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The variational determination of the two-fermion reduced density matrix is described for trapped, ultracold few-fermion systems in one dimension with equal spin populations. This is accomplished by formulating the problem as a semi-definite program, with the two-fermion reduced density matrix being subject to the D, Q, G, T1, and T2 N-representability conditions. The ground-state energies of $N = 2, 4$, and $8$ fermion systems are found by utilising an augmented Lagrangian method for semi-definite programming. The ground-state energies are found to match extremely well to those determined by full-configuration interaction and coupled-cluster calculations. This demonstrates the utility of the reduced density matrix approach to strongly correlated, ultracold few-fermion systems.

I. INTRODUCTION

The study of few-fermion systems in quantum mechanics began in earnest immediately after the discovery of the Schrödinger equation in 1925 [1]. The first such systems to be analysed were simple atoms and molecules. The treatments were extended to larger systems as the computational power increased and the theoretical methods became more well-founded. In more recent years, experimental data have permitted the study of more exotic few-fermion systems, such as quantum dots [2–5] and trapped, highly correlated ultracold fermionic gases [6–25]. Ongoing theoretical efforts to accurately and efficiently capture the ground state properties and dynamics of these systems coupled with ever-growing experimental capacities has ensured that the field of few-fermion systems retains immense interest.

A main goal many-body quantum mechanics is the accurate description of correlation in the system, which constitutes the intricate interactions that are not captured by a mean-field approach. Many such schemes exist, such as post-Hartree-Fock (HF) methods which use the mean-field HF ground state as an initial step to construct a wavefunction solution to the Schrödinger equation. For example, the coupled-cluster (CC) method has been successfully applied to a large range of atomic and molecular systems [26–32] as well as, more recently, ultracold bosonic [33, 34] and fermionic systems [14, 35]. Post-HF methods are not limited to an exact solution of the Schrödinger equation in the Hilbert space spanned by the finite basis set used. Such a process, known as full-configuration interaction (FCI), is equivalent to a direct diagonalisation of the many-body Hamiltonian. As such, the FCI ground state can be used as the primary benchmark against which the accuracy and efficiency of different techniques can be measured [36]. However, such an approach is computationally expensive, and cannot be extended to arbitrarily large systems.

Due to the immense number of parameters in the $N$-fermion wavefunction, where $N$ is the number of fermions in the system, for moderate to large $N$ in FCI calculations, it is enticing to consider whether the ground state properties of these systems can be found using reduced quantities. These quantities would ideally depend on fewer parameters than the $N$-fermion wavefunction. Density functional theory (DFT) is one such approach, which utilises the single-particle electron density as the fundamental variable, rather than the $N$-fermion wavefunction. It has seen wide success in capturing correlation in atomic and molecular systems, as well as larger, more complicated systems such as those arising in materials science [37–40]. The reduction in complexity attained by utilising the electron density comes at a cost, however, as the exact energy functional for the system is replaced by an unknown energy functional of the electron density. This replacement brings about numerous issues concerning the accuracy and range of applicability of DFT [41].

An alternative approach to DFT which still uses reduced quantities utilises what is known as the two-fermion reduced density matrix (2-RDM). The 2-RDM is derived from an $N$-fermion wavefunction by integrating out the spin and spatial coordinates of the 3rd to the $N$th fermion. It was shown by Husimi [42], Löwdin [43], and Mayer [44] that any quantum system of $N$ particles with at-most pairwise interactions can be described completely by the 2-RDM [42]. In other words, physical characteristics of the system such as the ground state energies and fermion density can be expressed as linear functionals of the 2-RDM. Earlier, Dirac [45] had shown that the HF ground state for an $N$-fermion system could be expressed explicitly in terms of the one-fermion reduced density matrix (1-RDM). Soon thereafter, the idea of reducing an $N$-fermion problem to an effective 2-particle problem was promoted by the mathematician A. J. Coleman [46]. Early attempts by Mayer [44], Tredgold [47], and Coleman [46, 48] to utilise this methodology yielded poor results, with the ground state energy being far too low. It was soon realised that a Rayleigh-Ritz minimisation of the ground state energy subject to variation in the elements of the 2-RDM failed to impose sufficient constraints.

The additional constraints were termed $N$-representability conditions [48], and were required
to ensure that a trial 2-RDM that is determined variationally corresponds to a legitimate $N$-fermion wavefunction. The search for a complete set of such conditions was known as the $N$-representability problem, and was pursed actively in electronic structure theory and many-body quantum mechanics for around five decades. While the complete solution to the $N$-representability problem eluded the theoretical community, necessary (but not sufficient, except in the $N = 2$ fermion case) conditions, known as the D, G, and Q conditions, were found by Coleman [48] and Garrod and Percus [49]. These manifested as semidefinite constraints on matrices representing the probability distribution of two fermions, one fermion and one hole, and two holes, respectively. Further conditions were soon found by Erdahl [50], which are known as the T1 and T2 conditions, which constitute semidefinite constraints on matrices corresponding to the various distributions of three fermions and holes.

With these $N$-representability conditions, significant progress was made throughout the early 2000s, motivated by the development of sophisticated and efficient methods in semidefinite programming [51, 52], to variationally determine the 2-RDM while applying the D, Q, G, T1, and T2 conditions to simple atomic and molecular systems [53–60], as well as quantum dots [61] and the Hubbard model [60, 62–64]. The standard formulation of the RDM method is as a semidefinite program (SDP) and the development of powerful interior-point methods in the late 1990’s spawned the rise of interest in the 2-RDM method as a whole. Later, significantly more powerful boundary-point methods were developed, which greatly increased the efficiency of the implementation [55, 56, 65].

In this work, we apply the RDM method to the field of trapped, ultracold few-fermion systems. Specifically, we consider the simplest of such systems: a one-dimensional, harmonically trapped system of ultracold fermions interacting by a contact interaction, with equal spin populations. Such a system can be regarded as the simplest system in the field of ultracold fermionic systems, yet serves as an excellent testbed to demonstrate the effectiveness of the RDM method, which has seen use primarily in electronic structure applications in atoms and molecules.

Ultracold quantum gases serve as excellent systems in which to study many-body quantum mechanics as they are highly controllable experimentally [17, 66]. Also, the intricacies of the interactions in simple ultracold gases with a small number of particles can be utilised to study larger, and more complicated condensed matter systems [67]. As such, they have seen immense theoretical interest. Furthermore, the application of quantum chemistry techniques to trapped ultracold few-fermion systems has allowed the treatment of larger systems where an exact diagonalisation of the Hamiltonian is completely infeasible [14, 35]. Here, the utility and accuracy of the RDM method for highly correlated systems is demonstrated in the ground-state calculations for simple $N = 2, 4$, and 8 fermion systems.

The organisation of this paper is as follows. In Sec. II we present the general theory of the RDM approach, and demonstrate how the expectation value of a many-body Hamiltonian can be expressed directly in terms of the 2-RDM. In Sec. III we briefly outline the $N$-representability problem, and discuss the constructive solution while explicitly giving the matrix representations of the well-known conditions. In Sec. IV we discuss the implementation of the RDM as an SDP. In Sec. V we briefly discuss ultracold few-fermion systems and in Sec. VI we demonstrate the results of the RDM calculations. We conclude with a discussion on the limitations of the RDM methodology, as well as discussing the key benefits of using the RDM in the ultracold few-fermion field of research.

II. REDUCED DENSITY MATRIX THEORY

Consider an $N$-fermion quantum system. It is an axiomatic assumption that the Hamiltonian for this system can be expressed as the sum of one-body and two-body operators as,

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} (1) \hat{h}(i) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} (2) \hat{V}(i,j),$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $(1) \hat{h}(i)$ is the one-body operator that acts on a single fermion, $i$, and $(2) \hat{V}(i,j)$ is a two-body operator that acts on the pair of fermions, $i$ and $j$.

Let $|\Psi\rangle$ be the (pure) state vector describing the ground state of this system. Then, the ground state energy of the system, $E_0$, can be found from the time-independent Schrödinger equation [1], $\hat{H}|\Psi\rangle = E_0|\Psi\rangle$. The $N$-fermion density operator, $(N)\hat{\rho}$, for this system, as introduced by von Neumann [68], is given by the outer product of the state vector $|\Psi\rangle$ with itself, $(N)\hat{\rho} = |\Psi\rangle \langle \Psi |$. If we project this operator into coordinate space then we arrive at the $N$-fermion density matrix,

$$(N)D(x_1,...,x_N;x'_1,...,x'_N) := \langle x_1,...,x_N|\Psi\rangle \langle \Psi | x'_1,...,x'_N \rangle = \Psi^*(x_1,...,x_N) \Psi(x'_1,...,x'_N).$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where $x_j$ denotes the spin and spatial coordinates of the $j$th fermion [69]. The diagonal element of the $N$-fermion density matrix, when $x'_1 = x_1, ... , x'_N = x_N$, has the usual statistical interpretation: $(N)D(x_1,...,x_N;x_1,...,x_N)$ is a probability distribution function describing the locations in space and spins of the $N$ fermions.

The $p$-fermion reduced density matrix ($p$-RDM) is the probability distribution function for $p < N$ fermions occupying any $p$ of the $N$ positions and spins given by $x_1,...,x_p$. It is found by integrating out the spin and spatial coordinates of the $(p+1)$th to the $N$th fermions,
This object was first introduced by Husimi [42] although Dirac [45] showed in 1930 that a Hartree-Fock ground state for a fermionic system can be expressed in terms of 1-RDMs. The normalisation factor $p! \binom{N}{p}$ was introduced by McWeeny [70]. Other normalisation factors exist in the literature today, with the factor $\binom{N}{p}$ due to Löwdin [43] and the factor of unity due to ter Haar [71] and Coleman [48].

\begin{align}
(1) D(x; x') &= N \int dx_2 \cdots dx_N \langle x, x' | D(x_1, \ldots, x_N; x_1', \ldots, x'_N) | x, x' \rangle, \\
(2) D(x, x' | x_1, \ldots, x_N) &= N(N - 1) \int dx_3 \cdots dx_N \langle x, x' | D(x_1, \ldots, x_N; x_1', \ldots, x'_N) | x, x' \rangle.
\end{align}

To apply the RDM apparatus to physical problems, a finite basis set must be introduced. Typically, this is a single-particle basis of spin-orbitals, which we denote by \{ $\varphi_i(x)$ \}. We denote the size of the spin-orbital basis set by $r$. Due to the two-fold spin multiplicity of fermions, a rank $r$ spin-orbital basis means we have $r^2$ spatial-orbital functions in the given basis. The 1- and 2-RDMs are represented by

\begin{align}
(1) D(x; x') &= \sum_{ij} (1) D^i_j \varphi_i(x) \varphi_j(x'), \\
(2) D(x, x' | x_1, \ldots, x_N) &= \sum_{ijkl} (2) D^i_j k l \varphi_i(x) \varphi_j(x_2) \varphi_k(x_1') \varphi_l(x_2').
\end{align}

The tensors \( (1) D^i_j \) and \( (2) D^i_j k l \) can be expressed conveniently in second-quantised notation, providing the most common expressions for the 1- and 2-RDMs found in the literature,

\begin{align}
(1) D^i_j &= \langle \Psi | \hat{a}_i^\dagger \hat{a}_j | \Psi \rangle, \\
(2) D^i_j k l &= \langle \Psi | \hat{a}_i^\dagger \hat{a}_j \hat{a}_k \hat{a}_l | \Psi \rangle,
\end{align}

where \( \hat{a}_i \) and \( \hat{a}_i^\dagger \) are the annihilation and creation operators for fermions. We can express the general Hamiltonian in Eq. (1) in a second-quantised form as

\begin{align}
\hat{H} &= \sum_{ij} (1) h^i_j \hat{a}_i^\dagger \hat{a}_j + \sum_{ijkl} (2) V^i_j k l \hat{a}_i^\dagger \hat{a}_j \hat{a}_k \hat{a}_l,
\end{align}

where the indices $i, j, k, l$ correspond to elements of the spin-orbital basis set \{ $\varphi_i(x)$ \}, the sums run over all possible values of the indices in the basis, $i, j, k, l \in \{1, 2, \ldots, r\}$, and \( (1) h^i_j \) and \( (2) V^i_j k l \) are the one- and two-fermion integrals,

\begin{align}
(1) h^i_j &= \langle \psi | (1) \hat{h}_{ij} | \psi \rangle = \int dx \varphi_i^\dagger(x) \langle 1 \hat{h}_{ij} \varphi_j(x), \\
(2) V^i_j k l &= \langle \psi | (2) \hat{V}_{kl}^{ij} | \psi \rangle = \int dx_1 dx_2 \varphi_i^\dagger(x_1) \varphi_j^\dagger(x_2) \\
&\times \langle 2 \hat{V}_{kl}^{ij} \varphi_k(x_1) \varphi_l(x_2) \rangle.
\end{align}

By taking the expectation value of the Hamiltonian with respect to the ground state $|\Psi\rangle$ and incorporating the expressions of the 1- and 2-RDMs in second-quantised notation (Eqs. (8) and (9)) we see that the ground state energy is a linear functional of the 1- and 2-RDMs,

\begin{align}
\langle \Psi | \hat{H} | \Psi \rangle &= \sum_{ij} (1) h^i_j (1) D^i_j + \sum_{ijkl} (2) V^i_j k l (2) D^i_j k l \\
&= \text{Tr} \left\{ (1) h^i_j (1) D^i_j \right\} + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left\{ (2) V^i_j k l (2) D^i_j k l \right\}.
\end{align}

### III. N-REPRESENTABILITY

Initial efforts to calculate the ground state properties of simple systems with the RDM method yielded drastically incorrect results [46–49, 72]. This is due to the lack of N-representability conditions applied to the 2-RDM. The search for these N-representability conditions, which ensure the 2-RDM corresponds to a legitimate $N$-particle wavefunction, are what Coleman [48] called the $N$-representability problem, i.e., the search for $N$-representability constraints on the 1- and 2-RDMs.
Denote by \((N)\mathcal{P}\) the set of all positive semidefinite Hermitian operators of unit trace on the Hilbert space for our \(N\)-fermion system. This set is equivalent to the set of all possible \(N\)-fermion density operators \((N)\mathcal{D}\) \([48, 73]\). Denote by \((p)\mathcal{P}_N\) the set of all \(N\)-representable \(p\)-RDMs. The prescription given in Eq. (3) for calculating a \(p\)-RDM from an element of \((N)\mathcal{P}\) does not necessarily return an element of \((p)\mathcal{P}_N\), but rather a general \(p\)-RDM, which may not be \(N\)-representable, the set of which we denote \((p)\mathcal{P}\). Hence, \((p)\mathcal{P}_N \subset (p)\mathcal{P}\), i.e., \((p)\mathcal{P}_N\) is a proper subset of \((p)\mathcal{P}\). Thus, the \(N\)-representability problem can be stated as the search for constraints on a given \(p\)-RDM, \((p)\mathcal{D}\), such that we ensure \((p)\mathcal{D} \in (p)\mathcal{P}_N\). In other words, we seek a complete characterisation of the set \((p)\mathcal{P}_N\) as a subset of \((p)\mathcal{P}\).

Now, the set \((N)\mathcal{P}\) is convex as are its subsets \((p)\mathcal{P}\) and \((p)\mathcal{P}_N\), with \((p)\mathcal{P}_N\) being a convex subset of \((p)\mathcal{P}\). A convex set is a set \(\mathcal{S}\) such that if \(x, y \in \mathcal{S}\) then \(\alpha x + \beta y \in \mathcal{S}\), for all \(\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\) such that \(\alpha + \beta = 1\). An extreme element of a convex set is an element that cannot be expressed as a convex combination of other elements in the set \([74, 75]\). By the Krein-Milman theorem \([76]\), a convex set is completely specified by its extreme elements. From this theorem, a complete characterisation of the set \((p)\mathcal{P}_N\) can be garnered from its extreme elements.

The complete characterisation was first discovered by Mazziotti \([77, 78]\). Define the convex set of \(p\)-fermion operators that are positive semidefinite in their trace against an \(N\)-representable \(p\)-RDM by \((p)\mathcal{P}_N^*\),

\[
(p)\mathcal{P}_N^* := \left\{ (p)\mathcal{O} \mid \text{tr}( (p)\mathcal{D}(p)\mathcal{O} ) \geq 0, \forall (p)\mathcal{D} \in (p)\mathcal{P}_N \right\}.
\]

Kummer \([79]\) showed that this set explicitly exists, and this set provides a complete characterisation of its dual or polar set, i.e., the set of \(N\)-representable \(p\)-RDMs, \((p)\mathcal{P}_N\). As such, a knowledge of the extreme elements in \((p)\mathcal{P}_N^*\) allows us to completely characterise the set of \(p\)-RDMs. Mazziotti noted the important relation that \((2)\mathcal{P}_N^* \subseteq (3)\mathcal{P}_N^* \subseteq \cdots \subseteq (r)\mathcal{P}_N^*\), where \(r\) is the rank of the spin orbital basis. As such, the extreme elements of \((2)\mathcal{P}_N^*\) are specified by convex combinations of the extreme elements of \((r)\mathcal{P}_N^*\), which are of the form \((r)\mathcal{O}_i = (r)\tilde{C}_i^r (r)\tilde{C}_i^r\), where \((r)\tilde{C}_i\) is a polynomial in creation and annihilation operators of order \(r\). Hence, the operators which constrain the 2-RDM to be \(N\)-representable are represented by \((2)\mathcal{O} = \sum_i \omega_i (r)\tilde{C}_i^r (r)\tilde{C}_i^r\) where the weights \(\omega_i\) are chosen such that all three-body or higher operators cancel on their trace against the 2-RDM.

Such a solution yields a collection of \((p,q)\)-positivity conditions, where the \(p\) indicates the highest RDM required to evaluate the condition (here that remains the 1-, and 2-RDM) and the \(q\) indicates the highest \(q\)-body operator cancelled by the combinations expressed above. For example, the \((1,1)\)-positivity conditions are the conditions of the 1-RDM which come from considering operators \((1)\tilde{C}_i = \sum_j b_{ij} a_j^\dagger\) and \((1)\tilde{C}_Q = \sum_j b_{ij} a_j\). Keeping the trace of these operators with the 1-RDM greater than or equal to zero yields the \(N\)-representability conditions on the 1-RDM, first found by Coleman \([48]\)

\[
\langle \Psi | a_j^\dagger a_l | \Psi \rangle = (1)D_{jl}^I \geq 0 \quad (14)
\]
\[
\langle \Psi | a_j a_l^\dagger | \Psi \rangle = (1)D_{jl}^F \geq 0, \quad (15)
\]

where \(\geq 0\) means ‘positive semidefinite’, \(\delta\) is the Kronecker delta, and Eq. (15) follows from the anticommutation relation for fermion creation and annihilation operators.

The constraints here are necessary and complete, that is, the 1-RDM is completely \(N\)-representable if equipped with these constraints, and the constraints are equivalent to the Pauli exclusion principle: the occupation numbers of a given state in a fermion system must be 0 or 1.

The \((2,2)\)-positivity conditions arise from considering the operators \((2)\tilde{C}_D = \sum_{ij} b_{ij} a_j^\dagger a_k a_j\), \((2)\tilde{C}_Q = \sum_{ij} b_{ij} a_j a_k\), and \((2)\tilde{C}_{\tilde{G}} = \sum_{ij} b_{ij} a_j^\dagger a_k^\dagger\). Restricting the trace of the operators \((2)\tilde{O}_D, (2)\tilde{O}_Q,\) and \((2)\tilde{O}_{\tilde{G}}\) then gives us the well-known \(D, Q,\) and \(G\) conditions, first due to Coleman \([48]\) and Garrod and Percus \([49]\),

\[
\langle \Psi | a_j^\dagger a_l^\dagger a_i a_k | \Psi \rangle = (2)D_{ijkl} \geq 0 \quad (16)
\]
\[
\langle \Psi | a_j a_l^\dagger a_i a_k | \Psi \rangle = (2)Q_{ijkl} \geq 0 \quad (17)
\]
\[
\langle \Psi | a_j^\dagger a_l a_i a_k | \Psi \rangle = (2)G_{ijkl} \geq 0. \quad (18)
\]

The conditions given in Eq. (16), Eq. (17), and Eq. (18) are physically interpreted as constraining the probability distributions of two fermions, two holes, and one fermion and one hole to be non-negative, respectively. They do not form a complete set, however, of \(N\)-representability conditions on the 2-RDM. For example, the \((2,3)\)-positivity conditions are also necessary for a description of a system of \(N > 2\) fermions. Typically, combinations of constraint matrices derived from considering \((r)\tilde{C}_i\) operators of degree 3 are utilised. These are called the T1 and T2 conditions, and have the expression,

\[
(3)T1 = (3)D + (3)Q \geq 0 \quad (19)
\]
\[
(3)T2 = (3)E + (3)F \geq 0, \quad (20)
\]

where

\[
(3)D_{lmn}^{ijk} = \langle \Psi | a_i^\dagger a_j^\dagger a_k a_l a_m a_i | \Psi \rangle \quad (21)
\]
\[
(3)E_{lmn}^{ijk} = \langle \Psi | a_i a_j a_k a_l a_m a_i | \Psi \rangle \quad (22)
\]
\[
(3)F_{lmn}^{ijk} = \langle \Psi | a_i a_m a_j a_k a_l a_i | \Psi \rangle \quad (23)
\]
\[
(3)Q_{lmn}^{ijk} = \langle \Psi | a_i^\dagger a_m a_j^\dagger a_k a_l a_i | \Psi \rangle. \quad (24)
\]

These four matrices corresponding to the distributions of three fermions, two fermions and a hole, one fermion and two holes, and three holes, respectively. Although these matrices are created through consideration of three-body operators, the combinations given by Eq. (19) and Eq. (20) constrain the 2-RDM through cancellation. The T1 and T2 conditions were found implicitly by Erdahl \([50]\) and first implemented by Zhao \([58]\) and Mazziotti \([54, 57]\).
All conditions expressed here can be recast as linear constraints on the 1- and 2-RDMs by implementing the fermion anti-commutation relations. For example, the $Q$ and $G$ matrices can be expressed as,

\begin{align}
(2) Q_{kl}^{ij} & = \delta_k^i \delta_l^j - \delta_l^i \delta_k^j - \delta_l^i (1) D_k^j - \delta_k^i (1) D_j^l + \delta_l^j (1) D_k^i + \delta_k^j (1) D_j^l \\
(2) G_{kl}^{ij} & = \delta_k^i (1) D_j^l - 2 (2) D_{kl}^{ji} \tag{25}
\end{align}

Similar expressions can be found for the $T1$ and $T2$ matrices. For example, see Zhao et al. [58]. With these expressions, a set of linear constraints on the components of the 1- and 2-RDMs are now available in a variational calculation, and the 2-RDM can be held to be approximately $N$-representable. We will see that the $(2, 2)$- and $(2, 3)$-positivity conditions, given by constraining $(2) D$, $(2) Q$, and $(2) G$, and $(3) T1$ and $(3) T2$ to be positive semidefinite, yield accurate results for the ground state energy when compared to other methods.

### III.1. Spin-Adaption

The basis set we introduced is such that each spin-orbital is a product of a spatial wavefunction and a number representing the spin, $\phi_i(x) = \phi_i(r) \sigma_i(\omega)$ where $\sigma_i(\omega) = \alpha(\omega)$ or $\sigma_i(\omega) = \beta(\omega)$ if spin-up or spin-down, respectively, where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are eigenfunctions of the spin operator $S_z$. That is, we have $L$ spatial wavefunctions and hence $r = 2L$ spin-orbitals, allowing for the twofold spin multiplicity. We also order our basis appropriately such that the first $L$ spin-orbitals all are spin-up (or all spin-down) and the next $L$ are all spin-down (or all spin-up). Then, the spin-orbitals indicated by the index 1 and $L + 1$ have the same spatial wavefunction, but differ in their spin.

Through this construction of the basis, we cause our 2-RDM and associated matrices to become block-diagonal in a process known as spin-adaption. Typically, the term spin-adaption refers to constraining the basis functions to be simultaneous eigenfunctions of $\hat{S}_z$ and $\hat{S}_z^2$ [36], but here we simply enforce the former condition and implement the latter as a constraint enforced during the variational optimisation through Eq. (37). This form of implementation has been used numerous times in applications to atomic and molecular systems [53, 54, 58–60, 80]. Spin and symmetry adaption from both the $\hat{S}_z$ and $\hat{S}_z^2$ operator of the $(2) D$, $(2) Q$, and $(2) G$ matrices has been analysed [81].

The spin-adapted 1-RDM has the form,

\begin{align}
(1) D^{ij}_j = \begin{pmatrix} (1) D^{\alpha \alpha}_j \\ (1) D^{\beta \beta}_j \end{pmatrix} \tag{27}
\end{align}

since in our basis $(1) D^{\alpha \alpha}_j = (1) D^{\beta \beta}_j = 0$. Here, the blocks are identical due to the ordering of the spin-orbital basis, and have size $(r/2) \times (r/2)$. The spin-adapted 2-RDM has the form,

\begin{align}
(2) D^{ij}_{kl} = \begin{pmatrix} (2) D^{\alpha \alpha}_{\beta \beta} \\ (2) D^{\beta \alpha}_{\alpha \beta} \end{pmatrix} \tag{28}
\end{align}

In the case of a closed-shell system, where each spatial orbital is doubly-occupied, the first and second blocks of the 1- and 2-RDMs are identical, and the sizes of the first two blocks of the 2-RDM are $r(r/2 − 1)/4 \times r(r/2 − 1)/4$, whereas the third block has size $r^2/4$. The $(2) Q$ matrix has the same block structure as the 2-RDM since it is the two-hole reduced density matrix and holes obey the same statistics. The one-hole one-fermion RDM, $(2) G$, has a more complicated block structure as it does not exhibit as much symmetry properties as the other matrices. It has the spin-adapted form,

\begin{align}
(2) G^{ij}_{kl} = \begin{pmatrix} (2) G^{\alpha \alpha}_{\alpha \alpha} \\ (2) G^{\alpha \alpha}_{\beta \beta} \\ (2) G^{\beta \alpha}_{\alpha \beta} \\ (2) G^{\beta \alpha}_{\beta \alpha} \end{pmatrix} \tag{29}
\end{align}

The block structure of the $(3) T1$ and $(3) T2$ matrices have more complicated representation which we will not give here.

### III.2. A Summary of the $N$-Representability Conditions

In addition to the $N$-representability conditions which manifest in the $D$, $Q$, $G$, $T1$, and $T2$ conditions, we have the conditions that hold for density matrices in general. We list these conditions here.

1. The 2-RDM is anti-symmetric in its upper and lower indices,

\begin{align}
(2) D^{ij}_{kl} & = - (2) D^{ji}_{lk} = - (2) D^{ji}_{lk} = (2) D^{ij}_{kl} \tag{30}
\end{align}

The $(2) Q$ matrix has the exact same anti-symmetry as the 2-RDM, yet the $(2) G$ matrix does not. Furthermore, the $(3) T1$ matrix is anti-symmetric with respect to interchange of its triples of indices, and the $(3) T2$ matrix is anti-symmetric with interchange of the latter pairs in each triple.

2. Hermiticity of the 1- and 2-RDMs,

\begin{align}
(1) D^{ii}_j & = (1) D^{ij}_j \tag{31} \\
(2) D^{ij}_{kl} & = (2) D^{ij}_{kl} \tag{32}
\end{align}

This Hermiticity is also extended to the $(2) Q$, $(2) G$, $(3) T1$ and $(3) T2$ matrices.
(3) We ensure that the constant number of fermions (spin-up and spin-down) in the physical system is reflected in the trace of the 1- and 2-RDMs. We hence have, the 1- and 2-RDM are appropriately normalised according to the total number of fermions,
\[
\text{tr} \left\{ (1) D^i_j \right\} = \sum_{i} (1) D^i_i = N, \quad (33)
\]
\[
\text{tr} \left\{ (2) D^i_{ij} \right\} = \sum_{ij} (2) D^i_{ij} = N(N - 1). \quad (34)
\]
We recall that this normalisation scheme is a convention, as the 1- and 2-RDMs can be normalised to unity.

(4) The number of spin-up (or spin-down) fermions is held constant, a constraint which must show up in the normalisation:
\[
\text{tr} \left\{ (1) D^i_{i\alpha} \right\} = \sum_{i\alpha} (1) D^i_{i\alpha} = N_{\alpha}, \quad (35)
\]
\[
\text{tr} \left\{ (2) D^i_{i\alpha j\beta} \right\} = \sum_{i\alpha j\beta} (2) D^i_{i\alpha j\beta} = N_{\alpha}(N_{\alpha} - 1), \quad (36)
\]
where \(i\alpha, j\beta, \ldots\) indicate indices corresponding to spin-up orbitals, and \(N_{\alpha}\) is the number of spin-up orbitals. The latter of these constraints can be derived from the fact that the wavefunction, \(|\Psi\rangle\), of the system is an eigenstate of the number operator for the spin-up electrons, \(\hat{N}_{\alpha}\) [53].

(5) We ensure we have a linear constraint involving the net spin, \(S\). This is due to the fact that \(|\Psi\rangle\) is held to be an eigenfunction of the \(\hat{S}^2\) operator. This condition is difficult to express in the notation above, so we use an alternate notation to ensure this constraint is explicit. Following Zhao et al. [58], we let \(n_i, n_j, \ldots\) denote spatial orbital indices, with \(n_i\alpha\) and \(n_i\beta\) denoting spin-up and spin-down spatial orbitals, respectively.

Then, we ensure
\[
\sum_{n_i, n_j} \left\{ (2) D^{n_i\alpha n_j\alpha} + (2) D^{n_i\beta n_j\beta} \right\} - 2 \sum_{n_i, n_j} (2) D^{n_i\alpha n_j\beta} n_i\alpha n_j\alpha - 4 \sum_{n_i, n_j} (2) D^{n_i\alpha n_j\beta} + 3N = 4S(S + 1). \quad (37)
\]

Note that in all applications in this work, the net spin is always zero, \(S = 0\).

(6) We ensure we have the correct spin-symmetries of the matrices \((1) D, (1) D, (1) D, (2) D, (2) Q, (2) G, (3) T1, \) and \((3) T2\). For example, we ensure
\[
(2) D^{i\alpha j\beta} = 0, \quad \text{when } \sigma_i + \sigma_j \neq \sigma_i + \sigma_j, \quad (38)
\]
where \(\sigma_i\) is the spin of the \(i\)th spin-orbital. There are similar constraints for the remaining matrices, which are listed elsewhere [58].

(7) The \(N\)-representability constraints; the positive semidefiniteness of the matrices \((1) D, (1) D, (2) D, (2) Q, (2) G, (3) T1, \) and \((3) T2\).

Due to the symmetries (and anti-symmetries) of the Hamiltonian and 1- and 2-RDMs, as well as the other matrices we constrain to be positive semidefinite, we can restrict the elements of the matrices we use in the calculation to increase efficiency. For example, due to the anti-symmetry of the 2-RDM, we can now only consider elements of \((2) D^i_{ij}\) for \(1 \leq i < j \leq r\) and \(1 \leq k < l \leq r\). We can do the same for \((2) Q^i_{kl}\). However, \((2) G\) matrix does not permit such reductions as it does not have the same anti-symmetric structure. For \((3) T1_{lmn}\) we can take \(1 \leq i < j < k \leq r\) and \(1 \leq l < m < n \leq r\), and for \((3) T2_{lmn}\) we take those elements with \(1 \leq j < k \leq r\) and \(1 \leq n < m \leq r\), where \(r\) is the spin-orbital basis rank.

Similarly, in the Hamiltonian given in Eq. (10), with the matrix elements of the two-body operator, \((2) V^i_{kl}\), we take the elements \(1 \leq i < j \leq r\) and \(1 \leq k < l \leq r\). As such, the optimisation problem becomes,
\[
\langle \Psi | \hat{H} | \Psi \rangle = \sum_{ij} \langle ij | (1) D^i_j + \sum_{i < j \leq k < l} (2) \tilde{V}^i_{kl} (2) D^i_j \rangle, \quad (39)
\]
where \((2) \tilde{V}\) is now the anti-symmetrised two-fermion integral,
\[
(2) \tilde{V}^i_{kl} = \langle ij | (2) \tilde{V} | kl \rangle - \langle ij | (2) \tilde{V} | lk \rangle. \quad (40)
\]

IV. IMPLEMENTATION AS A SEMIDEFINITE PROGRAM

The type of the optimisation problem given by Eq. (39) with the necessity for constraining matrices to be positive semidefinite is one that naturally facilitates the use of semidefinite programming. A semidefinite program (SDP) is a general optimisation problem that can be expressed (in its dual form) as [51, 52],
\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{y} & \quad h^T y \\
\text{subject to} & \quad \sum_{p=1}^{m} A_p y_p - C \succeq 0,
\end{align*} \quad (41)
\]
where \(h, y \in \mathbb{R}^m\) are vectors (where \(m\) is the number of constraints), and \(A_p, C \in \mathbb{S}^n\) are real symmetric matrices of size \(n\) (where \(n\) depends on the number of constraints and the basis rank. See Fukuda et al. [59]). Here, \(h^T\) denotes the transpose of \(h\), so the product \(h^T y\) represents the typical inner product between two Euclidean vectors.

We formulate the RDM variational problem as an SDP if we let the vector \(h\) contain the matrix elements of the Hamiltonian and the vector \(y\) contain the variational
components of the 1- and 2-RDM which will be determined by the SDP. Then, by judicious choices of the matrices $A_p$ and $C$, we can implement conditions (1)-(7) given in the previous section. Explicitly, let us define a linear transformation: $\text{svec} : S^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n(n+1)/2}$, where $S^n$ is the set of real, symmetric matrices of size $n \times n$, by

$$\text{svec}(U) = (U_{11}, \sqrt{2}U_{12}, \sqrt{2}U_{13}, \ldots, U_{22}, \sqrt{2}U_{23}, \ldots)^T,$$

where $U \in S^n$. The appearance of the $\sqrt{2}$ ensures that we need not consider two products of the form, for example, $(1)h_1^2(1)D_1$ and $(1)h_3^2(1)D_2$, but simply double count one of them as they are equal. This transformation allows us to consistently place the elements of a symmetric matrix into a vectorised form. Hence, in the SDP above, we let $h = (\text{svec}(1)h_1)^T, \text{svec}(2)h_1(1)^T)$ and similarly for the $y$ vector which contains elements of the 1- and 2-RDMs [58, 59]. We then ensure that the matrix held to be positive semidefinite, which is constructed by the $A_p$ and $C$ matrices, has the following diagonal blocks: $(1)D, (2)D, (2)Q, (2)G, (3)T1$, and $(3)T2$, i.e.,

$$\sum_{p=1}^m A_p y_p - C = \begin{pmatrix} (1)D & (2)D & (2)D & \cdots \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 - (1)D & (2)D & (2)Q & \cdots \end{pmatrix}.$$

So, if we consider the first block in which we are constraining $(1)D$ to be positive semidefinite, we note that the first elements of the $y$ matrix are those containing the elements of $(1)D$, i.e., $y = (1)D_1, \sqrt{2}(1)D_2, \ldots$ then one can see that in the corresponding blocks of $A_p$, we would have

$$A_{1\text{st block}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots \ 0 & 0 & \cdots \ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_{2\text{nd block}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots \ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix},$$

and the first block of the $C$ matrix would contain all zeros. As such, the matrices involved in such a calculation are extremely sparse. The size of sparsity of the SDPs for RDM implementation has been covered in detail elsewhere [59].

The formulation of the RDM apparatus as an SDP was implicit in the early works of Garrod et al. [82, 83] on atomic beryllium and Rosina et al. [84]. The development of powerful interior points methods [85, 86] for SDPs were developed largely in the late 1990s which lead to a resurgence in the application of the RDM theory to atoms and molecules [53, 54, 58]. These calculations yielded accurate results, but were restricted to relatively small basis sizes. However, boundary-point methods [87] have facilitated an enormous increase in computational efficiency, allowing the analysis of more complicated systems [55, 56, 65]. In this work, we utilise the Semidefinite Programming Algorithm (SDPA) [88, 89] which utilises interior point methods, as well as SDPNAL+ [90–92] which utilises an augmented Lagrangian method [90, 93], rendering it extremely efficient for large-scale SDPs.

V. APPLICATION TO ULTRACOLD FEW-FERMION SYSTEMS

In this work, the RDM method is not spruised as a method leading to extraordinary accuracy relative to available methods in the field, but a promising alternative to treat large systems that is competitive in its accuracy and efficiency to known methods whatever the basis used. Due to the method’s dependence on the basis rank and not the particle number $N$, improvements in optimisation will allow small to moderately sized systems that are highly correlated to be analysed.

The utility of the RDM method has been demonstrated in the field of quantum chemistry, but has seen few applications outside this field. Here, we apply the method in another field, that of ultracold few-fermion systems. We choose the most simple of such systems: a one-dimensional, harmonically trapped system of $N$ particles with even populations of spin-up and spin-down particles. We let the particles interact by a contact interaction. By a comparison to Eq. (1), we make the identifications,

$$\sum_{i=1}^N (1)h = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N p_i^2, \quad (42)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^N (2)\tilde{V} = \frac{1}{2} g \sum_{i,j=1}^N \delta(x_i - x_j), \quad (43)$$

Here, we are working in units where $\hbar = m = \omega = 1$ where $m$ is the mass of the fermion and $\omega$ is the one-dimensional trapping frequency. Also, $g$ parametrises the interaction strength, and has the units $\hbar \omega a_0$, where $a_0$ is the oscillator length of the harmonic trapping potential. The energy of this system is consequently measured in units of $\hbar \omega$. This system has been studied at length both theoretically [6–19, 35, 94] and experimentally [19–25].

The finite, single-particle basis we introduce is the set of simple, harmonic oscillator functions, which are the eigenfunctions of the Hamiltonian when the interaction is switched off ($g = 0$),

$$\varphi_n(x) := \frac{1}{\pi^{1/4}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n n!}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{x^2}{2} \right\} H_n(x), \quad (44)$$

where $H_n(x)$ is a Hermite polynomial. Such a choice of basis is not ideal as it leads to poor convergence of the energy and other observables in the unitary limit ($g \rightarrow \infty$) [14]. The convergence of the energy with the size of the harmonic oscillator basis has been discussed elsewhere [14]. A correlated basis, such as one consisting of explicitly correlated Gaussians [95], is typically chosen in strongly interacting regimes, yet the methodology of the RDM theory outlined in this works only permits a simple implementation in a single-particle basis. Due to these shortcomings of the basis, the results presented here do not exhibit any improvement in the accuracy of the ground state energies of $N$ fermion systems, yet the results do show that the RDM method with appropriate $N$-representability conditions accurately captures
the correlation in these systems when compared to other well-known, and accurate, methods.

In the harmonic oscillator basis, the matrix elements of the Hamiltonian can be calculated quickly, as the one-electron integrals are given by the well-known harmonic oscillator energy \(\langle i | \hat{H} | j \rangle = \delta_{ij} (i + 1/2)\), and the two-electron integrals can be calculated exactly using Gaussian-Hermite quadrature.

To assess the accuracy of the RDM method, we compare it to the exact solution of the system, in the given basis, if feasible. This method is called the full-configuration interaction (FCI) method and is equivalent to a direct diagonalisation of the Hamiltonian. From a quantum chemistry theoretic point of view, FCI is a post-Hartree-Fock method as it uses the Hartree-Fock (HF) ground state as a reference wavefunction, and then uses as a variational wavefunction the linear combination of all possible excitations from the HF ground state. FCI calculations are infeasible for large systems, as an upper bound to size of the FCI problem is \((r!)^2/(N/2)! (r - N/2)!\)^2 \[96\].

For such systems where the FCI result is not available, we compare to the energy as found from coupled-cluster (CC) method \[26–32\]. This method utilises the Hartree-Fock ground state and accounts for correlation through the use of a cluster operator, which acts on the reference wavefunction and produces linear combinations of excitations \[32\]. The inclusion of single and double excitations is called the CCSD method, and if we further include approximate contributions from triple excitations which are found using many-body perturbation theory, we have the CCSD(T) method, which can be regarded as the gold standard in terms of efficiency and accuracy for small to medium size systems. The CC method has been used for the one-dimensional ultracold few-fermion system extensively in the work by Grining et al. \[14, 35\].

In this work, the FCI, CCSD, and CCSD(T) were found by using the PySCF program, a Python-based quantum chemistry package \[97\] where we customised the Hamiltonian for our purposes.

VI. RESULTS

Here, we give results for the ground state of various systems that differ in their total number of fermions. We adopt the notation of \(N = N_\uparrow + N_\downarrow\); thus, for example, the \(N = 1 + 1\) system is the two fermion system with one spin-up and one spin-down fermion.

In Fig. 1 we plot the ground state energy, relative to the energy of the non-interacting system, \(\mathcal{E}_F\), for the \(N = 2 + 2\) systems. We first make a comparison between the RDM method with conditions DQG enforced and the FCI energy (top panel) for \(r = 20\) and \(r = 30\). We can see that for the strongly correlated system the RDM method overestimates the correlation energy significantly, and consequently underestimates the total energy. This happens because the 2-RDM is not sufficiently constrained, and higher-order \(N\)-representability conditions are needed. In the lower panel of Fig. 2 we compare the 2-RDM with the \(T_1\) and \(T_2\) conditions in addition to the DQG conditions. We can see that the predicted ground state energy is significantly more accurate in the regime where we simultaneously enforce all conditions up to the \(T_2\) condition, and the energy matches extremely well with the FCI energy.

In Fig. 2 we plot the ground state energy, relative to the ground state energy of the non-interacting system, \(\mathcal{E}_F\), for the \(N = 1 + 1\) particle system. We first make a comparison between the RDM method with conditions DQG enforced and the FCI energy (top panel) for \(r = 20\) and \(r = 50\). We can see that for the strongly correlated system the RDM method overestimates the correlation energy significantly, and consequently underestimates the total energy. This happens because the 2-RDM is not sufficiently constrained, and higher-order \(N\)-representability conditions are needed. In the lower panel of Fig. 2 we compare the 2-RDM with the \(T_1\) and \(T_2\) conditions in addition to the DQG conditions. We can see that the predicted ground state energy is significantly more accurate in the regime where we simultaneously enforce all conditions up to the \(T_2\) condition, and the energy matches extremely well with the FCI energy.

A key demonstration of the efficacy of the RDM method is that the number of particles, \(N\), merely enters as a trace constrain on the 2-RDM, and the whole method itself only scales with rank and number of \(N\)-representability conditions enforced, from a computational complexity perspective. Therefore, provided that the rank \(r\) and the number of \(N\)-representability conditions enforced constitute a feasibly solvable problem for a given amount of computational resources, we can vary the number of particles at will, provided the number of fermions is small enough relative to the rank to produce meaningful results. To demonstrate this, in Fig. 3 we consider the ground state energy, relative to \(\mathcal{E}_F\), of the \(N = 4 + 4\) fermion system, for \(r = 40\). A comparison to the FCI energy was not computationally feasible in the
FIG. 2. The ground state energy (relative to the energy of the non-interacting system, $E_F$) for the $N = 2 + 2$ particle system. In the upper panel, we consider the RDM method with only the D, Q and G conditions simultaneously enforced and compare the results to the FCI energy for $r = 20$ and $r = 30$. In the lower panel, we consider the case where $r = 30$ and constrain the 2-RDM further with the T1 and T2 conditions.

FIG. 3. The ground state energy (relative to the energy of the non-interacting system, $E_F$) for the $N = 4 + 4$ particle system. The RDM method with the DQG conditions enforced are given by the circles, and the diamonds and triangles indicated the CCSD and CCSD(T) results, respectively. Here, $r = 40$.

VI.1. A Note on Efficiency

A key facet of the effectiveness of the RDM method is the relative lack of memory and time requirements when it comes to computational implementation compared to the FCI method, as the RDM method scales polynomially in the basis rank (with the FCI method scaling exponentially at best [98]). The computational complexity of the interior-point methods scaled approximately as $r^{16}$, where $r$ is the basis rank. Such a poor scaling meant that the method was confined to small atomic and molecular systems. However, faster algorithms, such as those used by SDPNAL+ result in a scaling of approximately $r^6$ to $r^8$. Such an improvement in the scaling of the complexity was also manifest in the boundary-point method developed by Mazziotti [65], which demonstrated a ten- to twenty-fold increase in efficiency to other calculations at the time.

To demonstrate the efficiency, we found, in Tab. I, the CPU time (in minutes) for various calculations, and the dependency of the CPU time on fermion number and
TABLE I. CPU time (in minutes) for various systems and spin-orbital basis ranks for the 2-RDM and FCI calculations. All 2-RDM calculations simultaneously enforced the D, Q, and G conditions. We note that the 2-RDM calculations scale only as a function of the rank \( r \), and hence only one calculation need be performed for each, whereas the FCI method scales exponentially with both basis size and rank, as seen for each rank as we increase the particle number. Calculations were performed on a laptop with Intel Core i7 2.60GHz processors (64GB RAM) using 6 cores. The accuracy of the sample 2-RDM calculations is indicated by the percentage of the correlation energy (where the correlation energy is defined by \( E_{\text{corr}} = E_H - E_F \), i.e., the difference between the mean-field HF energy and the exact FCI energy). In all calculations, \( g = 10 \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rank, ( r ) fermions, ( N )</th>
<th>FCI time (m)</th>
<th>2-RDM time (m)</th>
<th>RDM % ( E_{\text{corr}} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>102.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>117.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>102.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.050</td>
<td>116.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>102.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>353.403</td>
<td>116.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

basis rank for the 2-RDM and FCI calculations, as well as the percentage of the correlation energy captured by the 2-RDM method, with the FCI energy being defined as 100% correlated. The 2-RDM method does not scale with fermion number, which is an enormous advantage over methods that require to calculation of the \( N \)-fermion wavefunction. We can see the extremely large increase in CPU time for large rank and fermion number for the FCI calculations, with the relatively slow increase with rank of the 2-RDM calculations. All 2-RDM calculations simultaneously enforce the P, Q, and G conditions.

Enforcing further constraints on the 2-RDM, such as the T1 and T2 constraints results in a much larger SDP and hence a larger CPU time. The largest hindrance to the widespread adoption of this method is the poor scaling with rank as one increasing the amount of \( N \)-representability conditions enforced, yet further developments in optimisation, coupled with the accuracy of the method itself, would render it extremely useful in the study of highly-correlated systems.

VII. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this work, we outlined the theoretical development of the RDM method, as well as briefly demonstrating how to complete a simple implementation via a formulation as an SDP. Such a method has seen wide success in atomic and molecular applications, and here we extend the range of applicability by considering a simple, highly correlated few-fermion system. Specifically, we applied the RDM method with the D, Q, G, T1, and T2 \( N \)-representability constraints to a trapped, one-dimensional system of fermions interacting via a contact interaction, while constraining the system to have an equal number of spin-up and spin-down fermions. The ground state energy was found for \( N = 2 \), 4, and 8 particle systems and was found to match extremely well with the best theoretical results in the given harmonic oscillator basis, provided by the FCI or exact energy for the \( N = 2 \) and \( N = 4 \) system, and by the CCSD and CCSD(T) method for the \( N = 8 \) system.

Specifically, for the \( N = 1 + 1 \) case, the energy given by the RDM method with the DQG conditions implemented agreed with the exact FCI energy for all interaction strengths, \( g \leq 15 \), which is expected. In the \( N = 2 + 2 \) and \( N = 4 + 4 \) cases, it was demonstrated that while constraining the 2-RDM with the D, Q, G, T1, and T2 conditions, the strong correlation was accurately captured, with the ground state energy being extremely close to that given by FCI and CCSD(T) methods. This demonstrates the effectiveness of the RDM method when it comes to treating strongly correlated systems, and further demonstrates that this method is an extremely promising alternative to typical methods based on the complete knowledge of the \( N \)-fermion wavefunction.

The strong correlation of these one-dimensional systems, which occurs in the regime of \( g \gg 1 \), was accurately captured by the RDM method after implementing the three-body constraints known as the T1 and T2 conditions. This shows that, in addition to the RDM method accurately capturing strong electron correlation in atomic and molecular systems, the RDM method accurately accounts for strong correlation in ultracold few-fermion systems where \( g \) can be made arbitrarily high. An important point to note, with regard to this method, is that the introduction of higher order constraints provides a mechanism for understanding the limitations of lower order calculations. Additionally, for a given rank, utilisation of the RDM method in parallel with conventional wavefunction techniques can allow one to evaluate an upper and lower bound for the ground state energy of the system.

The choice of basis, namely the harmonic oscillator basis, naturally hinders the attempt to find extremely accurate ground state energies relative to the known, analytic case for the \( N = 1 + 1 \) system, and other approach for larger \( N \) that involve, for example, correlated basis sets. However, what has been clearly demonstrated is that the RDM method gives extremely accurate results relative to the FCI and CCSD(T) methods for relatively large systems and strong interaction strengths in the same basis.

The accuracy of the RDM method for these simple systems opens the door to applying the same method for more complex interacting systems. An extension to the analogous system studied here in two and three dimensions is a natural case for further investigation. Further extensions using this methodology could include spin imbalanced systems, where \( N_\uparrow \neq N_\downarrow \), as well as mass-
imbalanced systems. Minor imbalances in these systems can be exaggerated to permit the study of single impurities in otherwise homogeneous systems [99–101]. Alternative interactions, such as soft-core, dipolar, or Coulombic interactions can be analysed with this method also.

The 2-RDM approach adopted here achieves the goals of N-representability and universality that have driven the development of DFT, which is the 1-RDM method for fermion systems. The exponential complexity of N-fermion wavefunction-based approaches has been circumvented in favour of a method with polynomial scaling characteristics. The systematic order-by-order application of N-representability constraints leads to a computational scheme for 2-RDM that can be made as accurate as required; it is a “gold standard” comparable to full configuration interaction (FCI). Nevertheless, the computational cost of 2-RDM exhibits an intrinsic computational complexity far greater than that of DFT, and comparable with coupled-pair methods, such as the coupled-cluster approximation. The 2-RDM method is, however, more than just a convenient computational tool. It provides direct insights into the relationship between the energy of a fermionic system and its 2-RDM through the simple process of integration over the coordinates of a single fermion. The physical principles that underpin the properties of N-fermion wavefunctions that are used to derive the Hohenberg-Kohn theorems of DFT apply with equal validity to an N-representable 2-RDM. This suggests the potential for a parallel development of 1-RDM methods based on the availability of 2-RDM approaches for complex fermion systems.
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