

A uniqueness theorem in a density-matrix functional theory

Koichi Kusakabe

Graduate School of Engineering Science, Osaka University
1-3 Machikaneyama-cho, Toyonaka, Osaka 560-8531, Japan
(dated: March 23, 2024)

Uniqueness of effective interaction defined in an extension of the Kohn-Sham theory is proved, if the model with a non-degenerate ground state exists and to reproduce a correlation function as well as the single-particle density of an electron system. The two-body interaction term is regarded as a Hubbard-type short range interaction term. The interaction strength is a functional of an element of a two-body reduced density matrix of the electron system. The uniqueness theorem gives a basic principle for effective description of electron systems.

PACS numbers: 31.15.Ew, 71.15.Mb, 71.10.-w, 71.10.Fd

Progress in theoretical description of many-electron systems and the high-performance computational techniques have allowed us to predict new functionality of materials and even to design unknown materials by theoretical model calculations. The density-functional theory (DFT) [1, 2, 3, 4, 5] has played a central role to realize reliable and powerful skills for the materials scientists. Moreover, DFT is valuable for pure physics since it provides a way to create an effective Hamiltonian of an interacting quantum system.

By introducing an idea that the single-particle density is reproduced by an effective many-body system, Kusakabe derived a kind of extension of the Kohn-Sham theory. [6] In our extended Kohn-Sham scheme, we have an effective many-body Hamiltonian expressed in second quantization. The creation and annihilation operators for artificial particles are defined using single-particle wave functions which may be expanded in Kohn-Sham orbitals. The effective potential for our modified Kohn-Sham single-particle equation is defined with a residual exchange-correlation energy functional $E_{\text{xc}}[n]$. Here $n(\mathbf{r})$ is the electron density. This residual term is determined via selection of the interaction term introduced explicitly in the model. If an interaction term is written in terms of a localized orbital, the interaction may be interpreted as the Hubbard-type short-range interaction. Shift in interaction strength may change $E_{\text{xc}}[n]$, but the formulation holds without uncertainty. This arbitrariness means that our effective theory is not uniquely determined within the framework of the density-functional theory.

This problem of uncertainty is solved in this paper by formulating the theory as a density-matrix-functional theory (DMFT). DMFT is originally written as an extension of DFT. In the usual DMFT, many-body reduced density matrices $\rho_m(\mathbf{r}_1^0; \dots; \mathbf{r}_m^0; \mathbf{r}_1; \dots; \mathbf{r}_m)$ are used as the basic variable. [7, 8] Here \mathbf{r}_i is a space coordinate for electrons. Since a two-body reduced density matrix gives the exact interaction energy, knowledge of the reduced

density matrices determines the true ground state energy of a many-electron system. However, there remains the N-representability problem in the known DMFT.

On the other hand, a natural form of two-body reduced density matrices appears in our extended Kohn-Sham scheme. [6] The form representing density fluctuation can be a density-density correlation function in a localized orbital. We will show that the simplest form is positive real-valued and its range is from 0 to 1. Our model gives a minimization process of a wave-function functional and the minimum of the model is shown to exist. If we request that the fluctuation in the original Coulomb system is reproduced in our model, which should have a non-degenerate ground state, the model of the many-electron system is uniquely determined. In a specified situation, we will conclude an existence condition of the properly defined extended Kohn-Sham model with an interaction parameter U as a density-matrix functional.

We may choose relevant orbitals and introduce an operator detecting fluctuation per each orbital. To simplify the discussion, we consider at first an impurity problem with a single relevant orbital $\phi_i(\mathbf{r})$ at an atomic center in a bulk. This situation naturally gives a Kondo problem. However, it is only technical to consider an impurity problem. Once our strategy is given for this typical case, further possible extension becomes trivial.

We introduce an operator defining a correlation function \hat{h}_i^2 , which is the density-density correlation function on $\phi_i(\mathbf{r})$.

$$\hat{h}_i^2 = \hat{h}(n_i + n_{i\neq} - n_i - n_{i\neq})^2 \quad (1)$$

Here, $\phi_i(\mathbf{r})$ is normalized and defines associated creation and annihilation operators denoted by $c_{i\neq}^\dagger$ and $c_{i\neq}$. The number operator $n_i = c_{i\neq}^\dagger c_{i\neq}$ is used. Expectation values $n_i = \langle \hat{h}_i \rangle$, $\langle \hat{h}_i \hat{h}_j \rangle$ are taken for a many-body state $|j\rangle$, which is a trial state unless explicitly specified.

The density $n(\mathbf{r})$ and the expectation value \hat{h}_i^2 given by $|j\rangle$ are the fundamental variables in our theory. For the ground state $|j_G\rangle$ of the Coulomb system, $n_G(\mathbf{r})$, $\hat{h}_i^2|_G$ given by $|j_G\rangle$ will be used. We are seeking for a model in which $n_G(\mathbf{r})$ and $\hat{h}_i^2|_G$ are reproduced exactly.

We first show the next lemma.

Electronic address: kabe@mp.es.osaka-u.ac.jp

Lemma 1

\bar{h}_i^2 is real. The next inequality holds.

$$0 \leq \bar{h}_i^2 \leq 1: \quad (2)$$

Proof: Since n_i is Hermitian, \bar{h}_i^2 is real and positive-semidefinite. An arbitrary j is expanded as,

$$j = A_0 j_0 + A_1 C_{1,\#}^Y j_1 + A_2 C_{2,\#}^Y j_2 + A_3 C_{3,\#}^Y j_3:$$

Here each j_i ($i = 0, 1, 2, 3$) satisfies $C_i j_i = 0$. Coefficients A_i satisfies a normalization condition $A_0^2 + A_1^2 + A_2^2 + A_3^2 = 1$. Using A_i , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{h}_i^2 &= 2A_3^2 + A_1^2 + A_2^2 + 2A_3^2 \\ &= 1 - A_0^2 + A_1^2 + A_2^2 + 2A_3^2: \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

This expression has the maximum value 1, only if $A_0 = A_3 = 1/\sqrt{2}$ and $A_1 = A_2 = 0$.

We require \bar{h}_i^2 to be reproduced in our model system. There are some possible manners to formulate the density matrix functional theory. One might consider generalization of constrained search of Levy [9] in order to make a density matrix functional theory. However, this is not the only way. We utilize Levy's universal energy functional $F[n]$ given by

$$F[n] = \min_{\psi} \int |\psi|^2 \hat{T} + \hat{V}_{ee} j_0;$$

to formulate our theory. Using the electron field operators $\psi(r)$ and $\psi^\dagger(r)$, the kinetic energy operator \hat{T} and the Coulomb interaction \hat{V}_{ee} are given by,

$$\hat{T} = \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \int d^3r \sum_{\mathbf{r}^0} \psi^\dagger(\mathbf{r}^0) \nabla^2 \psi(\mathbf{r}):$$

$$\hat{V}_{ee} = \frac{1}{2} \int d^3r d^3r^0 \frac{e^2}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}^0|} \sum_{\mathbf{r}^0} \psi^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_0(\mathbf{r}^0) \psi_0(\mathbf{r}^0) \psi(\mathbf{r}):$$

It is known that a minimizing ψ_0 in the definition of $F[n]$ exists, although the convexity of $F[n]$ is denied. [5]

Now we consider the reduced interaction term, which may be regarded as correlation or fluctuation given by,

$$h j_{red} j_i = \frac{U}{2} h j_i^2 j_i: \quad (4)$$

We define a functional $G[\cdot]$, which is an extension of Hadjisavvas-Theophilou's functional [6, 10]

$$\begin{aligned} G[\cdot] &= h j \hat{T} + \hat{V}_{red} j_i - \min_{\psi} \int |\psi|^2 \hat{T} + \hat{V}_{red} j_0 \\ &\quad + F[n] + \int d^3r v_{ext}(r) n(r) \\ &= h j \hat{T} + \hat{V}_{red} j_i + \frac{1}{2} \int d^3r \frac{n(r) n(r^0)}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}^0|} d^3r d^3r^0 \\ &\quad + E_{xc}[n] + \int d^3r v_{ext}(r) n(r): \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Here, the residual-exchange-correlation functional is,

$$\begin{aligned} E_{xc}[n] &= \min_{\psi} \int |\psi|^2 \hat{T} + \hat{V}_{ee} j_0 - \min_{\psi} \int |\psi|^2 \hat{T} + \hat{V}_{red} j_0 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int d^3r \frac{n(r) n(r^0)}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}^0|} d^3r d^3r^0: \end{aligned}$$

In general, the definition of V_{red} determines E_{xc} . Varying U may change E_{xc} . Any U is allowed to determine a model. However, almost all of the models are not proper, since fluctuation may not be reproduced. To make U dependence explicit, we utilize a symbol $G_U[\cdot]$ below.

We next prove a set of exact statements in our theory.

Lemma 2 Assume that the ground state of a Coulomb system given by $v_{ext}(r)$ is non-degenerate. i) The ground state of a corresponding extended-Kohn-Sham model $G_U[\cdot]$ with a given positive U exists. ii) For fixed $n(r)$, $F(U) = \min_{\psi} \int |\psi|^2 \hat{T} + \frac{U}{2} j_i^2 j_i$ is a continuous function of U . iii) If a state j_i is the ground state of $G_{U_1}[\cdot]$ and $G_{U_2}[\cdot]$ with $0 \leq U_1 < U_2$ simultaneously, j_i is the ground state of $G_U[\cdot]$ in a finite range $[U_1; U_2]$ of U .

Proof: The ground state, which gives the minimum of $G_U[\cdot]$, satisfies two conditions. (1) $j_i \neq n_G(r)$. (2) j_i minimizes $\int |\psi|^2 \hat{T} + \frac{U}{2} j_i^2 j_i$. The first statement i) is proved following the same argument in the proof of the theorem 3.3 in [5]. The only requirement which has to be shown is that $\int |\psi|^2 \hat{T} + \frac{U}{2} j_i^2 j_i$ is a positive quadratic form, which is trivial from the definition.

The second statement ii) is now discussed. Assume that $F(U)$ is not continuous when $U = U_0 > 0$. This is equivalent to a statement that $^9n > 0$; $^8n > 0$; $^9U > 0$; s.t: $f j U_0 j < \dots$ & $f j (U) - F(U_0) j > ^9g$. For simplicity, let us further assume that $0 < U - U_0 < \dots$ and $F(U) - F(U_0) > \dots$. If we let \dots , we have,

$$\begin{aligned} &\min_{\psi} \int |\psi|^2 \hat{T} + \frac{U}{2} j_i^2 j_i \\ &> \min_{\psi} \int |\psi|^2 \hat{T} + \frac{U_0}{2} j_i^2 j_i + \dots \\ &= h j_0 \hat{T} + \frac{U_0}{2} j_i^2 j_i + \dots \\ &= h j_0 \hat{T} + \frac{U}{2} j_i^2 j_i + \frac{U_0 - U}{2} h j_0 j_i^2 j_i + \dots \\ &> h j_0 \hat{T} + \frac{U}{2} j_i^2 j_i - \frac{\dots}{2} + \dots \\ &= h j_0 \hat{T} + \frac{U}{2} j_i^2 j_i + \frac{\dots}{2}: \end{aligned}$$

Here we have utilized the lemma 1. This inequality contradicts the definition of $\min_{\psi} \int |\psi|^2 \hat{T} + \frac{U}{2} j_i^2 j_i$. In other possible cases, we have the same conclusion.

The third statement iii) is shown as follows. We define $H_G = f j_0 j_i j_i \neq n_G(r) g$. Assume that a j_i minimizes both $G_{U_1}[\cdot]$ and $G_{U_2}[\cdot]$. Then for any $j_i^2 H_G$

we have the next inequality with two parameters U_1 and U_2 , which do not simultaneously become zero.

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \hat{H} \rangle_{j_1^0 i_1^0} + \frac{U_1}{2} \langle \hat{n}_i^2 \rangle_{j_1^0 i_1^0} + \langle \hat{H} \rangle_{j_2^0 i_2^0} + \frac{U_2}{2} \langle \hat{n}_i^2 \rangle_{j_2^0 i_2^0} \\ & \langle \hat{H} \rangle_{j_1^0 i_1^0} + \frac{U_1}{2} \langle \hat{n}_i^2 \rangle_{j_1^0 i_1^0} + \langle \hat{H} \rangle_{j_2^0 i_2^0} + \frac{U_2}{2} \langle \hat{n}_i^2 \rangle_{j_2^0 i_2^0} : \end{aligned}$$

This inequality ensures that for $U^0 = \frac{U_1 + U_2}{2}$

$$\langle \hat{H} \rangle_{j_1^0 i_1^0} + \frac{U^0}{2} \langle \hat{n}_i^2 \rangle_{j_1^0 i_1^0} = \langle \hat{H} \rangle_{j_2^0 i_2^0} + \frac{U^0}{2} \langle \hat{n}_i^2 \rangle_{j_2^0 i_2^0} :$$

A minimizing $j_1^0 i_1^0$ of $G_{U^0}[\cdot]$ is given by $j_1 i_1$. Thus $j_1 i_1$ has to be always a ground state of $G_U[\cdot]$, if U satisfies $U_1 \leq U \leq U_2$.

We now define a concept of "a proper model". In the present context, a model is properly determined, if its lowest level is non-degenerate and if it reproduces $n_G(r)$ and $\langle \hat{n}_i^2 \rangle_{i_G}$ at the same time. The second condition should be changed, if the definition of V_{red} is changed. The central problem of the present study is summarized in the next question. If we find a proper model $G_U[\cdot]$ by optimizing U , is there another U^0 which do give a proper model? Our uniqueness theorem given below denies existence of the other model.

Suppose we found a proper model with $U = U_1$. The ground state $j_1 i_1$ of $G_{U_1}[\cdot]$ is non-degenerate and thus unique. If we shift U , $j_1 i_1$ may found as a ground state of $G_{U_2}[\cdot]$ with e.g. $U_2 > U_1$, in which the lowest level may be degenerate. Lemma 2 iii) tells us that, in a finite region $[U_1; U_2]$, $j_1 i_1$ is always the ground state of the model $G_U[\cdot]$. The ground state $j_1 i_1$ of the model does not feel the short range interaction by U . We call the situation "the irrelevant U case". This happens when i_1 is out of the system with no electron occupying i_1 or i_1 is occupied by a single electron without hybridization. Another case is when the system shows the complete ferromagnetism. We do not intend to consider these situations. In real materials, we have finite hybridization matrix elements between i_1 and a neighboring orbital. Without the large magnetic field, the true complete ferromagnetism never exists in real solids. Thus we assume that $j_1 i_1$ does not appear as a ground state of $G_U[\cdot]$ except for $U = U_1$. We do not assume, however, that $G_U[\cdot]$ may have degeneracy at $U \notin [U_1; U_2]$. We now state our main theorem.

Theorem 3 Assume that the ground state of a Coulomb system is non-degenerate. A proper extended-Kohn-Sham model given by $G_U[\cdot]$ which has a non-degenerate ground state and reproduces both $n_G(r)$ and $\langle \hat{n}_i^2 \rangle_{i_G}$ is uniquely determined, or it does not exist.

Proof: Assume that we have $U_1 \leq U_2$ and two extended Kohn-Sham models, i.e. $G_{U_1}[\cdot]$ and $G_{U_2}[\cdot]$, reproduce $n_G(r)$ and $\langle \hat{n}_i^2 \rangle_{i_G}$. Because we do not consider an irrelevant U case, $j_{U_1} i_{U_1}$ and $j_{U_2} i_{U_2}$ are different with each other. Let us define $E_{GS}^{(i)}$ be the ground-state energy and

$E_{\text{xc}}^{(i)}[n_G]$ be the residual exchange-correlation energy of these models. ($i = 1; 2$.) We have the next inequality.

$$\begin{aligned} & E_{GS}^{(2)} \\ & \langle \hat{H} \rangle_{j_{U_2} i_{U_2}} + \frac{U_2}{2} \langle \hat{n}_i^2 \rangle_{j_{U_2} i_{U_2}} + E_{\text{xc}}^{(2)}[n_G] \\ & + \frac{e^2}{2} \int d^3r d^3r' \frac{n_G(r)n_G(r')}{|r-r'|} + \int d^3r v_{\text{ext}}(r)n_G(r) \\ & = \langle \hat{H} \rangle_{j_{U_2} i_{U_2}} + \frac{U_1}{2} \langle \hat{n}_i^2 \rangle_{j_{U_2} i_{U_2}} + E_{\text{xc}}^{(1)}[n_G] \\ & + \frac{e^2}{2} \int d^3r d^3r' \frac{n_G(r)n_G(r')}{|r-r'|} + \int d^3r v_{\text{ext}}(r)n_G(r) \\ & + \frac{1}{2}(U_2 - U_1) \langle \hat{n}_i^2 \rangle_{j_{U_2} i_{U_2}} + E_{\text{xc}}^{(2)}[n_G] - E_{\text{xc}}^{(1)}[n_G] \\ & > \langle \hat{H} \rangle_{j_{U_1} i_{U_1}} + \frac{U_1}{2} \langle \hat{n}_i^2 \rangle_{j_{U_1} i_{U_1}} + E_{\text{xc}}^{(1)}[n_G] \\ & + \frac{e^2}{2} \int d^3r d^3r' \frac{n_G(r)n_G(r')}{|r-r'|} + \int d^3r v_{\text{ext}}(r)n_G(r) \\ & + \frac{1}{2}(U_2 - U_1) \langle \hat{n}_i^2 \rangle_{j_{U_1} i_{U_1}} + E_{\text{xc}}^{(2)}[n_G] - E_{\text{xc}}^{(1)}[n_G] \\ & = \langle \hat{H} \rangle_{j_{U_1} i_{U_1}} + \frac{U_2}{2} \langle \hat{n}_i^2 \rangle_{j_{U_1} i_{U_1}} + E_{\text{xc}}^{(2)}[n_G] \\ & + \frac{e^2}{2} \int d^3r d^3r' \frac{n_G(r)n_G(r')}{|r-r'|} + \int d^3r v_{\text{ext}}(r)n_G(r) : \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts that $j_{U_2} i_{U_2}$ is the ground state of a model $G_{U_2}[\cdot]$. The above argument does not deny non-existence of such a model.

Thus, we have shown that U is uniquely determined, if a proper model exists. Does U really exist? If we have a case (called a case II below) in which $G_U[\cdot]$ has always a unique ground state irrespective of U , we can show a sufficient condition for existence of the proper model. We have a next corollary.

Theorem 4 Assume that the ground state of a Coulomb system is non-degenerate and that we have a case II. An expectation value $\langle \hat{n}_i^2 \rangle_{i_G}$ given by the minimizing $j_1 i_1$ of $G_U[\cdot]$ is a function of U . The map from $[0; 1]$ to $[0; 1]$ is one-to-one, continuous and thus monotone.

Proof: Since we have Lemma 1, we have to show that the map is a one-to-one mapping at first. Let us assume that we have two U_i s ($i = 1; 2$), satisfying $0 \leq U_1 < U_2 < 1$, for which the minimizing $j_{U_i} i_{U_i}$ of $G_{U_i}[\cdot]$ reproduces $n_G(r)$ and expectation values $\langle \hat{n}_i^2 \rangle_{i_G}$ at the same time. Using the same inequality used in the proof of Theorem 3 we see that the first assumption is in contradiction to the assumption of the case II.

On the continuity, let us assume the contrary. Then we have at least one U_0 on the U axis, where the discontinuity occurs. In another word,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{U \rightarrow U_0^+} \langle \hat{n}_i^2 \rangle_{j_U i_U} > 0; \lim_{U \rightarrow U_0^-} \langle \hat{n}_i^2 \rangle_{j_U i_U} < 0 \quad (i = 1; 2); \quad \lim_{U \rightarrow U_0} \langle \hat{n}_i^2 \rangle_{j_U i_U} = U_0 \\ & \text{and } \lim_{U \rightarrow U_1^+} \langle \hat{n}_i^2 \rangle_{j_U i_U} < \lim_{U \rightarrow U_0^+} \langle \hat{n}_i^2 \rangle_{j_U i_U} > \lim_{U \rightarrow U_0^-} \langle \hat{n}_i^2 \rangle_{j_U i_U} < \lim_{U \rightarrow U_1^-} \langle \hat{n}_i^2 \rangle_{j_U i_U} : \end{aligned}$$

This condition means that $j_{U_i} \notin j_{U_0}$. Now, the continuity of $F(U)$ shown by Lemma 2 ii) and the selection axiom ensures that

$$F(U_i) - F(U_0) < \epsilon.$$

Namely, j_{U_i} is also the ground state of $G(U_0)$. However, since $j_{U_i} \notin j_{U_0}$ for all U_i , this leads to a contradiction to the uniqueness of j_{U_0} assumed in the case II. Immediately, monotonous behavior is concluded.

Now we define a set of numbers $R_i = \{r \in [0, 1] \mid \exists U \text{ s.t. } r = h_{U_i}^2 j_{U_i}\}$. We have immediately a next corollary due to Theorem 4.

Corollary 5 There exists a one-to-one onto-mapping from R_i onto $[0, 1]$, which is defined by an inverse map of the function of U in Theorem 4.

We define a way of modelling of the Coulomb system as a process to find $G_U[\cdot]$ by determining i and U . We have immediately a next physical theorem.

Corollary 6 If and only if $h_{i_0}^2$ is in R_i , a proper extended Kohn-Sham model exists.

Proof: The statement is trivial due to Theorem 5.

Here we define three minimizing states, j_{0i} , j_{Ui} and j_{ci} , given by

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{0 \leq i} &= h_{0i}^2 j_{0i}; \\ \min_{U \leq i} &= h_{Ui}^2 + \frac{U}{2} h_{i_0}^2 j_{Ui}; \\ \min_{c \leq i} &= h_{ci}^2 + \hat{V}_{ee} j_{ci}; \end{aligned}$$

Apparently, $j_{ci} \leq j_{0i} \leq j_{Ui}$. We have $h_{i_0}^2 j_{0i} \leq h_{0i}^2 j_{0i}$, $h_{i_0}^2 j_{0i} \leq h_{Ui}^2 j_{Ui}$, $h_{i_0}^2 j_{0i} \leq h_{GS}^2 j_{GS}$. These definitions and statements above conclude the followings.

Lemma 7 The following holds.

1. $h_{i_0}^2 j_{0i} = \min_{0 \leq i} h_{i_0}^2 j_{0i}$.
2. $h_{i_0}^2 j_{0i} \leq h_{GS}^2 j_{GS}$.

Due to Theorem 4 we can say the following condition for U to exist.

Theorem 8 Consider a case II. Then, $R_i = [h_{i_0}^2 j_{0i}, h_{GS}^2 j_{GS}]$. If $h_{i_0}^2 j_{0i} < h_{GS}^2 j_{GS}$, the proper extended Kohn-Sham model exists and the unique U given by Theorem 3 exists.

Now we discuss several remaining problems. We may search for i to find a proper model. However, we should note that both $h_{i_0}^2 j_{0i}$ and R_i shift, if i is changed. For a lattice, we may consider

$$h_{\text{red}}^2 i = \frac{U}{2} \sum_i h_{i_0}^2 j_{0i}; \quad (6)$$

The same argument as the above is possible. Then one would find $U[h_{i_0}^2 j_{0i}]$.

To determine i , we may see the value of $h_{i_0}^2 j_{0i}$. Practically, we can check orbital energy ϵ_i of i , which is an expectation value of the one-body part of the extended Kohn-Sham equations.[6] We have a Fermi level E_F tentatively at the step to obtain the Kohn-Sham orbitals. If ϵ_i is far below E_F or far above E_F , the occupation of i becomes 2 or 0. Then, we inevitably have $h_{i_0}^2 j_{0i} = 0$. If ϵ_i is around E_F and if the system is in a delocalized scheme, $\epsilon_{i_0} = \epsilon_{i_1} = \epsilon_{i_2} = \epsilon_{i_3} = \dots = \epsilon_{i_{N-1}}$ and $h_{i_0}^2 j_{0i} = 1$. However, if the Coulomb correlation make reduction in $h_{i_0}^2 j_{0i}$ for ϵ_i is around E_F , we are required to introduce a U -term to reproduce the density-density correlation function. This guideline can be a determination rule of minimal numbers of localized orbitals i , for which we need to set U -terms up. If singly occupied configuration may not appear in the true ground state, then, $\epsilon_{i_1} = \epsilon_{i_2} = \dots = 0$ and $h_{i_0}^2 j_{0i} = 1$. This condition may be given if the state is superconducting. In this situation, negative U may be required, although we cannot utilize Lemma 2 i) for this case.

Lemma 2 iii) leads us to four possible scenarios for $G_U[\cdot]$ in the whole range of $0 \leq U < 1$. Here we do not consider the trivial degeneracy coming from $SU(2)$ symmetry of the total spin and take the highest weight state as a representative state.

Case I A single state j_i is always the ground state of $G_U[\cdot]$.

Case II For each U , a unique state j_i different from others appears as the ground state of $G_U[\cdot]$.

Case III In a finite region $[U_1; U_2]$ of U , a state j_i is a ground state of $G_U[\cdot]$. For any other U , the state j_i never becomes the ground state.

Case IV For any U_0 , a ground state of $G_{U_0}[\cdot]$ never becomes a ground state of $G_U[\cdot]$ with $U \neq U_0$. There is a U , for which two (or more) states become the ground state of $G_U[\cdot]$.

The case I is an irrelevant U case. If j_i reproduces $h_{i_0}^2 j_{0i}$ in a case III, this is an irrelevant U case. In the case III or in the case IV, we have at least one phase transition with respect to U in the model. If $h_{i_0}^2 j_{0i}$ is reproduced by a ground state of a degenerate model in a case IV, we have to deny the model, since the degeneracy is artificial and the model is improper.

If we do not have a case II for a Coulomb system, although $F(U)$ is continuous, $h_{i_0}^2 j_{0i}$ given by j_{U_i} may not be unique because of possible degeneracy and may have a jump as a function of U . The value of $h_{i_0}^2 j_{0i}$ might be in this jump. In this case, the model has an artificial phase transition and thus the model is not proper. Therefore, we have to search for a proper model with transferability against change in environment by changing i . If there exist discontinuity in $h_{i_0}^2 j_{0i}$ along the U axis, it is detected by a jump in $h_{i_0}^2 j_{0i}$, which is concluded by Lemma 2 ii).

Finally, we would like to comment on conceptual framework of the whole study. You may think that the case II may be special. Arbitrariness remains in the selection of ϕ_i . However, we can say that Theorems 3 and 8 are new guiding principles to construct an effective theory of complicated correlated systems. In our model, we may choose only one U -term, if appropriate. This is impossible for a method to make an effective model using reduction of the whole phase space by choosing a seemingly proper basis. Our method is completely different from the renormalization group approach. In our method, we keep the property that $n_G(r)$ is always re-

produced and obtainable. Otherwise, an inverse problem, e.g. the materials design, would not be solved properly.

The author is grateful for valuable comments and suggestions on future prospects by Prof. M. Imada and Prof. H. Akaï. He thanks for fruitful discussion with Prof. N. Suzuki, Prof. M. Higuchi, Prof. K. Higuchi and Dr. S. Yamataka and Mr M. Takahashi. The work is partly supported by the 21st COE Program by the Japan Society for Promotion of Science and a Grand-in-Aid for Scientific Research (No. 15GS0213) and (No. 17064006) of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology, Japan.

-
- [1] P. Hohenberg and W. Kohn, Phys. Rev. 136, B864 (1964).
 - [2] W. Kohn and L.J. Sham, Phys. Rev. 140, A1133 (1965).
 - [3] M. Levy, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. (U.S.A.) 76, 6062 (1979).
 - [4] M. Levy, Phys. Rev. A 26, 1200 (1982).
 - [5] E. Lieb, Int. J. Quantum. Chem. 24, 243 (1983).
 - [6] K. Kusakabe, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn 70, 2038 (2001).
 - [7] J. Cioslowski, Many-Electron Densities and Reduced

- Density Matrices (Kluwer Academic, New York, 2000).
- [8] R.A. Donnelly and R.G. Parr, J. Chem. Phys. 69, 4431 (1978).
- [9] M. Higuchi and K. Higuchi, Phys. Rev. B 69, 035113 (2004).
- [10] N. Hadjisavvas and A. Theophilou, Phys. Rev. A 30, 2183 (1984).