Microscopic theory of ionic motion in solids
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Drag and diffusion of mobile ions in solids are of interest for both purely theoretical and applied scientific communities. This article proposes a theoretical description of ion drag in solids that can be used to estimate ionic conductivities in crystals, and forms a basis for the rational design of solid electrolyte materials. Starting with a general solid-state Hamiltonian, we employ the non-equilibrium path integral formalism to develop a microscopic theory of ionic transport in solids in the presence of thermal fluctuations. As required by the fluctuation-dissipation theorem, we obtain a relation between the variance of the random force and friction. Because of the crystalline nature of the system, however, the two quantities are tensorial. We use the drag tensor to write down the formula for ionic mobility, determined by the potential profile generated by the crystal’s ions.

I. INTRODUCTION

As a part of the search for improved energy storage methods [1,2], substantial attention has been dedicated to the study and development of solid-state batteries in the last decade. [3–5] This technology relies on the use of solid electrolytes to conduct ions between the anode and the cathode. The use of all-solid components is advantageous from the safety point of view due to the increased stability of solid-solid interfaces compared to solid-liquid interfaces [6]. The main technological challenge lies in finding solid electrolyte materials with a high ionic conductivity at room temperature.

Four main characteristics distinguish solid electrolytes from their liquid counterparts. First, unlike liquid electrolytes, which act as sources of reagents in addition to providing a pathway between the electrodes, solid electrolytes act exclusively as bridges connecting the electrodes and are not consumed in the process of operation. Second, the solid framework through which the ions flow is not mobile, with its atoms vibrating around their equilibrium positions. Because of the periodicity of the vibrational motion, the interaction between the mobile ions and the framework cannot be generally regarded as a collection of uncorrelated collisions, as would be the case in a liquid. The third aspect that sets solid electrolytes apart is a non-trivial potential landscape produced by the framework ions and electrons, through which the mobile ions navigate. This landscape contains local energy minima, which can function as traps for the mobile ions, requiring them to regularly overcome potential barriers of fractions of eV during their motion. [7–15] The energy needed to escape the local minima originates from the framework itself as the thermally vibrating lattice kicks the mobile ions. Finally, the fourth key difference lies in the role played by quantum mechanics. Although the heavy ions traveling through the framework at the battery operation temperature are classical objects, they interact strongly with the framework quantum electrons. Moreover, the vibrational modes of the framework are also quantum mechanical objects with Bose statistics. These distinguishing features indicate that the problem of ionic conductors falls in the domain of solid-state physics and should be addressed in this context.

On the theoretical side, molecular dynamics (MD) simulations are an integral part of research in ionic conductors. They have been instrumental in shedding light on the atomic-scale processes behind the ionic conduction by identifying body-centered cubic crystals as the optimal lattice structures for fast ionic conduction [12,13], demonstrating the importance of cooperative (correlated) ionic transport [13,16], studying the role of frustration mechanisms [15,17,18], exploring the effects of anharmonicity [19,20], and providing a deeper understanding of the role played by the lattice dynamics [14,21] and structural modification. [22,23]

Despite MD simulations’ undisputed success and utility, the technique has some limitations, mainly originating from the computational cost. To ensure accuracy, the time steps in the simulations must be small (on the order of femtoseconds), meaning that the total simulation time is often limited to a few nanoseconds. Consequently, it is not uncommon to use temperatures much higher than those expected in the device operation to speed up the dynamics and observe sufficient ionic activity within the limited time window. Even then, the computation times are substantially shorter than experimentally relevant time scales. Moreover, given the structural complexity of many ionic conductors, computations are limited to a few unit cells since increasing the system size renders the calculations prohibitively expensive. Because of this constraint, it is very challenging to study multiple ions separated by large distances. Accordingly, a complementary tool to address the interplay between ions and the lattice over greater time and length scales is desirable.

As mentioned above, lattice vibrations impart kinetic energy onto mobile ions, allowing them to escape potential-energy valleys. This process is reminiscent of a random walk associated with Brownian motion. Just as
in the case of Brownian motion, however, the fluctuation-dissipation theorem demands that the lattice-to-ions energy flow must be accompanied by the reverse process, where the lattice saps the energy from the moving ions similar to that of the bath particles (lattice ions). Therefore, each collision between the two components can substantially modify the energy of the mobile ions. By contrast, Brownian particles (pollen organelles in the original experiment) experience an astronomical number of collisions before moving by an appreciable amount, allowing one to treat the collisions as uncorrelated white noise.

The problem of a small mobile particle coupled to a dissipative thermal bath has been of interest to the physics community for a long time. [24, 25] In recent years, there have been significant advances in understanding the dynamics of impurities immersed in bosonic [26–30] and fermionic [26, 31, 32] systems. The authors of Ref. [33] demonstrated the emergence of the Brownian motion in D-dimensional Bose-Einstein Condensate systems while Ref. [34] focused on the microscopic origins of friction in one-dimensional quantum liquids. Because these problems are commonly viewed from the perspective of (ultra-) cold atom experiments, they are typically formulated in one dimension.

In this work, we construct a general microscopic theory applicable to three dimensions to describe the motion of ions through a solid framework that can be used to estimate ionic conductivities and form a basis for the design of solid electrolyte materials. This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we set up the Hamiltonian for a system with vibrational modes and mobile masses. We also demonstrate how the motion of the mobile particles can be calculated using the classical framework. Section III focuses on the derivation of the semiclassical equations of motion for the mobile particles starting from the non-equilibrium quantum formulation. In Sec. IV, we establish the fluctuation-dissipation relation in crystalline materials and derive the expression of the ionic mobility in solids. Conclusions are found in Sec. V.

II. EFFECTIVE HAMILTONIAN

A. Ionic Hamiltonian

The most general microscopic Hamiltonian for a solid composed of ions and electrons can be written as

\[ H = K_e + V_{ee} + K_i + V_{ii} + V_{ei} + E_e + E_i, \]  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where \( K_e \) \( (K_i) \) is the kinetic energy of electrons (ions), \( V_{ee} \) \( (V_{ii}) \) is the electron-electron (ion-ion) interaction, \( V_{ei} \) is the electron-ion interaction, and \( E_e \) \( (E_i) \) is the external potential acting on electrons (ions). Generally, the external potentials \( E_{e/i} \) can be time-dependent, resulting in a non-equilibrium behavior.

From the practical standpoint, the time variation of \( E_e(t) \) seen in applications is expected to be sufficiently slow to treat its impact on the electrons quasistatically. Additionally, because ions are much heavier than electrons, one can follow the Born-Oppenheimer approximation and view them as static, as far as the electrons are concerned. Consequently, we can write the electronic Hamiltonian operator as

\[ \hat{H}_e (\{ \mathbf{R} \}, t) = \hat{K}_e + \hat{V}_{ee} + \hat{V}_{ei} (\{ \mathbf{R} \}) + \hat{E}_e(t), \]  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where \( \{ \mathbf{R} \} \) is the set of all the ionic coordinates. We stress that \( \{ \mathbf{R} \} \) and \( t \) are parameters of the electronic Hamiltonian operator, not dynamic variables.

It is useful to write \( V_{ei} (\{ \mathbf{R} \}) = \hat{V}_{ei} (\{ \mathbf{R}^0 \}) + \delta \hat{V}_{ei} (\{ \mathbf{R} \}) \), where \( \hat{V}_{ei} (\{ \mathbf{R}^0 \}) \) is the interaction between electrons and the system’s native ions when the ions are located at their energy minima. Note that \( \delta \hat{V}_{ei} (\{ \mathbf{R} \}) \) can also include the interaction of the system’s electrons with extra ions added to the system. We also define \( \hat{H}_e^0 = \hat{K}_e + \hat{V}_{ee} + \hat{V}_{ei} (\{ \mathbf{R}^0 \}) \) as the electronic Hamiltonian in a stationary unperturbed solid, so that the full electronic Hamiltonian is \( \hat{H}_e = \hat{H}_e^0 + \delta \hat{V}_{ei} (\{ \mathbf{R} \}) + \hat{E}_e(t) \).

Although the composition of solid electrolytes can vary widely, they must be electronic insulators to guarantee that the current passing through them is exclusively ionic. Consequently, \( \hat{H}_e^0 \) must possess a sufficiently wide gap for \( \delta \hat{V}_{ei} (\{ \mathbf{R} \}) + \hat{E}_e(t) \) not to create electron-hole excitations leading to electronic transport. As a result, the perturbation only leads to a modification of \( \hat{H}_e^0 \)'s energies, following the adiabatic theorem. Formally, the Helmholtz free energy for the electrons is given by

\[ F_e = -\frac{1}{\beta} \sum_n \ln \left| -\beta \left( G_n^{-1} - \delta V_{ei} (\{ \mathbf{R} \}) - E_e(t) \right) \right| \]
\[ = -\frac{1}{\beta} \sum_n \ln \left| -\beta G_n^{-1} \right| \]
\[ -\frac{1}{\beta} \sum_n \ln \left| 1 - G_n [\delta V_{ei} (\{ \mathbf{R} \}) + E_e(t)] \right| , \]  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where \( \beta^{-1} = k_B T \), \( k_B \) is the Boltzmann constant, \( T \) is the temperature, \( G_n^{-1} = i\omega_n + \mu - H_e^0 \) is the Green’s function matrix, \( \mu \) is the chemical potential, and \( \omega_n \) are the fermionic Matsubara frequencies. \( F_e^0 \) is the electronic contribution to the free energy in an unperturbed system and the second term gives the perturbation-induced correction. The latter can be rewritten as

\[ \delta F_e = -\frac{1}{\beta} \sum_n \ln \left| 1 - G_n [\delta V_{ei} (\{ \mathbf{R} \}) + E_e(t)] \right| \]
\[ -\frac{1}{\beta} \sum_n \ln \left| 1 - G_n [\delta V_{ei} (\{ \mathbf{R} \}) + E_e(t)]^{-1} G_n E_e(t) \right| . \]  \hspace{1cm} (4)
Combining the electronic free energy with the remaining terms of $H$ gives the effective Hamiltonian describing the ionic motion:

$$H_i = K_i + V_i + F \frac{\beta}{n} \sum \ln \left[ 1 - G_n \delta V_{ei} \left\{(\mathbf{R})\right\} \right] + E_i(t) + \frac{1}{\beta} \sum \ln \left| 1 - \left[ 1 - G_n \delta V_{ei} \left\{(\mathbf{R})\right\} \right]^{-1} G_n E_e \right| . \quad (5)$$

$U\left\{(\mathbf{R})\right\}$ describes the interaction between ions, including the electronic effects, and can be computed ab initio using density functional theory (DFT) by calculating the energy of a system with ionic coordinates $(\mathbf{R})$.

The last term in Eq. (5) gives the energy due to the electrons’ interaction with the external potential, including the effects of the perturbed ionic background. For a stable solid not undergoing a phase transition, it is reasonable to expect that the system-wide electronic density will not change drastically in response to the small shift in ionic coordinates around their equilibrium positions. Therefore, we drop $\delta V_{ei} \left\{(\mathbf{R})\right\}$ in this expression, rendering it independent of the ionic position. Consequently, the effective ionic Hamiltonian involves only the first line of Eq. (5) because the last line does not depend on $\mathbf{R}$ after $\delta V_{ei}$ is dropped and, to the leading order in $E_e$, gives the Hartree energy of electrons in an external potential.

### B. Ion-framework interaction

To study the ionic motion described by Eq. (5), we divide the ions into two groups: those that propagate through the solid (mobile ions) and those that vibrate around their equilibrium positions and provide the solid framework (stationary ions). We make this distinction explicit by rewriting Eq. (5) as

$$H_i = K_i^M + K_i^S + U \left\{ (\mathbf{r}) , \{ \mathbf{u} \} \right\} + E_i(t), \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{r}$ ($\mathbf{u}$) are the positions of the mobile (stationary) ions.

At this point, there are two main approaches that can be used to solve the problem. On the one hand, it is possible to view the system as entirely classical to obtain the trajectories of the mobile ions. The benefit of this method is that it is conceptually simpler and puts fewer restrictions on the interaction between the mobile and the stationary ions. The downside is that the thermal motion of the framework is not automatically captured from the partition function. In addition, the classical formalism might be inapplicable when quantum effects become important, such as for proton diffusion or in certain cold-atom setups.

On the other hand, one can start by assuming that the framework ions do not deviate substantially from their equilibrium positions $\mathbf{u}^0$ and expand the potential energy term for small displacement $\delta = \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^0$. Following this expansion, one writes $\delta$ in terms of the oscillatory modes of the framework. The interaction between the two groups of ions then becomes linear in $\delta$. By second-quantizing the modes, quantum mechanics is included in the problem formulation, delaying the semi-classical treatment until the very end. This approach makes it possible to include quantum-mechanical corrections beyond the leading-order classical behavior. Most importantly, this method explicitly encodes the thermal occupancy of phonons, producing the correct fluctuation-dissipation relation. Naturally, in the classical limit, the two approaches should give identical results. Therefore, for the sake of completeness, we show both treatments.

### C. Classical Formulation

It is convenient to start by separating the interaction term into three components: $U \left\{ (\mathbf{r}) , \{ \mathbf{u} \} \right\} = U^M \left\{ (\mathbf{r}) \right\} + U^S \left\{ (\mathbf{r}) \right\} + U \left\{ (\mathbf{r}) , \{ \mathbf{u} \} \right\}$. Next, suppressing the function arguments for brevity, we can write the Lagrangian for the system as

$$L = (K_i^M - U^M) + (K_i^S - U^S) - U - E_i^S - E_i^M. \quad (7)$$

Assuming that the motion of the framework ions can be described using the harmonic approximation, the homogeneous portion of the framework Lagrangian becomes

$$K_i^S - U^S \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{m} \mathbf{u} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{V} \mathbf{u}. \quad (8)$$

Here, we combined the positions of the framework ions into a $D$-dimensional vector $\mathbf{u} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^I \mathbf{u}_j$, where $I$ is the number of the framework ions and $D$ is the system dimensionality. $\mathbf{m} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^I m_j \mathbf{1}_{D \times D}$ is a block-diagonal matrix, where $m_j$ is the mass of the $j$th framework ion.

The homogeneous equation of motion $\mathbf{m} \ddot{\mathbf{u}} = -\mathbf{V} \mathbf{u}$ can be transformed into a symmetric eigenvalue problem by first defining $\ddot{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{m}^{1/2} \ddot{\mathbf{u}}$ so that

$$\ddot{\mathbf{u}} = -\Omega^2 \ddot{\mathbf{u}} = -\mathbf{m}^{-1/2} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{m}^{-1/2} \ddot{\mathbf{u}} = -\overline{\mathbf{V}} \ddot{\mathbf{u}}, \quad (9)$$

with the eigenvectors $\mathbf{u}_s$ and corresponding eigenvalues $\Omega_s$. Hence, we can write $\ddot{\mathbf{u}}(t) = \mathbf{e} \zeta(t)$ so that $\mathbf{u}(t) = \mathbf{e} \zeta(t)$, where $\zeta(t)$ is a column vector of normal coordinates giving the amplitude of each mode, while $\mathbf{e}$ is a row of column vectors $\mathbf{u}_s$.

Returning to the inhomogeneous equation of motion for the framework ions, we write

$$\mathbf{m} \ddot{\mathbf{u}} = -\mathbf{V} \mathbf{u} - \nabla_{\mathbf{u}} \left( U + E_i^S \right) \Rightarrow \ddot{\mathbf{u}} = -\overline{\mathbf{V}} \ddot{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{m}^{-1/2} \nabla_{\mathbf{u}} \left( U + E_i^S \right)$$

$$\Rightarrow \ddot{\mathbf{\zeta}} = -\Omega^2 \ddot{\mathbf{\zeta}} - \mathbf{e}^{-1} \mathbf{m}^{-1/2} \nabla_{\mathbf{u}} \left( U + E_i^S \right), \quad (10)$$
\[ \zeta_j(t) = \zeta_j^H(t) - \int_0^t dt' \sin \left[ \frac{\Omega_j(t-t')}{\Omega_j} \right] J_j = \zeta_j^H(t) - \int_0^t dt' \sin \left[ \frac{\Omega_j(t-t')}{\Omega_j} \right] \left[ \varepsilon^{-1} m^{-1/2} \nabla_u (U + E_{r}^S) \right]_j \]

where \( \zeta_j^H(t) \) is the homogeneous solution and the subscript \( j \) at the brackets indicates that we pick out the \( j \)th element of the column vector. The last line follows from the fact that \( \varepsilon \) is an orthogonal matrix, \( m \) is a diagonal matrix, and that the transpose of the expression in the brackets it the expression itself.

Finally, using \( \mathbf{u} = \sum_j \zeta_j \varepsilon_j \), we obtain

\[
\mathbf{u}(t) = \mathbf{u}^0 + \delta^H(t) \\
- \sum_j m^{-1/2} \varepsilon_j \left\{ \int_0^t dt' \sin \left[ \frac{\Omega_j(t-t')}{\Omega_j} \right] \right. \\
\left. \times \left[ \nabla_u \left( U + E_{r}^S \right) \right]^T m^{-1/2} \varepsilon_j \right\}.
\]

where \( \mathbf{u}^0 \) gives the equilibrium positions of the framework ions and \( \delta^H(t) \) is the displacement from the equilibrium coming from the homogeneous solution.

Reinserting the expression of \( \mathbf{u}(t) \) into the interaction energy \( U(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{r}) \), we can calculate the force that this interaction exerts on the mobile ions \( -\nabla_r U(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{r}) = -\nabla_r U(\mathbf{u}^0 + \delta, \mathbf{r}) \). By assuming that the framework ions do not move far from the equilibrium, we expand the expression in \( \delta \) to obtain

\[ G_j(t, t') = \frac{\sin [\Omega_j(t-t')] \Theta(t-t')}{\Omega_j}, \quad (11) \]

we have

\[ -\nabla_r U(\mathbf{u}^0 + \delta, \mathbf{r}) \approx -\nabla_r U(\mathbf{u}^0, \mathbf{r}) - \nabla_r \left[ \nabla_u U(\mathbf{u}^0, \mathbf{r}) \cdot \delta \right] \]

\[ \approx -\nabla_r U(\mathbf{u}^0, \mathbf{r}) - \nabla_r \left[ \nabla_u U(\mathbf{u}^0, \mathbf{r}) \cdot \delta^H(t) \right] \]

\[ + \frac{2}{\hbar} \sum_j \nabla_r (t) \left\{ Y_j(r(t)) \int_0^t dt' \sin [\Omega_j(t-t')] \right. \]

\[ \left. \times [Y_j(r'(t')) + W_j(r'(t'))] \right\}, \quad (14) \]

\[ Y_s(r) = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{2\Omega_s}} \left[ \nabla_u U(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{u}^0) \right]^T m^{-1/2} \varepsilon_s, \quad (15) \]

\[ W_s(t) = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{2\Omega_s}} \left[ \nabla_u E_{r}^S (\mathbf{u}^0, t) \right]^T m^{-1/2} \varepsilon_s. \quad (16) \]

We show below that one arrives at the same expression in the semi-classical limit of the quantum-mechanical formulation, except that the quantum-mechanical treatment explicitly gives the temperature dependence of the homogeneous term.

### D. Quantum Formulation

For the quantum-mechanical approach, we start by expanding the potential term to the second order in the framework ion displacement \( \delta = \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^0 \) to get

\[ U (\{ \mathbf{r} \}, \mathbf{u}) \approx U (\{ \mathbf{r} \}, \mathbf{u}^0) + [\nabla_u U (\{ \mathbf{r} \}, \mathbf{u}^0)]^T \delta \]

\[ + \frac{1}{2} \delta^T \left[ \nabla_u U - \nabla_u U (\{ \mathbf{r} \}, \mathbf{u}^0) \right] \delta. \quad (17) \]

Note that we combined all the framework coordinates and displacements into two vectors: \( \mathbf{u} = \bigoplus \mathbf{u}_i \) and \( \delta = \bigoplus \delta_i \), as was done in the classical treatment.

The last portion of Eq. (17) can be identified as the elastic potential energy with the term in the brackets being the matrix of force constants coupling the displacements of the stationary ions. For a fixed \( \{ \mathbf{r} \} \), combining
this term with the kinetic energy \(K^S_q\) gives rise to a collection of oscillatory modes. Strictly speaking, changing \(\{r\}\) modifies the force-constant matrix and alters the mode frequencies. However, it is reasonable to expect that, for a stable system, moving the mobile ions through the system does not drastically alter the structure of the stationary framework. Consequently, we will assume that the term in the brackets does not depend on \(\{r\}\), allowing us to promote \(\hat{H}_i\) to the operator status and write
\[
\hat{H}_i = \sum_s \hbar \Omega_s \left( a^\dagger_s a_s + \frac{1}{2} \right) + E_i^S(\hat{u}, t)
\]
\[
+ \sum_j \frac{\hat{p}_j \hat{p}_j}{2M_j} + U \left( \{\hat{r}\}, u^0 \right) + E_i^M \left( \{\hat{r}\}, t \right)
\]
\[
+ \left[ \nabla_{u^0} U \left( \{\hat{r}\}, u^0 \right) \right]^T \delta ,
\]
where the first term is the second-quantized Hamiltonian of the oscillatory modes \(s\) with frequency \(\Omega_s\) independent of \(\{r\}\), resulting from combining \(K^S_q\) with the last term in Eq. (17). If the framework is crystalline, these vibrational modes correspond to phonons and the node label \(s\) denotes the phonon branch and momentum. The first term in the second line of Eq. (18) is the kinetic energy \(K^M_j\) with \(p_j\) corresponding to the momentum of the \(j\)th mobile ion and \(M_j\) to its mass. Note that we split the effects of the external potential into portions corresponding to stationary and mobile ions.

Using the fact that the external perturbation is not expected to vary substantially on the scale of \(\delta\), we write
\[
E_i^S(\hat{u}, t) \approx E_i^S(u^0, t) + \left[ \nabla_{u^0} E_i^S(\hat{u}, t) \right]^T \delta .
\]

The first term does not depend on the ionic displacement and, therefore, does not impact the system’s dynamics. Hence, we drop this term from the Hamiltonian.

To describe \(\delta\) in terms of the solid’s vibrational modes, recall that, in the harmonic approximation, the displacement is
\[
\delta = \sum_s (a_s + a^\dagger_s) \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{2\Omega_s}} m^{-1/2} e_s ,
\]
where \(e_s\) is the polarization vector for mode \(s\). Using this definition, we obtain
\[
\hat{H}_i = \sum_s \hbar \Omega_s \left( a^\dagger_s a_s + \frac{1}{2} \right) + \sum_j \frac{\hat{p}_j \hat{p}_j}{2M_j} + U \left( \{\hat{r}\} \right) + E_i^M \left( \{\hat{r}\}, t \right) + \sum_s \left[ \nabla_{u^0} U \left( \{\hat{r}\}, u^0 \right) \right] \left( a_s + a^\dagger_s \right) .
\]

The second line of Eq. (21) describes the mobile ions in the presence of a potential produced by the framework ions at their equilibrium positions \(U(\hat{r}) \equiv U(\hat{r}, u^0)\) and an external time- and position-dependent perturbation \(E_i^M(\hat{r}, t)\).

Finally, the last line of Eq. (21) gives the coupling between the oscillatory modes and the mobile ions \(Y_s(\hat{r})\), and the modes and the external potential \(W_s(t)\). To make the subsequent derivation more compact, we combine the two coupling terms into one, denoted by \(C_s(\hat{r}, t)\), as shown by the underbrace.

### III. System Dynamics

With the effective time-dependent ionic Hamiltonian given by Eq. (21), we can now address the dynamics of the system. We begin by formulating the problem using the path integral language and then proceed to extract the semiclassical equations of motion for the mobile ions.

#### A. Path Integral

Recall that if, at \(t = 0\), the system is described by a density operator \(\hat{\rho}_0\), then the expectation value of some operator \(O\) at \(\tau > t\) is given by
\[
\langle O \rangle (\tau) = \frac{\text{Tr}[e^{i\frac{\hat{H}_i \tau}{\hbar}} \hat{O} e^{-i\frac{\hat{H}_i \tau}{\hbar}} \hat{\rho}_0]}{\text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_0]}
\]
\[
= \sum_{n,r} \langle r, n | e^{i\frac{\hat{H}_i \tau}{\hbar}} \hat{O} e^{-i\frac{\hat{H}_i \tau}{\hbar}} \hat{\rho}_0 | r, n \rangle .
\]

To go from the first line to the second one, we used the fact that the trace of the operator can be taken in any complete basis, allowing us to choose \(|r, n\rangle = |r\rangle \otimes |n\rangle\) with \(|n\rangle\) enumerating all the Fock states for the vibrational modes and \(|r\rangle\) corresponding to the multi-particle position states. In this study, we are primarily interested in how the mobile ions behave when interacting with the solid. Therefore, we assert that \(\hat{O}\) corresponds to some observable for the mobile ions so that, in the particle-mode space, it becomes \(\hat{O} \to \hat{O} \otimes 1\).

To proceed from Eq. (22), we employ the standard path integral approach of rewriting the time evolution operators as
\[
e^{\pm \frac{i\hat{H}_i \tau}{\hbar}} = \left( e^{\pm \frac{i\hat{H}_i \Delta}{\hbar}} \right)^{N-1} \text{ for } \tau/(N - 1) = \Delta
\]
and \(N \to \infty\), and inserting identity operators between the multiples:
\[
\langle O \rangle (\tau) = \frac{1}{\text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_0]} \sum_{n,r} \langle r, n | 1^1 e^{\frac{i\hat{H}_i \Delta}{\hbar}} 1^2 \ldots e^{\frac{i\hat{H}_i \Delta}{\hbar}} 1^N \times \hat{O} 1^1 e^{-\frac{i\hat{H}_i \Delta}{\hbar}} \ldots e^{-\frac{i\hat{H}_i \Delta}{\hbar}} 1^N \hat{\rho}_0 | r, n \rangle .
\]
The subscript on the identity operators indicates whether they are located on the right (+) or on the left (−) of $\hat{O}$. The superscript indicates how many time steps from $t = 0$ the operator is positioned (note that the negative sign in the exponential moves the time forward, and the positive one moves it backward).

It is convenient to choose the identity operators composed of bosonic coherent states:

$$1_\pm = \int d\mathbf{r}_\pm \int d\mathbf{s}_\pm^j \frac{\pi}{\tau} e^{-\mathbf{s}_\pm^j \mathbf{s}_\pm^j} |\mathbf{r}_\pm^j, \mathbf{s}_\pm^j\rangle \langle \mathbf{r}_\pm^j, \mathbf{s}_\pm^j| \quad (24)$$

Here, $\mathbf{s}_\pm^j$ is a column vector of complex numbers, one for each vibrational mode $s$ and $\mathbf{s}_\pm^j$ is its conjugate transpose. Because $|\mathbf{r}_\pm^j, \mathbf{s}_\pm^j\rangle = |\mathbf{r}_\pm^j\rangle \otimes |\mathbf{s}_\pm^j\rangle$, Eq. (24) can be regarded as a direct product of two identities.

In the first part of the right-hand side of Eq. (25), we have a term $\langle \mathbf{r}, n | \mathbf{r}_-^1, \mathbf{s}_-^1 \rangle \langle \mathbf{r}_-^1, \mathbf{s}_-^1 | \ldots$. Because $\langle \mathbf{r}, n | \mathbf{r}_-^1, \mathbf{s}_-^1 \rangle$ is a number, we can move it to the right of Eq. (25) to obtain $\sum_{\mathbf{r}, n} \langle \mathbf{r}, n | \hat{P} | \mathbf{r}_-^1, \mathbf{s}_-^1 \rangle$. This step allows us to eliminate the summation over $\mathbf{r}$ and $n$ because it has the form of a resolution identity. With this rearrangement, we obtain

$$\langle \hat{O} | = \int \frac{D(\ldots)}{\text{Tr} \hat{\rho}_0} \exp \left[-\sum_{j=1}^N \left( \mathbf{s}_-^j \mathbf{s}_+^j + \mathbf{s}_+^j \mathbf{s}_-^j \right) \right]$$

$$\times \langle \mathbf{r}_-^1, \mathbf{s}_-^1 | e^{i\mathbf{H}_0 \Delta} | \mathbf{r}_-^2, \mathbf{s}_-^2 \rangle \langle \mathbf{r}_-^2, \mathbf{s}_-^2 | \ldots e^{i\mathbf{H}_0 \Delta} | \mathbf{r}_-^N, \mathbf{s}_-^N \rangle$$

$$\times \langle \mathbf{r}_+^1, \mathbf{s}_+^1 | \hat{O} | \mathbf{r}_+^1, \mathbf{s}_+^1 \rangle \langle \mathbf{r}_+^1, \mathbf{s}_+^1 | \hat{O} | \mathbf{r}_+^2, \mathbf{s}_+^2 \rangle e^{-i\mathbf{H}_0 \Delta} | \mathbf{r}_+^1, \mathbf{s}_+^1 \rangle$$

$$\times \langle \mathbf{r}_+^N, \mathbf{s}_+^N | \hat{O} | \mathbf{r}_+^N, \mathbf{s}_+^N \rangle | \mathbf{r}_+^1, \mathbf{s}_+^1 \rangle \hat{\rho}_0 | \mathbf{r}_+^1, \mathbf{s}_+^1 \rangle$$

where $\mathbf{D}(\ldots)$ contains all the differentials and $\pi^{-1}$ prefactors of the integrals.

Computing the matrix elements, as shown in Appendix A, followed by the integration over the mode fields, as outlined in Appendix B, gives

$$\langle \hat{O} | = \frac{1}{\text{Tr} \hat{\rho}_0} \int \mathbf{D}(\ldots) \langle \mathbf{r}_-^N | \hat{O} | \mathbf{r}_+^N \rangle | \mathbf{r}_+^1, \hat{\rho}_0 | \mathbf{r}_+^1 \rangle$$

$$\times \frac{M}{2\pi \Delta h} \prod_s \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \coth \left( \frac{\beta h \Omega_s}{2} \right) Q_s Q_s^* \right]$$

$$\times \prod_s \sum_{l=1}^N \sin (\Delta \Omega_s(n-l)) (Y_s(r^l_+ - Y_s(r^l_-)) \Theta(n-l) (Y_s(r^l_+ + Y_s(r^l_-) + 2W_s(l\Delta)))$$

$$\times \prod_j \exp \left[ \sum_{\sigma = \pm} \sigma i \langle r^j_+ - r^j_- \rangle T \frac{M}{2\Delta h} (r^j_+ - r^j_-) \right]$$

$$\times \prod_j \exp \left[ \sigma i \frac{\Delta h}{\hbar} U(r^j_+) \right]$$

(26)

with

$$Q_s = \frac{\Delta h}{\hbar} \sum_{l=1}^N e^{-i\Delta \Omega_s l} [Y_s(r^l_+ - Y_s(r^l_-)]$$

(27)

Note that the $\hat{\rho}$ in the trace is that of the mobile particles since the mode portion is cancelled by the field integration.

**B. Hubbard-Stratonovich Transformation**

As the next step, we employ the Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation to separate the product $Q_s Q_s^*$ in the exponential. The first step is to define a unity

$$1 = \frac{2}{\pi} \tanh \left( \frac{\beta h \Omega_s}{2} \right)$$

$$\times \int d\xi d\xi^* \exp \left[ -2\xi^* \tanh \left( \frac{\beta h \Omega_s}{2} \right) \xi \right].$$

(28)
At this point, it might be unclear why we used the decoupling. After all, it appears to have reinserted a phononic fields that we just integrated out. In fact, it is not quite that: this decoupling eliminated a specific type of term (the product of differences of $Y_s$, the benefit of which will become apparent when we treat the system semiclassically.

**C. Semiclassical Approximation**

We start by rewriting the coordinates as $r^j_{\pm} = (r^j_c \pm r^j_q)/\sqrt{2}$. Expanding the terms in the exponential in Eq. (29) to the leading order in $r_q^j$ gives:

$$
U(r^j_+) - U(r^j_-) \rightarrow \sqrt{2} \left[ \nabla U(r^j_c/\sqrt{2}) \right]^T r^j_q,
$$

$$
Y_s(r^j_+) + Y_s(r^j_-) \rightarrow 2Y_s(r^j_c/\sqrt{2}),
$$

$$
Y_s(r^j_+) - Y_s(r^j_-) \rightarrow \sqrt{2} \left[ \nabla Y_s(r^j_c/\sqrt{2}) \right] r^j_q,
$$

$$
\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\sigma=\pm} \sigma (r^{j+1}_\sigma - r^{j}_\sigma)^T M (r^{j+1}_\sigma - r^{j}_\sigma) \rightarrow (r^{j+1}_q - r^{j}_q)^T M (r^{j+1}_c - r^{j}_c). \quad (30)
$$

Following this expansion, we write

$$
\prod_{j=1}^{N-1} \exp \left[ \sum_{\sigma=\pm} \sigma \frac{(r^{j+1\sigma} - r^{j\sigma})^T M (r^{j+1\sigma} - r^{j\sigma})}{2\Delta h} \right] \rightarrow \exp \left[ \sum_{j=2}^{N-1} \frac{r^{j\sigma} - r^{j-1\sigma} + r^{j+1\sigma}}{\Delta h} M \right]. \quad (31)
$$

in Eq. (29), where we set $r_q$ to vanish at the endpoints of the time contour. Inserting the rest of expressions from Eq. (30) into Eq. (29) and integrating over $r_q$ results in

$$
\langle \hat{O}\rangle (\tau) = \frac{1}{\text{Tr}[\rho_m]} \left| \frac{M}{2\pi \Delta h} \right|^N \prod_{j=1}^{N-2} \left[ \frac{2}{\pi} \tanh \left( \frac{\beta \hbar \Omega_s}{2} \right) \int d\xi_s d\xi_c \exp \left[ -2\xi_s^* \tanh \left( \frac{\beta \hbar \Omega_s}{2} \right) \xi_s \right] \right. 
\times \int \prod_j d\xi_c \prod_{n=2}^{N-2} \delta \left( M (2r^j_c - r^{j-1\sigma} - r^{j+1\sigma}) \right. - \frac{\Delta}{\hbar} \sqrt{2} \nabla U(r^j_c/\sqrt{2}) - \frac{\Delta}{\hbar} \sqrt{2} \nabla Y_s(r^j_c/\sqrt{2}) [\xi_s e^{i\Delta \Omega_s n + \xi_s^* e^{-i\Delta \Omega_s n}] 
+ \frac{\Delta^2}{\hbar} \sum_{l=1}^{N} \sin (\Delta \Omega_s (n-l)) \sqrt{2} \nabla Y_s(r^j_c/\sqrt{2}) \Theta(n-l) 2 \left[ Y_s(r^j_c/\sqrt{2}) + W_s(l\Delta) \right] \left. \right] \rangle (r^j_c (\hat{O} r^j_c) (r^j_c |\rho_m| r^j_c)). \quad (32)
$$

Relabeling $\frac{r_q}{\sqrt{2}} \rightarrow r$ in Eq. (32), one can identify the equation of motion for the ions inside the Dirac delta
The first line of Eq. (33) describes the motion of the ions in a \( t \)- and \( r \)-dependent potential. The second line introduces the recoil: mobile ions experience a force at time \( n \) as a consequence of the stationary ions being perturbed by the external potential and the mobile ions at time \( l \). Finally, the third line describes the stochastic thermal force with the probability distribution of \( \zeta_s \) given by the integrand of Eq. (28). The right-hand side of Eq. (33) expression agrees with Eq. (14) obtained using the classical approach, but Eq. (33) also explicitly gives the temperature dependence of the homogeneous solution of the framework’s equations of motion.

\[
\begin{align*}
    &\mathbf{M} \frac{\mathbf{r}_{n-1} - 2\mathbf{r}_n + \mathbf{r}_{n+1}}{\Delta^2} = -\nabla U(\mathbf{r}_n, n\Delta) \\
    &+ \frac{2\Delta}{\hbar} \sum_s \nabla Y_s(\mathbf{r}_n) \sum_{l=1}^n \sin[\Delta\Omega_s(n-l)] Y_s(\mathbf{r}_l) + W_s(l\Delta) \\
    &- \sum_s \nabla Y_s(\mathbf{r}_n) [e^{i\Delta\Omega_s n\zeta_s} + e^{-i\Delta\Omega_s n\zeta_s}] . \\
\end{align*}
\]

\( (33) \)

IV. DRIFT AND DIFFUSION

A. Fluctuation-dissipation in solids

Because the thermal force originates from the vibrations of the solid, it exhibits a finite correlation in time, which can be quantified using the correlation tensor

\[
\langle \mathbf{\hat{f}}_n \otimes \mathbf{\hat{f}}_l \rangle = \sum_s \nabla Y_s(\mathbf{r}_n) \otimes \nabla Y_s(\mathbf{r}_l) \\
\times \coth \left( \frac{\beta \hbar \Omega_s}{2} \right) \cos[\Delta\Omega_s(n-l)] ,
\]

\( (34) \)

see Appendix D for the derivation.

In accordance with the fluctuation-dissipation theorem, the recoil and thermal noise terms in Eq. (33) form a fluctuation-dissipation pair as they originate from the same physical phenomenon, namely the interaction of mobile ions with the framework. To bring this relationship to a more familiar form, let us consider a scenario where the there is no external perturbation, eliminating the \( W \) term and the time-dependence of \( U \) from Eq. (33). As shown in Appendix E, for \( \Delta \rightarrow 0 \), we can write the recoil term as

\[
2\frac{\Delta}{\hbar} \sum_l \sum_s \nabla Y_s(\mathbf{r}_n) \sum_{l=1}^n \sin[\Delta\Omega_s(n-l)] Y_s(\mathbf{r}_l) \\
\approx \nabla \sum_l \frac{Y_s^2(\mathbf{r}_n)}{\hbar \Omega_s} - 2 \sum_l \nabla Y_s(\mathbf{r}_n) \frac{\cos[\Delta\Omega_s n]}{\hbar \Omega_s} Y_s(\mathbf{r}_1) \\
- \sum_l \sum_{l=1}^{n-1} \frac{\cos[\Delta\Omega_s(n-l)]}{\Omega_s} \nabla Y_s(\mathbf{r}_n) \otimes \nabla Y_s(\mathbf{r}_l) \mathbf{\hat{r}}_l .
\]

\( (35) \)

The first term describes the softening of the potential \( U \) due to the solid’s elasticity, as one can see by combining it with the first term on the r.h.s. of Eq. (33). The second one is the boundary term carrying the information about the initial configuration and vanishing as \( n \rightarrow \infty \).

Comparing the final term to Eq. (34) for \( T \gg 1 \) with \( \coth(\beta \hbar \Omega_s/2) \approx 2\beta^{-1/\hbar \Omega_s} \), shows that it can be written as \(-\beta \Delta \sum_l \langle \mathbf{\hat{f}}_n \otimes \mathbf{\hat{f}}_l \rangle \mathbf{\hat{r}}_l \). This relation between the recoil term and the noise correlation tensor is a consequence of the fluctuation-dissipation theorem. To make this connection more explicit, we write the high-\( T \) version of the correlation tensor explicitly as

\[
\langle \mathbf{\hat{f}}_n \otimes \mathbf{\hat{f}}_l \rangle = \sum_s \nabla \left[ \nabla \mathbf{u} U(\mathbf{\hat{r}}, \mathbf{u}) \right]^T \mathbf{m}^{-1/2} \frac{\cos[\Delta\Omega_s(n-l)]}{\beta \Omega_s^2}.
\]

\( (36) \)

If the system is three-dimensional, the vibrational modes at low energy have a density of states that is quadratic in \( \Omega_s \), corresponding to acoustic modes. This density of states cancels the \( \Omega_s^2 \) term in the denominator, preventing a low-energy divergence seen in one- and two-dimensional systems. This cancellation means that the oscillatory cosine term strongly suppresses the correlation tensor for \( n \neq l \). In the case of low-dimensional systems, one needs to suppress the divergence by, for example, confining the system in an external potential, eliminating the zero-frequency modes.

If the the velocities and the positions of the mobile ions change on much longer time scales than the decay of the correlation tensor, we can replace \( \mathbf{\hat{r}}_l \rightarrow \mathbf{\hat{r}}_n \) and \( \mathbf{\hat{r}}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{\hat{r}}_l \), and, for \( n \gg 1 \), extend the lower bound of the \( l \) summation to \(-\infty \) in Eq. (35). We can then write the last term of Eq. (35) as \(-\gamma_n \mathbf{\hat{r}}_n \), with

\[
2k_B T \gamma_n = 2\Delta \sum_{l=-\infty}^n \langle \mathbf{\hat{f}}_n \otimes \mathbf{\hat{f}}_l \rangle = \Delta \sum_{l=-\infty}^\infty \langle \mathbf{\hat{f}}_n \otimes \mathbf{\hat{f}}_l \rangle .
\]

\( (37) \)

The second equality holds because, after the \( \mathbf{\hat{r}}_l \rightarrow \mathbf{\hat{r}}_n \) replacement in \( \langle \mathbf{\hat{f}}_n \otimes \mathbf{\hat{f}}_l \rangle \), \( l \) appears only in the cosine term.

One can identify \( \gamma_n \) as the position-dependent drag tensor. The relation between \( \gamma_n \) and the noise correlation tensor in Eq. (37) is precisely the form required
by the fluctuation-dissipation theorem in the Langevin limit, where rapid light particles of the medium impact slow impurities in a white-noise-like manner. Performing the summation over \( l \) yields

\[
\gamma_s = 2\pi \sum_s \nabla Y_s (r_n) \otimes \nabla Y_s (r_n) \frac{\delta(\Omega_s)}{h\Omega_s}. \tag{38}
\]

demonstrating that, in the Langevin regime, mobile particles dissipate energy via low-frequency framework modes.

Because, in the limit of \( \Omega_s \to 0 \), all crystal atoms move with the same phase and amplitude, leading to \( m^{-1/2} \varepsilon_s \to 1 \otimes \varepsilon_s/(\sqrt{mL}) \), where \( m \) is the mass of all the atoms in the unit cell, \( L \) is the number of unit cells in the system, and the newly-defined \( \varepsilon_s \) is a \( D \)-dimensional polarization vector. This form results in a substantial approximation by setting \( \varepsilon_s \) equal to \( \varepsilon \) with respect to the uniform shift of all the stationary ions.

where \( mL \) is the total mass of the system, \( V/(mL) \) gives the density \( \rho \). In the \( q \to 0 \) limit, \( \Omega_{b,q} \to v_b(\theta, \phi)q \), where \( v_b(\theta, \phi) \) is the direction-dependent sound velocity for branch \( b \).

If we make \( v_b \) isotropic (as one can expect it to be in a polycrystalline macroscopic sample), the integral can be written as

\[
\frac{1}{2(2\pi)^2} \rho \int d\Omega \frac{\delta(v_bq)}{v_b^2} = \frac{1}{2(2\pi)^2} \rho \int d\Phi \int d\Theta \sin \Theta \int dq \frac{\delta(v_Lq)}{v_L^2} + \int d\Omega (1 - \hat{r} \otimes \hat{r}) \int dq \frac{\delta(v_Tq)}{v_T^2} = \frac{1}{12\pi \rho} \left( \frac{1}{v_L^2} + \frac{2}{v_T^2} \right), \tag{43}
\]

where \( d\Omega \) denotes the integration over the solid angle, while \( v_L \) and \( v_T \) are the speeds of sound for longitudinal and transverse modes, respectively. At each momentum \( q \), there are three phonon branches: a longitudinal one propagating in the \( \hat{r} \) direction and two transverse ones propagating in \( \hat{\phi} \) and \( \hat{\theta} \) directions. It is these branches that give rise to the three terms in the second line above.

Combining the results yields

\[
\nabla Y_s (r) = -\sqrt{\frac{h}{2mL\Omega_s}} \left[ \sum_s \frac{2\pi}{mL} \delta(\Omega_s) \frac{\varepsilon_s \otimes \varepsilon_s}{\Omega_s^2} \right] \left[ H_r U (r) \right]. \tag{41}
\]

For the expression in the brackets, we write

\[
\frac{2\pi}{2mL} \sum_s \delta(\Omega_s) \frac{\varepsilon_s \otimes \varepsilon_s}{\Omega_s^2} = \frac{2\pi}{2mL} \sum_{b,q} \delta(\Omega_{b,q}) \frac{\varepsilon_{b,q} \otimes \varepsilon_{b,q}}{\Omega_{b,q}^2} = \frac{2\pi V}{2(2\pi)^3 mL} \sum_b \int dq \frac{\varepsilon_{b,q} \otimes \varepsilon_{b,q}}{\Omega_{b,q}^2} \delta(\Omega_{b,q}). \tag{42}
\]

where \( b \) labels the phonon branch and \( V \) is the volume of the system. Because \( mL \) is the total mass of the system, \( V/(mL) \) gives the density \( \rho \). In the \( q \to 0 \) limit, \( \Omega_{b,q} \to v_b(\theta, \phi)q \), where \( v_b(\theta, \phi) \) is the direction-dependent sound velocity for branch \( b \).
\[
\gamma = \frac{1}{12\pi \rho} \left( \frac{1}{v_e^2} + \frac{2}{v_f^2} \right) |\mathbf{Hr}U(\mathbf{r})|^2 .
\]

In the long-time limit, the inertia term \( M \ddot{\mathbf{r}} \) and the random force \( \dot{\mathbf{f}} \) can be dropped from the single-ion equation of motion, leading to \( \gamma(\mathbf{r})\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}) = -\nabla U(\mathbf{r}) + \mathbf{F} \) or, alternatively, \( \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}) = \gamma^{-1}(\mathbf{r}) \left[ -\nabla U(\mathbf{r}) + \mathbf{F} \right] \). Because the potential and the drift terms have the lattice periodicity, so will \( \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}) \). Hence, in Fourier space, we write

\[
\mathbf{v}_\mathbf{K} = (2\pi)^{3/2} \sum_{\mathbf{K}'} \gamma_{\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K}'}^{-1} \left[ -i\mathbf{K}'\dot{U}_{\mathbf{K}'} + \mathbf{F}\delta_{0,\mathbf{K}'} \right].
\]

Setting \( \mathbf{K} \to 0 \) yields the drift velocity \( \mathbf{v}_0 \). Because \( \dot{U}_\mathbf{K} = \dot{U}_{-\mathbf{K}} \), \( \gamma_\mathbf{K} = \gamma_{-\mathbf{K}} \), and \( (2\pi)^{3/2} \gamma_{\mathbf{K}=0}^{-1} = \langle \gamma^{-1} \rangle \) is the average of the inverse drag tensor, \( \mathbf{v}_{\text{drift}} = \langle \gamma^{-1} \rangle \mathbf{F} \).

Using \( \mathbf{v}_{\text{drift}} \), we can define the ionic mobility. Assuming that the external force originates from a constant electric field, we have \( \mathbf{F} = q\mathbf{E} \), where \( q \) is the ionic charge. This yields the mobility \( \mu = q\langle \gamma^{-1} \rangle \).

Note that this is the mobility per mobile ion — similar to the definition of the mobility of electrons and holes in metals or semiconductors, which naturally excludes the electrons that are not involved in the transport. This mobility originates from the ion-lattice collision frequency, which depends on the structure of the medium, but not on the temperature, reminiscent of the Drude model for electrons.

Knowing the potential landscape \( U(\mathbf{r}) \), which can be obtained for example from density functional theory calculations, it is possible to obtain estimates for the ion mobilities from Eq. (44), as we have shown in a related work. One of the advantages of this method is that, by construction, the whole potential surface is taken into account. In contrast, in molecular dynamics a satisfactory sampling of the configuration space requires, in practice, very long integration times. In theory, the expectation that in molecular dynamics the system will eventually pass through all possible states, if allowed to evolve indefinitely, is based on the ergodic hypothesis, which states that the time average equals the ensemble average[35]. Such an approach is not necessarily valid for non-equilibrium systems.

Additionally, molecular dynamics simulations require the choice of a time integration step that is small enough to guarantee the convergence of the integrated coordinates. Thus, it is impractical to simulate using the same method diffusion or drag in conditions where the conductivity varies by orders of magnitude. In contrast, the present approach measures energies, rather than energy, and is therefore widely applicable to different materials.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In summary, we have presented a formalism to describe the drag and diffusion of ions in solid crystals, derived both in classical and quantum formulations. Further, we have demonstrated a method to compute the long-time limit ionic drift of a mobile ion in the superionic regime. Such an approach opens the possibility of tractable estimates of the ionic mobility of solid electrolytes via, e.g., \textit{ab initio} approaches.
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Appendix A: Matrix Elements

Starting with \( \langle r_{j+}^{s+} | s_{j+}^{s+} | e^{-i\frac{\mathbf{H}_d}{\hbar} \Delta} | r_{j+}^{s+}, s_{j+}^{s+} \rangle \), we note that the Hamiltonian is normal-ordered with respect to the second-quantization operators. This means that \( a_+ \) and \( a_{+}^\dagger \) are replaced by \( s_{+} \) and \( s_{+}^\dagger \) (since the annihilation operators act on the ket and creation ones act on the bra, they pick up the corresponding time slice index). This gives

\[
\langle r_{j+}^{s+} | s_{j+}^{s+} | e^{-i\frac{\mathbf{H}_d}{\hbar} \Delta} | r_{j+}^{s+}, s_{j+}^{s+} \rangle = \exp \left[ -i\frac{\Delta}{\hbar} \sum s \hbar \Omega_s s_{j}^{s+} s_{+}^{s+} \right] \times \langle r_{j+}^{s+} \rangle \exp \left[ -i\frac{\Delta}{\hbar} \left( \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{p}^\dagger \mathbf{M}^{-1} \mathbf{p} + U(r, t) + \sum s \left( s_{j+}^{s+} C_s(r, t) + s_{+}^{s+} C^\dagger_s(r, t) \right) \right) \right] |r_{j+}^{s+} \rangle \otimes |s_{j+}^{s+} \rangle . \tag{A1}
\]

With all the second-quantization operators replaced by complex numbers, we can evaluate \( \langle s_{j+}^{s+} | s_{+}^{s+} \rangle = e^{i\Delta s_{j}^{s+} s_{+}^{s+}} \). We combine the exponential in the first line of the equation above with this term to get

\[
\exp \left[ -i\frac{\Delta}{\hbar} \sum s \hbar \Omega_s s_{j}^{s+} s_{+}^{s+} \right] e^{i\Delta s_{j}^{s+} s_{+}^{s+}} = \exp \left[ -i\frac{\Delta}{\hbar} \sum s \hbar \Omega_s s_{j}^{s+} s_{+}^{s+} + \sum s s_{j}^{s+} s_{+}^{s+} \right] = \exp \left[ \sum s e^{-i\frac{\Delta}{\hbar} \frac{\hbar \Omega_s}{s_{j}^{s+} s_{+}^{s+}}} \right] , \tag{A2}
\]
where the last equality holds because $\Delta \ll 1$.

Next, in the limit $\Delta \to 0$, the exponential can be split into four parts:

$$\exp\left[ -\frac{i\Delta}{\hbar} \left( \frac{1}{2} \hat{p} \hat{M}^{-1} \hat{p} + U(\hat{r}, t) + \sum_s \left[ \hat{s}_s^{j+1} C_s(\hat{r}, t) + \hat{s}_s^j C_s(\hat{r}, t) \right] \right) \right]$$

$$\approx \exp\left[ -\frac{i\Delta}{\hbar} \sum_s \hat{s}_s^{j+1} C_s(\hat{r}, t) \right] \exp\left[ -\frac{i\Delta}{\hbar} \frac{1}{2} \hat{p} \hat{M}^{-1} \hat{p} \right] \exp\left[ -\frac{i\Delta}{\hbar} U(\hat{r}, t) \right] \exp\left[ -\frac{i\Delta}{\hbar} \sum_s \hat{s}_s^j C_s(\hat{r}, t) \right]. \quad (A3)$$

The first exponential acts on the bra so that $\hat{r} \to \hat{r}_+^{j+1}$, while the last two act on the ket with $\hat{r} \to \hat{r}_+^j$. The remaining part is

$$\langle \hat{r}_+^{j+1} | e^{-\frac{i\Delta}{\hbar} \frac{1}{2} \hat{p} \hat{M}^{-1} \hat{p}} | \hat{r}_+^j \rangle = \int d\hat{p} \langle \hat{r}_+^{j+1} | \hat{p} | \hat{p} e^{-\frac{i\Delta}{\hbar} \frac{1}{2} \hat{p} \hat{M}^{-1} \hat{p}} | \hat{r}_+^j \rangle = \int d\hat{p} e^{-\frac{i\Delta}{\hbar} \frac{1}{2} \hat{p} \hat{M}^{-1} \hat{p}} \langle \hat{r}_+^{j+1} | \hat{p} | \hat{p} \rangle$$

$$= \int d\hat{p} \exp\left[ -\frac{i\Delta}{\hbar} \frac{1}{2} \hat{p} \hat{M}^{-1} \hat{p} + i \hat{p} \hat{r}_+^{j+1} - i \hat{p} \hat{r}_+^j \right] \frac{1}{(2\pi\hbar)^{1/2}} \exp\left[ \frac{i\hat{r}_+^{j+1} - \hat{r}_+^j}{2\Delta\hbar} \right],$$

where $I$ is the number of mobile ions. Combining the components gives

$$\langle \hat{r}_+^{j+1}, \hat{s}_+^{j+1} | e^{-\frac{i\Delta}{\hbar} \frac{1}{2} \hat{p} \hat{M}^{-1} \hat{p}} | \hat{r}_+^j, \hat{s}_+^j \rangle = \exp\left[ \sum_s e^{-\frac{i\Delta}{\hbar} \hat{s}_s^{j+1} \hat{s}_s^j} \right] \frac{M}{2\pi\Delta\hbar}^{1/2} \times \exp\left[ \frac{i\Delta}{\hbar} \sum_s \hat{s}_s^{j+1} C_s(\hat{r}_+^{j+1}, (j+1)\Delta) + \hat{s}_s^j C_s(\hat{r}_+^j, j\Delta) \right] \times \exp\left[ \frac{i\Delta}{\hbar} U(\hat{r}_+^j, j\Delta) \right]. \quad (A5)$$

Similar steps lead to

$$\langle \hat{r}_-^j, \hat{s}_-^j | e^{\frac{i\Delta}{\hbar} \frac{1}{2} \hat{p} \hat{M}^{-1} \hat{p}} | \hat{r}_+^{j+1}, \hat{s}_+^{j+1} \rangle = \exp\left[ \sum_s e^{\frac{i\Delta}{\hbar} \hat{s}_s^j \hat{s}_s^{j+1}} \right] \frac{iM}{2\pi\Delta\hbar}^{1/2} \times \exp\left[ \frac{i\Delta}{\hbar} \sum_s \hat{s}_s^j C_s(\hat{r}_-^j, j\Delta) + \hat{s}_s^{j+1} C_s(\hat{r}_+^{j+1}, (j+1)\Delta) \right] \times \exp\left[ \frac{-i\Delta}{\hbar} U(\hat{r}_-^j, j\Delta) \right]. \quad (A6)$$

A quick way to do it is to replace $\Delta \to -\Delta$, switch the subscripts from $+ \to -$, and interchange $j \leftrightarrow j+1$. For $\langle \hat{r}_+^N, \hat{s}_-^N | \hat{O} | \hat{r}_+^N, \hat{s}_-^N \rangle$, we have

$$\langle \hat{r}_+^N \otimes \hat{s}_-^N | \hat{O} \otimes \hat{1} | \hat{r}_+^N \otimes \hat{s}_-^N \rangle = \langle \hat{r}_+^N | \hat{O} | \hat{r}_+^N \rangle \langle \hat{s}_-^N | \hat{s}_-^N \rangle = \langle \hat{r}_+^N | \hat{O} | \hat{r}_+^N \rangle \hat{e}^{\hat{s}_-^N \hat{s}_-^N}. \quad (A7)$$

Finally, we calculate $\langle \hat{r}_+^1, \hat{s}_+^1 | \hat{p}_0 | \hat{r}_-^1, \hat{s}_-^1 \rangle$. We assume that at $t = 0$ the mobile and stationary ions and described by their own independent density operators. Specifically, we allow the stationary ions to be in a thermal equilibrium with an external bath, while the mobile ions start with a known density distribution $\hat{\rho}_m$, allowing us to write $\hat{\rho}_0 = \hat{\rho}_m \otimes e^{-\hat{H}_S}$, so that

$$\langle \hat{r}_+^1, \hat{s}_+^1 | \hat{p}_0 | \hat{r}_-^1, \hat{s}_-^1 \rangle = \langle \hat{r}_+^1 | \hat{\rho}_m | \hat{r}_-^1 \rangle \langle \hat{s}_+^1 | e^{-\beta H_S} | \hat{s}_-^1 \rangle = \langle \hat{r}_+^1 | \hat{\rho}_m | \hat{r}_-^1 \rangle \exp\left( \sum_s e^{-\beta \hbar \Omega_s} \hat{s}_+^1 \hat{s}_-^1 \right), \quad (A8)$$

where we have used $\langle \phi | \hat{a} \phi \rangle = e^{\hat{a}^\dagger \phi} \psi$. 
Appendix B: Field Integration

Plugging Eqs. (A5)-(A8) into Eq. (25) gives

\[
(\hat{O})(\tau) = \frac{1}{\text{Tr}[\rho_0]} \int \mathcal{D}(\ldots) \langle r_N^N | \hat{O} | r_N^N \rangle \langle r_1^+ | \rho_m r_1^+ \rangle \left| \frac{\mathbf{M}}{2\pi \Delta \hbar} \right|^{N-1} 
\times \prod_s \exp \left[ - \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left( \tilde{s}^j_s \tilde{s}^j_s + \tilde{s}_r^j \tilde{s}_r^j \right) + \tilde{s}_r^1 s_\perp e^{-\beta \Omega s} + \tilde{s}_r^N s_\perp^N \right]
\times \prod_s \exp \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} e^{-i \Delta \Omega s} \tilde{s}^{j+1}_s \tilde{s}^{j+1}_s - \frac{i \Delta}{\hbar} \left[ \tilde{s}^{j+1}_s C_s(r^{j+1}) + s^{j+1}_r C_s(r^{j+1}) \right] \right]
\times \prod_s \exp \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} e^{i \Delta \Omega s} \tilde{s}^{-j}_s \tilde{s}^{-j}_s + \frac{i \Delta}{\hbar} \left[ \tilde{s}^{-j}_s C_s(r^{-j}) + s^{-j+1}_r C_s(r^{-j+1}) \right] \right]
\times \prod_s \exp \left[ \sum_{\sigma=\pm} \frac{i}{\hbar} \left( r^{j+1}_\sigma - r^j_\sigma \right)^T \mathbf{M} \left( r^{j+1}_\sigma - r^j_\sigma \right) - \sigma \frac{i \Delta}{\hbar} U(r^j_\sigma) \right],
\]

(B1)

where $\rho_m$ is the density operator for the mobile ions at $t = 0$. Note that we suppress the redundant time label in $C_s$ and $U$ because it is already present as the superscript of $r$.

The next step involves integrating over the complex numbers $s^j_s$ and $\tilde{s}^j_s$. Before we do that, however, there are two important features worth highlighting in Eq. (B1). First, each vibrational mode $s$ has 4N complex variables associated with it: $s^j_\pm$ and $\tilde{s}^j_\pm$ for $j = 1 \ldots N$. Second, the different modes do not mix directly as there are no products of the form $s^j_\pm \tilde{s}^k_\pm$. This feature considerably simplifies the integration.

Picking out only the terms in the second, third, and fourth lines of Eq. (B1) that depend on the mode $s$ allows us to define a multidimensional complex Gaussian integral

\[
\mathcal{I}_s = \int \mathcal{D}(\ldots) \exp \left[ \tilde{s}^1_s s_\perp e^{-\beta \Omega s} + \tilde{s}^N_s s_\perp^N \right]
\times \exp \left[ - \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left( \tilde{s}^j_s \tilde{s}^j_s + \tilde{s}_r^j \tilde{s}_r^j \right) \right]
\times \exp \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} e^{-i \Delta \Omega s} \tilde{s}^{j+1}_s \tilde{s}^{j+1}_s + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} e^{i \Delta \Omega s} \tilde{s}^{-j}_s \tilde{s}^{-j}_s \right]
\times \exp \left[ - \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \frac{i \Delta}{\hbar} \left[ \tilde{s}^{j+1}_s C_s(r^{j+1}) + s^{j+1}_r C_s(r^{j+1}) \right] \right]
\times \exp \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \frac{i \Delta}{\hbar} \left[ \tilde{s}^{-j}_s C_s(r^{-j}) + s^{-j+1}_r C_s(r^{-j+1}) \right] \right].
\]

(B2)
To evaluate the integral in Eq. (B2), we first write the terms inside the exponential as

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -e^{-\beta \Omega_s} \\
-e^{-i \Delta \Omega_s} & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \\
\cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
s_+ \\
s \\
\vdots \\
0 \\
\cdots \\
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
0 \\
C_s(r_{+}^{2}) \\
\vdots \\
C_s(r_{+}^{N}) \\
0 \\
-C_s(r_{-}^{-1}) \\
\vdots \\
-C_s(r_{-}^{1}) \\
\end{pmatrix}
\] (B3)

\[
-\frac{i \Delta}{\hbar} \left( C_s(r_{+}^{1}) \cdots C_s(r_{-}^{N-1}) 0 -C_s(r_{+}^{N}) \cdots -C_s(r_{-}^{2}) 0 \right) \begin{pmatrix}
s_+ \\
s \\
\vdots \\
0 \\
\cdots \\
\end{pmatrix}
\]

where \( \begin{pmatrix} s_+ \ s_- \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} s_+^2 \ s_+^1 \ s_-^N \ s_-^N \ s_-^2 \ s_-^1 \end{pmatrix} \).

Performing the integral requires inverting the matrix in Eq. (B3). The top left (bottom right) quadrants of this matrix are lower bidiagonal matrices with 1 on the main diagonal and \(-e^{-i \Delta \Omega_s} (-e^{i \Delta \Omega_s})\) on the first subdiagonal. The remaining two quadrants have a single non-zero entry each, located at their top right corner. It is convenient to write the inverse as

\[
G_s = \begin{pmatrix}
G_{s+}^{++} & G_{s+}^{+-} \\
G_{s-}^{+-} & G_{s-}^{--} \\
\end{pmatrix}
\]

\[
\begin{aligned}
[G_{s+}^{++}]_{ln} &= e^{-i \Delta \Omega_s (l-n)} [\Theta(l-n) + n_B (\Omega_s)] \\
[G_{s-}^{+-}]_{ln} &= e^{i \Delta \Omega_s (l-n)} [\Theta(l-n) + n_B (\Omega_s)] \\
[G_{s+}^{+-}]_{ln} &= e^{i \Delta \Omega_s (N+1-l-n)} n_B (\Omega_s) \\
[G_{s-}^{--}]_{ln} &= e^{-i \Delta \Omega_s (N+1-l-n)} [n_B (\Omega_s) + 1],
\end{aligned}
\] (B4)

where the discrete Heaviside function \( \Theta(0) = 1 \) and \( n_B(x) \) is the Bose-Einstein distribution. The details of the inversion procedure can be found in Appendix C. The resulting expression is

\[
\mathcal{I}_s = |G_s| \exp \left[ -\frac{\Delta^2}{\hbar^2} \sum_{ln=1}^{N} C_s(r_{+}^{l}) \left[ G_{s+}^{++} \right]_{ln} C_s(r_{-}^{n}) (1 - \delta_{n,1}) (1 - \delta_{l,N}) \right] \\
\times \exp \left[ -\frac{\Delta^2}{\hbar^2} \sum_{ln=1}^{N} C_s(r_{+}^{N+1-l}) \left[ G_{s-}^{+-} \right]_{ln} C_s(r_{-}^{N+1-n}) (1 - \delta_{n,1}) (1 - \delta_{l,N}) \right] \\
\times \exp \left[ \frac{\Delta^2}{\hbar^2} \sum_{ln=1}^{N} C_s(r_{+}^{l}) \left[ G_{s+}^{+-} \right]_{ln} C_s(r_{-}^{N+1-n}) (1 - \delta_{n,1}) (1 - \delta_{l,N}) \right] \\
\times \exp \left[ \frac{\Delta^2}{\hbar^2} \sum_{ln=1}^{N} C_s(r_{+}^{N+1-l}) \left[ G_{s-}^{--} \right]_{ln} C_s(r_{-}^{n}) (1 - \delta_{n,1}) (1 - \delta_{l,N}) \right].
\] (B5)

Here, the \( \pi^{2N} \) term from the Gaussian integration is cancelled by \( \pi^{2N} \) in the denominator originating from Eq. (24). The expression can be made more symmetric by relabeling \( N + 1 - n \to n \) for the \( r_{+}^{N+1-n} \) terms (and, of course, changing the corresponding index of the \( G \) matrix element). In addition, for the sake of brevity, we will suppress the Kronecker deltas and set \( C_s(r_{+}^{N}) = C_s(r_{-}^{1}) = C_s(r_{+}^{1}) = C_s(r_{-}^{N}) = 0 \) implicitly. Plugging in the expressions
Note that the phase term $e^{-i\Delta \Omega_s (l-n)}$ in Eq. (B6) is the same for all the exponentials, allowing us to combine the terms as

$$
\begin{align*}
(C_s(r^l_+) \quad C_s(r^l_-)) 
& \left( \Theta(l-n) + n_B(\Omega_s) \quad -n_B(\Omega_s) \right) 
\left( C_s(r^n_+) \quad C_s(r^n_-) \right) \\
= & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( C_s(r^l_+) + C_s(r^l_-) \quad C_s(r^l_+) - C_s(r^l_-) \right) 
\left( \delta_{ln}/2 - \Theta(n-l) \right) 
\left( \Theta(l-n) + 1 + 2n_B(\Omega_s) + \delta_{ln}/2 \right) 
\left( C_s(r^n_+) + C_s(r^n_-) \quad C_s(r^n_+) - C_s(r^n_-) \right) 
\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\
\rightarrow & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( C_s(r^l_+) + C_s(r^l_-) \quad C_s(r^l_+) - C_s(r^l_-) \right) 
\left( 0 \quad -\Theta(n-l) \right) 
\left( \Theta(l-n) \coth\left( \frac{\beta h \Omega_s}{2} \right) \right) 
\left( C_s(r^n_+) + C_s(r^n_-) \quad C_s(r^n_+) - C_s(r^n_-) \right) 
\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}.
\end{align*}
$$

(B7)

We drop the $\delta_{ln}$ terms because their contribution decays as $\sim 1/N$: $\Delta^2 \propto N^{-2}$ in the prefactor, while the Kronecker deltas provide only $N$ terms.

Next, we write $I_s$ as

$$
I_s = |G_s| \exp \left[ -\frac{\Delta^2}{\hbar^2} \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{e^{-i\Delta \Omega_s (l-n)}}{2} \right] 
\times \left( C_s(r^l_+) + C_s(r^l_-) \quad C_s(r^l_+) - C_s(r^l_-) \right) 
\left( 0 \quad -\Theta(n-l) \right) 
\left( \Theta(l-n) \coth\left( \frac{\beta h \Omega_s}{2} \right) \right) 
\left( C_s(r^n_+) + C_s(r^n_-) \quad C_s(r^n_+) - C_s(r^n_-) \right) 
$$

(B8)

where we drop the $C_s(r^{l=N}_+)$, $C_s(r^{l=1}_-)$, $C_s(r^{n=1}_+)$, $C_s(r^{n=N}_-)$ requirement for $\Delta \to 0$ as the contribution of these terms goes as $\sim 1/N$.

The term $|G_s| = |G_s^{-1}|^{-1} = 1/(1-e^{-\beta h \Omega_s}) = \text{Tr} \left[ e^{-\beta h \Omega_s b_i} \right]$ = $\text{Tr} [\hat{\rho}_s]$ cancels $\text{Tr} [\hat{\rho}_s]$ in the denominator of Eq. (B1)
for each mode $s$, leaving only $\text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_m]$. Combining all the $\mathcal{I}_s$ terms gives

$$\langle \hat{O}(\tau) \rangle = \frac{1}{\text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_m]} \int \mathcal{D} (\cdots) (r_N^N | \hat{O} | r_0^N)(r_+^1 | \hat{\rho}_m | r_0^1) \frac{M}{2\pi \Delta h} \prod_{s} \exp \left[ - \frac{1}{2} \coth \left( \frac{\beta \hbar \Omega_s}{2} \right) Q_s Q_s^* \right]$$

$$\times \prod_{s} \exp \left[ \frac{\Delta^2}{h^2} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \sin (\Delta \Omega_s(n - l)) \right. \left. (C_s(r_+^n) - C_s(r_-^n)) \Theta(n - l) \left( C_s(r_+^l) + C_s(r_-^l) \right) \right]$$

$$\times \prod_{j=1}^{N-1} \exp \left[ \sum_{s=\pm} \left( \frac{i (r_{j+1}^s - r_j^s)^T M (r_{j+1}^s - r_j^s)}{2\Delta h} - \frac{\sigma \Delta}{\hbar} U(r_j^s) \right) \right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{\text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_m]} \int \mathcal{D} (\cdots) (r_N^N | \hat{O} | r_0^N)(r_+^1 | \hat{\rho}_m | r_0^1) \frac{M}{2\pi \Delta h} \prod_{s} \exp \left[ - \frac{1}{2} \coth \left( \frac{\beta \hbar \Omega_s}{2} \right) Q_s Q_s^* \right]$$

$$\times \prod_{s} \exp \left[ \frac{\Delta^2}{h^2} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \sin (\Delta \Omega_s(n - l)) \right. \left. (Y_s(r_+^n) - Y_s(r_-^n)) \Theta(n - l) \left( Y_s(r_+^l) + Y_s(r_-^l) + 2W_s(\Delta) \right) \right]$$

$$\times \prod_{j=1}^{N-1} \exp \left[ \sum_{s=\pm} \left( \frac{i (r_{j+1}^s - r_j^s)^T M (r_{j+1}^s - r_j^s)}{2\Delta h} - \frac{\sigma \Delta}{\hbar} U(r_j^s) \right) \right] \quad \text{(B9)}$$

with

$$Q_s = \frac{\Delta}{\hbar} \sum_{l=1}^{N} e^{-i\Delta \Omega_s l} [C_s(r_+^l) - C_s(r_-^l)] = \frac{\Delta}{\hbar} \sum_{l=1}^{N} e^{-i\Delta \Omega_s l} [Y_s(r_+^l) - Y_s(r_-^l)] \quad \text{(B10)}$$

### Appendix C: Inverting the Mode Matrix

Our goal is to invert

$$Y = \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & -e^{-\beta \hbar \Omega_s} \\
-e^{-i\theta} & 1 & \ldots & 0 & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
\ldots & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\
\ldots & 0 & 0 & -e^{i\theta} & 1 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
a & b \\
c & d
\end{pmatrix} \quad \text{(C1)}$$

Using the Banachiewicz identity,

$$Y^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix}
a^{-1} + a^{-1} b (d - ca^{-1} b)^{-1} ca^{-1} - a^{-1} b (d - ca^{-1} b)^{-1} \\
-(d - ca^{-1} b)^{-1} ca^{-1} & (d - ca^{-1} b)^{-1}
\end{pmatrix} \quad \text{(C2)}$$

The advantage here is that $a$ is a bidirectional matrix with 1’s on the main diagonal and identical entries on the subdiagonal. Writing $a = 1 - S$, we have

$$a^{-1} = \left(1 - S\right)^{-1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} S^n \quad \text{(C3)}$$

One can check that for $n > N$, $S^n$ vanishes while for $n \leq N$, the negative of the subdiagonal entry of $a$ is raised to the power $n$ and positioned on the $n$th diagonal. In other words, $[a^{-1}]_{jk} = \Theta(j - k) e^{-\beta(j-k)\hbar}$, where we define Heaviside function $\Theta(0) = 1$. 
Next, we have
\[
\begin{align*}
[ca^{-1}]_{jk} &= \sum_{lm} c_l a_{lm}^{-1} b_{mk} = \sum_{lm} (-1) \delta_{j,1} \delta_{l,N} a_{jm}^{-1} (-e^{-\beta \Lambda_{k}} \delta_{m,1} \delta_{l,N}) = \frac{1}{N} e^{-\beta \Lambda_{k}} \delta_{j,1} \delta_{l,N} \\
&= e^{-i(N-1)\theta} e^{-\beta \Lambda_{k}} \delta_{j,1} \delta_{l,N}, \\
[a^{-1}]_{jk} &= \sum_{m} a_{jm}^{-1} b_{mk} = \sum_{m} a_{jm}^{-1} (-e^{-\beta \Lambda_{k}} \delta_{m,1} \delta_{l,N}) = -e^{-i(j-1)\theta} e^{-\beta \Lambda_{k}} \delta_{j,1} \delta_{l,N}, \\
[ca^{-1}]_{jk} &= \sum_{l} c_l a_{lk}^{-1} = \sum_{l} (-1) \delta_{j,1} \delta_{l,N} a_{lk}^{-1} = -\delta_{j,1} e^{-i(N-k)\theta}.
\end{align*}
\]

To obtain \((d-ca^{-1})^{-1}\), note that \(d\) is also bidiagonal with 1’s on the diagonal and identical terms on the subdiagonal. Subtracting \(ca^{-1}b\) adds a single element \(-e^{-i(N-1)\theta}e^{-\beta \Lambda_{k}}\) to the top right corner. Hence, we need to invert
\[
X = (d-ca^{-1})^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & -e^{-i(N-1)\theta} e^{-\beta \Lambda_{k}} \\
e^{i\theta} & 1 & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\
0 & -e^{i\theta} & 1 & \ldots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}.
\]

Here, \(D = 1, B\) is the last column of \(X\) without the final elements, \(C\) is the last row of \(X\) without the last element, and \(A\) is the remaining \((N-1) \times (N-1)\) matrix. Invoking the Banachiewicz identity again, we write
\[
\begin{align*}
(d-ca^{-1})^{-1} &= \left( A^{-1} + A^{-1} B (D-CA^{-1}B)^{-1} CA^{-1} - A^{-1} B (D-CA^{-1}B)^{-1} \right) \\
&= \left( A^{-1} 0 \\ 0 0 \right) + (D-CA^{-1}B)^{-1} \left( A^{-1} BCA^{-1} - A^{-1} B \right) \\
&= \left( A^{-1} 0 \\ 0 0 \right) + (D-CA^{-1}B)^{-1} \left( A^{-1} BCA^{-1} - A^{-1} B \right).
\end{align*}
\]

As before, \([A^{-1}]_{jk} = \Theta(j-k)e^{i(j-k)\theta}\) and
\[
\begin{align*}
[CA^{-1} B]_{jk} &= \sum_{lm} C_{jl} A_{lm}^{-1} B_{mk} = \sum_{lm} (-e^{i\theta} \delta_{j,1} \delta_{l,N-1}) A_{lm}^{-1} (-e^{-i(N-1)\theta} e^{-\beta \Lambda_{k}} \delta_{m,1} \delta_{l,k,1}) \\
&= e^{i\theta} \delta_{j,1} A_{N-1,1}^{-1} e^{-i(N-1)\theta} e^{-\beta \Lambda_{k}} \delta_{k,1} = e^{i\theta} \delta_{j,1} e^{i(N-2)\theta} e^{-i(N-1)\theta} e^{-\beta \Lambda_{k}} \delta_{k,1} = \delta_{j,1} e^{-\beta \Lambda_{k}} \delta_{k,1}, \\
[A^{-1} B]_{jk} &= \sum_{m} A_{jm}^{-1} B_{mk} = \sum_{m} A_{jm}^{-1} (-e^{-\beta \Lambda_{k}} e^{-i(N-1)\theta} \delta_{m,1} \delta_{l,k,1}) = -A_{j1}^{-1} e^{-\beta \Lambda_{k}} e^{-i(N-1)\theta} \delta_{k,1} \\
&= -\Theta(j-1)e^{i(j-1)\theta} e^{-\beta \Lambda_{k}} e^{-i(N-1)\theta} \delta_{k,1} = -e^{-\beta \Lambda_{k}} e^{-i(N-j)\theta} \delta_{k,1}, \\
[CA^{-1}]_{jk} &= \sum_{l} C_{jl} A_{lk}^{-1} = \sum_{l} (-e^{i\theta} \delta_{j,1} \delta_{l,N-1}) A_{lk}^{-1} = -e^{i\theta} \delta_{j,1} A_{N-1,k}^{-1} \\
&= -e^{i\theta} \delta_{j,1} \Theta(N-1-k)e^{i(N-1-k)\theta} = -\delta_{j,1} e^{i(N-k)\theta},
\end{align*}
\]

leading to \((D-CA^{-1}B)^{-1} = (1-e^{-\beta \Lambda_{k}})^{-1} = n_B(\Theta_{s}) + 1\) in addition,
\[
\begin{align*}
[A^{-1} BCA^{-1}]_{jk} &= \sum_{l} [A^{-1} B]_{jl} [CA^{-1}]_{lk} = \sum_{l} A_{jl}^{-1} e^{-\beta \Lambda_{k}} e^{-i(N-1)\theta} \delta_{l,1} e^{i\theta} \delta_{j,1} A_{N-1,k}^{-1} \\
&= \Theta(j-1)e^{i(j-1)\theta} e^{-\beta \Lambda_{k}} e^{-i(N-1)\theta} e^{i\theta}(N-1-k)e^{i(N-1-k)\theta} \\
&= e^{-\beta \Lambda_{k}} e^{i(j-k)\theta},
\end{align*}
\]

which yields
\[
\begin{align*}
[A^{-1} + (D-CA^{-1}B)^{-1} A^{-1} BCA^{-1}]_{jk} &= \Theta(j-k)e^{i(j-k)\theta} + [n_B(\Theta_{s}) + 1] e^{-\beta \Lambda_{k}} e^{i(j-k)\theta} \\
&= \Theta(j-k) + [n_B(\Theta_{s}) + 1] e^{-\beta \Lambda_{k}} e^{i(j-k)\theta} \\
&= \Theta(j-k) + n_B(\Theta_{s}) e^{i(j-k)\theta}.
\end{align*}
\]
One can see that the same form holds for the remaining terms of \((d - ca^{-1}b)^{-1}\), in agreement with \(G_{\Delta_\alpha}^c\) for \(\theta = \Delta_\alpha\).

Having obtained \((d - ca^{-1}b)^{-1}\), we can calculate the remaining three quadrants of \(Y^{-1}\) as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
[-a^{-1}b (d - ca^{-1}b)^{-1}]_{jk} & = \sum_l \left[ -a^{-1}b \right]_{jl} \left[ (d - ca^{-1}b)^{-1} \right]_{lk} \\
& = \sum_l a^{-1} e^{-\Delta_\alpha \cdot [\Theta(l - k) + n_B(\Omega_s)]} e^{(l-k)\theta} \\
& = e^{-\Delta_\alpha} \left[ 1 + n_B(\Omega_s) \right] e^{(N-k-j+1)\theta} = n_B(\Omega_s) e^{i(N-k-j+1)\theta}, \\
[-(d - ca^{-1}b)^{-1}ca^{-1}]_{jk} & = \sum_l \left[ -(d - ca^{-1}b)^{-1} \right]_{jl} \left[ ca^{-1} \right]_{lk} \\
& = \sum_l \left[ (d - ca^{-1}b)^{-1} \right]_{jl} \left[ ca^{-1} \right]_{lk} \\
& = \sum_l \left[ \Theta(j - l) + n_B(\Omega_s) \right] e^{i(l-j)\theta} \delta_{l,1} a_{\Omega N}^{-1} \\
& = [1 + n_B(\Omega_s)] e^{-i(N-k-j+1)\theta}, \\
[ a^{-1} + a^{-1}b (d - ca^{-1}b)^{-1} ca^{-1} ]_{jk} & = \sum_l \left[ a^{-1} \right]_{jl} \left[ (d - ca^{-1}b)^{-1} \right]_{lk} \left[ ca^{-1} \right]_{mk} \\
& = \Theta(j - k) e^{-i(j-k)\theta} + \sum_l a^{-1} e^{-\Delta_\alpha \cdot [\Theta(l - m) + n_B(\Omega_s)]} e^{(l-m)\theta} \delta_{l,1} a_{\Omega N}^{-1} \\
& = \Theta(j - k) e^{-i(j-k)\theta} + e^{-i(l-j)\theta} e^{-\Delta_\alpha \cdot [1 + n_B(\Omega_s)]} e^{i(N-j-k)\theta} \\
& = \Theta(j - k) e^{-i(j-k)\theta} + e^{-i(j-k)\theta} e^{-\Delta_\alpha \cdot [1 + n_B(\Omega_s)]} \\
& = [\Theta(j - k) + n_B(\Omega_s)] e^{-i(j-k)\theta}.
\end{align*}
\]

Appendix D: Correlation Tensor

\[
(\hat{f}_n \otimes \hat{f}_l) = \left\{ \sum_s \nabla Y_s (r_n) \left[ e^{i\Delta_\alpha \cdot n_\xi_s} + e^{-i\Delta_\alpha \cdot n_\xi_s^*} \right] \otimes \sum_s' \nabla Y_s' (r_l) \left[ e^{i\Delta_\alpha \cdot l_\xi_{s'}} + e^{-i\Delta_\alpha \cdot l_\xi_{s'}} \right] \right\} \\
= \int \prod_{s',s''} d_\xi_{s'} d_\xi_{s''} \sum_s \nabla Y_s (r_n) \left[ e^{i\Delta_\alpha \cdot n_\xi_s} + e^{-i\Delta_\alpha \cdot n_\xi_s^*} \right] \otimes \sum_s' \nabla Y_s' (r_l) \left[ e^{i\Delta_\alpha \cdot l_\xi_{s'}} + e^{-i\Delta_\alpha \cdot l_\xi_{s'}} \right] P_{s,s''} \\
= \sum_s \int d_\xi_s d_\xi_s^* \nabla Y_s (r_n) \left[ e^{i\Delta_\alpha \cdot n_\xi_s} + e^{-i\Delta_\alpha \cdot n_\xi_s^*} \right] \otimes \nabla Y_s (r_l) \left[ e^{i\Delta_\alpha \cdot l_\xi_s} + e^{-i\Delta_\alpha \cdot l_\xi_s^*} \right] P_s \\
= \sum_s \nabla Y_s (r_n) \otimes \nabla Y_s (r_l) \int d_\xi_s d_\xi_s^* \left[ e^{i\Delta_\alpha \cdot n_\xi_s} + e^{-i\Delta_\alpha \cdot n_\xi_s^*} \right] \left[ e^{i\Delta_\alpha \cdot l_\xi_s} + e^{-i\Delta_\alpha \cdot l_\xi_s^*} \right] P_s \\
= \sum_s \nabla Y_s (r_n) \otimes \nabla Y_s (r_l) (\xi_s \xi_s^*) 2 \cos [\Delta_\alpha (n - l)] \\
= \sum_s \nabla Y_s (r_n) \otimes \nabla Y_s (r_l) \coth \left( \frac{\beta H_{\alpha}}{2} \right) \cos [\Delta_\alpha (n - l)].
\]

(D1)
Appendix E: Recoil Term

\[
\sum_{l=1}^{n} \sin [\Delta \Omega_s (n - l)] Y_s(r_l) = \sum_{l=1}^{n} \cos [\Delta \Omega_s (n - l)] \cos [\Delta \Omega_s] - \cos [\Delta \Omega_s (n + 1 - l)] Y_s(r_l)
\]

\[
= \sum_{l=1}^{n} \frac{\cos [\Delta \Omega_s (n - l)] \cos [\Delta \Omega_s]}{\sin [\Delta \Omega_s]} Y_s(r_l) - \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} \frac{\cos [\Delta \Omega_s (n - l)]}{\sin [\Delta \Omega_s]} Y_s(r_{l+1})
\]

\[
= \sum_{l=1}^{n} \cos [\Delta \Omega_s (n - l)] \cos [\Delta \Omega_s] Y_s(r_l) - \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} \frac{\cos [\Delta \Omega_s (n - l)]}{\sin [\Delta \Omega_s]} Y_s(r_{l+1}) + \frac{\cos [\Delta \Omega_s] Y_s(r_n)}{\sin [\Delta \Omega_s]} Y_s(r_1)
\]

\[
- \sum_{l=1}^{n-1} \frac{\cos [\Delta \Omega_s (n - l)]}{\sin [\Delta \Omega_s]} [Y_s(r_{l+1}) - Y_s(r_l)] + \sum_{l=1}^{n-1} \frac{\cos [\Delta \Omega_s] Y_s(r_n)}{\sin [\Delta \Omega_s]} Y_s(r_1)
\]

\[
\approx - \sum_{l=1}^{n-1} \frac{\cos [\Delta \Omega_s (n - l)]}{\Omega_s} \nabla_r Y_s(r_l) \cdot (r_{l+1} - r_l) + \frac{\cos [\Delta \Omega_s] Y_s(r_n)}{\Omega_s} Y_s(r_1) - \frac{\cos [\Delta \Omega_s] Y_s(r_n)}{\Omega_s} Y_s(r_1)
\]

\[
\approx - \sum_{l=1}^{n-1} \frac{\cos [\Delta \Omega_s (n - l)]}{\Omega_s} \nabla_r Y_s(r_l) \cdot r_l + \frac{\cos [\Delta \Omega_s]}{\Delta \Omega_s} Y_s(r_n) - \frac{\cos [\Delta \Omega_s] Y_s(r_n)}{\Delta \Omega_s} Y_s(r_1),
\]  
(E1)

where the last expression holds in the $\Delta \to 0$ limit.
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