_{R\mu} P_R f^{\dagger}_{Rd} f_{Re} f_{Rf}\,|\Psi_0\rangle=\\
&\langle\Psi_0|\left[\sum_b \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu b} f^{\dagger}_{Rb}+\sum_a \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^c_{R\mu ab} f^{\dagger}_{Ra} f^{\dagger}_{Rb} f_{Rc}\right]\cdot\\
&\cdot f^{\dagger}_{Rd} f_{Re} f_{Rf}\,|\Psi_0\rangle
\end{aligned}\tag{C6}$$

b. Bosonic Equivalences (fermion number conserving operators)

We consider bosonic operators that conserve fermion number. In Appendix D 4 b we show the following equivalence:

$$\begin{aligned}
P^{\dagger}_R O_{R\mu} P_R \sim &\sum_{abcd}\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{cd}_{R\mu ab} f^{\dagger}_{Ra} f^{\dagger}_{Rb} f_{Rc} f_{Rd}+\\
&+\sum_{ab}\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^b_{R\mu a} f^{\dagger}_{Ra} f_{Rb}+\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu I} I
\end{aligned}\tag{C7}$$

We show that $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{cd}_{R\mu ab}, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{d}_{R\mu c}, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu I}$ are determined by the following equations (see Appendix D 4 b):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle\Psi_0| P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R f^\dagger_{Re} f^\dagger_{Rf} f_{Rg} f_{Rh} |\Psi_0\rangle = \\
&= \langle\Psi_0| \left[\sum_{abcd} \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{cd}_{R\mu ab} f^\dagger_{Ra} f^\dagger_{Rb} f_{Rc} f_{Rd} + \right. \\
&\left. \sum_{ab} \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{b}_{R\mu a} f^\dagger_{Ra} f_{Rb} + \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu I} I \right] f^\dagger_{Re} f^\dagger_{Rf} f_{Rg} f_{Rh} |\Psi_0\rangle ; \\
&= \langle\Psi_0| P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R f^\dagger_{Re} f_{Rf} |\Psi_0\rangle = \\
&\langle\Psi_0| \left[\sum_{abcd} \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{cd}_{R\mu ab} f^\dagger_{Ra} f^\dagger_{Rb} f_{Rc} f_{Rd} \right. \\
&\left. + \sum_{ab} \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{b}_{R\mu a} f^\dagger_{Ra} f_{Rb} + \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu I} I \right] \cdot f^\dagger_{Re} f_{Rf} |\Psi_0\rangle ; \\
&\langle\Psi_0| P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R \cdot I |\Psi_0\rangle = \\
&= \langle\Psi_0| \left[\sum_{abcd} \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{cd}_{R\mu ab} f^\dagger_{Ra} f^\dagger_{Rb} f_{Rc} f_{Rd} + \right. \\
&\left. \sum_{ab} \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{b}_{R\mu a} f^\dagger_{Ra} f_{Rb} + \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu I} I \right] \cdot I |\Psi_0\rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{C8}$$

c. Bosonic Equivalences (fermion number changing operators)

We now consider bosonic operators that change the total number of electrons by two, such as pair hopping terms. In Appendix D 4 c we show that:

$$P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R \sim \sum_{ab} \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu ab} f^\dagger_{Ra} f^\dagger_{Rb} + \sum_{ab} \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{d}_{R\mu abc} f^\dagger_{Ra} f^\dagger_{Rb} f^\dagger_{Rc} f_{Rd} \tag{C9}$$

and similarly for its complex conjugate. We show that $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{d}_{R\mu abc}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu ab}$ are determined by the following equations (see Appendix D 4 b):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle\Psi_0| P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R f^\dagger_{Re} f_{Rf} f_{Rg} f_{Rh} |\Psi_0\rangle = \\
&= \langle\Psi_0| \left[\sum_{ab} \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu ab} f^\dagger_{Ra} f^\dagger_{Rb} + \sum_{ab} \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu ab} f^\dagger_{Ra} f^\dagger_{Rb} f^\dagger_{Rc} f_{Rd} \right] \cdot \\
&\cdot f^\dagger_{Re} f_{Rf} f_{Rg} f_{Rh} |\Psi_0\rangle ; \\
&\langle\Psi_0| P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R f_{Re} f_{Rf} |\Psi_0\rangle = \\
&= \langle\Psi_0| \left[\sum_{ab} \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu ab} f^\dagger_{Ra} f^\dagger_{Rb} + \sum_{ab} \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu ab} f^\dagger_{Ra} f^\dagger_{Rb} f^\dagger_{Rc} f_{Rd} \right] \cdot \\
&\cdot f_{Re} f_{Rf} |\Psi_0\rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{C10}$$

Appendix D: Derivations of equivalence relations

1. Useful identities

In this section we drop the index R as only one site is considered and $\Delta = \Delta_{R,R}$. Below to derive the Lagrangian in Section D 3 we will need the functions:

$$\begin{aligned}
Tr\left\{\rho_0 O_i O_j\right\} &= F_{i;j}\left(\Delta\right) \\
\frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho_0}} O_i \sqrt{\rho_0} &= \sum_k \mathcal{G}_{i;k}\left(\Delta\right) O_k
\end{aligned} \tag{D1}$$

For $O_i \subset I, f_a, f_a^\dagger, f_a^\dagger f_b, f_a f_b, f_a^\dagger f_b^\dagger$. Indeed we have by Wick's theorem:

$$\begin{aligned}
Tr\left\{\rho_0 f_a^\dagger f_b\right\} =& \Delta_{ab} \\
Tr\left\{\rho_0 f_a f_b^\dagger\right\} =& \left(\mathbb{I} - \Delta\right)_{ba} \\
Tr\left\{\rho_0 f_a^\dagger f_b f_c^\dagger f_d\right\} =& \Delta_{ab}\Delta_{cd} + \Delta_{ac}\left(\mathbb{I} - \Delta\right)_{db} \\
Tr\left\{\rho_0 f_a^\dagger f_b^\dagger f_c f_d\right\} =& -\Delta_{ac}\Delta_{bd} + \Delta_{ad}\Delta_{bc} \\
Tr\left\{\rho_0 f_a f_b f_c^\dagger f_d^\dagger\right\} =& -\left(\mathbb{I} - \Delta\right)_{ca}\left(\mathbb{I} - \Delta\right)_{db} \\
&+ \left(\mathbb{I} - \Delta\right)_{da}\left(\mathbb{I} - \Delta\right)_{cb}
\end{aligned} \tag{D2}$$

We further have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho_0}} f_a \sqrt{\rho_0} &= \sum_b \left[\frac{\Delta^T}{\mathbb{I} - \Delta^T}\right]^{1/2}_{ab} f_b \\
\frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho_0}} f_a^\dagger \sqrt{\rho_0} &= \sum_b \left[\frac{\mathbb{I} - \Delta^T}{\Delta^T}\right]^{1/2}_{ba} f_b^\dagger \\
\frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho_0}} f_a^\dagger f_b \sqrt{\rho_0} &= \sum_{cd} \left[\frac{\Delta^T}{\mathbb{I} - \Delta^T}\right]^{1/2}_{bd} \left[\frac{\mathbb{I} - \Delta^T}{\Delta^T}\right]^{1/2}_{ca} f_c^\dagger f_d \\
\frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho_0}} f_a^\dagger f_b^\dagger \sqrt{\rho_0} &= \sum_{cd} \left[\frac{\mathbb{I} - \Delta^T}{\Delta^T}\right]^{1/2}_{ca} \left[\frac{\mathbb{I} - \Delta^T}{\Delta^T}\right]^{1/2}_{db} f_c^\dagger f_d^\dagger \\
\frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho_0}} f_a f_b \sqrt{\rho_0} &= \sum_{cd} \left[\frac{\Delta^T}{\mathbb{I} - \Delta^T}\right]^{1/2}_{ac} \left[\frac{\Delta^T}{\mathbb{I} - \Delta^T}\right]^{1/2}_{bd} f_c f_d
\end{aligned} \tag{D3}$$

Where repetitive use of Eq. (32) has been made. Explicitly this means that:

2. Operators in the embedding mapping

$$\mathcal{G}_{f_a;f_b}(\Delta)=\left[\frac{\Delta^T}{\mathbb{I}-\Delta^T}\right]^{1/2}_{ab}$$
$$\mathcal{G}_{f_a^\dagger;f_b^\dagger}(\Delta)=\left[\frac{\mathbb{I}-\Delta^T}{\Delta^T}\right]^{1/2}_{ba}$$
$$\mathcal{G}_{f_a^\dagger f_b;f_c^\dagger f_d}(\Delta)=\left[\frac{\Delta^T}{\mathbb{I}-\Delta^T}\right]^{1/2}_{bd}\left[\frac{\mathbb{I}-\Delta^T}{\Delta^T}\right]^{1/2}_{ca}$$
$$\mathcal{G}_{f_a^\dagger f_b^\dagger;f_c^\dagger f_d^\dagger}(\Delta)=\left[\frac{\mathbb{I}-\Delta^T}{\Delta^T}\right]^{1/2}_{ca}\left[\frac{\mathbb{I}-\Delta^T}{\Delta^T}\right]^{1/2}_{db}$$
$$\mathcal{G}_{f_af_b;f_cf_d}(\Delta)=\left[\frac{\Delta^T}{\mathbb{I}-\Delta^T}\right]^{1/2}_{ac}\left[\frac{\Delta^T}{\mathbb{I}-\Delta^T}\right]^{1/2}_{bd} \tag{D4}$$

In this section we have suppressed the site index R in our notation as we will be dealing with a single site only. We would like to show that:

$$Tr\left[\phi^\dagger O_\mu\phi O_i\right]=\langle\Phi|\hat{O}_\mu\hat{O}_i^R|\Phi\rangle\exp\left[i\frac{\pi}{2}\left[\left[N(n')-N(n)\right]^2-\left[N(n')-N(n)\right]\right]\right] \tag{D5}$$

Here we define:

$$O_i=\prod_{i=0}^{m}f_{a_i}^{(\dagger)},\ \hat{O}_i^R=\prod_{i=0}^{m}\hat{f}_{a_{m-i}}^{(\dagger)} \tag{D6}$$

and

$$O_\mu=\prod_{i=0}^{K}c_{\alpha_i}^{(\dagger)},\ \hat{O}_\mu=\prod_{i=0}^{K}\hat{c}_{\alpha_i}^{(\dagger)}$$

Here R stands for reverse order. Here $(\dagger)$ means that there may or may not be Hermitian conjugation (so that Eq. (D5) can be used to handle strings of both creation and annihilation operators). We have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle\Phi|\hat{O}_\mu\hat{O}_i|\Phi\rangle\\
&=\sum_{n',\Gamma'}\langle\hat{n}'|\left\langle\hat{\Gamma}'\right|\phi^*_{n'\Gamma'}\hat{O}_\mu\times\\
&\times\sum_{\Gamma,n}\phi_{\Gamma n}U^\dagger_{PH}\hat{O}_iU_{PH}\left|\hat{\Gamma}\right\rangle|\hat{n}\rangle\exp\left(i\frac{\pi}{2}N(n)(N(n)-1)\right)\\
&\times\exp\left(-i\frac{\pi}{2}N(n')(N(n')-1)\right)\\
&=\sum_{n',\Gamma'}\sum_{\Gamma,n}\phi_{\Gamma n}\langle\hat{n}'|\left\langle\hat{\Gamma}'\right|\phi^*_{n'\Gamma'}\hat{O}_\mu\hat{O}_i^{R\dagger}\left|\hat{\Gamma}\right\rangle|\hat{n}\rangle\times\exp\left(i\frac{\pi}{2}N(n)(N(n)-1)\right)\\
&\times\exp\left(-i\frac{\pi}{2}N(n')(N(n')-1)\right)\\
&=\sum_{n',\Gamma'}\sum_{\Gamma,n}\exp\left(i\frac{\pi}{2}N(n)(N(n)-1)-i\frac{\pi}{2}N(n')(N(n')-1)\right)(-1)^{[N(\Gamma)][m+1]}\\
&\times\phi^*_{n'\Gamma'}\phi_{\Gamma n}\times\left\langle\hat{\Gamma}'\right|\hat{O}_\mu\left|\hat{\Gamma}\right\rangle\langle\hat{n}'|\hat{O}_i^{R\dagger}|\hat{n}\rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{D7}$$

Now we have that:

$$N(\Gamma)=N(n) \tag{D8}$$

This means that $(-1)^{[N(\Gamma)][m+1]}=(-1)^{[N(n)][m+1]}$. Furthermore we have that:

$$m+1=N(n')-N(n)\,[mod\,2] \tag{D9}$$

This means that

$$= \exp\left(i\frac{\pi}{2}N(n)(N(n)-1) - i\frac{\pi}{2}N(n')(N(n')-1)\right)(-1)^{[N(\Gamma)][m+1]}$$
$$= \exp\left[i\frac{\pi}{2}\left[N(n)(N(n)-1) - N(n')(N(n')-1) - 2[N(n')-N(n)][N(n)]\right]\right] \quad \text{(D10)}$$

We now write:

$$N(n') = N(n) + [N(n') - N(n)] \quad \text{(D11)}$$

This means that:

$$\exp\left[i\frac{\pi}{2}\left[N(n)(N(n)-1) - N(n')(N(n')-1)\right.\right.$$
$$\left.\left.-2[N(n')-N(n)][N(n)]\right]\right]$$
$$= \exp\left[i\frac{\pi}{2}\left[[N(n')-N(n)]^2 - [N(n')-N(n)]\right]\right]$$
$$= \begin{cases} 1, & N(n')-N(n) = 0\,[mod\,4] \\ 1, & N(n')-N(n) = 1\,[mod\,4] \\ -1, & N(n')-N(n) = 2\,[mod\,4] \\ -1, & N(n')-N(n) = 3\,[mod\,4] \end{cases} \quad \text{(D12)}$$

We now write:

$$\langle\Phi|\hat{O}_\mu\hat{O}_i|\Phi\rangle$$
$$= \sum_{n',\Gamma'}\sum_{\Gamma,n}\exp\left[i\frac{\pi}{2}\left[[N(n')-N(n)]^2 - [N(n')-N(n)]\right]\right]$$
$$\times\phi^*_{n'\Gamma'}\phi_{\Gamma n}\times\left\langle\hat{\Gamma}'\right|\hat{O}_\mu\left|\hat{\Gamma}\right\rangle\langle\hat{n}'|\hat{O}_i^{R\dagger}|\hat{n}\rangle$$
$$= Tr\left[\phi^\dagger O_\mu\phi O_i^R\right]\times$$
$$\times\exp\left[i\frac{\pi}{2}\left[[N(n')-N(n)]^2 - [N(n')-N(n)]\right]\right] \quad \text{(D13)}$$

and relation (D5) follows. We have also assumed that $\langle n'|\hat{O}_i^{R\dagger}|n\rangle = \langle n|\hat{O}^R|n'\rangle$, e.g. the operator $\hat{O}_i^R$ is real, however all operators of the form in Eq. (D6) are of this form.

3. Derivations of equivalence relations

We will focus on the case of two point operators. The general case in Eq. (29) can not be done similarly, as was shown in Appendix C 1.

a. *Fermionic operators*

Equivalence results By Wicks theorem in the limit of large dimensions we may write that:

$$\langle\Psi_0|P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu}P_R P_{R'}^\dagger O_{R'\nu}P_{R'}|\Psi_0\rangle =$$
$$= [P_R^\dagger\overbrace{O_{R\mu}P_R][P_{R'}^\dagger O_{R'\nu}}P_{R'}]$$
$$\times\left(1+O\left(\frac{1}{z}\right)\right) \quad \text{(D14)}$$

Where $[P_R^\dagger\overbrace{O_{R\mu}P_R][P_{R'}^\dagger O_{R'\nu}}P_{R'}]$ means perform all intrasite contractions and then a single intersite contractions between R and R'. Terms with more then one contraction between R and R' are higher order in $1/z$. We may write that [15, 60, 61, 65–67]:

$$[P_R^\dagger\overbrace{O_{R\mu}P_R][P_{R'}^\dagger O_{R'\nu}}P_{R'}]$$
$$= \sum_{ab}T_{R\mu a}T_{R'\nu b}\left\langle f_{Ra}^\dagger f_{R'b}\right\rangle \quad \text{(D15)}$$

For some coefficients $T_{R\mu a}$. Indeed to obtain the expectation in the first line of Eq. (D14) we can contract the operators $P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu}P_R$ and $P_{R'}^\dagger O_{R'\nu}P_{R'}$ in all possible ways while leaving only one operator uncontracted. We can then write contractions between the two remaining single fermion terms. Since this is a well defined procedure there is unique $T_{R\mu a}$, $T_{R'\nu b}$ that represent the final states after all but one of the contractions have been made. As such to derive that Eq. (29) is reproduced to order $1/z$ we need only show that:

$$\mathcal{Z}_{R\mu a} = T_{R\mu a} \quad \text{(D16)}$$

However we have that:

$$\langle\Psi_0|\left[\sum_a\mathcal{Z}_{R\mu a}f_{Ra}^\dagger\right]f_{Rb}|\Psi_0\rangle$$
$$= \langle\Psi_0|P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu}P_R f_{Rb}|\Psi_0\rangle =$$
$$= \langle\Psi_0|\left[\sum_a T_{R\mu a}f_{Ra}^\dagger\right]f_{Rb}|\Psi_0\rangle. \quad \text{(D17)}$$

From which Eq. (D16) follows.

solutions to equivalence relations In this Appendix we have suppressed the site index R in our notation as we will be dealing with a single site only and $\Delta = \Delta_{R,R}$. We will also not distinguish between linear operators and their matrices in the natural basis. We know that the equivalence relationship may be written as:

$$Tr\left[\sqrt{\rho_0}P_R^\dagger O_\mu P_R f_a\sqrt{\rho_0}\right] = \sum_b\mathcal{Z}_{\mu b}\left\langle f_b^\dagger f_a\right\rangle \quad \text{(D18)}$$

We have that

$$\sum_b\mathcal{Z}_{\mu b}\left\langle f_b^\dagger f_a\right\rangle = \sum_b\mathcal{Z}_{\mu b}\Delta_{ba} \quad \text{(D19)}$$

Furthermore using the results in Section D 1:

$$Tr\left[\sqrt{\rho_0}P_R^\dagger O_\mu P_R f_a\sqrt{\rho_0}\right] = \sum_b \left[\frac{\Delta}{\mathbb{I}-\Delta}\right]_{ba}^{1/2} Tr\left[\phi^\dagger O_\mu \phi f_b\right] \quad \text{(D20)}$$

$$\equiv \Gamma\sqrt{\frac{\Delta}{\mathbb{I}-\Delta}} \quad \text{(D21)}$$

Here Γ_b is the vector $\left[\phi^\dagger O_\mu \phi f_b\right]$ and we are using matrix notation. We now have that in matrix notation

$$\mathcal{Z}_\mu\Delta = \Gamma\sqrt{\frac{\Delta}{\mathbb{I}-\Delta}}$$
$$\mathcal{Z}_{\mu a} = \sum_b Tr\left[\phi^\dagger O_\mu \phi f_b\right]\left[\frac{1}{(\mathbb{I}-\Delta)\Delta}\right]_{ba}^{1/2} \quad \text{(D22)}$$

Now using Eq. (D5) we have Eq. (52) follows. Or alternatively:

$$\left[\mathcal{Z}\left[(\mathbb{I}-\Delta)\Delta\right]^{1/2}\right]_b = Tr\left[\phi^\dagger O_\mu \phi f_b\right] \quad \text{(D23)}$$

We note that by the complex conjugation property in Eq. (E7) we have that:

$$\hat{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mu^\dagger a} = \mathcal{Z}^*_{\mu a} = \Gamma^\dagger_\mu\sqrt{\frac{\Delta^*}{\mathbb{I}-\Delta^*}}$$
$$= \sum_b Tr\left[\phi^\dagger O_\mu^\dagger \phi f_b^\dagger\right]\left[\frac{1}{(\mathbb{I}-\Delta^T)\Delta^T}\right]_{ab}^{1/2} \quad \text{(D24)}$$

Here we have used the following notation:

$$P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu^\dagger}^\dagger P_R \sim \sum_a \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu^\dagger a} f_{Ra}.$$

b. *Bosonic operators with same number of creation operators as annihilation operators*

Equivalence results We would like to make Eq. (29) more precise. Explicitly below we show that the Gutzwiller equivalences are set up so that if $P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R \sim \sum_i \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu i} O_{Ri}$ then:

$$\langle\Psi_0| P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R P_{R'}^\dagger O_{R'\nu} P_{R'} |\Psi_0\rangle_{Hartree} =$$
$$= \langle\Psi_0|\left[\sum_i \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu i} O_{Ri}\right]\left[\sum_j \mathcal{Z}_{R'\nu j} O_{R'j}\right]|\Psi_0\rangle_{Hartree} \quad \text{(D25)}$$

with no corrections of any form. Here $Hartree$ means that only intersite Wick contractions are done [53]. Furthermore we will show that the Fock term only renormalizes weakly:

$$\langle\Psi_0| P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R P_{R'}^\dagger O_{R'\nu} P_{R'} |\Psi_0\rangle_{Fock} =$$
$$= \langle\Psi_0|\left[\sum_i \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu i} O_{Ri}\right]\left[\sum_j \mathcal{Z}_{R'\nu j} O_{R'j}\right]|\Psi_0\rangle_{Fock} \times$$
$$\times\left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{z}\right)\right) \quad \text{(D26)}$$

Here $Fock$ means that there are two or more intersite Wick contraction[53] (or equivalently all the terms not included in the $Hartree$ piece). Here z is the number of nearest neighbors. In some sense the Gutzwiller equivalence procedure is designed to change as little of the expectation values as possible and use the simplest operators possible to do so [15, 60, 61, 66, 67].

Hartree contributions We would like to show that the Hartree contribution to correlation functions does not renormalize under the equivalences in Eq. (54). For this we first consider the equation (see Eq. (54):

$$Tr\left[\rho_{R0} P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R \cdot I\right] =$$
$$Tr\left[\rho_{R0}\left[\sum_{cd} \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu dc} f_{Rc}^\dagger f_{Rd} + \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu I} I\right]\cdot I\right] \quad \text{(D27)}$$

That says that trace of an operator with respect to the non-interacting density matrix is preserved under equivalences. This means that the Hartree term does not renormalize under these equivalences, indeed the Hartree term may be written as:

$$\langle\Psi_0| P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R P_{R'}^\dagger O_{R'\nu} P_{R'} |\Psi_0\rangle_{Hartree}$$
$$= Tr\left\{\rho_{R,0} P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R\right\}\cdot Tr\left\{\rho_{R',0} P_{R'}^\dagger O_{R'\nu} P_{R'}\right\}$$
$$= Tr\left[\rho_{R,0}\left[\sum_{cd} \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu dc} f_{Rc}^\dagger f_{Rd} + \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu I} I\right]\right]\times$$
$$\times Tr\left[\rho_{R'0}\left[\sum_{cd} \mathcal{Z}_{R'\nu dc} f_{R'c}^\dagger f_{R'd} + \mathcal{Z}_{R'\nu I} I\right]\right]$$
$$= \langle\Psi_0|\left[\sum_{cd} \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu dc} f_{Rc}^\dagger f_{Rc} + \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu I} I\right]\times$$
$$\times\left[\sum_{cd} \mathcal{Z}_{R'\nu dc} f_{R'c}^\dagger f_{R'd} + \mathcal{Z}_{R'\nu I} I\right]|\Psi_0\rangle_{Hartree}$$

Which shows explicitly that in all cases the Hartree term does not renormalize. We will see below that the Fock does. However due to operator mixing and Eqs. 54 the Fock term only renormalizes by factors of order $1/z$ see Section D 3 b.

Fock contributions Consider bosonic operators with an equal number of creation and annihilation operators: $O_{R\mu}$ and $O_{R'\nu}$. By Wicks theorem in the limit of large

dimensions we may write that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle\Psi_0|\, P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R P_{R'}^\dagger O_{R'\nu} P_{R'}\,|\Psi_0\rangle = \\
&= \langle\Psi_0|\, P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R P_{R'}^\dagger O_{R'\nu} P_{R'}\,|\Psi_0\rangle_{Hartree} + \\
&+ [P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R^\dagger][P_{R'}^\dagger O_{R'\nu} P_{R'}]\times \\
&\times \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{z}\right)\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{D28}$$

Where $[P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R^\dagger][P_{R'}^\dagger O_{R'\nu} P_{R'}]$ means perform all intrasite contractions and then two intersite contractions between R and R'. Terms with more then two contractions between R and R' are higher order in $1/z$. We may write that [15, 60, 65**?** –67]:

$$\begin{aligned}
&[P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R^\dagger][P_{R'}^\dagger O_{R'\nu} P_{R'}] \\
&= \sum_{abcd} T_{R\mu ba} T_{R'\nu dc} \left\langle f_{Ra}^\dagger f_{Rb} f_{R'c}^\dagger f_{R'd} \right\rangle_{Fock}
\end{aligned} \tag{D29}$$

For some coefficients $T_{R\mu ba}$. Indeed to obtain the expectation in the first line of Eq. (D14) we can contract the operators $P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R$ and $P_{R'}^\dagger O_{R'\nu} P_{R'}$ in all possible ways while leaving only two operator uncontracted. We can then write contractions between the four remaining single fermion terms. Since this is a well defined procedure there is unique $T_{R\mu ba}$, $T_{R'\nu dc}$ that represent the final states after all but two of the contractions have been made. Now the Hartree terms in Eq. (D28) are exactly reproduced by Eq. (D25) as derived in Section D 3 b, as such we need only derive that the Fock terms are reproduced to order $1/z$ or:

$$\mathcal{Z}_{R\mu ba} = T_{R\mu ba} \tag{D30}$$

However we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \langle\Psi_0|\left[\sum_{ab} \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu ba} f_a^\dagger f_b + \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu I} I\right]|\Psi_0\rangle \langle\Psi_0|\, f_{Rc}^\dagger f_{Rd}\,|\Psi_0\rangle \\
&+ \langle\Psi_0|\left[\sum_{ab} \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu ba} f_a^\dagger f_b + \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu I} I\right] f_{Rc}^\dagger f_{Rd}\,|\Psi_0\rangle_{Fock} \\
&= \langle\Psi_0|\, P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R f_{Rc}^\dagger f_{Rc}\,|\Psi_0\rangle = \\
&= \langle\Psi_0|\, P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R\,|\Psi_0\rangle \langle\Psi_0|\, f_{Rc}^\dagger f_{Rc}\,|\Psi_0\rangle \\
&+ \langle\Psi_0|\left[\sum_{ab} T_{R\mu ba} f_{Ra}^\dagger f_{Rb}\right] f_{Rc}^\dagger f_{Rd}\,|\Psi_0\rangle_{Fock} \\
&= \langle\Psi_0|\left[\sum_{ab} \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu ba} f_{Ra}^\dagger f_{Rb} + \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu I} I\right]|\Psi_0\rangle \langle\Psi_0|\, f_{Rc}^\dagger f_{Rd}\,|\Psi_0\rangle \\
&+ \langle\Psi_0|\left[\sum_{ab} T_{R\mu ba} f_{Ra}^\dagger f_{Rb} + \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu I} I\right] f_{Rc}^\dagger f_{Rd}\,|\Psi_0\rangle_{Fock}
\end{aligned} \tag{D31}$$

From which Eq. (D30) follows.

Solutions to equivalence relations In this Appendix we have suppressed the site index R in our notation as we will be dealing with a single site only and $\Delta = \Delta_{R,R}$. We will also not distinguish between linear operators and their matrices in the natural basis. With this definition due to the relations in Section D 3 b we know that the equivalence relationship may be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}
&Tr\left[\sqrt{\rho_0} P_R^\dagger O_\mu P_R f_a^\dagger f_b \sqrt{\rho_0}\right] \\
&= Tr\left[\sqrt{\rho_0} P_R^\dagger O_\mu P_R \sqrt{\rho_0}\right] \cdot Tr\left[\rho_0 f_a^\dagger f_b\right] && \text{(D32)} \\
&+ \sum_{\gamma\delta} \mathcal{Z}_{\mu dc} \left\langle f_c^\dagger f_d f_a^\dagger f_b \right\rangle_{Fock} && \text{(D33)}
\end{aligned}$$

We now have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&Tr\left[\sqrt{\rho_0} P_R^\dagger O_\mu P_R \sqrt{\rho_0}\right] \cdot Tr\left[\rho_0 f_a^\dagger f_b\right] \\
&= Tr\left[\phi^\dagger O_\mu \phi\right] \cdot \Delta_{ab}
\end{aligned} \tag{D34}$$

Furthermore we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\gamma\delta} \mathcal{Z}_{\mu dc} \left\langle f_c^\dagger f_d f_a^\dagger f_b \right\rangle_{Fock} &= \sum_{\gamma\delta} \mathcal{Z}_{\mu dc} \Delta_{cb} \left(\mathbb{I} - \Delta_{ad}\right) \\
&= \left[\left(\mathbb{I} - \Delta\right) \mathcal{Z}_\mu \Delta\right]_{ab}
\end{aligned} \tag{D35}$$

Furthermore by the results of Section D 1 we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&Tr\left[\sqrt{\rho_0} P_R^\dagger O_\mu P_R f_a^\dagger f_b \sqrt{\rho_0}\right] \\
&= \sum_\delta \left[\frac{\Delta}{\mathbb{I} - \Delta}\right]_{db}^{1/2} \sum_\gamma \left[\frac{\mathbb{I} - \Delta}{\Delta}\right]_{ac}^{1/2} Tr\left[\phi^\dagger O_\mu \phi f_c^\dagger f_d\right] \\
&= \sum_\delta \left[\frac{\Delta}{\mathbb{I} - \Delta}\right]_{db}^{1/2} \sum_\gamma \left[\frac{\mathbb{I} - \Delta}{\Delta}\right]_{ac}^{1/2} \Upsilon_{cd} \\
&= \left[\sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{I} - \Delta}{\Delta}} \Upsilon \sqrt{\frac{\Delta}{\mathbb{I} - \Delta}}\right]_{ab}
\end{aligned} \tag{D36}$$

Here we have defined the matrix $\Upsilon_{cd} = Tr\left[\phi^\dagger O_\mu \phi f_c^\dagger f_d\right]$. This means that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\mathbb{I} - \Delta\right) \mathcal{Z}_\mu \Delta = &\sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{I} - \Delta}{\Delta}} \Upsilon \sqrt{\frac{\Delta}{\mathbb{I} - \Delta}} \\
&- Tr\left[\phi^\dagger O_\mu \phi\right] \cdot \Delta
\end{aligned} \tag{D37}$$

Or equivalently

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Z}_\mu = &\sqrt{\frac{1}{\left(\mathbb{I} - \Delta\right)\Delta}} \Upsilon \sqrt{\frac{1}{\left(\mathbb{I} - \Delta\right)\Delta}} \\
&- Tr\left[\phi^\dagger O_\mu \phi\right] \frac{\mathbb{I}}{\left(\mathbb{I} - \Delta\right)}
\end{aligned} \tag{D38}$$

Furthermore we have that in index notation:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Z}_{\mu dc} = &\sum_{ab} \left[\frac{1}{\left(\mathbb{I} - \Delta\right)\Delta}\right]_{da}^{1/2} \times Tr\left[\phi^\dagger O_\mu \phi f_a^\dagger f_b\right] \times \\
&\times \left[\frac{1}{\left(\mathbb{I} - \Delta\right)\Delta}\right]_{bc}^{1/2} - Tr\left[\phi^\dagger O_\mu \phi\right] \cdot \left[\frac{\mathbb{I}}{\left(\mathbb{I} - \Delta\right)}\right]_{dc}
\end{aligned} \tag{D39}$$

Now using Eq. (D5) we have Eqs. (62) and (63) follow. Or alternatively:

$$\begin{aligned}&\left[\left(\left(\mathbb{I}-\Delta\right)\Delta\right)^{1/2}\mathcal{Z}\left[\left(\mathbb{I}-\Delta\right)\Delta\right]^{1/2}\right]_{ab}\\&=Tr\left[\phi^{\dagger}O_{\mu}\phi f_{a}^{\dagger}f_{b}\right]\\&-Tr\left[\phi^{\dagger}O_{\mu}\phi\right]\cdot\left[\Delta\right]_{ab}\end{aligned}\tag{D40}$$

Furthermore we have that

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\mu I}=Tr\left[\phi^{\dagger}O_{\mu}\phi\right]-\sum_{\gamma\delta}\mathcal{Z}_{\mu dc}\Delta_{cd}\tag{D41}$$

c. *Bosonic operators with two more creation operators then annihilation operators*

Equivalence results By Wicks theorem in the limit of large dimensions we may write that:

$$\begin{aligned}&\overbrace{\left\langle\Psi_{0}\right|P_{R}^{\dagger}O_{R\mu}P_{R}P_{R'}^{\dagger}O_{R'\nu}P_{R'}\left|\Psi_{0}\right\rangle}=\\&=\overbrace{[P_{R}^{\dagger}O_{R\mu}\overbrace{P_{R}^{\dagger}}][P_{R'}^{\dagger}}O_{R'\nu}\,P_{R'}]\\&\times\left(1+O\left(\frac{1}{z}\right)\right)\end{aligned}\tag{D42}$$

Where $\overbrace{[P_{R}^{\dagger}O_{R\mu}\overbrace{P_{R}^{\dagger}}][P_{R'}^{\dagger}}O_{R'\nu}\,P_{R'}]$ means perform all intrasite contractions and then two intersite contractions between R and R'. Terms with more then two contraction between R and R' are higher order in $1/z$. We may write that [15, 60, 61, 65–67]:

$$\begin{aligned}&\overbrace{[P_{R}^{\dagger}O_{R\mu}\overbrace{P_{R}^{\dagger}}][P_{R'}^{\dagger}}O_{R'\nu}\,P_{R'}]\\&=\sum_{abcd}T_{R\mu ab}T_{R'\nu cd}\left\langle f_{Ra}^{\dagger}f_{Rb}^{\dagger}f_{R'c}f_{R'd}\right\rangle\end{aligned}\tag{D43}$$

For some coefficients $T_{R\mu ab}$. Indeed to obtain the expectation in the first line of Eq. (D14) we can contract the operators $P_{R}^{\dagger}O_{R\mu}P_{R}$ and $P_{R'}^{\dagger}O_{R'\nu}P_{R'}$ in all possible ways while leaving only two operator uncontracted. We can then write contractions between the four remaining single fermion terms. Since this is a well defined procedure there is unique $T_{R\mu ab}$, $T_{R'\nu cd}$ that represent the final states after all but two of the contractions have been made. As such to derive that Eq. (29) is reproduced to order $1/z$ we need to show that:

$$\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu ab}=T_{R\mu ab}\tag{D44}$$

However we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\langle\Psi_{0}\right|\left[\sum_{ab}\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu ab}c_{Ra}^{\dagger}c_{Rb}^{\dagger}\right]c_{Rc}c_{Rd}\left|\Psi_{0}\right\rangle\\&=\left\langle\Psi_{0}\right|P_{R}^{\dagger}O_{R\mu}P_{R}c_{Rc}c_{Rd}\left|\Psi_{0}\right\rangle=\\&=\left\langle\Psi_{0}\right|\left[\sum_{ab}T_{R\mu ab}c_{Ra}^{\dagger}c_{Rb}^{\dagger}\right]c_{Rc}c_{Rd}\left|\Psi_{0}\right\rangle\end{aligned}\tag{D45}$$

From which Eq. (D44) follows.

Solutions to equivalence relations In this Appendix we have suppressed the site index R in our notation as we will be dealing with a single site only and $\Delta=\Delta_{R,R}$. We will also not distinguish between linear operators and their matrices in the natural basis. We know that the equivalence relationship may be written as:

$$Tr\left[\sqrt{\rho_{0}}P_{R}^{\dagger}O_{\mu}P_{R}f_{a}f_{b}\sqrt{\rho_{0}}\right]=\sum_{c>d}\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mu cd}\left\langle f_{c}^{\dagger}f_{d}^{\dagger}f_{a}f_{b}\right\rangle_{Fock}\tag{D46}$$

Now we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{c>d}\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mu cd}\left\langle f_{c}^{\dagger}f_{d}^{\dagger}f_{a}f_{b}\right\rangle_{Fock}&=\sum_{c>c}\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mu cc}\times\\&\times\left(-\Delta_{ca}\Delta_{db}+\Delta_{cb}\Delta_{da}\right)\end{aligned}\tag{D47}$$

Now define:

$$\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mu cd}=-\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mu dc}\tag{D48}$$

This means that:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{c>d}\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mu cd}\left\langle f_{c}^{\dagger}f_{d}^{\dagger}f_{a}f_{b}\right\rangle_{Fock}&=\sum_{cd}\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mu cd}\Delta_{cb}\Delta_{da}\\&=\left[\Delta^{T}\mathcal{Z}_{\mu}\Delta\right]_{ab}\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore by the results of Section D 1 we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}&Tr\left[\sqrt{\rho_{0}}P_{R}^{\dagger}O_{\mu}P_{R}f_{a}f_{b}\sqrt{\rho_{0}}\right]\\&=\sum_{\gamma}\left[\frac{\Delta^{T}}{\mathbb{I}-\Delta^{T}}\right]_{ac}^{1/2}\sum_{\delta}\left[\frac{\Delta^{T}}{\mathbb{I}-\Delta^{T}}\right]_{bd}^{1/2}Tr\left[\phi^{\dagger}O_{\mu}\phi f_{c}f_{d}\right]\\&=\sum_{\gamma}\left[\frac{\Delta^{T}}{\mathbb{I}-\Delta^{T}}\right]_{ac}^{1/2}\sum_{\delta}\left[\frac{\Delta^{T}}{\mathbb{I}-\Delta^{T}}\right]_{bd}^{1/2}\Omega_{cd}\\&=\left[\sqrt{\frac{\Delta^{T}}{\mathbb{I}-\Delta^{T}}}\cdot\Omega\cdot\sqrt{\frac{\Delta}{\mathbb{I}-\Delta}}\right]_{ab}\end{aligned}\tag{D49}$$

Here we have defined the matrix $\Omega_{cd}=Tr\left[\phi^{\dagger}O_{\mu}\phi f_{c}f_{d}\right]$. This means that

$$\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mu}=\sqrt{\frac{1}{\left(\mathbb{I}-\Delta^{T}\right)\Delta^{T}}}\cdot\Omega\cdot\sqrt{\frac{1}{\left(\mathbb{I}-\Delta\right)\Delta}}\tag{D50}$$

Or equivalently

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mu ab}=\sum_{cd}&\left[\frac{1}{\left(\mathbb{I}-\Delta^{T}\right)\Delta^{T}}\right]_{ac}^{1/2}\cdot\\&Tr\left[\phi^{\dagger}O_{\mu}\phi f_{c}f_{d}\right]\cdot\left[\frac{1}{\left(\mathbb{I}-\Delta\right)\Delta}\right]_{db}^{1/2}\end{aligned}\tag{D51}$$

Now using Eq. (D5) we have Eq. (72) follows. Or alternatively:

$$\left[\left[\left(\mathbb{I}-\Delta^T\right)\Delta^T\right]^{1/2}\bar{\mathcal{Z}}\left[\left(\mathbb{I}-\Delta\right)\Delta\right]^{1/2}\right]_{cd}$$
$$= Tr\left[\phi^\dagger O_\mu \phi f_c f_d\right] \tag{D52}$$

Now we know that:

$$\hat{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mu^\dagger ba} = \bar{\mathcal{Z}}^*_{\mu ab} = \sum_{cd}\left[\frac{1}{\left(\mathbb{I}-\Delta\right)\Delta}\right]^{1/2}_{ac}\cdot$$
$$Tr\left[\phi^\dagger O^\dagger_\mu \phi f^\dagger_d f^\dagger_c\right]\cdot\left[\frac{1}{\left(\mathbb{I}-\Delta^T\right)\Delta^T}\right]^{1/2}_{db} \tag{D53}$$

4. Proofs for Section C 3

We would like to show that the equivalences presented in Section C 3 represent all three contraction terms. We will show this on the example of just two operators, where these terms may be used to generate higher order terms in $1/z$, but they can directly be generalized to three and four site terms where they can be used as part of the leading order contribution.

a. Fermionic equivalences

We have that:

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle\Psi_0|\, P^\dagger_R O_{R\mu} P_R P^\dagger_{R'} O_{R'\nu} P_{R'}\,|\Psi_0\rangle\\ &= \overbrace{[P^\dagger_R \overbrace{O_{R\mu}P_R][P^\dagger_{R'}O_{R'\nu}}\, P_{R'}]}\\ &+ [P^\dagger_R\, O_{R\mu}\, \overbrace{P_R][P^\dagger_{R'}}\, O_{R'\nu}\, P_{R'}]\times\\ &\times\left(1+O\left(\frac{1}{z}\right)\right)\end{aligned} \tag{D54}$$

From this it is clear that all we have to show for Eq. (C6) is to show that all one and three contraction terms are reproduced. However the Equations in Eq. (C6) are linear combinations of these equations with invertible coefficients (for generic contractions $\left\langle f^\dagger_a f_b\right\rangle$) from which Eq. (C6) follows.

b. Bosonic equivalences (fermion number preserving)

We have that:

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle\Psi_0|\, P^\dagger_R O_{R\mu} P_R P^\dagger_{R'} O_{R'\nu} P_{R'}\,|\Psi_0\rangle\\ &= \overbrace{\langle\Psi_0|\, P^\dagger_R O_{R\mu} P_R P^\dagger_{R'} O_{R'\nu} P_{R'}\,|\Psi_0\rangle_{Hartree}}\\ &+ \overbrace{[P^\dagger_R O_{R\mu}\, \overbrace{P^\dagger_R}][P^\dagger_{R'}\, O_{R'\nu}\, P_{R'}]}+\\ &+ [P^\dagger_R\, O_{R\mu}\, P_R]\overbrace{[P^\dagger_{R'}\, O_{R'\nu}\, P_{R'}]}\times\\ &\times\left(1+O\left(\frac{1}{z}\right)\right)\end{aligned} \tag{D55}$$

From this it is clear that all we have to show for Eq. (C7) is to show that all zero, two and four contraction terms are reproduced. However the Equations in Eq. (C7) are linear combinations of these equations with invertible coefficients (for generic contractions $\left\langle f^\dagger_a f_b\right\rangle$) from which Eq. (C7) follows.

c. Bosonic equivalences (fermion number changing)

We have that:

$$\begin{aligned}&\overbrace{\langle\Psi_0|\, P^\dagger_R O_{R\mu} P_R P^\dagger_{R'} O_{R'\nu} P_{R'}\,|\Psi_0\rangle} =\\ &= \overbrace{[P^\dagger_R O_{R\mu}\, \overbrace{P_R][P^\dagger_{R'}}\, O_{R'\nu}\, P_{R'}]}+\\ &+ [P^\dagger_R\, O_{R\mu}\, P_R]\overbrace{[P_{R'}\, O_{R'\nu}\, P_{R'}]}\times\\ &\times\left(1+O\left(\frac{1}{z}\right)\right)\end{aligned} \tag{D56}$$

\From this it is clear that all we have to show for Eq. (C10) is to show that all two and four contraction terms are reproduced. However the Equations in Eq. (C10) are linear combinations of these equations with invertible coefficients (for generic contractions $\left\langle f^\dagger_a f_b\right\rangle$) from which Eq. (C10) follows.

Appendix E: Sanity checks

1. Gutzwiller constraints: the identity operator

So far we have not used the Gutzwiller constrains in Eq. (23) in our derivations. We would like to use these constraints to show that it is possible to insert an identity operators in Eq. (29) without changing the ground state energy within our calculations and as such provide a consistency check. More precisely we would like to show that for:

$$O_{R\mu} = \kappa I, \tag{E1}$$

we have that

$$\mathcal{Z}_{R\mu I} = \kappa,\ \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu ba} = 0, \tag{E2}$$

and as such

$$P_R^\dagger I P_R \sim I. \tag{E3}$$

To do so lets rewrite the Gutzwiller constraints in Eq. (23) in the following suggestive way:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle\Psi_0|\, P_R^\dagger \kappa I P_R f_{Ra}^\dagger f_{Rb}\,|\Psi_0\rangle = \\
&\langle\Psi_0|\left[\sum_{cd} 0\cdot f_{Rc}^\dagger f_{Rd} + \kappa I\right] f_{Ra}^\dagger f_{Rb}\,|\Psi_0\rangle \\
&\langle\Psi_0|\, P_R^\dagger \kappa I P_R\cdot I\,|\Psi_0\rangle = \\
&\langle\Psi_0|\left[\sum_{cd} 0\cdot f_{Rc}^\dagger f_{Rd} + \kappa I\right]\cdot I\,|\Psi_0\rangle\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{E4}$$

From which Eqs. (E2) and (E3) follow.

2. Hermicity check

We would like to show that under the equivalence in Eqs. (50), (62) , (63) and (72) Hermitian Hamiltonians are mapped onto Hermitian Hamiltonians. The main idea will to show that the Hermitian conjugate of an operator is equivalent to the Hermitian conjugate of the equivalent operator. Below in Appendix E 2 d we will show that this is sufficient for the Hamiltonian in Eq. (29) to be Hermitian.

a. Fermionic operators

We start with the case where the operator $O_{R\mu}$ is fermionic. For this case we would like to check that if:

$$P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R \sim \sum_a \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu a} f_{Ra} \tag{E5}$$

then

$$P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu}^\dagger P_R \sim \sum_a \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu a}^* f_{Ra}^\dagger \tag{E6}$$

More precisely we would like to show that:

$$\mathcal{Z}_{R\mu^\dagger a} = \hat{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu a}^*. \tag{E7}$$

To do so, we notice that Eq. (51) may be rewritten as:

$$\langle\Psi_0|\, f_{Ra} P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R\,|\Psi_0\rangle = \langle\Psi_0|\, f_{Ra}\left[\sum_b \mathcal{Z}_{\mu b} f_{Rb}^\dagger\right]|\Psi_0\rangle\,. \tag{E8}$$

Indeed after we perform all contractions and reduced $P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R$ to a single annihilation operator in every possible way using Wick's theorem we get that

$$P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R \sim \sum_a \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu a} f_{Ra} \tag{E9}$$

and it does not matter which order we put the operators f_{Ra} in order to determine the coefficients $\mathcal{Z}_{R\mu a}$, e.g. $\mathcal{Z}_{R\mu a}$ are unique and it does not matter which of the two types of equations we use to determine them. Taking the Hermitian conjugate of this equation (Eq. (E8)) we get that:

$$\langle\Psi_0|\, P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu}^\dagger P_R f_{Ra}^\dagger\,|\Psi_0\rangle = \langle\Psi_0|\left[\sum_b \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu b}^* f_{Rb}\right] f_{Ra}^\dagger\,|\Psi_0\rangle\,. \tag{E10}$$

As such Eq. (E7) follows. The bosonic Hermicity checks are highly similar and done below.

b. Bosonic operator with the same number of creation and annihilation operators

We continue with the case where the operator $O_{R\mu}$ is bosonic number conserving operator. For this case we would like to check that if:

$$P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R \sim \sum_{\alpha\beta} \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu ba} f_{Ra}^\dagger f_{Rb} + \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu I} I \tag{E11}$$

then

$$P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu}^\dagger P_R \sim \sum_{\alpha\beta} \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu ba}^* f_{Rb}^\dagger f_{Ra} + \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu I}^* I \tag{E12}$$

e.g.

$$\mathcal{Z}_{R\mu ba}^* = \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu^\dagger ab},\ \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu I}^* = \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu^\dagger I}. \tag{E13}$$

However in a manner similar to Appendix E 2 a we can show that $\mathcal{Z}_{R\mu cd}, \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu I}$ satisfy the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle\Psi_0|\, f_{Rb}^\dagger f_{Ra} P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R\,|\Psi_0\rangle = \\
&\langle\Psi_0|\, f_{Rb}^\dagger f_{Ra}\left[\sum_{cd} \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu cd} f_{Rd}^\dagger f_{Rc} + \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu I} I\right]|\Psi_0\rangle \\
&\langle\Psi_0|\, I\cdot P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R\,|\Psi_0\rangle = \\
&\langle\Psi_0|\, I\cdot\left[\sum_{cd} \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu cd} f_{Rd}^\dagger f_{Rc} + \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu I} I\right]|\Psi_0\rangle\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{E14}$$

Taking the Hermitian conjugate of these equations we get that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle\Psi_0|\, P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R f_{Ra}^\dagger f_{Rb}\,|\Psi_0\rangle = \\
&\langle\Psi_0|\left[\sum_{cd} \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu cd}^* f_{Rc}^\dagger f_{Rd} + \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu I}^* I\right] f_{Ra}^\dagger f_{Rb}\,|\Psi_0\rangle \\
&\langle\Psi_0|\, P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R\cdot I\,|\Psi_0\rangle = \\
&\langle\Psi_0|\left[\sum_{cd} \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu cd}^* f_{Rc}^\dagger f_{Rd} + \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu I}^* I\right]\cdot I\,|\Psi_0\rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{E15}$$

and Eqs. (E12) and (E13) follow.

c. Bosonic operators that change fermion number by two

We continue with the case where the operator $O_{R\mu}$ is bosonic operator that changes the fermion number by two. For this case we would like to check that if:

$$P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R \sim \sum_{\alpha\beta} \bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu ab} f_{Ra}^\dagger f_{Rb}^\dagger \tag{E16}$$

then:

$$P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu}^\dagger P_R \sim \sum_{\alpha\beta} \hat{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu ab}^* f_{Rb} f_{Ra} \tag{E17}$$

e.g.

$$\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu ab}^* = \hat{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu^\dagger ba}. \tag{E18}$$

However we have that $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu\alpha\beta}$ satisfy the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle\Psi_0| f_{Rb} f_{Ra} P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu} P_R |\Psi_0\rangle \\ &= \langle\Psi_0| f_{Rb} f_{Ra} \left[\sum_{cd} \bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu dc} f_{Rd}^\dagger f_{Rc}^\dagger\right] |\Psi_0\rangle .\end{aligned} \tag{E19}$$

Taking the hermitian conjugate of this equation we get that:

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle\Psi_0| P_R^\dagger O_{R\mu}^\dagger P_R f_{Ra}^\dagger f_{Rb}^\dagger |\Psi_0\rangle = \\ &\langle\Psi_0| \left[\sum_{cd} \bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{R\mu dc}^* f_{Rc} f_{Rd}\right] f_{Ra}^\dagger f_{Rb}^\dagger |\Psi_0\rangle\end{aligned} \tag{E20}$$

and Eqs. (E17) and (E18) follow.

d. Explicit hermicity proof

We note that for a hermitian Hamiltonian we may write

$$\begin{aligned}H &= \frac{1}{2}\left(H + H^\dagger\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left[\sum_n \sum_{R_1\ldots R_n} \sum_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_n} J_{R_1\ldots R_n}^{\mu_1;\ldots\mu_n} O_{R_1\mu_1}\ldots O_{R_n\mu_n}\right] \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\left[\sum_n \sum_{R_1\ldots R_n} \sum_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_n} J_{R_1\ldots R_n}^{\mu_1;\ldots\mu_n *} O_{R_n\mu_n}^\dagger \ldots O_{R_1\mu_1}^\dagger\right].\end{aligned} \tag{E21}$$

In which case

$$\begin{aligned}H \sim H_{Eff} = &\frac{1}{2}\left[\sum_n \sum_{R_1\ldots R_n} \sum_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_n} J_{R_1\ldots R_n}^{\mu_1;\ldots\mu_n} \left[\sum_{i_1} \mathcal{Z}_{R_1\mu_1 i_1} O_{R_1\mu_1 i_1}.\right] \ldots \left[\sum_{i_n} \mathcal{Z}_{R_1\alpha_n i_n} O_{R_n\mu_n i_n}\right]\right] \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\left[\sum_n \sum_{R_1\ldots R_n} \sum_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_n} J_{R_1\ldots R_n}^{\mu_1;\ldots\mu_n *} \left[\sum_{i_n} \mathcal{Z}_{R_1\alpha_n i_n}^* O_{R_n\mu_n i_n}^\dagger\right] \ldots \left[\sum_{i_1} \mathcal{Z}_{R_1\alpha_1 i_1}^* O_{R_1\mu_1 i_1}^\dagger\right]\right].\end{aligned} \tag{E22}$$

Which is clearly Hermitian.

Appendix F: Short Lagrangian

We can now obtain and analog of Eq. (73) by replacing the various constraints by Lagrange multipliers and the main Hamiltonian by the embedding Hamiltonian. As such we have the following action (which is for simplicity specialized to the case where we only consider the first two lines of Eq. (20)):

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{L}_N\left(D_{R\mu i}, E_R^c, \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu i}, \phi_R, \left[\lambda_{R_1R_2}^s\right]_{ab}, \left[\lambda_R^{cs}\right]_{ab}, \left[\Delta_{R_1R_2}\right]_{ab}, |\Psi_0\rangle\right) = \langle\Psi_0| \varepsilon_{HF} + \left[\lambda_{R_1R_2}^s\right]_{ab} - \mu |\Psi_0\rangle \\ &+ \sum_R E_R^c - \sum_{R,ab} \left(\left[\lambda_{RR}^s\right]_{ab} + \left[\lambda_R^{cs}\right]_{ab}\right)\left[\Delta_{RR}\right]_{ab} - \mathcal{F}_D\left(\left\{\left[\Delta_{R_1R_2}\right]_{ab}\right\}\right) - \sum_{R\mu i,j} D_{R\mu j} \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu i} F_{ij}\left(\left[\Delta_{RR}\right]_{ab}\right) - \\ &- \sum_{R_1\neq R_2,} \sum_{ab} \left[\lambda_{R_1R_2}^s\right]_{ab}\left[\Delta_{R_1R_2}\right]_{ab} + \mathcal{L}_{embed} + \mu N\end{aligned} \tag{F1}$$

Where we define define $\mathcal{L}_{embed} = \sum_R \langle \Phi_R | H^R_{embed} | \Phi_R \rangle + \sum_R E^{cs}_R$, where:

$$H_{embed} = \sum_{\mu i} D_{R\mu i} \left(\sum_k \hat{O}_{R\mu} \hat{O}^R_{Rk} \mathcal{G}_{i;k} (\Delta_R) \right) \exp \left[i \frac{\pi}{2} \left[[N(n') - N(n)]^2 - [N(n') - N(n)] \right] \right] + H^{loc}_R - \sum_R E^{cs}_R + \sum_{ab} [\lambda^{cs}_R]_{ab} \hat{f}_{Rb} \hat{f}^\dagger_{Ra} \tag{F2}$$

Where ε is the Hartree Fock energy, e.g.

$$\varepsilon_{HF} = \sum_{\mu\nu} \sum_{R_1,R_2} \sum_{ij} J^{\mu;\nu}_{R_1;R_2} \mathcal{Z}_{R_1\mu i} \mathcal{Z}_{R_2\nu j} [O_{R_1 i} O_{R_2 j}]_{HF} \tag{F3}$$

Where for example

$$\left[f^\dagger_{R_1 a} f_{R_1 b} f^\dagger_{R_2 c} f_{R_2 d} \right]_{HF} = [\Delta_{R_1 R_1}]_{ab} f^\dagger_{R_2 c} f_{R_2 d} + [\Delta_{R_2 R_2}]_{cd} f^\dagger_{R_1 a} f_{R_1 b} + [\Delta_{R_2 R_1}]_{ad} f_{R_1 b} f^\dagger_{R_2 c} - [\Delta_{R_1 R_2}]_{bc} f^\dagger_{R_1 a} f_{R_2 d} \tag{F4}$$

And

$$\mathcal{F}_D (\{ [\Delta_{R_1 R_2}]_{ab} \}) \supset J^{\mu;\nu}_{R_1;R_2} [[\Delta_{R_1 R_1}]_{ab} [\Delta_{R_2 R_2}]_{cd} - [\Delta_{R_2 R_1}]_{ad} [\Delta_{R_1 R_2}]_{bc}] \tag{F5}$$

The extermination is carried out over all variables including Lagrange multipliers [15, 60, 61, 65–67]. We have that at saddle point $\left[\lambda^s_{R_1 \neq R_2} \right]_{ab} = 0$, see Appendix F 1. We note that the Lagrangian in Eq. (F1) is not real so it cannot be minimized only extremized (the saddle point energy is real though). For a more complex but completely real Lagrangian that is specialized to the Hamiltonian in Eq. (III) see Section VI which is our main result.

1. Quasiparticle energies

a. *Argument why $\left[\lambda^s_{R_1 \neq R_2} \right]_{ab} = 0$ at saddle point*

In the formulation in Appendix F we have that the energy functional is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_N = & \langle \Psi_0 | \varepsilon_{HF} + \left[\lambda^s_{R_1 R_2} \right]_{ab} - \mu | \Psi_0 \rangle \\ & - \sum_{R_1 \neq R_2, ab} \left[\lambda^s_{R_1 R_2} \right]_{ab} [\Delta_{R_1 R_2}]_{ab} - \\ & - \sum_{R_1 \neq R_2, \mu\nu} J^{\mu;\nu}_{R_1;R_2} \sum_{i,j} \mathcal{Z}_{R_1 \mu i} \mathcal{Z}_{R_2 \nu i} [\Delta_{R_1 R_2}]_{ab} \cdot \\ & \cdot [\Delta_{R_2 R_1}]_{cd} + ... \end{aligned} \tag{F6}$$

Where +.... will not effect our derivations. We now have that extremizing with respect to the variables in the Lagrange function:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_N}{\partial [\Delta_{R_1 \neq R_2}]_{ab}} = & \sum_{\mu\nu} J^{\mu;\nu}_{R_1;R_2} \sum_{i,j} \mathcal{Z}_{R_1 \mu i} \mathcal{Z}_{R_2 \nu i} [\Delta_{R_2 R_1}]_{cd} \\ & + \sum_{\mu\nu} J^{\mu;\nu}_{R_1;R_2} \sum_{i,j} \mathcal{Z}_{R_1 \mu i} \mathcal{Z}_{R_2 \nu i} \left\langle f^\dagger_{R_2 c} f_{R_1 d} \right\rangle - \\ & - \left[\lambda^s_{R_1 R_2} \right]_{ab} = \left[\lambda^s_{R_1 R_2} \right]_{ab} \end{aligned} \tag{F7}$$

This greatly simplifies the saddle point, and in particular the quasiparticle Hamiltonian H_{QP} see below.

b. *Excitations*

We know that the proper way to study the quasiparticle energy is to take the thermodynamic limit and to study the following wave function:

$$P_G \sum_\alpha \psi_{R\alpha} f^\dagger_\alpha (R) | \Psi_{Slater} \rangle = P_G \left| \Psi^\psi_{Slater} \right\rangle \tag{F8}$$

Now the single particle density matrix $\Delta_{RR;\alpha\beta}$ for $\left| \Psi^\psi_{Slater} \right\rangle$ is almost the same as for $|\Psi_{Slater}\rangle$ plus $\frac{1}{N}$ corrections (here N is the number of atoms which blows up in the thermodynamic limit). This means that the equivalence relations

$$O_{R\mu} \sim \sum_i \mathcal{Z}^\psi_{R\mu i} O_{Ri} = \sum_i \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu i} O_i + O\left(\frac{1}{N} \right) \tag{F9}$$

$$\mathcal{Z}^\psi_{R\mu i} = \mathcal{R}_{R\mu i} + O\left(\frac{1}{N} \right) \tag{F10}$$

However we know that the energy functional is stationary with respect to variations of $\mathcal{Z}_{R\mu i}$ which means that:

$$Z \mathcal{L}_N \left(\mathcal{Z}^\psi_{R\mu i} \right) = \mathcal{L}_N (\mathcal{Z}_{R\mu i}) + O\left(N \cdot \frac{1}{N^2} \right) \tag{F11}$$

This means that we may as well ignore the changes in $\mathcal{Z}_{R\mu i}$ and set

$$\mathcal{Z}^\psi_{R\mu i} \cong \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu i} \tag{F12}$$

As such the Hamiltonian for the original problem

$$H = \sum_{R,R',\mu\nu} J^{\mu;\nu}_{R_1;R_2} O_{R_1\mu} O_{R_2\nu} + H^{loc} + \sum_R \left[\lambda^s_{RR}\right]_{ab} f^\dagger_{Ra} f_{Rb} \tag{F13}$$

While H^{loc} and the other terms in $\mathcal{L}_N$ depend on $\left[\Delta_{R_1R_2}\right]_{ab}$ because of the stationarity conditions their effect may be neglected. As such the problem of excitations maps onto the problem of excitations of the following Hamiltonian:

$$\begin{aligned} H_{eff} = & \sum_{R,R',\mu\nu} J^{\mu;\nu}_{R_1;R_2} \sum_{i,j} \mathcal{Z}_{R\mu i} \mathcal{Z}_{R'\nu i} O_{R_1 i} O_{R_2 j} \\ & + \sum_{Rab} \left[\lambda^s_{RR}\right]_{ab} f^\dagger_{Ra} f_{Rb} \end{aligned} \tag{F14}$$

Which has no dependence on ψ of any form. This means that the excitation energy for the Gutzwiller Lagrange function is the same as the excitation energy of H_{eff} which is the Hartree Fock excitation energy which is given by the eigenenergies of the Hamiltonian:

$$\begin{aligned} H_{QP} = & \sum_{R,R',\mu\nu} J^{\mu;\nu}_{R_1;R_2} \sum_{i,j} \mathcal{Z}_{R_1\mu i} \mathcal{Z}_{R_2\nu i} \left[O_{R_1 i} O_{R_2 j}\right]_{HF} \\ & + \sum_{Rab} \left[\lambda^s_{RR}\right]_{ab} f^\dagger_{Ra} f_{Rn} \end{aligned} \tag{F15}$$

Appendix G: Example: the extended single-band Hubbard model

1. Hamiltonian and setup

As a further example of the general formalism presented in Section VI, here we consider the single-band extended Hubbard model [37–46, 69–79]:

$$\begin{aligned} H_{SB} = & -t \sum_{\langle R,R'\rangle,\sigma=\pm} \left(c^\dagger_{R\sigma} c_{R'\sigma} + h.c.\right) + U \sum_R n_{R\uparrow} n_{R\downarrow} \\ & + V \sum_{\langle R,R'\rangle} n_R n_{R'} - J \sum_{\langle R,R'\rangle} \vec{S}_R \cdot \vec{S}_{R'} + \\ & + X \sum_{\langle R,R'\rangle,\sigma=\pm} \left(c^\dagger_{R\sigma} c_{R'\sigma} + h.c.\right) \left(n_{R-\sigma} + n_{R'-\sigma}\right) \\ & + Y \sum_{\langle R,R'\rangle} \left(c^\dagger_{R\uparrow} c^\dagger_{R\downarrow} c_{R'\downarrow} c_{R'\uparrow} + h.c.\right) - \mu \sum_{R\sigma} n_{R\sigma}, \end{aligned} \tag{G1}$$

where $\langle R, R'\rangle$ denotes nearest neighbors R and R' with the sum being over both R and R'. In the next section we will write the single-band Hubbard model Gutzwiller Lagrange function, assuming translational invariance. We summarize the relevant terms in Table G 2.

2. Gutzwiller Lagrange function

Here we consider the extended single-band Hubbard model, see Eq. (G1), for an arbitrary Bravis lattice (e.g., square, cubic, triangular, body centered cubic (BCC), face centered cubic (FCC)). Following our derivations in Section VI, the single band Gutzwiller Lagrange function is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{L}_N \left(\left\{D_\sigma, E_\sigma, F_{\sigma a}, F, G\right\}, \left\{D^*_\sigma, E^*_\sigma, F^*, G^*\right\}, \left\{\mathcal{R}_\sigma, \mathcal{S}_\sigma, \mathcal{T}_{\sigma a}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{U}\right\}, \left\{\mathcal{R}^*_\sigma, \mathcal{S}^*_\sigma, \mathcal{T}^*, \mathcal{U}^*\right\}\right. \\ & \left.\lambda_\sigma, \lambda^{(n.n.)}_\sigma, \lambda^c_\sigma, \lambda^b_\sigma, \Delta_\sigma, \Delta^{(n.n.)}_\sigma, o_\sigma, E, \mu, \left|\Psi_0\right\rangle, \left|\Phi\right\rangle\right) + \\ & = \mathcal{L}_{QP} \left(\left\{\mathcal{R}_\sigma, \mathcal{S}_\sigma\right\}, \left\{\mathcal{R}^*_\sigma, \mathcal{S}^*_\sigma\right\}, \lambda_\sigma, E, \mu, \left|\Psi_0\right\rangle\right) = \\ & + \mathcal{L}_{Embed} \left(\left\{D_\sigma, E_\sigma, F_{\sigma a}, F, G\right\}, \left\{D^*_\sigma, E^*_\sigma, F^*, G^*\right\}, E^c, \lambda^b_\sigma, \Delta_a, \left|\Phi\right\rangle\right) + \\ & + \mathcal{L}_{Mix} \left(\left\{D_\sigma, E_\sigma, F_{\sigma a}, F, G\right\}, \left\{D^*_\sigma, E^*_\sigma, F^*, G^*\right\}, \left\{\mathcal{R}_\sigma, \mathcal{S}_\sigma, \mathcal{T}_{\sigma a}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{U}\right\}, \left\{\mathcal{R}^*_\sigma, \mathcal{S}^*_\sigma, \mathcal{T}^*, \mathcal{U}^*\right\}, \right. \\ & \left.\lambda_\sigma, \lambda^{(n.n.)}_\sigma, \lambda^c_\sigma, \lambda^b_\sigma, \Delta_\sigma, \Delta^{(n.n.)}_\sigma, o_\sigma\right) + \\ & + \mathcal{L}_{HF} \left(\left\{\mathcal{T}_{\sigma a}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{U}\right\}, \left\{\mathcal{T}^*, \mathcal{U}^*\right\}, \Delta^{(n.n.)}_\sigma, o_\sigma\right). \end{aligned} \tag{G2}$$

Where:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{L}_{QP}\left(\{\mathcal{R}_\sigma,\mathcal{S}_\sigma\},\{\mathcal{R}^*_\sigma,\mathcal{S}^*_\sigma\},\lambda_\sigma,E,\mu,|\Psi_0\rangle\right)=\\
&=\langle\Psi_0|-t\sum_{\langle RR'\rangle\sigma}\mathcal{R}_\sigma\mathcal{R}^*_\sigma f^\dagger_{R\sigma}f_{R'\sigma}+\left[X\sum_{\langle RR'\rangle\sigma}\mathcal{S}_\sigma\mathcal{R}^*_\sigma f^\dagger_{R\sigma}f_{R'\sigma}+h.c.\right]+\\
&+\sum_{\langle RR'\rangle\sigma}\lambda^{(n.n.)}_\sigma f^\dagger_{R\sigma}f_{R'\sigma}+\sum_{R\sigma}\lambda_\sigma f^\dagger_{R\sigma}f_{R\sigma}-\mu\sum_{R\sigma}f^\dagger_{R\sigma}f_{R\sigma}|\Psi_0\rangle+E\left(1-\langle\Psi_0\mid\Psi_0\rangle\right)+\mu N,
\end{aligned}\tag{G3}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{Embed}\left(\{D_\sigma,E_\sigma,F_{\sigma a},F,G\},\{D^*_\sigma,E^*_\sigma,F^*,G^*\},E^c,\lambda^b_\sigma,\Delta_a,|\Phi\rangle\right)=\langle\Phi|H_{Embed}|\Phi\rangle+E^c\left(1-\langle\Phi\mid\Phi\rangle\right),\tag{G4}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{embed}=&U\hat{c}^\dagger_\uparrow\hat{c}_\uparrow\hat{c}^\dagger_\downarrow\hat{c}_\downarrow+\sum_\sigma\lambda^c_\sigma\hat{f}_\sigma\hat{f}^\dagger_\sigma+\left[\sum_\sigma D_\sigma\hat{c}^\dagger_\sigma\hat{f}_\sigma+h.c.\right]\\
&+\left[\sum_\sigma E_\sigma\hat{c}^\dagger_\sigma\hat{c}^\dagger_{\bar\sigma}\hat{c}_{\bar\sigma}\hat{f}_\sigma+h.c.\right]+\sum_{\sigma a}F_{\sigma a}\left(\hat{c}^\dagger_\sigma\hat{c}_\sigma\hat{f}_a\hat{f}^\dagger_a-\hat{c}^\dagger_\sigma\hat{c}_\sigma\Delta_a\right)+\\
&+\left[F\hat{c}^\dagger_\uparrow\hat{c}_\downarrow\hat{f}_\downarrow\hat{f}^\dagger_\uparrow+h.c.\right]-\left[G\hat{c}^\dagger_\uparrow\hat{c}^\dagger_\downarrow\hat{f}_\downarrow\hat{f}_\uparrow+h.c.\right]+\sum_\sigma\lambda^b_\sigma\hat{c}^\dagger_\sigma\hat{c}_\sigma,
\end{aligned}\tag{G5}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{L}_{Mix}\left(\{D_\sigma,E_\sigma,F_{\sigma a},F,G\},\{D^*_\sigma,E^*_\sigma,F^*,G^*\},\{\mathcal{R}_\sigma,\mathcal{S}_\sigma,\mathcal{T}_{\sigma a},\mathcal{T},\mathcal{U}\},\{\mathcal{R}^*_\sigma,\mathcal{S}^*_\sigma,\mathcal{T}^*,\mathcal{U}^*\},\right.\\
&\left.\lambda_\sigma,\lambda^{(n.n.)}_\sigma,\lambda^c_\sigma,\lambda^b_\sigma,\Delta_\sigma,\Delta^{(n.n.)}_\sigma,o_\sigma\right)\\
&=-\sum_\sigma\left(\lambda_\sigma+\lambda^c_\sigma\right)\Delta_\sigma-\sum_\sigma\lambda^{(n.n.)}_\sigma\Delta^{(n.n.)}_\sigma-\sum_\sigma\lambda^b_\sigma o_\sigma-\sum_\sigma\left[D_\sigma\left(\mathcal{R}_\sigma\sqrt{\left(1-\Delta_\sigma\right)\Delta_\sigma}\right)+c.c.\right]\\
&-\sum_\sigma\left[E_\sigma\left(\left[\mathcal{S}_\sigma\sqrt{\left(1-\Delta_\sigma\right)\Delta_\sigma}\right]\right)+c.c.\right]-\sum_{\sigma a}F_{\sigma a}\left(1-\Delta_a\right)\Delta_a\mathcal{T}_{\sigma a}-\\
&-\left[F\sqrt{\left(1-\Delta_\uparrow\right)\Delta_\uparrow}\mathcal{T}\sqrt{\left(1-\Delta_\downarrow\right)\Delta_\downarrow}+c.c.\right]-\left[G\sqrt{\left(1-\Delta_\uparrow\right)\Delta_\uparrow}\mathcal{U}\sqrt{\left(1-\Delta_\downarrow\right)\Delta_\downarrow}+c.c.\right],
\end{aligned}\tag{G6}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{L}_{HF}\left(\{\mathcal{T}_{\sigma a},\mathcal{T},\mathcal{U}\},\{\mathcal{T}^*,\mathcal{U}^*\},\Delta^{(n.n.)}_\sigma,o_\sigma\right)=\\
&=\frac{z}{2}V\left(\sum_\sigma o_\sigma\right)^2+\frac{z}{8}J\left(\sum_\sigma\sigma o_\sigma\right)^2+\frac{z}{2}Y\left(\sum_\sigma\Delta^{(n.n.)}_\sigma\Delta^{(n.n.)}_{\bar\sigma}\right)\mathcal{U}\cdot\mathcal{U}^*\\
&-\frac{z}{2}V\sum_{\sigma\sigma' aa}\Delta^{(n.n.)}_a\Delta^{(n.n)}_a\mathcal{T}_{\sigma a}\mathcal{T}_{\sigma' a}-\frac{z}{8}J\sum_{\sigma\sigma' a}\sigma\sigma'\Delta^{(n.n.)}_a\Delta^{(n.n)}_a\mathcal{T}_{\sigma a}\mathcal{T}_{\sigma' a}-zJ\left[\Delta^{(n.n.)}_\uparrow\Delta^{(n.n)}_\downarrow\mathcal{T}\mathcal{T}^*+c.c.\right].
\end{aligned}\tag{G7}$$

In Appendix H below we show that, for this single-band problem, it is possible to reduce the problem of extremizing the Lagrange function $\mathcal{L}$ to the problem of minimizing the Gutzwiller energy as a function of the double occupancy η.

3. Extended Hubbard model: half filling

We express the Gutzwiller operators in the so-called "mixed-basis representation" [15, 65, 67] defined as follows:

$$P_R=\sum_{\Gamma,n}[\Lambda_R]_{\Gamma n}|\Gamma_R\rangle\langle n_R|\,,\tag{G8}$$

Here the basis set we use is:

$$\begin{aligned}
\{|\Gamma_R\rangle\}&=\{|0\rangle,|\uparrow\rangle,|\downarrow\rangle,|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle\},\\
\{|n_R\rangle\}&=\{|0\rangle,|\uparrow\rangle,|\downarrow\rangle,|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle\}.
\end{aligned}\tag{G9}$$

For clarity, here we briefly review some definitions in relation with the notation utilized in previous work [26, 50,

Symbol	Meaning	Term	Gutzwiller equivalent (half filling)
t	Hopping	$-t\sum_{\langle R,R'\rangle,\sigma=\pm}\left(c^{\dagger}_{R\sigma}c_{R'\sigma}+h.c.\right)$	$-8t\eta\left(1-2\eta\right)\sum_{\langle R,R'\rangle,\sigma=\pm}\left(c^{\dagger}_{R\sigma}c_{R'\sigma}+h.c.\right)$
U	Hubbard U	$U\sum_{R}n_{R\uparrow}n_{R\downarrow}$	$U\eta\sum_{R}1$
V	Density density	$V\sum_{\langle R,R'\rangle}n_{R}n_{R'}$	$V\sum_{\langle R,R'\rangle}\left(4\eta n_{R}+1-4\eta\right)\left(4\eta n_{R'}+1-4\eta\right)$
X	Coulomb assisted hopping	$X\sum_{\langle R,R'\rangle,\sigma=\pm}\left(c^{\dagger}_{R\sigma}c_{R'\sigma}+h.c.\right)\left(n_{R-\sigma}+n_{R'-\sigma}\right)$	$-8X\eta\left(1-2\eta\right)\sum_{\langle R,R'\rangle,\sigma=\pm}\left(c^{\dagger}_{R\sigma}c_{R'\sigma}+h.c.\right)$
Y	Pair hopping	$Y\sum_{\langle R,R'\rangle}\left(c^{\dagger}_{R\uparrow}c^{\dagger}_{R\downarrow}c_{R'\downarrow}c_{R'\uparrow}+h.c.\right)$	$16\eta^{2}Y\sum_{\langle R,R'\rangle}\left(c^{\dagger}_{R\uparrow}c^{\dagger}_{R\downarrow}c_{R'\downarrow}c_{R'\uparrow}+h.c.\right)$
J	Exchange interaction	$-J\sum_{\langle R,R'\rangle}\vec{S}_{R}\cdot\vec{S}_{R'}$	$-4J\left(1-2\eta\right)^{2}\sum_{\langle R,R'\rangle}\vec{S}_{R}\cdot\vec{S}_{R'}$

Table I. **The various terms entering the Hamiltonian in Eq. (G1) as well as their operatorial equivalences, which are explained in the main text.**

60]. We consider the projector [15, 50, 60, 61, 66, 67]:

$$\Lambda_{R}=\begin{pmatrix}a_{00} & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & a_{\uparrow 0} & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & a_{0\downarrow} & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & g\end{pmatrix}, \tag{G10}$$

which we assume does not depend on R as we have assumed that translational invariance is preserved. We conveniently express the local reduced density matrix of $|\Psi_0\rangle$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\rho^{0}_{R}&\equiv Tr_{R'\neq R}\left|\Psi_{0}\right\rangle\left\langle\Psi_{0}\right|\\&=\frac{1}{Z}\exp\left(-\sum_{\sigma}\left[\ln\left(\frac{1-\Delta_{RR\sigma}}{\Delta_{RR\sigma}}\right)\right]c^{\dagger}_{R\sigma}c_{R\sigma}\right),\end{aligned} \tag{G11}$$

where

$$\left[\Delta_{R_1R_2}\right]_{\sigma}=\left\langle\Psi_{0}\right|c^{\dagger}_{R_1\sigma}c_{R_2\sigma}\left|\Psi_{0}\right\rangle \tag{G12}$$

Z is a normalization constant insuring that $Tr\left[\rho^{0}_{R}\right]=1$. In the same basis as Eq. (G9) we may write:

$$\left[P^{0}_{R}\right]_{nn'}=\left\langle n_{R}\mid\rho^{0}_{R}\mid n'_{R}\right\rangle. \tag{G13}$$

We now assume that P^{0}_{R} (with respect to the same basis set) is given by [15, 50, 60, 61, 66, 67]:

$$P^{0}_{R}=\begin{pmatrix}\left(1-n_{\uparrow}\right)\left(1-n_{\downarrow}\right) & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & n_{\uparrow}\left(1-n_{\downarrow}\right) & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & n_{\downarrow}\left(1-n_{\uparrow}\right) & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & n_{\uparrow}n_{\downarrow}\end{pmatrix}, \tag{G14}$$

Following Kotliar and Ruckenstein [26] we define the matrix of slave boson amplitudes [15, 50, 60, 61, 65–67]:

$$\phi_{R}=\begin{pmatrix}e & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & p_{\uparrow} & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & p_{\downarrow} & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & d\end{pmatrix}=\Lambda_{R}\sqrt{P^{0}_{R}}. \tag{G15}$$

We will assume that:

$$p_{\uparrow}=p_{\downarrow}=p \tag{G16}$$

that is paramagnetism. We will solve this problem in the limit of large co-ordinations number and using the $P^{\dagger}_{R}P_{R}-I$ expansion (see Appendices A and B).

The Gutzwiller constraints are that:

$$\begin{aligned}p^{2}_{\uparrow}+d^{2}&=\Delta_{\uparrow}\equiv\left\langle\Psi_{0}\right|f^{\dagger}_{R\uparrow}f_{R\uparrow}\left|\Psi_{0}\right\rangle\\p^{2}_{\downarrow}+d^{2}&=\Delta_{\downarrow}\equiv\left\langle\Psi_{0}\right|f^{\dagger}_{R\downarrow}f_{R\downarrow}\left|\Psi_{0}\right\rangle\\e^{2}+p^{2}_{\uparrow}+p^{2}_{\downarrow}+d^{2}&=1\end{aligned} \tag{G17}$$

Furthermore as $\left[P_{R},\rho_{R0}P^{\dagger}_{R}\right]=0$ (this is not the case in general) we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}\left\langle\Phi_{R}\right|c^{\dagger}_{R\uparrow}c_{R\uparrow}\left|\Phi_{R}\right\rangle&\equiv n_{\uparrow}=\Delta_{\uparrow}\\\left\langle\Phi_{R}\right|c^{\dagger}_{R\downarrow}c_{R\downarrow}\left|\Phi_{R}\right\rangle&\equiv n_{\downarrow}=\Delta_{\downarrow}\end{aligned} \tag{G18}$$

Indeed we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\langle\Phi_{R}\right|c^{\dagger}_{R\alpha}c_{R\beta}\left|\Phi_{R}\right\rangle\\&=Tr\left[\rho_{R0}P^{\dagger}_{R}c^{\dagger}_{R\alpha}c_{R\beta}P_{R}\right]\\&=Tr\left[\rho_{R0}P^{\dagger}_{R}P_{R}c^{\dagger}_{R\alpha}c_{R\beta}\right]+Tr\left[\left[P_{R},\rho_{R0}P^{\dagger}_{R}\right]c^{\dagger}_{R\alpha}c_{R\beta}\right]\\&=Tr\left[\rho_{R0}c^{\dagger}_{R\alpha}c_{R\beta}\right]\end{aligned} \tag{G19}$$

We note that for general use we phrased the proof in a general language applicable to multiband models. In particular we may now set $c_{\sigma}=f_{\sigma}$. We note that the solutions to the Gutzwiller equivalences depend only on e, $p_{\uparrow}$, $p_{\downarrow}$, d as well as $\Delta_{\uparrow}$ and $\Delta_{\downarrow}$. Now because of Eq. (G18) we have that $\Delta_{\uparrow}$ and $\Delta_{\downarrow}$ are fixed for all states with a fixed magnetization and occupation and because we are considering only the paramagnetic case $\Delta_{\uparrow}=\Delta_{\downarrow}$. Furthermore because of the Gutzwiller constraints we have that e, $p_{\uparrow}=p_{\downarrow}$ are functions of d and the occupation

and magnetization (which we will ignore in the paramagnetic case). As such the renormalization coefficients $\{\mathcal{R}_\sigma, \mathcal{S}_\sigma, \mathcal{T}_{\sigma a}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{U}\}$ depend only on d and on the occupation and magnetization (which are fixed, with the magnetization being zero in this case) and not explicitly on the wavefunction $|\Psi_0\rangle$. This greatly facilitates analytic calculations in this special case.

To assess the influence of inter-site interactions on the Mott physics, in this subsection we study the Hamiltonian in Eq. (G1) at half filling. Note that, because we are at half filling in the normal phase, we have that $n_\uparrow = n_\downarrow = \frac{1}{2}$.

As shown in Appendix H, for this system we obtain following operator equivalences:

$$\begin{aligned} P_R^\dagger c_{R\sigma} P_R &\sim 2\sqrt{2\eta\,(1-2\eta)}\, c_{R\sigma} \\ P_R^\dagger n_R P_R &\sim 4\eta n_R + (1-4\eta)\, I \\ P_R^\dagger c_{R\uparrow}^\dagger c_{R\downarrow}^\dagger P_R &\sim 4\eta c_{R\uparrow}^\dagger c_{R\downarrow}^\dagger \\ P_R^\dagger \vec{S}_R P_R &\sim 2\,(1-2\eta)\,\vec{S}_R \\ P_R^\dagger c_{R\sigma}^\dagger n_{R-\sigma} P_R &\sim \sqrt{2\eta\,(1-2\eta)}\, c_{R\sigma}^\dagger. \end{aligned} \tag{G20}$$

This leads to the result that extremizing Eq. (G2) amounts to minimize the following energy function of the local double occupancy $\eta \equiv d^2$:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle H \rangle = {} & \eta^2 \left[32\,(t-X)\, z\chi - 16\,(V-Y)\, z\chi^2 - 12 z J \chi^2\right] \\ & + \eta\left[-16\,(t-X)\, z\chi + 12 z J \chi^2 + U\right] \\ & + \frac{1}{2} V z - 3 z J \chi^2 - \mu_{1/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{G21}$$

Here $\mu_{1/2}$ is the chemical potential needed to enforce that the system is at half filling. For simplicity, from now on we will assume that $J = 0$, as typically $J \ll t - X, V - Y, U$ [13, 36]. It is convenient to express our variables in terms of the following dimensionless quantities:

$$\begin{aligned} u &= \frac{U}{16\,(t-X)\, z\chi} \\ v &= \frac{16\,(V-Y)\, z\chi^2}{16\,(t-X)\, z\chi}. \end{aligned} \tag{G22}$$

The results are identical to Section II except for rescaling of the variables and will be repeated for clarity.

Consistently with the fact that our theory reduces to the ordinary GA in the limit of vanishing intersite interactions, at $v = 0$ we recover the Brinkman Rice transition [12], where $\eta = 0$ (i.e., the charge fluctuations are frozen) for all $u \geq 1$. More generally the Brinkman Rice phase occurs when $u > 1$ and $v < 2u$.

a. *Metallic phase: enhanced-valence crossover*

Minimizing the energy function [Eq. (G21)] it can be readily shown that for $u < 1$ and $v < v_c = 1 + u$ the system remains metallic and that, in this phase, the double occupancy is given by:

$$\eta = \frac{1-u}{4\,(1-v/2)}\,. \tag{G23}$$

Eq. (G23) shows that the intersite Coulomb interaction can enhance dramatically charge fluctuations. In particular, we note that η can even exceed $\frac{1}{4}$ for $v_c > v > 2u$ while this is impossible in the half-filled single-band Hubbard model with only local Hubbard repulsion. The line where $\eta = \frac{1}{4}$ we refer to as the "enhanced-valence crossover,"

b. *Valence-skipping phase*

Remarkably, we find that the non-local Coulomb interaction can induce a phase transition into a phase with double occupancy $\eta = \frac{1}{2}$, which is stable for $v > 1 + u$ and $v > 2u$.

In this work we refer to this region as the "valence-skipping phase". We note that we call this a valence skipping phase because the single site density matrix in this phase is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_R &= Tr_{R' \neq R} |\Psi\rangle \langle\Psi| = P_R \rho_R^0 P_R^\dagger + O\left(\frac{1}{z}\right), \\ P_R \rho_R^0 P_R^\dagger &= \begin{pmatrix} 1/2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/2 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{G24}$$

For $v > 2$ there is a first order phase transition between the Brinkman Rice phase [12] and the valence skipping phase while for $v < 2$ there is a second order phase transition between the metallic phase and the valence skipping phase. The order of the transition is signified by the continuity or discontinuity of η across these phase transitions. $(u, v) = (1, 2)$ is a multiciritical point.

4. Quasiparticle dispersion

In this Section we restore $J \neq 0$. We have that the quasiparticle dispersion is given by (see Appendix F 1):

$$\begin{aligned} H_{QP} = {} & \sum_{\langle R,R'\rangle,\sigma} c_{R\sigma}^\dagger c_{R'\sigma} [-8\eta\,(1-2\eta)\,(t-X) \\ & - (3\,(1-2\eta)^2 J + 16\eta^2\,(V-Y))\chi] \\ \equiv {} & -Zt \sum_{\langle R,R'\rangle,\sigma} c_{R\sigma}^\dagger c_{R'\sigma} + \Delta t \sum_{\langle R,R'\rangle,\sigma} c_{R\sigma}^\dagger c_{R'\sigma}, \end{aligned} \tag{G25}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= 8\eta\left(1-2\eta\right) \\ \Delta &= -8\eta\left(1-2\eta\right)\frac{X}{t} \\ &\quad -\left[3\left(1-2\eta\right)^{2}\frac{J}{t}+16\eta^{2}\frac{\left(V-Y\right)}{t}\right]\chi. \end{aligned} \tag{G26}$$

Now we follow [15, 20] and write

$$\begin{aligned} G^{coh} &= \frac{Z}{i\omega_n - Z\varepsilon\left(k\right)+\Delta\varepsilon\left(k\right)+\bar{\mu}_{1/2}} \\ &= \frac{1}{i\omega_n-\varepsilon\left(k\right)+\mu_{1/2}-\Sigma\left(k,\omega\right)}, \end{aligned} \tag{G27}$$

where $\bar{\mu}_{1/2}$ is the chemical potential at half filling for the quasiparticle Hamiltonian, so that:

$$\Sigma\left(k,\omega_n\right) = -\frac{\Delta}{Z}\varepsilon\left(k\right)+\mu_{1/2}+i\omega_n\left[1-\frac{1}{Z}\right]-\frac{\bar{\mu}_{1/2}}{Z}. \tag{G28}$$

We note that, consistently with previous GW+DMFT studies of the two dimensional extended Hubbard model [37, 38], the self energy is a function of both momentum and frequency. Furthermore we note that G^{coh} is the coherent part of the Green's functions [88]. Indeed the coherent part of the Greens function satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} G^{coh}\left(k,\omega\right) &= \int\frac{A^{coh}\left(k,\nu\right)}{\omega-\nu}d\nu \\ A^{coh}\left(k,\omega\right) &= Z\delta\left(\omega-\left[Z\varepsilon\left(k\right)-\Delta\varepsilon\left(k\right)-\bar{\mu}_{1/2}\right]\right) \\ \int A^{coh}\left(k,\omega\right)d\omega &= Z<1 \end{aligned} \tag{G29}$$

The missing quasiparticle weight $1-Z$ is provided by the incoherent piece [88].

Appendix H: Mott Gap

1. Mott gap

As a benchmark of our theory, in this subsection we calculate the Mott gap (defined as the jump in chemical potential across the Mott transition) and compare our results with Ref. [80]. As shown below, extremizing Eq. (G2), we obtain that the Mott gap is given by:

$$\Delta\mu = \bar{U}\sqrt{1-\frac{\bar{U}_c}{\bar{U}}}\,, \tag{H1}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{U} &= U+12Jz\chi^{2} \\ \bar{U}_c &= 16z\chi(t-X)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{H2}$$

We note that Eq. (H1) reduces to the result of Ref. [80] for the standard Hubbard model when we set the intersite interactions to zero, where, by definition, $\bar{U}=U$ and $\bar{U}_c=U_c$. The details of the calculations are given below.

2. Expectation values and equivalence relationships

We want to solve for the Mott gap in the Brinkman Rice transition. We will consider the generic single band Hubbard Hamiltonian with nearest neighbor interactions given in Eq. (G1). We will assume that

$$p_{\uparrow}=p_{\downarrow}=p \tag{H3}$$

In this case the Gutzwiller equivalences (which may be obtained from the Lagrange multiplier terms in the Lagrangian in Eq. (G2)) are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} P_R^{\dagger}c_{\alpha}P_R &\sim \frac{\left(e+d\right)p}{\sqrt{1-d^2-p^2}\sqrt{1-e^2-p^2}}c_{\alpha} \\ P_R^{\dagger}nP_R &\sim \frac{\left[e^2-d^2+\frac{d^2}{p^2+d^2}\right]}{\left(1-p^2-d^2\right)}n+ \\ &\quad \left[+2p^2+2d^2-\right. \\ &\quad \left.-2\left[\frac{\left[e^2-d^2+\frac{d^2}{p^2+d^2}\right]}{\left(1-p^2-d^2\right)}\right]\left(p^2+d^2\right)\right]I \\ P_R^{\dagger}c_{\uparrow}^{\dagger}c_{\downarrow}^{\dagger}P_R &\sim \frac{de}{\left(1-p^2-d^2\right)\left(p^2+d^2\right)}c_{\uparrow}^{\dagger}c_{\downarrow}^{\dagger} \\ P_R^{\dagger}\vec{S}P_R &\sim \frac{p^2}{\left(1-p^2-d^2\right)\left(p^2+d^2\right)}\vec{S} \\ P_R^{\dagger}c_{\alpha}^{\dagger}n_{\bar{\alpha}}P_R &\sim \frac{dp}{\sqrt{1-d^2-p^2}\sqrt{1-e^2-p^2}}c_{\alpha}^{\dagger} \\ P_R^{\dagger}n_{\uparrow}n_{\downarrow}P_R &\sim \left(\frac{d^2}{p^2+d^2}\right)n-d^2I \end{aligned} \tag{H4}$$

Indeed one can take derivatives with respect to D_{σ}, E_{σ}, $F_{\sigma\sigma'}$, F and set them to zero to obtain Eq. (H4).

3. Gutzwiller Lagrange function

We now calculate the Gutzwiller Lagrange function, we follow the notation in [80] which facilities comparison. In this notation using the Gutzwiller equivalences in Eq. (H4) the Gutzwiller energy functional is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} = & -2\frac{(e+d)^2 p^2}{(1-d^2-p^2)(1-e^2-p^2)} tz\chi + Ud^2 \\ & + 2V\left(\left\langle c^\dagger c\right\rangle\right)^2 - \frac{3}{4}\left[\frac{p^2}{(1-p^2-d^2)(p^2+d^2)}\right]^2 zJ\chi^2 - \left(\frac{\left[e^2-d^2+\frac{d^2}{p^2+d^2}\right]}{(1-p^2-d^2)}\right)^2 Vz\chi^2 \\ & + Yz\frac{d^2e^2}{(1-p^2-d^2)^2(p^2+d^2)^2}\chi^2 + 4\frac{d(e+d)p^2}{(1-d^2-p^2)(1-e^2-p^2)} z\chi X \\ & + \lambda^{(1)}\left(e^2+2p^2+d^2-1\right) + \lambda^{(2)}\left(2p^2+2d^2-2\left\langle f^\dagger f\right\rangle\right) - \mu\left(n-2\left\langle f^\dagger f\right\rangle\right)\end{aligned} \tag{H5}$$

We now replace $\left\langle c_\sigma^\dagger c_\sigma\right\rangle = \left\langle f^\dagger f\right\rangle$ (see Eqs. (G18)) which is special to the case at hand. Here we have introduced the same notation as [80] and have gotten rid of the terms enforcing the Gutzwiller constraints as they are of Lagrange multiplier form and do not contribute to the total energy and replaced the coefficients $\mathcal{R}_{\mu i}$ with their saddle point values. Furthermore since there is no magnetization we have simplified our calculations to the case of spinless fermions (by doubling certain terms). Using the Gutzwiller constraints we have that

$$\begin{aligned}p^2 &= \frac{n}{2} - d^2 \\ e^2 &= 1 - n + d^2\end{aligned} \tag{H6}$$

We now have that the energy functional is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle H\rangle = & -2\frac{\left(\sqrt{1-n+d^2}+d\right)^2\left(\frac{n}{2}-d^2\right)}{\left(1-\frac{n}{2}\right)\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)} tz\chi + Ud^2 \\ & + \frac{1}{2}Vn^2z - \frac{3}{4}\left[\frac{\left(\frac{n}{2}-d^2\right)}{\left(1-\frac{n}{2}\right)\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)}\right]^2 zJ\chi^2 - \left(\frac{\left[(1-n)+\frac{d^2}{\frac{n}{2}}\right]}{\left(1-\frac{n}{2}\right)}\right)^2 Vz\chi^2 \\ & + Yz\frac{d^2\left(1-n+d^2\right)}{\left(1-\frac{n}{2}\right)^2\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^2}\chi^2 + 4\frac{d\left(\sqrt{1-n+d^2}+d\right)\left(\frac{n}{2}-d^2\right)}{\left(1-\frac{n}{2}\right)\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)} z\chi X\end{aligned} \tag{H7}$$

We now assume that $n = 1+\delta$ with $\delta, d \ll 1$ then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle H\rangle = & -8\frac{\left(\sqrt{d^2-\delta}+d\right)^2\left(\frac{1+\delta}{2}-d^2\right)}{1-\delta^2} tz\chi + Ud^2 \\ & + \frac{1}{2}Vn^2z - 12\left[\frac{\left(\frac{1+\delta-2d^2}{2}\right)}{1-\delta^2}\right]^2 zJ\chi^2 - 2\left(\frac{\left[-\delta+2\frac{d^2}{1+\delta}\right]}{(1-\delta)}\right)^2 Vz\chi^2 \\ & + 16Yz\frac{d^2\left(d^2-\delta\right)}{\left(1-\delta^2\right)^2}\chi^2 + 16\frac{d\left(\sqrt{d^2-\delta}+d\right)\left(\frac{1+\delta}{2}-d^2\right)}{1-\delta^2} z\chi X\end{aligned} \tag{H8}$$

Now we introduce the variable $x = e+d$ then we have that [87]:

$$d^2 = \left(\frac{x^2+\delta}{2x}\right)^2 \tag{H9}$$

$$p^2 = \frac{1+\delta}{2} - \left(\frac{x^2+\delta}{2x}\right)^2 \tag{H10}$$

$$e^2 = \left(\frac{x^2+\delta}{2x}\right)^2 - \delta \tag{H11}$$

Then we have that [87]:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle H\rangle = &-2\left[1-\frac{\left(1-x^2\right)^2}{1-\delta^2}\right]tz\chi+U\left(\frac{x^2+\delta}{2x}\right)^2\\&+\frac{1}{2}V\left(1+\delta\right)^2z-\frac{3}{4}\left[\frac{2x^2-\left(x^4+\delta^2\right)}{x^2\left[1-\delta^2\right]}\right]^2zJ\chi^2-\left(\frac{\left[-\delta^2 2x^2+\left(x^4+\delta^2\right)\right]}{\left(1-\delta^2\right)x^2}\right)^2Vz\chi^2\\&+Yz\frac{\left(x^4-\delta^2\right)^2}{\left(1-\delta^2\right)^2x^4}\chi^2+2\frac{\left(x^2+\delta\right)\left(2x^2-\left(x^4+\delta^2\right)\right)}{\left[1-\delta^2\right]x^2}z\chi X\end{aligned}\tag{H12}$$

We now introduce $y=x^2$ and write:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle H\rangle = &-2\left[1-\frac{\left(1-y\right)^2}{1-\delta^2}\right]tz\chi+U\left(\frac{y}{4}+\frac{\delta}{2}+\frac{\delta^2}{4y}\right)\\&+\frac{1}{2}V\left(1+\delta\right)^2z-\frac{3}{4}\left[\frac{2y-\left(y^2+\delta^2\right)}{y\left[1-\delta^2\right]}\right]^2zJ\chi^2-\left(\frac{\left[-\delta^2 2y+\left(y^2+\delta^2\right)\right]}{\left(1-\delta^2\right)y}\right)^2Vz\chi^2\\&+Yz\frac{\left(y^2-\delta^2\right)^2}{\left(1-\delta^2\right)^2y^2}\chi^2+2\left[1-\frac{\left(1-y\right)^2}{1-\delta^2}+\frac{\delta}{y}\left[1-\frac{\left(1-y\right)^2}{1-\delta^2}\right]\right]z\chi X\end{aligned}\tag{H13}$$

Now minimizing the energy with respect to y we get that:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial H}{\partial y} = &-4\left[\frac{\left(1-y\right)}{1-\delta^2}\right]\left(t-X\right)z\chi+U\left(\frac{1}{4}-\frac{\delta^2}{4y^2}\right)-\frac{3}{2}\left[\frac{2y-\left(y^2+\delta^2\right)}{y\left[1-\delta^2\right]}\right]\left[\frac{2-2y}{y\left[1-\delta^2\right]}-\frac{2y-\left(y^2+\delta^2\right)}{y^2\left[1-\delta^2\right]}\right]zJ\chi^2\\&+2\left(\frac{\left[-\delta^2 2y+\left(y^2+\delta^2\right)\right]}{\left(1-\delta^2\right)y}\right)\left[\frac{2}{y}-\frac{\left[-\delta^2 2y+\left(y^2+\delta^2\right)\right]}{\left(1-\delta^2\right)y^2}\right]Vz\chi^2+Yz\left[4\frac{\left(y^2-\delta^2\right)}{\left(1-\delta^2\right)^2y}-2\frac{\left(y^2-\delta^2\right)^2}{\left(1-\delta^2\right)^2y^3}\right]\chi^2\\&\left[-2\frac{\delta}{y^2}\left[1-\frac{\left(1-y\right)^2}{1-\delta^2}\right]+4\frac{\delta}{y}\left[\frac{\left(1-y\right)}{1-\delta^2}\right]\right]z\chi X=0\end{aligned}\tag{H14}$$

We now take $y,\delta\ll 1$, with this $\frac{\partial H}{\partial y}$ is approximately given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial H}{\partial y} = &-4\left(t-X\right)z\chi+U\left(\frac{1}{4}-\frac{\delta^2}{4y^2}\right)\\&-3\left[\frac{\left(-y^2+\delta^2\right)}{y^2}\right]zJ\chi^2=0\end{aligned}\tag{H15}$$

Where we have taken:

$$y=O\left(\delta\right),\tag{H16}$$

and have kept only the order one terms, the rest will not contribute to the Mott gap. Where we used approximations like:

$$-2\frac{\delta}{y^2}\left[1-\frac{\left(1-y\right)^2}{1-\delta^2}\right]\cong-4\frac{\delta}{y}\tag{H17}$$

We now rewrite Eq. (H15) as:

$$y^2\left[-4\left(t-X\right)z\chi+\frac{U}{4}+3zJ\chi^2\right]=\delta^2\left[\frac{U}{4}+3zJ\chi^2\right]\tag{H18}$$

In this case:

$$y=\left|\delta\right|\sqrt{\frac{\left[U+12zJ\chi^2\right]}{\left[U+12zJ\chi^2-16\left(t-X\right)z\chi\right]}}\equiv\frac{\left|\delta\right|}{\varsigma}\tag{H19}$$

From this we see that

$$U_c = 16\left(t - X\right) z\chi - 12 z J \chi^2 \tag{H20}$$

is the critical onsite Hubbard interaction where the Mott gap opens. This matches with Eq. (H2) from the main text. We now write [80]

$$\begin{aligned} y_{\pm} &= \frac{|\delta|}{\varsigma} \\ e^2 &= \left(\frac{y}{4} + \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{\delta^2}{4y}\right) - \delta = \left(\frac{|\delta|}{4\varsigma} + \frac{|\delta|\,\varsigma}{4} - \frac{\delta}{2}\right) = \varsigma_{\pm e}\,|\delta| \\ d^2 &= \left(\frac{y}{4} + \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{\delta^2}{4y}\right) = \left(\frac{|\delta|}{4\varsigma} + \frac{|\delta|\,\varsigma}{4} + \frac{\delta}{2}\right) = \varsigma_{\pm d}\,|\delta| \\ p^2 &= \frac{1}{2} - \left(\frac{|\delta|}{4\varsigma} + \frac{|\delta|\,\varsigma}{4}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{H21}$$

Where

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\varsigma_{\pm d}} &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{4\varsigma} + \frac{\varsigma}{4} \pm \frac{1}{2}} \\ \sqrt{\varsigma_{\pm e}} &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{4\varsigma} + \frac{\varsigma}{4} \mp \frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{H22}$$

4. The Mott gap

Now going back to Eq. (H5) we get that:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle H\rangle = \langle H_0\rangle &+ \lambda^{(1)}\left(e^2 + 2p^2 + d^2 - 1\right) \\ &+ \lambda^{(2)}\left(2p^2 + 2d^2 - 2\left\langle f^\dagger f\right\rangle\right) - \mu\left(n - 2\left\langle f^\dagger f\right\rangle\right) \end{aligned}$$

We then have that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle H_0\rangle = &-2\frac{\left(e+d\right)^2 p^2}{\left(1-d^2-p^2\right)\left(1-e^2-p^2\right)} tz\chi + Ud^2 \\ &+ 2V\left(\left\langle c^\dagger c\right\rangle\right)^2 - \frac{3}{4}\left[\frac{p^2}{\left(1-p^2-d^2\right)\left(p^2+d^2\right)}\right]^2 zJ\chi^2 \\ &- \left(\frac{\left[e^2 - d^2 + \frac{d^2}{p^2+d^2}\right]}{\left(1-p^2-d^2\right)}\right)^2 Vz\chi^2 \\ &+ Yz\frac{d^2e^2}{\left(1-p^2-d^2\right)^2\left(p^2+d^2\right)^2}\chi^2 \\ &+ 4\frac{d\left(e+d\right)p^2}{\left(1-d^2-p^2\right)\left(1-e^2-p^2\right)} z\chi X \end{aligned} \tag{H23}$$

Furthermore:

$$0 = \frac{\partial\left\langle H\right\rangle}{\partial\left\langle f^\dagger f\right\rangle} \Rightarrow \mu = \lambda^{(2)} \tag{H24}$$

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \frac{\partial\left\langle H\right\rangle}{\partial e} &\Rightarrow \lambda^{(1)} = -\frac{\frac{\partial\langle H_0\rangle}{\partial e}}{2e} \\ 0 = \frac{\partial\left\langle H\right\rangle}{\partial d} &\Rightarrow 2d\left(\lambda^{(1)} + 2\lambda^{(2)}\right) = -\frac{\partial\left\langle H_0\right\rangle}{\partial d} \\ &\Rightarrow \lambda^{(2)} = -\frac{\frac{\partial\langle H_0\rangle}{\partial d}}{4d} + \frac{\frac{\partial\langle H_0\rangle}{\partial e}}{4e} \end{aligned} \tag{H25}$$

Now we take:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial\left\langle H_0\right\rangle}{\partial d} &= -8\left(e+d\right)tz\chi + 2Ud + 8\left[e+2d\right]z\chi X + ... \\ \frac{\partial\left\langle H_0\right\rangle}{\partial e} &= -8\left(e+d\right)tz\chi + 8dz\chi X + ... \end{aligned} \tag{H26}$$

Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^{(2)}_{\pm} &= const - 2\left(t-X\right)z\chi\left[\frac{e}{d} - \frac{d}{e}\right] + ... \\ &= const - 2\left(t-X\right)z\chi\left[\frac{\sqrt{\varsigma_{\pm e}}}{\sqrt{\varsigma_{\pm d}}} - \frac{\sqrt{\varsigma_{\pm d}}}{\sqrt{\varsigma_{\pm e}}}\right] \end{aligned} \tag{H27}$$

Form this we see that:

$$\Delta\mu = \lambda^{(2)}_{+} - \lambda^{(2)}_{-} \tag{H28}$$

This means that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\mu &= 4\left(\left(t-X\right)z\chi\right)\left[\frac{\sqrt{\varsigma_{+d}}}{\sqrt{\varsigma_{+e}}} - \frac{\sqrt{\varsigma_{+e}}}{\sqrt{\varsigma_{+d}}}\right] \\ &= \frac{16\left(\left(t-X\right)z\chi\right)}{\sqrt{\frac{\left[U+12zJ\chi^2\right]}{\left[U+12zJ\chi^2-16(t-X)z\chi\right]}} - \sqrt{\frac{\left[U+12zJ\chi^2-16(t-X)z\chi\right]}{\left[U+12zJ\chi^2\right]}}} \end{aligned} \tag{H29}$$

a. Simplifying the expressions

We write:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{U} &= U + 12Jz\chi^2 \\ \bar{t} &= t - X\end{aligned} \tag{H30}$$

Then

$$\Delta\mu = \frac{16z\chi\bar{t}}{\sqrt{\frac{\bar{U}}{\bar{U}-16z\chi\bar{t}}} - \sqrt{\frac{\bar{U}-16z\chi\bar{t}}{\bar{U}}}} \tag{H31}$$

We now introduce

$$\bar{U}_c = 16z\chi\bar{t} \tag{H32}$$

Then

$$\Delta\mu = \sqrt{\bar{U}\left(\bar{U}-\bar{U}_c\right)} \tag{H33}$$

Then there are two cases to consider $\delta\bar{U} \equiv \bar{U} - \bar{U}_c \ll \bar{U}_c$ and $\bar{U} \gg \bar{U}_c$

Case $\delta\bar{U} \ll \bar{U}_c$ Then

$$\Delta\mu \cong \sqrt{U_c}\sqrt{\delta U} \tag{H34}$$

Case $\bar{U} \gg \bar{U}_c$ Then

$$\Delta\mu \cong \bar{U} - \frac{1}{2}\bar{U}_c \tag{H35}$$

Appendix I: Calculating the embedding Hamiltonian

We would like to qualitatively motivate the results of the previous section that the gap does not depend on V and Y by studying the embedding Hamiltonian [15, 65, 67, 68]. To do so we note that for cases when some of the variables $\{\mathcal{R}_\sigma, \mathcal{S}_\sigma, \mathcal{T}_{\sigma a}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{U}\}, \{\mathcal{R}^*_\sigma, \mathcal{S}^*_\sigma, \mathcal{T}^*, \mathcal{U}^*\}$ become zero the corresponding piece of the embedding Hamiltonian becomes zero. Indeed taking derivatives we get that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\mathcal{R}_\sigma} = 0 \Rightarrow 0 &= \langle\Psi_0| - t\sum_{\langle RR'\rangle\sigma}\mathcal{R}^*_\sigma f^\dagger_{R\sigma}f_{R'\sigma} + X\sum_{\langle RR'\rangle\sigma}\mathcal{S}^*_\sigma f^\dagger_{R\sigma}f_{R'\sigma}\left|\Psi_0\right\rangle = D_\sigma\sqrt{\left(1-\Delta_\sigma\right)\Delta_\sigma} \\
\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\mathcal{S}_\sigma} = 0 \Rightarrow 0 &= \langle\Psi_0| X\sum_{\langle RR'\rangle\sigma}\mathcal{R}^*_\sigma f^\dagger_{R\sigma}f_{R'\sigma}\left|\Psi_0\right\rangle = E_\sigma\sqrt{\left(1-\Delta_\sigma\right)\Delta_\sigma} \\
\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\mathcal{T}} = 0 \Rightarrow 0 &= -zJ\Delta^{(n.n.)}_\uparrow\Delta^{(n.n)}_\downarrow\mathcal{T}^* = F\sqrt{\left(1-\Delta_\uparrow\right)\Delta_\uparrow}\sqrt{\left(1-\Delta_\downarrow\right)\Delta_\downarrow} \\
\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\mathcal{U}} = 0 \Rightarrow 0 &= \frac{z}{2}Y\left(\sum_\sigma\Delta^{(n.n.)}_\sigma\Delta^{(n.n.)}_{\bar{\sigma}}\right)\mathcal{U} = G\sqrt{\left(1-\Delta_\uparrow\right)\Delta_\uparrow}\sqrt{\left(1-\Delta_\downarrow\right)\Delta_\downarrow}
\end{aligned} \tag{I1}$$

From this we see that G, F, E_σ, D_σ vanish whenever $\mathcal{U}$, $\mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{S}_\sigma$, $\mathcal{R}_\sigma$ vanish. The situation with $F_{\sigma a}$ is more complex. The coefficients $\mathcal{T}_{\sigma a}$ do not vanish simultaneously anywhere in the phase diagram but instead satisfy $\mathcal{T}_{\uparrow\uparrow} = -\mathcal{T}_{\uparrow\downarrow} = \mathcal{T}_{\downarrow\downarrow} = -\mathcal{T}_{\downarrow\uparrow}$ when $\eta = 0$, $\Delta^{(n.n.)}_\uparrow = \Delta^{(n.n)}_\downarrow = \Delta^{(n.n.)} = \chi$ and $\Delta_a = \Delta_{\bar{a}} = \Delta = n_a = n_{\bar{a}} = n = \frac{1}{2}$ (we note that $\Delta_a = n_a$ is a direct consequence of our assumption that $\left[\Lambda_R, P^0_R\right] = 0$). We will now show that this implies the following relations between the coefficients $F_{\sigma a}$:

$$F_{\uparrow\uparrow} = -F_{\uparrow\downarrow} = F_{\downarrow\downarrow} = -F_{\downarrow\uparrow} \equiv \tilde{F} \tag{I2}$$

Indeed taking appropriate combinations of derivatives of the Lagrange function we get that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\mathcal{T}_{\sigma a}} + \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\mathcal{T}_{\bar{\sigma}a}} = 0 \Rightarrow 0 &= -2zV\sum_{\sigma'}\Delta^{(n.n.)}_a\Delta^{(n.n)}_a\mathcal{T}_{\sigma' a} + \frac{z}{4}J\sum_{\sigma' a}\left(\sigma+\bar{\sigma}\right)\sigma'\Delta^{(n.n.)}_a\Delta^{(n.n)}_a\mathcal{T}_{\sigma' a} \\
&= F_{\sigma a}\left(1-\Delta_a\right)\Delta_a + F_{\bar{\sigma}a}\left(1-\Delta_a\right)\Delta_a \\
\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\mathcal{T}_{\sigma a}} + \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\mathcal{T}_{\sigma\bar{a}}} = 0 \Rightarrow 0 &= -zV\sum_{\sigma'}\Delta^{(n.n.)}_a\Delta^{(n.n)}_a\mathcal{T}_{\sigma' a} - zV\sum_{\sigma'}\Delta^{(n.n.)}_{\bar{a}}\Delta^{(n.n)}_{\bar{a}}\mathcal{T}_{\sigma'\bar{a}} + \\
&\quad + \frac{z}{4}J\sum_{\sigma'}\sigma\sigma'\Delta^{(n.n.)}_a\Delta^{(n.n)}_a\mathcal{T}_{\sigma a}\mathcal{T}_{\sigma' a} + zJ\sum_{\sigma'}\sigma\sigma'\Delta^{(n.n.)}_{\bar{a}}\Delta^{(n.n)}_{\bar{a}}\mathcal{T}_{\sigma' a} \\
&= F_{\sigma a}\left(1-\Delta_a\right)\Delta_a + F_{\sigma\bar{a}}\left(1-\Delta_{\bar{a}}\right)\Delta_{\bar{a}}
\end{aligned} \tag{I3}$$

From this we get that Eq. (I2) follows. In particular at half filling for $\eta = 0$ we have that

$$H_{embed} = U\hat{c}^{\dagger}_{\uparrow}\hat{c}_{\uparrow}\hat{c}^{\dagger}_{\downarrow}\hat{c}_{\downarrow} + \sum_{\sigma}\lambda^{c}_{\sigma}\hat{f}_{\sigma}\hat{f}^{\dagger}_{\sigma} + \left[F\hat{c}^{\dagger}_{\uparrow}\hat{c}_{\downarrow}\hat{f}_{\downarrow}\hat{f}^{\dagger}_{\uparrow} + h.c.\right] + \tilde{F}\sum_{\sigma a}\sigma a\left(\hat{c}^{\dagger}_{\sigma}\hat{c}_{\sigma}\hat{f}_{a}\hat{f}^{\dagger}_{a}\right) + \sum_{\sigma}\lambda^{b}_{\sigma}\hat{c}^{\dagger}_{\sigma}\hat{c}_{\sigma} \tag{I4}$$

We see that there is no density density type of interaction or pair hopping. We note that we can get a relation between F and $\tilde{F}$ via:

$$F = \frac{-zJ\Delta^{(n.n.)}_{\uparrow}\Delta^{(n.n)}_{\downarrow}\mathcal{T}^{*}}{\sqrt{(1-\Delta_{\uparrow})\Delta_{\uparrow}}\sqrt{(1-\Delta_{\downarrow})\Delta_{\downarrow}}} = \frac{-zJ\chi^{2}\mathcal{T}^{*}}{(1-\Delta)\Delta}$$
$$\frac{\delta\mathcal{L}}{\delta\mathcal{T}_{\uparrow\uparrow}} = 0 \Rightarrow -\frac{z}{4}J\sum_{\sigma\sigma' ab}\sigma'\Delta^{(n.n.)}_{\uparrow}\Delta^{(n.n)}_{\uparrow}\mathcal{T}_{\sigma'\uparrow} = \tilde{F}(1-\Delta_{\uparrow})\Delta_{\uparrow} \Rightarrow \tilde{F} = \frac{-zJ\chi^{2}\mathcal{T}^{*}_{\uparrow\uparrow}}{2(1-\Delta)\Delta} \tag{I5}$$

We now use that $\mathcal{T}_{\uparrow\uparrow} = \frac{\mathcal{T}}{2} = 1$. Therefore we have that:

$$H_{embed} = U\hat{c}^{\dagger}_{\uparrow}\hat{c}_{\uparrow}\hat{c}^{\dagger}_{\downarrow}\hat{c}_{\downarrow} + \sum_{\sigma}\lambda^{c}_{\sigma}\hat{f}_{\sigma}\hat{f}^{\dagger}_{\sigma} - 8zJ\chi^{2}\left(\vec{S}_{c}\cdot\vec{S}_{f}\right) + \sum_{\sigma}\lambda^{b}_{\sigma}\hat{c}^{\dagger}_{\sigma}\hat{c}_{\sigma} \tag{I6}$$

Here $\vec{S}_c$ is the spin operator for the impurity and $\vec{S}_f$ is the spin operator for the bath. We note that the term:

$$-\sum_{\sigma a}F_{\sigma a}\hat{c}^{\dagger}_{\sigma}\hat{c}_{\sigma}\Delta_{a} = 0 \tag{I7}$$

due to Eq. (I2). We note that the parameters V and Y do not enter the embedding Hamiltonian at half filling in the Brinkman Rice phase.

[1] M. S. Hybertsen, M. Schluter, E. B. Stechel, D. R. Jennison, *Renormalization from density functional theory strong coupling models for the electronic structure of La_2CuO_4* United States: N. p., 1989. Web.

[2] A. Georges, G. Kotliar, W. Krauth, and M. J Rozenberg, Rev. Mod. Phys. **68**, 13 (1996).

[3] S. Wouters, C. A. Jiménez-Hoyos, Q. Sun and G. K.-L. Chan J. Chem Theory Comp. 12, 2706 (2016).

[4] M. C. Gutzwiller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 159 (1963).

[5] M. C. Gutzwiller, Phys. Rev. **134**, A923 (1964).

[6] M. C. Gutzwiller, Phys. Rev. **137**, A1726 (1965).

[7] M. Ferrero, P. S. Cornaglia, L. De Leo, O. Parcollet, G. Kotliar, and A. Georges Phys. Rev. B **80**, 064501 (2009).

[8] J. Bünemann and F. Gebhard Phys. Rev. B **76**, 193104 (2007).

[9] T. Ayral, T.-H. Lee, and G. Kotliar, Phys. Rev. B **96**, 235139 (2017).

[10] J. Bunemann, W. Weber and F. Gebhard, Phys. Rev. B **57**, 6896 (1998).\

[11] Michele Fabrizio, arXiv 2012.2175.

[12] W. F. Brinkman and T. M. Rice, Phys. Rev. B **2**, 4302 (1970).

[13] P. Fazekas, *Lecture notes on electron correlations and magnetism* (World scientific, Singapore, 1999).

[14] Y. X. Yao, J. Liu, and K. M. Ho, Phys Rev. B **89**, 045131 (2014). F. Gebhardt, *Gutzwiller density functional theory*, in *The physics of correlated insulators metals and superconductors*, Eva Pavarini, Erik Koch, Richard Schalettar, and Richard Martin eds.

[15] N. Lanata, Y. Yao, C-Z Wang, K-M Ho, and G. Kotliar, Phys. Rev. X **5**, 011008 (2015).

[16] W. Metzner and D. Vollhardt Phys. Rev. Lett. 62, 324 (1989).

[17] F. Gebhard Phys. Rev. B **41**, 9452 (1990)

[18] M. Schiró and M. Fabrizio Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 076401 (2010).

[19] N. Lanatà, P. Barone, and M. Fabrizio Phys. Rev. B **78**, 155127 (2008).

[20] J. Buenemann, F. Gebhard, R. Thul, Phys. Rev. B **67**, 075103 (2003).

[21] E. v. Oelsen, G. Seibold, J. Bünemann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 076402 (2011).

[22] E. v. Oelsen, G. Seibold, J. Bünemann, New J. Phys. **13,** 113031 (2011).

[23] J. Bünemann, M. Capone, J. Lorenzana, G. Seibold, New J. Phys. **15,** 053050 (2013).

[24] K. zu Münster, J. Bünemann, Phys. Rev. B **94**, 045135 (2016).

[25] Frank Lechermann, Antoine Georges, Gabriel Kotliar, Oliver Percollet, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 155102 (2007).

[26] G. Kotliar and A. E. Ruckenstein Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 1362 (1986).

[27] T. Li, P. Wölfle, and P. J. Hirschfeld Phys. Rev. B **40**, 6817 (1989)

[28] T.-H. Lee, T. Ayral, Y.-X. Yao, N. Lanata, G. Kotliar Phys. Rev. B **99**, 115129 (2019).

[29] Gabriel Kotliar, Sergej Y Savrasov, Kristjan Haule, Viktor S Oudovenko, O Parcollet, CA Marianetti, Rev. Mod.

Phys **78**, 865 (2006).
[30] V. I. Anisimov, A. I. Oteryaev, M. A. Korotin, A. O. Anokhin, and G. Kotliar, J. Phys. Condens. Matter 9, 7359 (1997).
[31] X. Y. Deng, L. Wang, X. Dai, and Z. Fang Phys. Rev. B **79**, 075114 (2009).
[32] Jörg Bünemann, arXiv:1207.6456.
[33] T. Schickling, J. Bünemann, F. Gebhard, Werner Weber, New J. Phys **16**, 093034 (2014).
[34] S.Y. Savrasov and G. Kotliar, Phys. Rev. B 69, 245101 (2004).
[35] R. H. McKenzie arXiv 9802198.
[36] J. Hubbard, Proc. R. Soc. London, 276 (1963).
[37] T. Ayral, S. Biermann, and P. Werner, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 125149 (2013).
[38] H. Terletska, T, Chen, and E. Gull Phys. Rev. B **95**, 115149 (2017).
[39] T. D. Stanescu, and G. Kotliar, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 205112 (2004).
[40] G. Rohringer, H. Hafermann, A. Toschi, A. A. Katanin, A. E. Antipov, M. I. Katsnelson, A. I. Lichtenstein, A. N. Rubtsov, and K. Held Rev. Mod. Phys. **90**, 025003 (2018).
[41] A. Schiller, and K. Ingersen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 113 (1995).
[42] A. I. Lichtenstein, and M. I. Katsnelson, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 9283 (2000).
[43] S. Biermann, F. Aryasetiawan, and A. Georges, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 086402 (2003).
[44] Q. Si, and J. L. Smith Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 3391 (1996).
[45] R. Chitra, and G. Kotliar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 3678 (2000).
[46] P. Werner and A. J. Millis Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 146401 (2010).
[47] F. C. Zhang, C. Gros, T. M. Rice and H. Shiba, Superconductor science and technology **1**, 36 (1988).
[48] M. Ogata and H. Himeda, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **72**, 374 (2003).
[49] R. Sensarma, a theoretical study of strongly interacting superfluids and superconductors, Ohaio State University, Columbus (Ohio, 2007, Thesis).
[50] C. Li, *Gutzwiller approximation to strongly correlated systems*, (Boston College, 2009, Thesis).
[51] Y. X. Yao, J. Liu, C. Z. Wang, and K. M. Ho, Phys Rev B **89**, 045131 (2014).
[52] C. Liu, J. Liu, Y. X. Yao, P. Wu, C. Z. Wang and K. M. Ho, Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation **12**, 4806 (2016).
[53] M. M. Wysokinski, *Unconventional superconductivity and hybridized correlated fermion systems*, Uniwersytet Jageillonski, (Krakow 2015, Thesis).
[54] M. Fidrysiak, D. Goc-Jaglo, E. Kądzielawa-Major, P. Kubiczek, J. Spalek, Phys. Rev. B **99**, 205106 (2019).
[55] M. Zegrodnik, J. Spalek, Phys. Rev. B **98**, 155144 (2018).
[56] M. Zegrodnik, A. Biborski, M. Fidrysiak, J. Spalek, Phys. Rev. B **99**, 104511 (2019).
[57] M. Zegrodnik, J. Spalek, Phys. Rev. B **96**, 054511 (2017).
[58] M. Zegrodnik, J. Spalek, Phys. Rev. B **98**, 155144 (2018).
[59] M. Abram, *Nonstandard Representation of Correlated-Fermion Models and its Application to Description of Magnetism and Unconventional Superconductivity*, Jagiellonian University, Krakow, 2016 (Thesis).
[60] Nicola Lanata, *The Gutzwiller variational approach to correlated systems*, (SISSA, 2009, Thesis).
[61] Mateo Sandri, *The Gutzwiller approach to out-of-equilibrium correlated fermions* (SISSA, 2014, Thesis).
[62] E. Kądzielawa-Major, M. Fidrysiak, P. Kubiczek, J. Spałek, Phys. Rev. B 97, 224519 (2018).
[63] A. N. Rubtsov, M. I. Katsnelson, A. I. Lichtenstein, Ann. Phys. 327 **5**, 1320 (2012).
[64] E. G. C. P. van Loon, A. I. Lichtenstein, M. I. Katsnelson, O. Parcollet, and H. Hafermann Phys. Rev. B **90**, 235135 (2014).
[65] N. Lanata, Y. Yao, V. Dobroslavljevic, and G. Kotliar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, 126401 (2017).
[66] Nicola Lanata, Hugo U. R. Strand, Xi Dai, and Bo Hellsing, Phys. Rev. B **85**, 035133 (2012).
[67] N. Lanata, Y. Yao, X. Deng, C-Z Wang, K-M Ho and G. Kotliar, Phys. Rev. B **93**, 045103 (2016).
[68] N. Lanata , T.-H. Lee, Y. Yao, V. Dobrosavljević, Phys. Rev. B **96**, 195126 (2017).
[69] A. Amaricci, A. Camjayi, D. Tanaskovic, K. Haule, V. Dobroslavjevic, G. Kotliar, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 155102 (2010).
[70] Y. Zhang and J. Callaway, Phys. Rev. B. **39**, 9397 (1989).
[71] X-Z. Yan, Phys. Rev. B **48**, 7140 (1993).
[72] P. G. J. van Dogen, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 7904 (1994).
[73] P. G. J. van Dogen, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 14016 (1994).
[74] P. G. J. van Dogen, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 1584 (1996).
[75] B. Chattopadhyay and D. M. Gaitonde, Phys. Rev. B **55**, 15364 (1997).
[76] C. Nayak, E. Pivovarov, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 064508 (2002).
[77] S. Onari, R. Arita, K. Kuroki, and H. Aoki, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 094523 (2004).
[78] M. Aichhorn, H. G. Evertz, W. von der Linden, and M. Potthoff, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 235107 (2004).
[79] M. Schuler, M. Rosner, T. O. Wehling, A. I. Lichtenstein, M. I. Katsnelson, Phys. Rev. Let. **111**, 033601 (20013).
[80] M. Lavagana, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 142 (1990).
[81] K. Haule, C.-H. Yee and K. Kim, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 195107 (2010).
[82] M. Airchorn, L. Pourovskii, V. Vildosola, M. Ferrero, O. Parcollet, T. Miyake, A. Georges, S. Biermann, Phys. Rev. B **80**, 085101 (2009).
[83] J.-Z. Zhao, J.-N. Zhuang, X.-Y. Deng, Y. Bi, L.-C. Cai, Z. Fang, and X. Dai, Chin. Phys. B **21**, 057106 (2012).
[84] F. Amadon, F. Lechermann, A. Georges, F. Jollet, T. O. Wehling, and A. I. Lichtenstein, Phys. Rev B **77**, 205112 (2008).
[85] V. I. Anisimov, D. Kondakov, A. V. Kozhevnikov, I. A. Nekrasov, Z. V. Pchelkina, J. W. Allen, S.-K. Mo, H.-D. Kim, P. Metcalf, S. Suga, A. Sekiyama, G. Keller, I. Leonov, X. Ren and D. Vollhardt, Phys. Rev. B **71**, 125119 (2005).
[86] J. Kunes, *Wannier functions and construction of model Hamiltonians*, Eva Pavarini, Erik Koch, Dieter Vollhardt, and Alexander Leichtenstein eds (Forschungzentrum Julich, 2017, Julich).
[87] D. Vollhardt, P. Wolfle and P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. B **35**, 6703 (1987).
[88] G. Goldstein, G. Kotliar and N. Lanata, in preparation.