

COUPLED CLUSTER THEORY: TOWARDS AN ALGEBRAIC GEOMETRY FORMULATION*

FABIAN M. FAULSTICH[†] AND MATHIAS OSTER[‡]

Abstract. Coupled cluster theory produced arguably the most widely used high-accuracy computational quantum chemistry methods. Despite the approach’s overall great computational success, its mathematical understanding is so far limited to results within the realm of functional analysis. The coupled cluster amplitudes, which are the targeted objects in coupled cluster theory, correspond to solutions to the coupled cluster equations, which is a system of polynomial equations of at most fourth order. The high-dimensionality of the electronic Schrödinger equation and the non-linearity of the coupled cluster ansatz have so far stalled a formal analysis of this polynomial system. In this article we present the first algebraic investigations that shed light on the coupled cluster equations and the root structure of this ansatz. This is of paramount importance for the *a posteriori* evaluation of coupled cluster calculations, where alternative benchmark procedures cannot be employed. To that end, we investigate the root structure by means of Newton polytopes. We derive a general v -description, which is subsequently turned into an h -description for explicit examples. This perspective reveals an apparent connection between *Pauli’s exclusion principle* and the geometrical structure of the Newton polytopes. Moreover, we provide numerical simulations of two computationally tractable systems, namely, the two electrons in four spin orbitals system and the three electrons in six spin orbitals system. These simulations provide novel insight into the physicality of the coupled cluster solutions when the coupled cluster ansatz is truncated.

Key words. homotopy continuation, Newton polytope, Bernstein–Khovanskii–Kushnirenko theorem, coupled-cluster theory, quantum many body problem, Schrödinger equation

MSC codes. 12D10, 14Q20, 90C53, 81-08, 81-10

1. Introduction. Electronic structure theory models a quantum mechanical system of electrons moving in an exterior potential, mostly given by the electrical field of (clamped) nuclei. This model covers most of quantum physical effects for chemistry and bulk crystals. *Ab initio* electronic structure calculations provide numerical simulations on an atomic and molecular scale based on first principles of quantum mechanics. The persistent difficulty in the study of a quantum many-particle system is the high-dimensionality. The object of interest, i.e., the system’s (ground state) wavefunction, is a function of potentially many variables—one variable for each particle. Consequently, the dimensionality of the underlying function space, grows exponentially in the number of particles. This exponential explosion of cost with respect to the number of particles is called the *curse of dimensionality*.

Coupled cluster theory is a well established and widely used approach in computational chemistry which is employed to circumvent the curse of dimensionality. It provides highly accurate approximations to the electronic Schrödinger equation. Although the coupled cluster approach makes molecular systems of tens and some hundreds atoms numerically tractable, it still faces severe scaling, for example, the coupled cluster method truncated at the singles and doubles level, which is subject of this article, has sixth order scaling with respect to the number of electrons.

The working equations, called the *coupled cluster equations*, correspond to a system of polynomial equations. Under certain assumptions, the roots of this poly-

*Submitted to the editors November 22, 2022.

Funding: This work was partially supported by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under award number FA9550-18-1-0095 and by the Simons Targeted Grants in Mathematics and Physical Sciences on Moiré Materials Magic (F.M.F.)

[†]Department of Mathematics, University of California, Berkeley, CA (f.m.faulstich@berkeley.edu)

[‡]Department of Mathematics, Technische Universität Berlin, Germany (oster@math.tu-berlin.de)

mial system describe the exact wavefunctions of a considered system. Therefore, it is important to understand the structural properties of said roots. However, due to the high-dimensionality and non-linearity of the coupled cluster equations, the algebraic and physical properties of the corresponding solution set are still far from being thoroughly understood.

Previous mathematical investigations related to the coupled cluster theory were performed within a functional analytic framework, addressing the approximation properties and local convergence results [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]. Mathematical articles that address the root structure of the coupled cluster equations are to the best of our knowledge limited to a very recent manuscript using topological degree theory [6]. Numerical investigations related to the problem of multiple (quasi) degenerate solutions to coupled cluster equations have been pioneered by Piotr Piecuch and Karol Kowalski in the quantum chemistry community [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13]. The objective of this article, however, is a more formal and algebraic understanding of the roots to the coupled cluster equations.

Aside from the recent mathematical interest, we wish to emphasize that state-of-the-art coupled cluster methods are advanced computational methods; in the past decades, different levels of approximation have been suggested to reduce the computational complexity, pushing the computational boundaries of this method, see e.g., [14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25]

In this article we take advantage of *algebraic-computational* methods to bound the number of roots of the coupled cluster equations and eventually gain novel insights to the origin of unphysical coupled cluster solutions. To that end, we employ numerical state-of-the-art software libraries such as `polymake` [26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31]. We numerically solve tractable examples as well as analyze the coupled cluster root structure using mixed volume computations. The latter are used to establish a Bernstein–Khovanskii–Kushnirenko (BKK) inspired bound [32, 33, 34]. Moreover, we perform calculations based on homotopy continuation methods, using the `Bertini` [35] software, to understand the quality of the approximations provided by truncated and untruncated coupled cluster parametrizations. Other algebraic methods such as univariate rational approximation [36] and multi-resultant techniques [37] are not subject of this article. As a first step towards a thorough understanding of this specific family of polynomial systems we establish a vertex description of surrogate Newton polytopes and conjecture an alternative description of the polynomials as quadratic form on some affine algebraic variety. Due to the exponential scaling of the polynomial system with respect to the number of electrons, already small systems become computationally challenging and might provide an interesting benchmark problem for future algebraic-computational techniques.

This article consists of two main parts, the first part, [sections 2 to 4](#) describes the underlying structures used in coupled cluster theory, i.e., the formulation of the electronic Schrödinger equation, excitation operators, and the exponential parametrization, from an algebraic and geometric perspective. The second part, [sections 5 to 7](#), contains the derivation of the coupled cluster equations, and the numerical simulation of two electrons in four spin orbitals and three electrons in six spin orbitals. Since the proofs of the novel results in this manuscript are rather straightforward but often tedious, we provide them in their entirety in the [appendix 10](#); for proofs of elementary results we provide the reader with direct references.

2. Brief Introduction to the Electronic Schrödinger Equation. The electronic Schrödinger equation of N electrons in the vicinity of N_{nuc} (clamped) nuclei is

an eigenvalue equation

$$(2.1) \quad H\Psi_* = E_*\Psi_*$$

where the operator H , also called the Coulomb Hamiltonian, is given by

$$(2.2) \quad H = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \Delta_{r_i} - \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{N_{\text{nuc}}} \frac{Z_j}{|r_i - R_j|} + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j>i}^N \frac{1}{|r_i - r_j|},$$

and Ψ_* , the wavefunction, is an anti-symmetric function in N variable. The energetically lowest eigenpair, subsequently denoted (Ψ_0, E_0) , is of particular importance to the computational chemistry community [38, 39]. The anti-symmetry is important since we consider electrons, i.e., fermions, which must obey *Pauli’s exclusion principle*. For the physical interpretation of Pauli’s exclusion principle we refer the interested reader to standard quantum mechanics textbooks, e.g., see [40, 38]. For the content of this article, it suffices to accept that Pauli’s exclusion principle is equivalent to the anti-symmetry property of the wavefunction and may be interpreted as a quantum mechanical axiom [39]. Since the Hamiltonian in (2.2) is a continuous operator, we require some kind of discretization to be able to perform numerical simulations. There are in principle two ways of doing this: The first is to use a *Galerkin discretization* [41] of the operator in (2.2) which is known as first quantization. The second, and in practice more common approach, is to use the fermionic Fock space [40, 42]. This approach is called second quantization and shall be further elaborated on in this article. For a more well-defined introduction to the electronic Schrödinger equation we refer the interested reader to [subsection 10.1](#).

Either discretization approach results in a linear eigenvalue problem. The challenge in this *quantum-many body problem* is the scaling of the discretization matrix with respect to the number of electrons, as well in first as in second quantization. In the parlance of high-dimensional numerical simulations this is also referred to as the *curse of dimensionality*, in other mathematical fields this might be known as the *combinatorial explosion*. Over the past century, there have been a great many approaches of different scalings and accuracies to circumvent this curse of dimensionality and make the electronic Schrödinger equation numerically tractable. One of the most widely used high-accuracy approach is the single reference coupled cluster approach, which is subject of this article. Despite the great progress made in the field, we emphasize that the quantum many body problem still poses one of today’s most challenging problems in computational and applied sciences.

3. Excitation Operators. The above mentioned first quantization is a useful framework for analyzing the Schrödinger equation from a functional analysis perspective [1, 2, 3, 5]. However, for practical implementations as well as for the algebraic and geometric analysis presented in this article, the second quantization is more suitable. We will not give a complete characterization of the second quantization, the interested reader is referred to [40], instead we will focus only on the mathematical constructions and objects that are important for the subsequently introduced coupled-cluster theory. We follow the common route of constructing fermionic M -particle spaces which are used to define the fermionic Fock space. The fermionic Fock space is the correct framework to define the *fermionic ladder operators*, which are used to construct the *excitation operators* which play an essential role in coupled cluster theory.

Starting point is a single-particle basis \mathcal{B} (for analytic considerations it is common to choose $\mathcal{B} \subseteq H^1(X)$ where $X = \mathbb{R}^3 \times \{\pm 1/2\}$, see [39]), which can in principle be

finite or infinite dimensional. Note that the single particle functions have a spatial and spin degree of freedom, which we shall combine, i.e., $X = \mathbb{R}^3 \times \{\pm 1/2\}$, for more details we refer the reader to [subsection 10.1](#). In case of a finite dimensional basis \mathcal{B} , we require the cardinality $K = |\mathcal{B}|$ to be larger than N , which is the number of electrons in our considered system. Note that in practical computations $K \gg N$. Moreover, we may assume without loss of generality that $\langle \chi_i, \chi_j \rangle_{L^2(X)} = \delta_{i,j}$ for all $\chi_i \in \mathcal{B}$, otherwise we employ molecular orbitals which by construction have said property [\[38\]](#).

We shall now construct the M -particle Hilbert space where $0 \leq M \leq K$. With the set of single particle functions \mathcal{B} at hand we can construct a basis of *Slater determinants*, which are M -particle functions fulfilling Pauli's exclusion principle through the anti-symmetry property. To that end, we choose M distinct single-particle functions from \mathcal{B} , i.e., $\{\chi_{p_1}, \dots, \chi_{p_M}\}$, and take their exterior product

$$(3.1) \quad \Phi[p_1, \dots, p_M](x_1, \dots, x_M) = \bigwedge_{i=1}^M \chi_{p_i}(x_1, \dots, x_M).$$

This construction merely yields a generator of the M -particle Hilbert space. We obtain a basis when considering canonical ordering, i.e., $p_1 < \dots < p_M$. The Slater determinants constructed in this way are orthonormal in the $L^2(X^M)$ -sense. We denote $\mathfrak{B}^{(M)}$ the set of all possible M -particle Slater determinants that can be constructed from \mathcal{B} . The M -particle full configuration interaction space $\mathcal{H}^{(M)}$ is then defined as the span of $\mathfrak{B}^{(M)}$. In order to define fermionic creation and annihilation operators, we require the freedom to alter the particle number. To that end, we define the fermionic Fock space as the direct sum of all M -particle Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}^{(M)}$, i.e.,

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{F} = \bigoplus_{M=0}^K \mathcal{H}^{(M)}.$$

We highlight that \mathcal{H}_0 consists only of the vacuum state. Recall that by Pauli's exclusion principle, a spin orbital can either be occupied or unoccupied, hence, any element in \mathcal{F} can be expressed by means of an occupation vector, i.e., a K -tuple of zeros and ones determining the occupation of an individual spin orbital [\[38\]](#). Said occupation vectors can be expressed in the compact bra-ket notation, i.e. $\phi = |k_1, k_2, \dots, k_K\rangle$ where $k_i \in \{0, 1\}$ denotes the occupation number of the i -th spin orbital.

Remark 3.1. Consider the case of $K = 4$ and $M = 2$. Then the two particle state $\Phi[1, 3]$ can be written as

$$\Phi[1, 3] = |1010\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Next we define creation and annihilation operators that manipulate the occupation vectors by inserting and removing '1' entries, respectively.

DEFINITION 3.2. Let $i \in \{0, \dots, K\}$. The fermionic creation operator $a_i^\dagger : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ is defined as

$$(3.3) \quad a_i^\dagger : |k_1, k_2, \dots, k_i, \dots, k_K\rangle \mapsto \begin{cases} \sigma(i, k) |k_1, k_2, \dots, 1_i, \dots, k_K\rangle, & \text{if } k_i = 0 \\ 0, & \text{if } k_i = 1 \end{cases}$$

where $\sigma(i, k)$ is the sign corresponding to the number of transitions of non-zero elements in $|k_1, k_2, \dots, k_i, \dots, k_K\rangle$ prior to the i -th position. The $L^2(X)$ -adjoint operator of a_i^\dagger is called the fermionic annihilation operator and is denoted a_i .

Remark 3.3. In the case of a finite dimensional basis, the matrix a_i^\dagger is simply the transposed or adjoint matrix of a_i if the elements are real or complex, respectively. For example, consider again the case of $K = 4$ and $M = 2$. Then $a_2^\dagger|100\rangle = -|110\rangle$ which yields the identification

$$a_2^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Given the fermionic ladder operators, the Coulomb Hamiltonian can be reformulated in second quantized form [40]; it reads

$$(3.4) \quad H = \sum_{p,q=1}^K h_{p,q} a_p^\dagger a_q + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p,q,r,s=1}^K v_{p,q,r,s} a_p^\dagger a_r^\dagger a_s a_q,$$

where

$$(3.5) \quad h_{p,q} = \int_X \chi_p^*(x_1) \left(-\frac{\Delta}{2} + \sum_j \frac{Z_j}{|r_1 - R_j|} \right) \chi_q(x_1) dx_1$$

and

$$(3.6) \quad v_{p,q,r,s} = \int_{X \times X} \frac{\chi_p^*(x_1) \chi_q(x_1) \chi_r^*(x_2) \chi_s(x_2)}{|r_1 - r_2|} dx_1 dx_2$$

Remark 3.4. We want to highlight a certain ambiguity in the definition of the two-particle interaction tensor $v_{p,q,r,s}$. The above definition follows the theoretical chemists' convention. In theoretical physics, however, it is convention to define $v_{p,q,r,s}$ as

$$(3.7) \quad v_{p,q,r,s}^{(\text{phys})} = \int_{X \times X} \frac{\chi_p^*(x_1) \chi_q^*(x_2) \chi_r(x_1) \chi_s(x_2)}{|r_1 - r_2|} dx_1 dx_2.$$

Although both formulations are very similar, they result in different permutational symmetries that are key to an efficient implementation [43].

Arguably, the most important property of said operators is the canonical anti-commutation relation (CAR).

LEMMA 3.5 (CAR). *The fermionic creation and annihilation operators fulfill the canonical anti-commutation relations, i.e.,*

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} [a_i^\dagger, a_j]_+ &= a_i^\dagger a_j + a_j a_i^\dagger = \delta_{i,j} \\ [a_i^\dagger, a_j^\dagger]_+ &= a_i^\dagger a_j^\dagger + a_j^\dagger a_i^\dagger = 0 \\ [a_i, a_j]_+ &= a_i a_j + a_j a_i = 0 \end{aligned}$$

The proof is elementary and can be found in e.g. Ref [38]. We can now define the vector space $\mathfrak{a} = \text{Span}\{a_i\}_i \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F})$, where $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F})$ denotes the bounded and linear operators on the Fock space, and the corresponding coordinate map

$$(3.9) \quad a : \mathbb{R}^K \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}; \quad v = (v_1, \dots, v_K) \mapsto v_1 a_1 + \dots + v_K a_K.$$

The canonical anti-commutation relations from Theorem 3.5 then generalize on the vector space \mathfrak{a} as

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} [a(v)^\dagger, a(w)]_+ &= \langle v, w \rangle \\ [a(v)^\dagger, a(w)^\dagger]_+ &= 0 \\ [a(v), a(w)]_+ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\langle v, w \rangle$ corresponds to the conventional scalar product of the linear expansion coefficients. This is commonly referred to as representation of the CARs of K degrees of freedom.

Remark 3.6. The above construction is the starting point for a description of fermionic ladder operators in the more general framework of C^* -algebras [44].

Central object of interest in this article are the excitation operators, which are essential in the coupled-cluster theory. Excitation operators are particle-number preserving operators acting on an M -particle Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{(M)} \subset \mathcal{F}$. As we are here concerned with the N -particle fermionic many-body problem, we shall henceforth consider the N -particle Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}^{(N)} \subset \mathcal{F}$. From a physics perspective, excitation operators are straightforward to understand from a particle-hole perspective. Starting point is the reference state $\Phi_0 = \Phi[1, \dots, N]$; we will now annihilate an electron (which corresponds to the creation of a hole) and then create an electron in the virtual space. This can be expressed as product of fermionic creation and annihilation operators

$$(3.11) \quad X_i^a = a_a^\dagger a_i.$$

Since the excitation operators are defined by means of the creation and annihilation operators, we can straightforwardly deduce their action of on Slater determinants, i.e.,

$$X_i^a : \Phi[p_1, \dots, p_N] \mapsto \begin{cases} \Phi[p_1, \dots, p_{j-1}, a, p_{j+1}, \dots, p_N], & \text{if } i = p_j \text{ and} \\ & a \neq p_k, 1 \leq k \leq N \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Note that the canonical ordering may introduce an additional phase in the above definition. In inner product expressions (vide infra), we may also interpret an excitation operator as ‘‘acting to the left’’. In this case, it acts as its adjoint, i.e., a de-excitation operator, on the Slater determinant to its left, i.e.,

$$(X_i^a)^\dagger : \Phi[p_1, \dots, p_N] \mapsto \begin{cases} \Phi[p_1, \dots, p_{j-1}, i, p_{j+1}, \dots, p_N], & \text{if } a = p_j \text{ and} \\ & i \neq p_k, 1 \leq k \leq N \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

again with a potential phase to ensure the canonical ordering.

Remark 3.7. For example, consider again the case of $K = 4$ and $N = 2$ and let the operator X_2^4 act on the two particle Slater determinant $\Phi[2, 3]$. Then we get

$$X_2^4 \Phi[2, 3] = a_4^\dagger a_2 \Phi[2, 3] = a_4^\dagger \Phi[3] = \Phi[4, 3] = -\Phi[3, 4].$$

Higher order excitation operators correspond to the normal-ordered distinct products of such single excitation operators, e.g.,

$$(3.12) \quad X_{ij}^{ab} = \{X_i^a X_j^b\} = a_a^\dagger a_b^\dagger a_i a_j$$

where $\{\cdot\}$ highlights the normal ordering (see e.g. [40, 38] for the definition of normal ordered operators). We furthermore introduce a canonical order on the occupied and virtual indices, i.e., $i < j$ and $a < b$, introducing an additional phase, i.e., a sign. For a general excitation operator $X_{i_1, \dots, i_k}^{a_1, \dots, a_k}$ we define the excitation multiindex

$$(3.13) \quad \mu = \begin{pmatrix} a_1, \dots, a_k \\ i_1, \dots, i_k \end{pmatrix},$$

i.e., $X_\mu = X_{i_1, \dots, i_k}^{a_1, \dots, a_k}$ and we call $|\mu| = k$ the excitation rank. Although this definition of excitation operators is rather general, we subsequently restrict the considerations to excitations w.r.t. one particular reference Slater determinant. More precisely, we pick an in principle arbitrary reference Slater determinant, denoted by Φ_0 —without loss of generality, we may assume $\Phi_0 = \Phi[1, \dots, N]$. The orbitals that are used to generate the reference Slater determinant are called *occupied orbitals*, and all the remaining spin orbitals are called *virtual orbitals*. Then, we only consider excitation indices μ that excite from the occupied into the virtual indices and denote the set of multiindices that describes said excitations as \mathcal{I} . Since this set of excitations corresponds to replacing indices in the string $[1, \dots, N]$ with indices in the string $[N + 1, \dots, K]$, we may deduce that there is a one-to-one relation between excitation operators and Slater determinants except for the reference Slater determinant Φ_0 . In other words, the excitation operators map the reference Slater determinant Φ_0 to all other Slater determinants. Given a reference Slater determinant Φ_0 , we may therefore identify every other Slater determinant by the corresponding excitation and consequently find

$$(3.14) \quad \mathfrak{B} = \{\Phi_0\} \cup \{\Phi_\mu = X_\mu \Phi_0 \mid \mu \in \mathcal{I}\}.$$

This allows us to introduce yet another representation of Slater determinants which is very useful for practical considerations. To that end, let μ be a multiindex

$$(3.15) \quad \mu = \begin{pmatrix} a_1, \dots, a_k \\ i_1, \dots, i_k \end{pmatrix},$$

then we may write the Slater determinant Φ_μ as

$$(3.16) \quad \Phi_\mu = X_\mu \Phi_0 = X_{i_1, \dots, i_k}^{a_1, \dots, a_k} \Phi_0 = \Phi_{i_1, \dots, i_k}^{a_1, \dots, a_k}.$$

Moreover, assuming without loss of generality that the N -particle basis \mathfrak{B} is ordered by the excitation rank of the Slater determinants w.r.t. the given reference state, then the excitation operators correspond to strictly lower-triangular block matrices, and are consequently nilpotent.

LEMMA 3.8. *The excitation operators fulfill the commutation relations*

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{aligned} [X_\mu, X_\nu] &= X_\mu X_\nu - X_\nu X_\mu = 0 \\ [X_\mu^\dagger, X_\nu^\dagger] &= X_\mu^\dagger X_\nu^\dagger - X_\nu^\dagger X_\mu^\dagger = 0 \end{aligned}$$

For a proof we again refer the interested reader to Ref. [38, 6]. We emphasize that $[X_\mu, X_\nu^\dagger]$ is not necessarily zero. However, the following statement can be made.

LEMMA 3.9. *Let X_μ, X_ν be excitation operators with*

$$(3.18) \quad \mu = \begin{pmatrix} a_1^{(\mu)}, \dots, a_k^{(\mu)} \\ i_1^{(\mu)}, \dots, i_k^{(\mu)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \nu = \begin{pmatrix} a_1^{(\nu)}, \dots, a_k^{(\nu)} \\ i_1^{(\nu)}, \dots, i_k^{(\nu)} \end{pmatrix},$$

and of rank $k^{(\mu)}, k^{(\nu)}$, respectively. Moreover, let $a_j^{(\mu)} \neq a_\ell^{(\nu)}, i_j^{(\mu)} \neq i_\ell^{(\nu)}$, then

$$(3.19) \quad [X_\mu, X_\nu^\dagger] = 0.$$

For the N -particle Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , we can now define the set of all creation operators defined on \mathcal{H} , we denote this set by $\mathfrak{E}(\mathcal{H})$. We emphasize that excitation operators always perform an excitation, in particular the excitation rank $k \geq 1$ which means $I \notin \mathfrak{E}(\mathcal{H})$.

THEOREM 3.10. *There exists a one-to-one relation between the N -particle basis functions \mathfrak{B} and $\mathfrak{E}(\mathcal{H}) \cup \{I\}$.*

We can now define the vector space

$$(3.20) \quad \mathfrak{b} = \text{Span}(\mathfrak{E}(\mathcal{H})),$$

which is known in the quantum-chemistry community as the space of cluster operators, i.e.,

$$(3.21) \quad \mathfrak{b} = \left\{ T = \sum_{k=1}^N T^{(k)} \mid T^{(k)} = \sum_{|\mu|=k} t_\mu X_\mu \right\}.$$

This vector space takes an essential role in coupled-cluster theory [38, 45].

THEOREM 3.11. *The vector space \mathfrak{b} together with the commutator*

$$(3.22) \quad [\cdot, \cdot] : \mathfrak{b} \times \mathfrak{b} ; (S, T) \mapsto ST - TS$$

forms an Abelian Lie algebra.

As Abelian Lie algebra, the following properties are naturally fulfilled

COROLLARY 3.12.

- i) The Lie algebra \mathfrak{b} is an Abelian subalgebra of a nilalgebra, and hence a nilpotent Lie algebra itself.*
- ii) The Lie algebra \mathfrak{b} is solvable.*
- iii) The center $Z(\mathfrak{b}) = \{T \in \mathfrak{b} \mid [T, S] = 0 \forall S \in \mathfrak{b}\} = \mathfrak{b}$*
- iv) The derivative algebra of \mathfrak{b} , denoted $[\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{b}]$, is equal to zero.*

Note that for elements in \mathfrak{b} there always exists a Jordan–Chevalley decomposition and as a consequence from Lie’s theorem; the corresponding matrix representation is of strict lower triangular form. Moreover, as \mathfrak{b} is solvable, there exists a chain of ideals of \mathfrak{b} s.t.

$$(3.23) \quad 0 = \mathfrak{b}_0 \subset \mathfrak{b}_1 \subset \dots \mathfrak{b}_K = \mathfrak{b}$$

with $\dim(\mathfrak{b}_i) = i$.

4. Exponential Parametrization. The success of coupled cluster methods can be traced back to the exponential parametrization of the wavefunction, which was independently derived by Hubbard [46] and Hugenholtz [47]. This exponential parametrization of a wave function can be derived in several ways. Mathematically, the Cauchy–Dunford calculus for linear operators in finite dimensions yields that the exponential parametrization is equivalent to the linear parametrization known as the full configuration interaction wavefunction [1], we note however, that the same result

can be obtained by using simple matrix calculus. However, this approach does not hold in infinite dimensions, in particular, the H^1 -continuity of the cluster operator, which is key in infinite dimensions, requires additional considerations, as was shown in [2]. More recently an alternative approach based on graph theory was introduced by Csirik and Laestadius [6].

In the following section we provide an alternative algebraic derivation of the exponential parametrization. From a mathematical perspective, it is natural to approach the characterization and resulting approximations of the fermionic many-body problem from a Ritz–Galerkin perspective [41], i.e.,

$$(4.1) \quad E_0 = \min_{\Psi \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{\langle \Psi, H\Psi \rangle}{\langle \Psi, \Psi \rangle}.$$

Note that the above expression is invariant w.r.t a normalization factor of Ψ . Quantum-mechanical principles dictate that the system’s *true* wavefunction has to be L^2 -normalized. However, the normalization is irrelevant for the system’s energy, and we shall henceforth assume Ψ to be intermediately normalized w.r.t. the reference state Φ_0 , i.e., $\langle \Psi, \Phi_0 \rangle = 1$. We denote \mathcal{H}_{int} the convex subset of all intermediately normalized wavefunctions in \mathcal{H} .

The construction of excitation operators allows us to transfer the degrees of freedom from the wavefunction to the *wave operator*. We define the wave-operator map

$$(4.2) \quad \Omega : \mathfrak{b} \rightarrow \mathcal{G} ; C \mapsto Id + C$$

where

$$(4.3) \quad \mathcal{G} = \{Id + C \mid C \in \mathfrak{b}\}.$$

We will now show the one-to-one correspondence between intermediately normalized functions $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} \subset \mathcal{H}$, and cluster operators $c \in \mathfrak{b}$. To that end we require the following two lemmata:

LEMMA 4.1. *Let $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{int}}$. There exists a unique element $(Id + C) \in \mathcal{G}$, s.t.,*

$$(4.4) \quad \Psi = (Id + C)\Phi_0.$$

LEMMA 4.2. *The wave-operator map Ω is bijective.*

Combining these two lemmata, we can show the desired one-to-one correspondence.

THEOREM 4.3. *Let $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{int}}$. There exists a unique element $C \in \mathfrak{b}$, s.t.,*

$$(4.5) \quad \Psi = \Omega(C)\Phi_0.$$

Although we have restricted the above theorem to intermediately normalized wavefunctions (the reason will become apparent shortly), [Theorem 4.3](#) is in fact the core of the (full) configuration interaction expansion [38]. Note moreover, since \mathfrak{b} is nilpotent the exponential series $\exp(T)$ for any element $T \in \mathfrak{b}$ terminates after at most N terms. We can therefore define the set

$$(4.6) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{G}} = \{\exp(T) \mid T \in \mathfrak{b}\}$$

where $\exp(T) = Id + P(T)$ and P is a polynomial of at most degree N .

LEMMA 4.4. *The set $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ is equal to \mathcal{G} .*

The common algebraic definition of the exponential map is by means of a map $\exp : \mathfrak{b} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$, where \mathcal{G} is a Lie group and \mathfrak{b} the corresponding Lie algebra. In particular, the exponential map is a map from the tangent space to the Lie group. We wish to equip \mathcal{G} with a particular group multiplication \odot , such that (\mathcal{G}, \odot) is a Lie group and \mathfrak{b} its Lie algebra. This group multiplication \odot is defined by means of the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula

$$\odot : \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}; \exp(T) \odot \exp(U) = \exp(T * U)$$

for an operation $*$ on \mathfrak{b} which takes the following simple form on Abelian algebras

$$(4.7) \quad * : \mathfrak{b} \times \mathfrak{b} \rightarrow \mathfrak{b}; (T, S) \mapsto T + S.$$

Note the following lemma.

LEMMA 4.5. *(\mathcal{G}, \odot) is a connected Abelian Lie group.*

Since $\mathfrak{b} \subseteq \mathfrak{n}$, i.e., the algebra of strictly lower triangular matrices, \mathcal{G} is a unipotent affine algebraic group, and the Jordan–Chevalley decomposition of $X \in \mathcal{G}$ has Id as semisimple part, and the nilpotent part is in \mathfrak{b} .

Remark 4.6. In case of a two-particle system in four spin orbitals, e.g., the hydrogen molecule in the minimal basis set description, (\mathcal{G}, \odot) is the real Heisenberg group of dimension $2n + 1$ with $n = 2$, i.e., matrices of the form

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ a & Id & 0 \\ c & b & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We can now show that the exponential map is in fact surjective.

THEOREM 4.7. *Given the Lie group \mathcal{G} with Lie algebra \mathfrak{b} . The exponential map $\exp : \mathfrak{b} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ is surjective.*

Note that this theorem can be generalized to the any nilpotent Lie algebra. However, the proof shows (see [section 10](#)) that the inverse of the exponential is in this particular case well-defined, which proves the following theorem.

THEOREM 4.8. *The exponential map from \mathfrak{b} to \mathcal{G} is bijective.*

This shows that any wavefunction that is intermediately normalize can be uniquely expressed by means of an element in \mathcal{G} , i.e., through the exponential of a cluster operator $T \in \mathfrak{b}$. This aligns with the known functional analytic results [[1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [5](#)], and is known in the quantum-chemistry community as the equivalence of FCI and FCC.

COROLLARY 4.9. *The group (\mathcal{G}, \odot) is closed Lie subgroup of $GL_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbb{R})$ where \mathcal{K} is the dimension of the FCI space, i.e.,*

$$\mathcal{K} = \binom{K}{N}.$$

In order to make practical computations numerically tractable, the cluster operator is truncated in some way. This could be either by the level of excitation, i.e., CCSD, etc. [[38](#)], by means of additional system specific information [[20](#), [18](#)], or active space considerations [[19](#), [16](#), [48](#), [49](#), [22](#), [50](#)]. Regardless of the origin of truncation,

we denote the vector space corresponding to truncated cluster operators by $\bar{\mathfrak{b}} \subset \mathfrak{b}$. Clearly $\bar{\mathfrak{b}}$ is again a vector space and equipped with the commutator it is an Abelian Lie algebra. Similar to the untruncated case, we define the set

$$(4.9) \quad \bar{\mathcal{G}} = \{\exp(T) \mid T \in \bar{\mathfrak{b}}\},$$

and find that $(\bar{\mathcal{G}}, \odot)$ is a Lie group.

DEFINITION 4.10. *We define the inclusion map $\iota : (\bar{\mathcal{G}}, \odot) \rightarrow (\mathcal{G}, \odot)$ with*

$$(4.10) \quad \iota : \exp(T) \mapsto \exp(\bar{T})$$

where

$$(4.11) \quad \bar{T} = T + 0,$$

i.e., trivially extending T with zeros.

For the inclusion map ι we can show the following two lemmata.

LEMMA 4.11. *The inclusion map $\iota : (\bar{\mathcal{G}}, \odot) \rightarrow (\mathcal{G}, \odot)$ is a group homomorphism.*

LEMMA 4.12. *The inclusion map $\iota : (\bar{\mathcal{G}}, \odot) \rightarrow (\mathcal{G}, \odot)$ is an injective immersion.*

With these properties at hand, we can show the closed connected Abelian subgroup property of $(\bar{\mathcal{G}}, \odot)$.

THEOREM 4.13. *$(\bar{\mathcal{G}}, \odot)$ is a closed connected Abelian subgroup of (\mathcal{G}, \odot) .*

Remark 4.14. The subgroup $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$ is not open, as we can draw arbitrarily small balls around the identity, which are not in $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$.

COROLLARY 4.15. *$\bar{\mathcal{G}}$ is an embedded Lie subgroup.*

5. Coupled Cluster Equations. In order to approximate solutions to the Schrödinger equation using coupled cluster theory, we need to derive working equations that can be solved numerically. There is a variety of ways the exponential ansatz can be used to derive numerical schemes that approximately solve the Schrödinger equation. We shall focus here on the most common application, i.e., the projected single-reference coupled cluster approach. In this approach, we define the coupled-cluster energy as

$$(5.1) \quad \mathcal{E}_{CC} = \langle \Phi_0, e^{-T} H e^T \Phi_0 \rangle$$

where $T \in \mathfrak{b}$ fulfills the coupled-cluster equations

$$(5.2) \quad \langle \Phi_\mu, e^{-T} H e^T \Phi_0 \rangle = 0, \quad \forall \Phi_\mu \in \mathfrak{B}.$$

The choice of T is here not unique (the different roots describe different wavefunctions); taking the energetically lowest solution, however, yields the FCI or Galerkin energy [4, 6]. Note that if a truncation is imposed on the cluster operator expansion, i.e., $T \in \bar{\mathfrak{b}}$, this equivalence does not hold necessarily. Moreover, since the coupled-cluster amplitude equations do not arise from the Rayleigh quotient, \mathcal{E}_{CC} is not necessarily bounded from below by the FCI energy, i.e., *the coupled cluster method is not variational*. Since each operator $T \in \mathfrak{b}$ can be uniquely described by its expansion coefficients $t = (t_\mu)_\mu$, the coupled-cluster equations can be understood as amplitude equations, i.e., equations that characterize the amplitudes t instead of the

operator T . From this perspective, the coupled cluster amplitudes correspond to roots of the coupled cluster function

$$(5.3) \quad f_\mu(t) = \langle \Phi_\mu, e^{-T(t)} H e^{T(t)} \Phi_0 \rangle, \quad \forall \mu \in \mathcal{I}.$$

Note that f_μ is defined on the amplitude vector space. A characteristic of the projected coupled-cluster approach is that the expansion of the similarity transformed Hamiltonian truncates after at most four terms [38], i.e.,

$$(5.4) \quad e^{-T} H e^T = H + [H, T] + \frac{1}{2} [[H, T], T] + \frac{1}{6} [[[H, T], T], T] + \frac{1}{24} [[[[H, T], T], T], T]$$

and, hence, every polynomial $f_\mu(t)$ is at most of degree four. Since we have as many polynomial equations as we have excited Slater determinants, i.e., we exclude the reference state, Bezout's theorem yields the rough upper bound of

$$(5.5) \quad \mathcal{N} \leq 4^{\mathcal{K}-1},$$

where \mathcal{N} is the number of solutions to the set of CC equations and $\mathcal{K}-1$ is the number of excited Slater determinants. Note, that already in the case of four electrons in eight spin orbitals, for example for LiH in the minimal basis description, this naïve Bezout bound for coupled cluster truncated at the single and double level of excitation (CCSD) is $2^{104} \approx 2 \cdot 10^{31}$. Any homotopy algorithm based on this Bezout bound is therefore infeasible. Clearly, more information on the number of roots of the projected coupled-cluster equations would be beneficial for various numerical approaches that characterize the roots of the coupled-cluster function.

In order to derive more accurate bounds to the number of roots, we require a more explicit description of the working equations. Since a general description of these equations for arbitrary truncations is not feasible, we subsequently focus on the most popular truncation scheme, i.e., the CCSD method. In terms of working equations, this results in a restriction of the projections onto merely singly and doubly excited Slater determinants. Although this seems like an aggressive truncation, the expressions of the working equations are still highly complicated. Therefore, we split the description of f_μ into the case when μ describes a singly excited Slater determinants (single-excitation CCSD equations), and to the case when μ describes a doubly excited Slater determinants (double-excitation CCSD equations).

We investigate the different terms of the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff expansion individually. It holds

$$\begin{aligned} [H, T] &= HT - TH, \\ [[H, T], T] &= HT^2 - 2THT + T^2H, \\ [[[H, T], T], T] &= HT^3 - 3THT^2 + 3T^2HT - T^3H, \\ [[[[H, T], T], T], T] &= HT^4 - 4THT^3 + 6T^2HT^2 - 4T^3HT + T^4H. \end{aligned}$$

Some very important rules of quantum chemistry simplify the higher order terms: Since we are only interested in the CCSD case all terms of the form $T^n H T^m$ with m arbitrary and $n > 2$ vanish since we are projecting onto at most doubly excited Slater determinants. Similarly, we find that

$$\langle \Phi_i^a, T^2 H T^m \rangle = 0.$$

for arbitrary m . Furthermore, the Slater Condon rules [40] imply that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \Phi_0, HT^n \Phi_0 \rangle &= 0, & \text{for } n > 2 \\ \langle \Phi_i^a, HT^n \Phi_0 \rangle &= 0, & \text{for } n > 3 \\ \langle \Phi_{ij}^{ab}, HT^n \Phi_0 \rangle &= 0, & \text{for } n > 4\end{aligned}$$

and by de-excitation rules

$$\langle \Phi_i^a, THT^m \Phi_0 \rangle = t_i^a \langle \Phi_0, HT^m \Phi_0 \rangle.$$

These rules may now be applied to expand the CCSD working equations. To that end, we investigate the the individual projections of the respective commutator terms. We exemplify this procedure with the standard commutator expression projected onto a singly excited Slater determinant. This yields

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \Phi_i^a, [H, T] \Phi_0 \rangle &= \langle \Phi_i^a, HT \Phi_0 \rangle - \langle \Phi_i^a, TH \Phi_0 \rangle \\ &= \sum_{j,b} t_j^b \langle \Phi_i^a, H \Phi_j^b \rangle + \sum_{\substack{j < k \\ b < c}} t_{jk}^{bc} \langle \Phi_i^a, H \Phi_{jk}^{bc} \rangle - t_i^a \langle \Phi_0, H \Phi_0 \rangle,\end{aligned}$$

i.e., a linear polynomial in the cluster amplitudes t_j^b, t_{ij}^{ab} . We emphasise that this procedure rapidly gets more involved, and refer the interested reader for a complete derivation of the coupled-cluster equations to [subsection 10.4](#). Note that due to the Slater–Condon rules, there exists no quadruple commutator contribution in the single-projection equations. Hence, the resulting polynomials that arise from projecting onto singly excited Slater determinants are of the form

$$\begin{aligned}f_i^a(t) &= \langle \Phi_i^a, H \Phi_0 \rangle + \langle \Phi_i^a, [H, T] \Phi_0 \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \Phi_i^a, [[H, T], T] \Phi_0 \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{6} \langle \Phi_i^a, [[[H, T], T], T] \Phi_0 \rangle \\ (5.6) \quad &= \langle \Phi_i^a, H \Phi_0 \rangle + \langle \Phi_i^a, [H, T] \Phi_0 \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \Phi_i^a, HT^2 \Phi_0 \rangle - \langle \Phi_i^a, THT \Phi_0 \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{6} \langle \Phi_i^a, HT^3 \Phi_0 \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle \Phi_i^a, THT^2 \Phi_0 \rangle.\end{aligned}$$

The expansion of the individual terms yields a polynomial of the form

$$\begin{aligned}f_i^a(t) &= \mathcal{C}(i, a) + \sum_{k,c} \mathcal{C}(k, c) t_{ik}^{ac} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,c,d} \mathcal{C}(a, k, c, d) t_{ik}^{cd} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,l,c} \mathcal{C}(k, l, i, d) t_{kl}^{ac} \\ &\quad + \sum_c \mathcal{C}(a, c) t_i^c - \sum_k \mathcal{C}(k, i) t_k^a + \sum_{k,c} \mathcal{C}(a, k, i, c) t_k^c \\ (5.7) \quad &- \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,l,c,d} \mathcal{C}(k, l, c, d) \langle t_i^c t_{kl}^{ad} + t_k^a t_{il}^{cd} - t_k^c t_{li}^{da} \rangle - \sum_{k,c} \mathcal{C}(k, c) t_i^c t_k^a \\ &\quad + \sum_{k,c,d} \mathcal{C}(a, k, c, d) t_i^c t_k^d - \sum_{k,l,c} \mathcal{C}(k, l, i, c) t_k^a t_l^c - \sum_{k,l,c,d} \mathcal{C}(k, l, c, d) \langle t_i^c t_k^a t_l^d \rangle,\end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{C} denotes a coefficient map that can be assembled by the coefficients that are derived in [subsection 10.4](#). We note that \mathcal{C} obeys some structural rules which are partially exploited in the subsequent paragraphs, see [subsection 10.4](#) for more details.

We see from (5.7) that the single-excitation CCSD equations consists of n_s equations of at most degree three, where

$$(5.8) \quad n_s = N(K - N).$$

In a similar fashion we can derive the polynomials that arise from projecting onto doubly excited Slater determinants. Here we find

$$(5.9) \quad \begin{aligned} f_{ij}^{ab}(t) &= \langle \Phi_{ij}^{ab}, H\Phi_0 \rangle + \langle \Phi_{ij}^{ab}, [H, T]\Phi_0 \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \Phi_{ij}^{ab}, [[H, T], T]\Phi_0 \rangle \\ &+ \frac{1}{6} \langle \Phi_{ij}^{ab}, [[[H, T], T], T]\Phi_0 \rangle + \frac{1}{24} \langle \Phi_{ij}^{ab}, [[[[H, T], T], T], T]\Phi_0 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The full derivation of the terms is again performed in subsection 10.4. Without going into full detail of the coefficient distribution, we present the general form of the polynomial that arises from the projections onto the doubly excited Slater determinants

$$(5.10) \quad \begin{aligned} f_{i,j}^{a,b}(t) &= \mathcal{C}(a, b, i, j) + \sum_k \mathcal{C}(k, j) t_{ik}^{ab} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{cd} \mathcal{C}(a, b, c, d) t_{ij}^{cd} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{kl} \mathcal{C}(k, l, i, j) t_{kl}^{ab} + \sum_{kc} \mathcal{C}(k, b, c, j) t_{ik}^{ac} \\ &+ \frac{1}{4} \sum_{klcd} \mathcal{C}(k, l, c, d) t_{ij}^{cd} t_{kl}^{ab} + \sum_{klcd} \mathcal{C}(k, l, c, d) t_{ij}^{cd} t_{ik}^{ac} t_{jl}^{bd} \\ &- \frac{1}{2} \sum_{klcd} \mathcal{C}(k, l, c, d) t_{ik}^{dc} t_{lj}^{ab} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{klcd} \mathcal{C}(k, l, c, d) t_{lk}^{ac} t_{ij}^{db} \\ &+ \sum_c \mathcal{C}(a, b, c, j) t_i^c - \sum_k \mathcal{C}(k, b, i, j) t_k^a - \sum_{kc} \mathcal{C}(k, c) t_i^c t_{kj}^{ab} \\ &- \sum_{kc} \mathcal{C}(k, c) t_k^a t_{ij}^{cb} + \sum_{kcd} \mathcal{C}(a, k, c, d) t_i^c t_{kj}^{db} - \sum_{klc} \mathcal{C}(k, l, i, c) t_k^a t_{lj}^{cb} \\ &- \frac{1}{2} \sum_{kcd} \mathcal{C}(k, b, c, d) t_k^a t_{ij}^{cd} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{klc} \mathcal{C}(k, l, c, j) t_i^c t_{kl}^{ab} \\ &+ \sum_{kcd} \mathcal{C}(k, a, c, d) t_k^c t_{ij}^{db} - \sum_{klc} \mathcal{C}(k, l, c, i) t_k^c t_{lj}^{ab} \\ &+ \sum_{cd} \mathcal{C}(a, b, c, d) t_i^c t_j^d + \sum_{kl} \mathcal{C}(k, l, i, j) t_k^a t_l^b \\ &- \sum_{kc} \mathcal{C}(k, b, c, j) t_i^c t_k^a + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{klcd} \mathcal{C}(k, l, c, d) t_i^c t_j^d t_{kl}^{ab} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{klcd} \mathcal{C}(k, l, c, d) t_k^a t_l^b t_{ij}^{cd} - \sum_{klcd} \mathcal{C}(k, l, c, d) t_i^c t_k^a t_{lj}^{db} \\ &- \sum_{klcd} \mathcal{C}(k, l, c, d) t_k^c t_i^d t_{lj}^{ab} - \sum_{klcd} \mathcal{C}(k, l, c, d) t_k^c t_l^a t_{ij}^{db} \\ &+ \sum_{kcd} \mathcal{C}(k, d, c, d) t_i^c t_k^a t_j^d + \sum_{klc} \mathcal{C}(k, l, c, j) t_i^c t_k^a t_l^b \\ &+ \sum_{klcd} \mathcal{C}(k, l, c, d) t_i^c t_j^d t_k^a t_l^b. \end{aligned}$$

From Eq. (5.10), we see that we have n_d equations of at most degree four, where

$$(5.11) \quad n_d = \frac{N(N-1)}{2} \frac{(K-N)(K-N-1)}{2}.$$

This yields a refined Bezout bound of

$$\mathcal{N} \leq 3^{n_s} 4^{n_d}.$$

5.1. Newton Polytopes. In order to advance towards a BKK-type bound, we provide the vertex description of two polytopes N_S and N_D . The polytope N_S is a superset for the Newton polytopes corresponding to the equations coming from projections to singly-excited Slater determinants. Similarly, N_D is a superset for the Newton polytopes corresponding to the equations coming from projections to doubly-excited Slater determinants. In principle, these supersets can be used to bound the mixed volume of the actual Newton polytopes. Yet, for this to be of practical relevance, we require a numerically tractable way to compute the mixed volume of these surrogate polytopes, which is left for future investigations.

We start by characterizing the sets of all possible vertices corresponding to monomials in the singly-excited projections. We define the sets $N_s = \{1, \dots, n_s\}$ and $N_d = \{1 + n_s, \dots, n_d + n_s\}$. All vertices describing the single-excited CCSD equations are then described by the following sets \mathcal{S}_i :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_1 &= \{v \mid \exists i \in N_s \text{ s.t. } v_i = 1 \text{ and } v_j = 0 \forall j \in N_s \setminus \{i\} \text{ or } j \in N_d\} \\ \mathcal{S}_2 &= \{v \mid \exists i \in N_d \text{ s.t. } v_i = 1 \text{ and } v_j = 0 \forall j \in N_d \setminus \{i\} \text{ or } j \in N_s\} \\ \mathcal{S}_3 &= \{v \mid \exists i \neq j \in N_s \text{ s.t. } v_i = v_j = 1 \text{ and } v_k = 0 \forall k \in N_s \setminus \{i, j\} \text{ or } k \in N_d\} \\ \mathcal{S}_4 &= \{v \mid \exists i \in N_s, \exists j \in N_d \text{ s.t. } v_i = v_j = 1 \text{ and } v_k = 0 \forall k \in N_s \setminus \{i\} \text{ or } k \in N_d \setminus \{j\}\} \\ \mathcal{S}_5 &= \{v \mid \exists i \neq j \neq k \in N_s \text{ s.t. } v_i = v_j = v_k = 1 \text{ and } v_\ell = 0 \forall \ell \in N_s \setminus \{i, j, k\} \text{ or } \ell \in N_d\} \\ \mathcal{S}_6 &= \{v \mid \exists i \in N_s \text{ s.t. } v_i = 2 \text{ and } v_j = 0 \forall j \in N_s \setminus \{i\} \text{ or } j \in N_d\} \\ \mathcal{S}_7 &= \{v \mid \exists i \neq j \in N_s \text{ s.t. } v_i = 2 \text{ and } v_j = 1 \text{ and } v_k = 0 \forall k \in N_s \setminus \{i, j\} \text{ or } k \in N_d\} \end{aligned}$$

Remark 5.1. A careful analysis of the coefficient map \mathcal{C} reveals that terms of the form $\mathcal{C}(k, l, c, d) t_i^c t_k^a t_l^d$ can only give rise to monomials of the form xyz or x^2y , where x, y, z are some distinct single excitation amplitudes. Thus, \mathcal{S}_7 and \mathcal{S}_5 are the only contributions of cubic terms.

The Newton polytopes corresponding to the monomials in the singly-excited projections lie in the convex hull of the derived vertices \mathcal{S}_i . In order to find the extremal points of said convex hull we establish the following lemmata of relations between the individual sets, the proofs are again provided in the appendix.

LEMMA 5.2. *The following set inclusions hold:*

$$(5.12) \quad \mathcal{S}_3 \subset \text{conv}(\mathcal{S}_6) \quad \mathcal{S}_1 \subset \text{conv}(\mathcal{S}_6 \cup \{0\}).$$

LEMMA 5.3. *The vertices described by \mathcal{S}_5 are not extremal points of the convex hull of $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_7$.*

LEMMA 5.4. *The vertices described by $\{0\}, \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{S}_4, \mathcal{S}_6, \mathcal{S}_7$ are extremal vertices of the convex hull of $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_7$.*

We will then define the surrogate polytope N_S as follows,

$$N_S := \text{conv}(\{0\} \cup \mathcal{S}_2 \cup \mathcal{S}_4 \cup \mathcal{S}_6 \cup \mathcal{S}_7).$$

Similarly to the projections onto singly excited Slater determinants we characterize the extremal vertices of the monomials arising in the projection to doubly-excited Slater determinants. All vertices describing double-excited CCSD equations are then described by the following sets \mathcal{D}_i :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}_1 &= \{v \mid \exists i \in N_d \text{ s.t. } v_i = 1 \text{ and } v_j = 0 \forall j \in N_d \setminus \{i\} \text{ or } j \in N_s\} \\
\mathcal{D}_2 &= \{v \mid \exists i \neq j \in N_d \text{ s.t. } v_i = v_j = 1 \text{ and } v_k = 0 \forall k \in N_d \setminus \{i, j\} \text{ or } k \in N_s\} \\
\mathcal{D}_3 &= \{v \mid \exists i \in N_d \text{ s.t. } v_i = 2 \text{ and } v_j = 0 \forall j \in N_d \setminus \{i\} \text{ or } j \in N_s\} \\
\mathcal{D}_4 &= \{v \mid \exists i \in N_s \text{ s.t. } v_i = 1 \text{ and } v_j = 0 \forall j \in N_s \setminus \{i\} \text{ or } j \in N_d\} \\
\mathcal{D}_5 &= \{v \mid \exists i \neq j \in N_s \text{ s.t. } v_i = v_j = 1 \text{ and } v_k = 0 \forall k \in N_s \setminus \{i, j\} \text{ or } k \in N_d\} \\
\mathcal{D}_6 &= \{v \mid \exists i \in N_s, \exists j \in N_d \text{ s.t. } v_i = v_j = 1 \text{ and } v_k = 0 \forall k \in N_s \setminus \{i\} \text{ or } k \in N_d \setminus \{j\}\} \\
\mathcal{D}_7 &= \{v \mid \exists i \neq j \in N_s, \exists k \in N_d \text{ s.t. } v_i = v_j = v_k = 1 \text{ and } v_\ell = 0 \forall \ell \in N_s \setminus \{i, j\} \text{ or } \ell \in N_d \setminus \{k\}\} \\
\mathcal{D}_8 &= \{v \mid \exists i \neq j \neq k \in N_s \text{ s.t. } v_i = v_j = v_k = 1 \text{ and } v_\ell = 0 \forall \ell \in N_s \setminus \{i, j, k\} \text{ or } \ell \in N_d\} \\
\mathcal{D}_9 &= \{v \mid \exists i \neq j \neq k \neq \ell \in N_s \text{ s.t. } v_i = v_j = v_k = v_\ell = 1 \text{ and } v_m = 0 \forall m \in N_s \setminus \{i, j, k, \ell\} \text{ or } m \in N_d\} \\
\mathcal{D}_{10} &= \{v \mid \exists i \in N_s \text{ s.t. } v_i = 2 \text{ and } v_j = 0 \forall j \in N_s \setminus \{i\} \text{ or } j \in N_d\} \\
\mathcal{D}_{11} &= \{v \mid \exists i \in N_s, \exists j \in N_d \text{ s.t. } v_i = 2 \text{ and } v_j = 1 \text{ and } v_k = 0 \forall k \in N_s \setminus \{i\} \text{ or } k \in N_d \setminus \{j\}\} \\
\mathcal{D}_{12} &= \{v \mid \exists i \neq j \in N_s \text{ s.t. } v_i = v_j = 2 \text{ and } v_k = 0 \forall k \in N_s \setminus \{i, j\} \text{ or } k \in N_d\}
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 5.5. Again, a careful analysis of the coefficient map \mathcal{C} reveals that terms of the form $\mathcal{C}(k, l, m, c, d, e) t_i^c t_k^a t_l^d t_m^e$ can only give rise to monomials of the form $w \cdot x \cdot y \cdot z$ or $x^2 \cdot y^2$, where w, x, y, z are distinct single excitation amplitudes. Thus, \mathcal{D}_9 and \mathcal{D}_{12} are the only contributions of quartic terms.

In order to find the extremal vertices, we use the following lemmata.

LEMMA 5.6. *The following set inclusions hold*

$$\begin{array}{lll}
\mathcal{D}_1 \subset \text{conv}(\mathcal{D}_3 \cup \{0\}) & \mathcal{D}_2 \subset \text{conv}(\mathcal{D}_3) & \mathcal{D}_4 \subset \text{conv}(\mathcal{D}_{10} \cup \{0\}) \\
\mathcal{D}_5 \subset \text{conv}(\mathcal{D}_{10}) & \mathcal{D}_6 \subset \text{conv}(\mathcal{D}_3 \cup \mathcal{D}_{10}) & \mathcal{D}_7 \subset \text{conv}(\mathcal{D}_3 \cup \mathcal{D}_{12}) \\
\mathcal{D}_8 \subset \text{conv}(\mathcal{D}_{10} \cup \mathcal{D}_{12}) & \mathcal{D}_9 \subset \text{conv}(\mathcal{D}_{12}) & \mathcal{S}_2 \subset \text{conv}(\mathcal{D}_3 \cup \{0\}) \\
\mathcal{S}_4 \subset \text{conv}(\mathcal{D}_3 \cup \mathcal{D}_{10}) & \mathcal{S}_6 = \mathcal{D}_{10} & \mathcal{S}_7 \subset \text{conv}(\mathcal{D}_{10} \cup \mathcal{D}_{12}).
\end{array}$$

Therefore, we can summarize the vertex description.

THEOREM 5.7. *The vertices described by $\{0\}, \mathcal{D}_3, \mathcal{D}_{10}, \mathcal{D}_{11}, \mathcal{D}_{12}$ are the extremal vertices of the convex hull of $\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_{12}$.*

We will then define the surrogate polytope N_D as follows,

$$N_D := \text{conv}(\{0\} \cup \mathcal{D}_3 \cup \mathcal{D}_{10} \cup \mathcal{D}_{11} \cup \mathcal{D}_{12}).$$

By construction, the polytopes N_S, N_D contain all Newton polytopes N_{S_i}, N_{D_i} of the single respectively double projections. Then, the mixed volume of the Newton polytopes can be bounded from above and below as

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{2^n}{n!} = \text{Vol}(S_n(2)) &\leq \text{mixedVolume}(N_{S_i}, N_{D_i}) \leq \text{mixedVolume}(\underbrace{N_S}_{n_s \text{ times}}, \underbrace{N_D}_{n_d \text{ times}}) \\
&\leq \text{Vol}(\text{conv}\{\{0\}, \mathcal{D}_3, \mathcal{D}_{10}, \mathcal{D}_{11}, \mathcal{D}_{12}\}) \leq \text{Vol}(S_n(4)) = \frac{4^n}{n!}
\end{aligned}$$

Using again the Slater–Condon rules and with some careful inspection of

$$(5.13) \quad \langle \Phi_{ij}^{ab}, HT^4 \Phi_0 \rangle = \sum_{k < l, c < d} (t_i^a t_j^b - t_i^b t_j^a)(t_k^c t_l^d - t_k^d t_l^c) \langle \Phi_{ij}^{ab}, H \Phi_{ijkl}^{abcd} \rangle$$

we can moreover discover further structures in the polynomial system. Due to the canonical ordering we can recover the index k of doubly excited determinants Φ_{ij}^{ab} from i, j, a, b and denote it by $k = k(i, j, a, b)$.

CONJECTURE 5.8. *The CCSD working equations can be written as a quadratic equation in $n_s + 2n_d$ variables, i.e.,*

$$f_\mu = \sum_{q,r} h_{q,r}^\mu x_q x_r$$

on the variety $A = \{x \in \mathbb{F}^{n_s + 2n_d} \mid x_k - x_i^a x_j^b + x_i^b x_j^a = 0 \text{ for all } k = k(i, j, a, b)\}$ where \mathbb{F} is either \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C} , and furthermore, if μ is a single excitation index we can decompose $h_{q,r}^\mu = \eta_{q,r}^\mu + \theta_{q,r}^\mu$ with

$$(5.14) \quad \eta_{q,r}^\mu = 0, \text{ if } q \neq 0 \text{ and } q \neq \mu$$

and

$$(5.15) \quad \theta_{q,r}^\mu \neq 0,$$

only if r is a double excitation containing μ as subindex and $[q, r]$ give a valid triple excitation.

With this quadratic form of the CCSD working equations at hand we can establish the following bound for the roots.

CONJECTURE 5.9. *The number of roots to the CCSD equations can be bounded by*

$$(5.16) \quad \mathcal{N} \leq 2^{n_s + 2n_d}.$$

Remark 5.10. The new bound provided by [Conjecture 5.9](#) is significantly better than the previously mentioned Bezout bounds, namely,

$$2^{n_s + 2n_d} = \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{n_s} 3^{n_s} 2^{2n_d} = \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{n_s} 3^{n_s} 4^{n_d} < 3^{n_s} 4^{n_d} < 4^{n_s + n_d}.$$

Notice, that this bound is asymptotically exponentially better.

6. Two Electrons in Four Spin Orbitals. In this section we scrutinize the algebraic and geometric properties and structures of the two electron in four spin orbital case and perform benchmark calculations revealing the highly intricate structures of coupled cluster theory. Although simple, this system corresponds to real chemical systems, for example, the hydrogen molecule in the minimal basis set (STO-3G [38]) description. In this discretization we find that the N -particle Hilbert space (here the two-particle Hilbert space), is spanned by six Slater determinants. Without loss of generality, we denote $\Phi_0 = \Phi[1, 2]$ the reference state, and the respectively excited Slater determinants are

$$(6.1) \quad \{\Phi_2^3, \Phi_2^4, \Phi_1^3, \Phi_1^4, \Phi_{12}^{34}\}.$$

6.1. Algebraic Description. We exemplify equation (5.7) for the polynomial corresponding to the projection onto Φ_2^3 in the minimal working example of two electrons in four spin orbitals and derive the Newton polytope on the fly.

The corresponding polynomial is given by

$$(6.2) \quad \langle \Phi_2^3, e^{-T} H e^T \Phi_0 \rangle.$$

We shall now expand the similarity transformed Hamiltonian and inspect the individual terms; we will mainly focusing on the degree of the individual monomials and as we are seeking a bound to \mathcal{N} that is based on the BKK theorem, i.e., we require to characterize the Newton polytope. The first part is given by the constant contribution

$$(6.3) \quad \langle \Phi_2^3, H \Phi_0 \rangle = C,$$

which corresponds to the origin $(0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$. The second part is given by the singly nested commutator contribution, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Phi_2^3, [H, T] \Phi_0 \rangle &= t_2^3 \langle \Phi_2^3, H \Phi_2^3 \rangle + t_2^4 \langle \Phi_2^3, H \Phi_2^4 \rangle + t_1^3 \langle \Phi_2^3, H \Phi_1^3 \rangle \\ &\quad + t_1^4 \langle \Phi_2^3, H \Phi_1^4 \rangle + t_{12}^3 \langle \Phi_2^3, H \Phi_{12}^{34} \rangle - t_2^3 \langle \Phi_0, H \Phi_0 \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to the vertices

$$\{(1, 0, 0, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1, 0, 0), (0, 0, 0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 0, 0, 1)\}.$$

The third part is given by the doubly nested commutator contribution, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Phi_2^3, [[H, T], T] \Phi_0 \rangle &= \langle \Phi_2^3, H T^2 \Phi_0 \rangle - 2 \langle \Phi_2^3, T H T \Phi_0 \rangle + \langle \Phi_2^3, T^2 H \Phi_0 \rangle \\ &= t_2^3 t_1^4 \langle \Phi_2^3, H \Phi_{12}^{34} \rangle - t_1^3 t_2^4 \langle \Phi_2^3, H \Phi_{12}^{34} \rangle - 2 t_2^3 \langle \Phi_0, H T \Phi_0 \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to the vertices

$$\{(1, 0, 0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1, 0, 0), (2, 0, 0, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0, 0, 0), (1, 0, 1, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0, 1, 0), (1, 0, 0, 0, 1)\}.$$

The fourth part is given by the triply nested commutator contribution, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Phi_2^3, [[[H, T], T], T] \Phi_0 \rangle &= \langle \Phi_2^3, H T^3 \Phi_0 \rangle - 3 \langle \Phi_2^3, (T H T^2 + T^2 H T) \Phi_0 \rangle + \langle \Phi_2^3, T^3 H \Phi_0 \rangle \\ &= -3 t_2^3 \langle \Phi_0, H T^2 \Phi_0 \rangle \\ &= -3 t_2^3 (t_2^3 t_1^4 \langle \Phi_0, H \Phi_{12}^{34} \rangle - t_1^3 t_2^4 \langle \Phi_0, H \Phi_{12}^{34} \rangle), \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to the vertices

$$(6.4) \quad \{(2, 0, 0, 1, 0), (1, 1, 1, 0, 0)\}.$$

The quadruple commutator gives no contributions due to the Slater Condon rules. The first polynomial can then be summarized as

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(t) &= \langle \Phi_2^3, e^{-T} H e^T \Phi_0 \rangle \\ &= C + t_2^3 \langle \Phi_2^3, H \Phi_2^3 \rangle + t_2^4 \langle \Phi_2^3, H \Phi_2^4 \rangle + t_1^3 \langle \Phi_2^3, H \Phi_1^3 \rangle + t_1^4 \langle \Phi_2^3, H \Phi_1^4 \rangle - t_2^3 \langle \Phi_0, H \Phi_0 \rangle \\ &\quad - t_2^3 (t_2^3 \langle \Phi_0, H \Phi_2^3 \rangle + t_2^4 \langle \Phi_0, H \Phi_2^4 \rangle + t_1^3 \langle \Phi_0, H \Phi_1^3 \rangle + t_1^4 \langle \Phi_0, H \Phi_1^4 \rangle + t_{12}^3 \langle \Phi_0, H \Phi_{12}^{34} \rangle) \\ &\quad + (t_{12}^{34} - t_2^3 t_1^4 + t_1^3 t_2^4) \langle \Phi_2^3, H \Phi_{12}^{34} \rangle - t_2^3 (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) \langle \Phi_0, H \Phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

and the corresponding Newton polytope is given by

$$(6.5) \quad \text{New}_2^3 = \text{conv}((0, 0, 0, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1, 0, 0), (0, 0, 0, 1, 0), \\ (0, 0, 0, 0, 1), (0, 1, 1, 0, 0), (2, 0, 0, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0, 0, 0), \\ (1, 0, 1, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0, 0, 1), (2, 0, 0, 1, 0), (1, 1, 1, 0, 0)).$$

The polynomials and polytopes corresponding to the remaining projections onto singly and doubly excited Slater determinants can be obtained correspondingly, see [subsection 10.5](#).

Using polymake, we calculated the BKK bound on the number of roots via the the mixed volume which is equal to 50. Comparing this with the different Bezout bounds derived above puts their quality into perspective

$$(6.6) \quad 50 < 2^6 = 64 < 3^3 4 = 324 < 4^5 = 1024.$$

Using polymake, we can also obtain the description of the facets of New_2^3 in homogeneous coordinates:

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ -1 \\ 0 \\ -1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -1 \\ -1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ -1 \\ 0 \\ -1 \\ 0 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ -1 \\ -1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$

This description reflects Pauli's exclusion principle in the Newton polytope. More precisely, in the vectors that do not correspond to canonical basis vectors, the distributions of the '-1' entries follow a particular selection procedure. We first note that the last entry which corresponds to the double excitation t_{12}^{34} is set to -1. Then, we see that the remaining entries are chosen corresponding to the physically allowed double excitations that correspond to t_{12}^{34} , i.e., pairs t_i^a, t_j^b that form t_{12}^{34} have one entry equal to -1 and one entry equal to 0. This procedure results in the particular distribution of -1 and 0 depicted in the facet description of New_2^3 in homogeneous coordinates.

Polymake also allows to compute the f-vector of the Newton polytope, for New_2^3 which yields (12, 33, 42, 28, 9). In order to obtain more geometric interpretation of the Newton polytopes we generate a graph that relates the individual facets. To that end, we enumerate the facets from zero to seven, and connect two facets if they intersect. It is worth noticing that in the case of two electrons in four spin orbitals, the intersection of two facets is either four or three dimensional, see [Figure 1](#). Moreover we see that the majority of facets intersect in four dimensions.

Since CCSD is equivalent to FCI in this particular example, one would hope to find only six roots. Our numerical investigations supported this hypothesis. This drastic reduction in the number of roots, compared to the generic case, might originate in the highly structured coefficient tensor of the polynomial system. As conjectured above, the polynomial system can be written as quadratic polynomial in

$$1, t_2^3, t_2^4, t_1^3, t_1^4, t_{12}^{34}, t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4.$$

Due to the system's size this can be confirmed by direct computation for the two electrons in four sin orbital case. Indeed, the coupled cluster equations can be written




FIG. 1. Graph that shows the dimensionality of the intersection of facets of the first newton polytope. If two facets have a four-dimensional intersection they are connected with a solid blue line, and if two facets have a three-dimensional intersection they are connected with a dotted red line.

as

$$p_i = v^T H(i)v$$

where $v \in A$ and

$$(6.7) \quad A = \{(x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6) : x_0 = 1 \text{ and } x_6 - x_2x_3 + x_1x_4 = 0\}.$$

We exemplify the coefficient matrix for the index $i = 1$, here,

$$(6.8) \quad H(1) = \begin{pmatrix} h_{1,0} & h_{1,1} & h_{1,2} & h_{1,3} & h_{1,4} & h_{1,5} & -h_{1,5} \\ -h_{0,0} & -h_{0,1} & -h_{0,2} & -h_{0,3} & -h_{0,4} & -h_{0,5} & h_{0,5} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The other coefficient matrices are listed in the [subsection 10.5](#). We emphasize that the Bezout bound that is closest to the BKK bound arises from this quadratic representation, i.e., $\mathcal{N} \leq 2^6 = 64$. A deeper investigation regarding the precise structures of the coefficient matrices $H(i)$ is left for future investigations.

Since CCSD, under certain assumptions, corresponds to the exact diagonalization of the underlying chemical system, we shall now consider the truncated version of CCSD which is merely CCS. We note that CCS corresponds to orbital rotations (see Thouless theorem [51]), yet, from the algebraic perspective this experiment reveals the highly complicated structure of the roots and the corresponding non-trivial effect on the computed energies. To that end, we perform the following experiment. We define an arbitrary Hamiltonian through

$$(6.9) \quad H(\varepsilon, \gamma) = V(\varepsilon)^\top \text{diag}\left(\frac{1}{6} - \gamma, \frac{1}{6} + \gamma, \frac{2}{6}, \frac{3}{6}, \frac{4}{6}, \frac{5}{6}\right) V(\varepsilon),$$

where $V(\varepsilon)$ is the orthonormalized part (via QR-decomposition) of $\tilde{V}(\varepsilon)$ which is




FIG. 2. The ε -energy trajectory of CCS, where ε was varied between zero and eight. The value of ε is indicated through different colors, the six FCI energies are marked with red vertical lines.

defined as

$$(6.10) \quad \tilde{V}(\varepsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1+\varepsilon & 1+\varepsilon & 1+\varepsilon & 1+\varepsilon & 1+\varepsilon \\ 0.05 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.05 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.05 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.05 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \varepsilon & \varepsilon & \varepsilon & \varepsilon & \varepsilon \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since, for fixed $\gamma = 1/12$, the parameter ε only affects the eigenstates, in particular, their relation to the reference state. Tuning the parameter ε allows us to track the roots of the polynomial system numerically. The parameter ε steers the overlap of the eigenstates with the doubly excited Slater determinant, except for the lowest lying state. We observe that the energy that corresponds to the lowest lying state does not change with the parameter ε , see Figure 2. This is not surprising, since the lowest lying state has significant overlap with the reference Slater determinant which is independent of the parameter ε . However, this is not the case for the remaining eigenstates. As we change the parameter ε the overlap of the eigenstates with the reference state changes yielding a poor representability in an exponential form. This poor representation has severe effects on the computed energies, see Figure 2. In fact, not only are the computed coupled cluster energies inaccurate but also complex valued, which means that they are unphysical.

We emphasize that employing CCSD in this case recovers all eigenstates correctly unless one of the eigenstates is orthogonal to the chosen reference state. Noting that the overlap with the reference state is deeply rooted in the local analysis of coupled cluster theory, this experiment indicates that the assumptions made in [1, 4], also

provide sufficient conditions for the coupled cluster solution to provide a physical description of the system. Hence, this experiment is an alternative confirmation that these assumptions can be used to derive a useful *a posteriori* diagnostic for single reference coupled cluster calculations.

Algebraically, it is remarkable that the number of roots to the polynomial system is dramatically lower than the BKK number, which turns out to be sharp for a generic polynomial system of this size. This might originate in the highly structured coefficient tensor of the polynomial system. We therefore believe that in order to obtain improved insight to the number and structure of roots of the CCSD working equations, new algebraic techniques have to be developed that incorporate the eminent structure of the quantum many body problem.

7. Three Electrons in Six Spin Orbitals. The rapid increase in size of the considered polynomial system is well demonstrated by the fact that for the next bigger system, i.e., three electrons in six spin orbitals, the system already supersedes the abilities of state-of-the-art algebraic geometry software. In order to numerically investigate the problem further, we perform a root search using Newton’s method. This procedure closely resembles the practical use of coupled-cluster theory, where the cluster amplitudes corresponding to the ground state solution are approximated using a quasi Newton method. An important unanswered question that arises in this regard is the convergence behaviour depending on the initial guess. In practical quantum chemical simulations it is common to use an initial guess that stems from second order Møller–Plesset perturbation theory (MP2) [38].

In order to understand the behavior of Newton’s methods for chemical like systems and the root structure around a given eigenstate of a Hamiltonian, we choose from a sequence of randomly generated, symmetric Hamiltonians fulfilling $\langle \Phi_0, H \Phi_{123}^{456} \rangle = 0$ an instance, such that for one of the eigenvectors v we have $\langle \Phi_0, v \rangle \approx 1$ and the contribution of the triple coupled cluster amplitude $t_{123}^{456} \ll 1$. Notice, that for the three electrons in six spin orbitals case CCSDT is exact and there is exactly one triple coupled cluster amplitude t_{123}^{456} , i.e. there is a bijective map between the FCI and CCSDT description. We want to recover the coupled cluster amplitudes of this eigenvector v .

In order to investigate the sensitivity of the Newton method in coupled cluster theory we perform Newton optimizations for a set of random perturbations of the exact coupled cluster amplitudes as initial value. For each experiment we draw 50 normal distributed perturbations and normalize them to be of the desired size. We then perform a newton optimization with at most 30 iterations, which is sufficient for the considered experimental set up. It turns out that in coupled-cluster theory, the sensitivity of Newton’s method is rather severe, see [Figure 3](#). We emphasize that the CCSD amplitude vector in this example consists of 18 values, i.e., in a perturbation that has norm 1 each entry is on average of size $1/18 \approx 0.056$. The [Figure 3](#) clearly shows the decrease of successfully converged Newton optimizations as we increase the norm of the perturbation (at 30 iterations we deem the optimization to have failed).

In [Figure 4](#) we show the success rate as a function of the norm of the perturbation. As expected, this shows a clearly decreasing trend. We emphasize that in practical simulations, the initial guess is not chosen at random but corresponds to the MP2 result. Yet, our experiments show that for the Newton optimization to be on average successful, we require the initial guess to be of high-quality. This again supports the assumptions made in [1]. We moreover note that if Newton’s method converges successfully, it mostly converge towards the originally perturbed solution. However,




FIG. 3. Number of Newton iterations for randomly perturbed initial guess. The imposed perturbations are of size 0.1, 0.6, 1.0, 2.0 in 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d, respectively.

in a few cases, we observe that Newton’s method successfully converges but towards a different solution. It is worth mentioning that this solution was not physical, i.e., the solution yielded an energy value of 51 which is outside the spectrum of the considered Hamiltonian ($\text{spec}(\mathbf{H}) = \llbracket 1, 20 \rrbracket$).

8. Conclusion and Outlook. In this article we investigated the coupled cluster (CC) formalism from an algebraic geometry perspective. To that end, we provided an alternative introduction to excitation operators and the CC working equations that is feasible for the algebraic geometry community. We moreover provided a derivation of the CC equations that correspond to the CC method with excitation rank truncation at the level of single and double excitations, called CCSD. This particular method, is of utmost importance to the computational chemistry community since it is a widely used high-accuracy method, and as such is commonly used for benchmarking purposes.

We approached the study of the CCSD equations, which is a system of polynomial equations, from an algebraic perspective. Since the number of roots is of general interest we here investigated different approaches. By mere inspection of the CCSD equations we find that the most naive Bezout bound of $\mathcal{O}(4^{(n_s+n_d)})$ can be straightforwardly improved to $\mathcal{O}(3^{n_s}4^{n_d})$. In order to establish a more profound bound, we investigated the use of the BKK theorem. To that end, we analyzed the Newton polytopes that correspond to the system of polynomial equations. Although the poly-




FIG. 4. Success rate of Newton's method as a function of the norm of the perturbation $\|t\|$.

nomials are at most of degree four, they have an intricate structure which impedes volume estimations from the vertex description. We establish surrogate Newton polytopes that show a simpler structure, which may simplify the path to a bound based on the BKK theorem.

We moreover conjectured a novel description of the CCSD equations as a quadratic system. This description provides a fundamentally new perspective to the CCSD working equations, and yielded a further improvement to the bound of zeros, namely, $\mathcal{O}(2^{n_s+2n_d})$.

We then performed numerical investigations for two non-trivial systems. The first is the two electron in four spin orbital system, which corresponds to physical systems like the hydrogen molecule or the helium atom. Here we calculated all Newton polytopes in the vertex description in order to provide an insight to their underlying structure. Using the Software package `polymake` we were able to compute the corresponding facet description. This revealed that Pauli's exclusion principle is deeply embedded into the structure of the polytopes as certain occupation rules of the orbitals have to be obeyed. We moreover investigated geometrical properties of the five dimensional polytope using a graph structure to reveal the orientation of the facets relative to each other. We found that if facets of this polytope have a non-empty intersection, this intersection is mostly of dimension four, very few have a three dimensional intersection, but lower dimensional intersections did not occur. In order to understand the algebraic structures, especially in the case of truncated coupled cluster theory, we constructed a model system that can be steered to produce unphysical solutions in the truncated coupled cluster approach. This experiment moreover related our algebraic investigations to previous functional analysis results, and revealed that the assumptions made in [1, 4] not only apply to the quality of the approximation provided by coupled cluster theory but also related to the physicality of the described solution.

To conclude, this article shows that the polynomial system corresponding to the CCSD equations is highly structured and attains significantly less roots than estimated with state-of-the-art techniques in algebraic geometry. Given the impact of

computational chemistry and its contemporary relevance, it appears worthwhile to develop new algebraic techniques that take the apparent structures into account in order to provide more detailed information on the number and structure of roots. We expect that the representation of the polynomials as quadratic form on an quadratic algebraic variety together with the banded structure of the coefficient matrix opens new lines of thought on tackling highly structured polynomial systems.

9. Acknowledgements. This work was partially supported by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under award number FA9550-18-1-0095 and by the Simons Targeted Grants in Mathematics and Physical Sciences on Moiré Materials Magic (F.M.F.). We also thank Prof. Bernd Sturmfels, and his graduate students Yelena Mandelshtam and Yulia Alexandr as well as Prof. Timo de Wolff and his group for fruitful discussions. Last but certainly not least, we wish to acknowledge that this work was predominantly developed during a *Research in Pairs* stay at the Oberwolfach Research Institute, and we thank its members for providing the outstanding, unique and inspiring atmosphere.

REFERENCES

- [1] Reinhold Schneider. Analysis of the projected coupled cluster method in electronic structure calculation. *Numerische Mathematik*, 113(3):433–471, 2009.
- [2] Thorsten Rohwedder. The continuous coupled cluster formulation for the electronic schrödinger equation. *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis-Modélisation Mathématique et Analyse Numérique*, 47(2):421–447, 2013.
- [3] Andre Laestadius and Simen Kvaal. Analysis of the extended coupled-cluster method in quantum chemistry. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 56(2):660–683, 2018.
- [4] Andre Laestadius and Fabian M Faulstich. The coupled-cluster formalism—a mathematical perspective. *Molecular Physics*, 117(17):2362–2373, 2019.
- [5] Fabian M Faulstich, Andre Laestadius, Örs Legeza, Reinhold Schneider, and Simen Kvaal. Analysis of the tailored coupled-cluster method in quantum chemistry. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 57(6):2579–2607, 2019.
- [6] Mihály András Csirik and Andre Laestadius. Coupled-cluster theory revisited. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.13134*, 2021.
- [7] Piotr Piecuch and Karol Kowalski. In search of the relationship between multiple solutions characterizing coupled-cluster theories. In *Computational chemistry: reviews of current trends*, pages 1–104. World Scientific, 2000.
- [8] K Kowalski and P Piecuch. Complete set of solutions of the generalized bloch equation. *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry*, 80(4-5):757–781, 2000.
- [9] Karol Kowalski and Piotr Piecuch. Complete set of solutions of multireference coupled-cluster equations: The state-universal formalism. *Physical Review A*, 61(5):052506, 2000.
- [10] Piotr Piecuch and Josef Paldus. Orthogonally spin-adapted state-universal coupled-cluster formalism: Implementation of the complete two-reference theory including cubic and quartic coupling terms. *The Journal of chemical physics*, 101(7):5875–5890, 1994.
- [11] Piotr Piecuch, Robert Toboła, and Josef Paldus. Approximate account of connected quadruply excited clusters in multi-reference hilbert space coupled-cluster theory. application to planar h4 models. *Chemical physics letters*, 210(1-3):243–252, 1993.
- [12] Piotr Piecuch and Josef Paldus. Application of hilbert-space coupled-cluster theory to simple (h 2) 2 model systems. ii. nonplanar models. *Physical Review A*, 49(5):3479, 1994.
- [13] J Paldus, P Piecuch, L Pylypow, and B Jeziorski. Application of hilbert-space coupled-cluster theory to simple (h 2) 2 model systems: Planar models. *Physical Review A*, 47(4):2738, 1993.
- [14] Rodney J Bartlett and Monika Musiał. Coupled-cluster theory in quantum chemistry. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 79(1):291, 2007.
- [15] Garnet Kin-Lic Chan, Mihály Kállay, and Jürgen Gauss. State-of-the-art density matrix renormalization group and coupled cluster theory studies of the nitrogen binding curve. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 121(13):6110–6116, 2004.
- [16] Piotr Piecuch. Active-space coupled-cluster methods. *Mol. Phys.*, 108(21-23):2987–3015, 2010.
- [17] James McClain, Qiming Sun, Garnet Kin Lic Chan, and Timothy C. Berkelbach. Gaussian-

- Based Coupled-Cluster Theory for the Ground-State and Band Structure of Solids. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 13(3):1209–1218, 2017.
- [18] Arnab Chakraborty, Stephen H Yuwono, J Emiliano Deustua, Jun Shen, and Piotr Piecuch. Benchmarking the semi-stochastic cc (p; q) approach for singlet-triplet gaps in biradicals. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.10707*, 2022.
- [19] Ilias Magoulas, Jun Shen, and Piotr Piecuch. Addressing strong correlation by approximate coupled-pair methods with active-space and full treatments of three-body clusters. *Molecular Physics*, page e2057365, 2022.
- [20] Karthik Gururangan, J Emiliano Deustua, Jun Shen, and Piotr Piecuch. High-level coupled-cluster energetics by merging moment expansions with selected configuration interaction. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 155(17):174114, 2021.
- [21] Nicholas P Bauman and Karol Kowalski. Coupled cluster downfolding theory: towards universal many-body algorithms for dimensionality reduction of composite quantum systems in chemistry and materials science. *Materials Theory*, 6(1):1–19, 2022.
- [22] Francesco A Evangelista. Alternative single-reference coupled cluster approaches for multireference problems: The simpler, the better. *The Journal of chemical physics*, 134(22):224102, 2011.
- [23] Francesco A Evangelista and Jürgen Gauss. On the approximation of the similarity-transformed hamiltonian in single-reference and multireference coupled cluster theory. *Chemical Physics*, 401:27–35, 2012.
- [24] Francesco A Evangelista. Perspective: Multireference coupled cluster theories of dynamical electron correlation. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 149(3):030901, 2018.
- [25] Varun Rishi, Ajith Perera, and Rodney J Bartlett. Behind the success of modified coupled-cluster methods: addition by subtraction. *Molecular Physics*, 117(17):2201–2216, 2019.
- [26] Ewgenij Gawrilow, Michael Joswig, Thilo Rörig, and Nikolaus Witte. Drawing polytopal graphs with `polymake`. *Comput. Vis. Sci.*, 13(2):99–110, 2010.
- [27] Ewgenij Gawrilow, Simon Hampe, and Michael Joswig. The `polymake` XML file format. In *Mathematical software – ICMS 2016. 5th international congress, Berlin, Germany, July 11–14, 2016. Proceedings*, pages 403–410. Berlin: Springer, 2016.
- [28] Ewgenij Gawrilow and Michael Joswig. `polymake`: a framework for analyzing convex polytopes. In *Polytopes—combinatorics and computation (Oberwolfach, 1997)*, volume 29 of *DMV Sem.*, pages 43–73. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2000.
- [29] Benjamin Assarf, Ewgenij Gawrilow, Katrin Herr, Michael Joswig, Benjamin Lorenz, Andreas Paffenholz, and Thomas Rehn. Computing convex hulls and counting integer points with `polymake`. *Math. Program. Comput.*, 9(1):1–38, 2017.
- [30] Michael Joswig, Benjamin Müller, and Andreas Paffenholz. `polymake` and lattice polytopes. In *21st International Conference on Formal Power Series and Algebraic Combinatorics (FPSAC 2009)*, Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci. Proc., AK, pages 491–502. Assoc. Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci., Nancy, 2009.
- [31] Ewgenij Gawrilow and Michael Joswig. Flexible object hierarchies in `polymake` (extended abstract). In *Mathematical software—ICMS 2006*, volume 4151 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 219–221. Springer, Berlin, 2006.
- [32] D. N. Bernshtein. The number of roots of a system of equations. *Functional Analysis and Its Applications*, 9(3):183–185, Jul 1975.
- [33] A. G. Kouchnirenko. Polyèdres de newton et nombres de milnor. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 32(1):1–31, Feb 1976.
- [34] D.A. Cox, J. Little, and D. O’Shea. *Using Algebraic Geometry*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer New York, 1991.
- [35] Daniel J. Bates, Jonathan D. Hauenstein, Andrew J. Sommese, and Charles W. Wampler. Bertini: Software for numerical algebraic geometry. Available at bertini.nd.edu with permanent doi: [dx.doi.org/10.7274/R0H41PB5](https://doi.org/10.7274/R0H41PB5).
- [36] Fanghui Xiao, Dong Lu, Xiaodong Ma, and Dingkang Wang. An improvement of the rational representation for high-dimensional systems. *Journal of Systems Science and Complexity*, 34(6):2410–2427, Dec 2021.
- [37] Muhammed I. Syam. Finding all real zeros of polynomial systems using multi-resultant. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 167(2):417–428, 2004.
- [38] Trygve Helgaker, Poul Jorgensen, and Jeppe Olsen. *Molecular electronic-structure theory*. John Wiley & Sons, 2014.
- [39] Harry Yserentant. *Regularity and approximability of electronic wave functions*. Springer, 2010.
- [40] Albert Messiah. *Albert Messiah: Quantenmechanik. Band 2*, volume 2. Walter de Gruyter, 1990.
- [41] Alexandre Ern and Jean-Luc Guermond. *Theory and practice of finite elements*, volume 159.

- Springer, 2004.
- [42] Szilárd Szalay, Max Pfeffer, Valentin Murg, Gergely Barcza, Frank Verstraete, Reinhold Schneider, and Örs Legeza. Tensor product methods and entanglement optimization for ab initio quantum chemistry. *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry*, 115(19):1342–1391, 2015.
 - [43] Isaiah Shavitt and Rodney J Bartlett. *Many-body methods in chemistry and physics: MBPT and coupled-cluster theory*. Cambridge university press, 2009.
 - [44] William Arveson. *An invitation to C*-algebras*, volume 39. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
 - [45] Fabian Maximilian Faulstich. Mathematical aspects of coupled-cluster theory in chemistry. *Det matematisk-naturvitenskapelige fakultet*, 2020.
 - [46] John Hubbard. The description of collective motions in terms of many-body perturbation theory. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 240(1223):539–560, 1957.
 - [47] NM Hugenholtz. Perturbation approach to the fermi gas model of heavy nuclei. *Physica*, 23(1-5):533–545, 1957.
 - [48] Libor Veis, Andrej Antalík, Jiri Brabec, Frank Neese, Ors Legeza, and Jiri Pittner. Coupled cluster method with single and double excitations tailored by matrix product state wave functions. *The journal of physical chemistry letters*, 7(20):4072–4078, 2016.
 - [49] Fabian M Faulstich, Mihály Máté, Andre Laestadius, Mihály András Csirik, Libor Veis, Andrej Antalík, Jiri Brabec, Reinhold Schneider, Jiri Pittner, Simen Kvaal, et al. Numerical and theoretical aspects of the dmrg-tcc method exemplified by the nitrogen dimer. *Journal of chemical theory and computation*, 15(4):2206–2220, 2019.
 - [50] Osamu Hino, Tomoko Kinoshita, Garnet Kin-Lic Chan, and Rodney J Bartlett. Tailored coupled cluster singles and doubles method applied to calculations on molecular structure and harmonic vibrational frequencies of ozone. *The Journal of chemical physics*, 124(11):114311, 2006.
 - [51] David J Thouless. Stability conditions and nuclear rotations in the hartree-fock theory. *Nuclear Physics*, 21:225–232, 1960.
 - [52] Max Born and Robert Oppenheimer. Zur Quantentheorie der Molekeln. *Ann. Phys.*, 389(20):457–484, 1927.
 - [53] M. Born and K. Huang. *Dynamical Theory of Crystal Lattices*. Clarendon, Oxford, 1954.
 - [54] Michael Reed, Barry Simon, et al. *I: Functional analysis*, volume 1. Gulf Professional Publishing, 1980.
 - [55] John M Lee. Smooth manifolds. In *Introduction to Smooth Manifolds*, pages 1–31. Springer, 2013.

10. Appendix.

10.1. Functional analytic framework of the electronic Schrödinger equation. The governing equation for the motion of electrons in a molecular system employing the adiabatic—or Born–Oppenheimer—approximation [52, 53] is the *electronic Schrödinger equation* [38]. For a system of N electrons and M nuclei, each of charge Z_j , the electronic Hamiltonian in atomic units is formally defined as

$$(10.1) \quad H = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \Delta_{r_i} - \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{Z_j}{|r_i - R_j|} + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j>i}^N \frac{1}{|r_i - r_j|},$$

where $\{r_i\}_{i=1}^N$ and $\{R_i\}_{i=1}^M$ describe the spatial coordinates of the electrons and the clamped nuclei, respectively, and Δ_{r_i} is the Laplacian with respect to the r_i -spatial coordinate. Central to the quantum-mechanical study of such electronic systems are the eigenfunctions of the Hamiltonian in Eq. (10.1). We define wavefunctions through the following mapping

$$(10.2) \quad \Psi: (\mathbb{R}^3)^N \times \{\pm 1/2\}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}: (r, s) \mapsto \Psi(r, s),$$

where s denotes the *electron spin* (or simply *spin*). Although spin does not appear directly in the electronic Hamiltonian in Eq. (10.1), it influences the structure of atoms and molecules [39]. On the fundamental level of measure theory, which is necessary to characterize the wave function in Eq. (10.2), it is straightforward to incorporate the spin variable; in the single-particle case we simply consider the product measure space

$$(X, \mathfrak{B}(X), \lambda_X) = \left(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \{\pm 1/2\}, \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{R}^3) \otimes \mathfrak{B}(\{\pm 1/2\}), \lambda \times c \right),$$

where \mathfrak{B} denotes the *Borel σ -algebra*, λ is the corresponding *Lebesgue measure* and c is the *counting measure*. This naturally extends to the N -body case, where we define

$$(X^N, \mathfrak{B}(X^N), \lambda_{X^N}) = \left(\mathbb{R}^{3N} \times \{\pm 1/2\}^N, \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{R}^{3N}) \otimes \mathfrak{B}(\{\pm 1/2\}^N), \lambda \times c \right).$$

We will use the short-hand notation and write $d\lambda_{X^N}(x) = dx$ and similar for the single-particle case.

In order to provide a precise description of the considered Coulomb Hamiltonian we require a characterization of the considered domain. To that end, we consider its weak formulation [41]. Following the standard procedure, we can derive the *form domain* of the Coulomb Hamiltonian, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{D}(H) = H^1(X^N) \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^N L^2(X).$$

For a more detailed description of this procedure, we refer the interested reader to [4, 5, 39, 54]

10.2. Excitation Operators. In this section of the appendix, we list the proofs of the results presented in Section 3.

Proof. [Theorem 3.10] Since excitation operators are defined w.r.t. a chosen reference Slater determinant Φ_0 it follows immediately that $\Phi_0 = I\Phi_0$. Subsequently

we assume without loss of generality that $\Phi_0 = \Phi[1, \dots, N]$. Let $\Phi[p_1, \dots, p_N] \in \mathcal{B}$ be arbitrary. Comparing $[1, \dots, N]$ to $[p_1, \dots, p_N]$ we can identify a multi-index μ describing the indices that have to be changed in $[1, \dots, N]$ to obtain $[p_1, \dots, p_N]$. Due to the canonical ordering, the multi-index μ is unique. Then, by definition we obtain $\Phi[p_1, \dots, p_N] = X_\mu \Phi_0$, hence it follows the claim. \square

Proof. [Theorem 3.11] It is sufficient to show that the commutator fulfills the Jacobi identity, i.e.,

$$(10.3) \quad [S, [T, U]] + [T, [U, S]] + [U, [S, T]] = 0,$$

for $S, T, U \in \mathfrak{b}$, which is a direct consequence from Lemma 3.8 and the bilinearity of the commutator. \square

Proof. [Corollary 3.12] Property i) is a direct consequence from Engel's theorem, and properties ii) – iv) follow immediately as \mathfrak{b} is Abelian. \square

10.3. Exponential Parametrization. In this section of the appendix, we list the proofs of the results presented in Section 4.

Proof. [Lemma 4.1] Note that $\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} \subset \mathcal{H}_N$ is convex since it is an affine subspace, and that the functions $\mathcal{B}_{\text{int}} = \{Id + \Phi_\mu \mid \Phi_\mu \in \mathcal{B}\}$ form an affine-independent set generating $\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} = \text{conv}(\mathcal{B}_{\text{int}})$. It is therefore sufficient to show the theorem for $\Psi \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{int}}$. In this case, however, it follows trivially from the fact that there exists a one-to-one relation between Φ_μ and X_μ , see Theorem 3.10. \square

Proof. [Lemma 4.2] By definition of \mathcal{G} , the map Ω is trivially surjective. Moreover, since $\dim(\mathfrak{b}) = \dim(\mathcal{G})$, it follows that Ω is a bijection. \square

Proof. [Theorem 4.3] The proof follows directly from Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2. \square

Proof. [Lemma 4.4] Let $T \in \mathfrak{b}$. Then by definition

$$(10.4) \quad \exp(T) = Id + P(T) \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$$

where $P(T) \in \mathfrak{b}$. Since \mathfrak{b} is a vector space, we get $P(T) \in \mathfrak{b}$, and therewith $\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$. Conversely, let $C \in \mathcal{G}$. Then $C - Id \in \mathfrak{b}$, which implies that

$$(10.5) \quad \log(C) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{n+1} (C - Id)^{n+1}$$

terminates after a final number of elements. Hence $\log(C)$ is an element in \mathfrak{b} and therewith $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$. \square

Proof. [Lemma 4.5] The Abelian group property follows directly from Lemma ???. Let $X \in \mathcal{G}$, then the Jordan-Chevalley decomposition is $X = Id + S$ where $S \in \mathfrak{b}$, and X is path connected to the identity via the linear segment $\gamma(t) = Id + tS$ where $0 \leq t \leq 1$. Hence, (\mathcal{G}, \odot) is connected. \square

Proof. [Theorem 4.7] Let $X \in \mathcal{G}$. The inverse of the exponential series is given by

$$(10.6) \quad \log(X) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{n+1} (X - Id)^{n+1}$$

This series terminates (see proof of Lemma 4.4), and $\log(X) = P(C) \in \mathfrak{b}$, which concludes the proof. \square

Proof. [Corollary 4.9] Since $(\mathfrak{b}, *)$ is closed w.r.t. the euclidean topology. Together with Theorem 4.8, this shows the claim. \square

Proof. [Lemma 4.11] Let $\exp(S), \exp(T) \in \bar{\mathcal{G}}$. Then

$$(10.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \iota(\exp(S) \odot \exp(T)) &= \iota(\exp(S + T)) = \exp(S + T) = \exp(S) \odot \iota(\exp(T)) \\ &= \iota(\exp(S)) \odot \iota(\exp(T)) \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Proof. [Lemma 4.12] As ι is taken to be the identity on the cluster operator, we inherit the injectivity from the exponential map. However, as the derivative of the exponential map is again the exponential map, this also implies that the ι is an immersion. \square

Proof. [Theorem 4.13] The theorem follows from Lemma 4.11 and 4.12, i.e., ι is an injective immersion that is a group homomorphism, which shows the subgroup property. This subgroup is furthermore Abelian. Moreover, analogously to the proof of Lemma 4.5, each element $X \in \bar{\mathcal{G}}$ is path connected to the identity. The subgroup is indeed closed w.r.t. the euclidean topology, as any Cauchy sequence in $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$ clearly converges in $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$. \square

Proof. [Corollary 4.15] This is a direct application of Cartan's theorem [55]. \square

10.4. Coupled Cluster Equation. We shall begin this section with the complete derivation of the coupled cluster working equations. Similarly to the example in the main text, we get by using above rules

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \phi_i^a, [[H, T], T] \phi_0 \rangle &= \langle \phi_i^a, HT^2 \phi_0 \rangle - 2 \langle \phi_i^a, THT \phi_0 \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\substack{j \neq k \\ b \neq c}} t_j^b t_k^c \langle \phi_i^a, H \phi_{jk}^{bc} \rangle + \sum_{\substack{j \neq k \\ b \neq c}} t_j^b t_{ik}^{ac} \langle \phi_i^a, H \phi_{ijk}^{abc} \rangle \\ &\quad - 2t_i^a \sum_{\substack{j \neq k \\ b \neq c}} t_{jk}^{bc} \langle \phi_0, H \phi_{jk}^{bc} \rangle - 2t_i^a \sum_{j,b} t_j^b \langle \phi_0, H \phi_j^b \rangle \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \phi_i^a, [[[H, T], T], T] \phi_0 \rangle &= \langle \phi_i^a, HT^3 \phi_0 \rangle - 3 \langle \phi_i^a, THT^2 \phi_0 \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\substack{j \neq k \neq l \\ b \neq c \neq d}} t_j^b t_k^c t_l^d \langle \phi_i^a, H \phi_{jkl}^{bcd} \rangle \\ &\quad - 3t_i^a \left(\sum_{\substack{j \neq k \\ b \neq c}} t_j^b t_k^c \langle \phi_0, H \phi_{jk}^{cd} \rangle + \sum_{\substack{j \neq k \\ b \neq c}} t_j^b t_{ik}^{ac} \langle \phi_i^a, H \phi_{ijk}^{abc} \rangle + \sum_{\substack{j \neq k \\ b \neq c}} t_i^a t_{jk}^{bc} \langle \phi_i^a, H \phi_{jk}^{bc} \rangle \right) \end{aligned}$$

Due to the Slater–Condon rules, there exists no quadruple commutator contribution in the single-projection equations. Hence, the resulting polynomials that arise from projecting onto singly excited Slater determinants are of the form

$$(10.8) \quad f_i^a(t) = \langle \Phi_i^a, e^{-T} H e^T \Phi_0 \rangle$$

Next we shall derive the polynomials that arise from projecting onto doubly ex-

cited Slater determinants. For the regular commutator term, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \phi_{ij}^{ab}, [H, T]\phi_0 \rangle &= \langle \phi_{ij}^{ab}, HT\phi_0 \rangle - \langle \phi_{ij}^{ab}, TH\phi_0 \rangle \\
&= \sum_{k,c} t_k^c \langle \phi_{ij}^{ab}, H\phi_k^c \rangle + \sum_{\substack{k<l \\ c<d}} t_{kl}^{cd} \langle \phi_{ij}^{ab}, H\phi_{kl}^{cd} \rangle \\
&\quad - t_{ij}^{ab} \langle \phi_0, H\phi_0 \rangle - \sum_{\substack{k \in \{i,j\}, l \in \{i,j\} \setminus k \\ c \in \{a,b\}, d \in \{a,b\} \setminus c}} t_k^c \langle \phi_l^d, H\phi_0 \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the canonical ordering, which is imposed here, results in further restrictions to the possible index pairs when de-exciting with a single excitation operator, see e.g. last the term in the equation above. For the double commutator we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \phi_{ij}^{ab}, [[H, T], T]\phi_0 \rangle &= \langle \phi_{ij}^{ab}, HT^2\phi_0 \rangle - 2\langle \phi_{ij}^{ab}, THT\phi_0 \rangle + \langle \phi_{ij}^{ab}, T^2H\phi_0 \rangle \\
&= \sum_{\substack{k \neq l \\ c \neq d}} t_k^c t_l^d \langle \phi_{ij}^{ab}, H\phi_{kl}^{cd} \rangle + \sum_{\substack{k \neq l < m \\ c \neq d < e}} t_k^c t_{lm}^{de} \langle \phi_{ij}^{ab}, H\phi_{klm}^{cde} \rangle \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{k \neq l \neq i,j \\ c \neq d \neq a,b}} t_{ij}^{ab} t_{kl}^{ce} \langle \phi_{ij}^{ab}, H\phi_{ijkl}^{abcd} \rangle - 2t_{ij}^{ab} \sum_{k,c} t_k^c \langle \phi_0, H\phi_k^c \rangle \\
&\quad - 2 \sum_{\substack{k \in \{i,j\}, l \in \{i,j\} \setminus k \\ c \in \{a,b\}, d \in \{a,b\} \setminus c}} \sum_{m,e} t_k^c t_m^e \langle \phi_l^d, H\phi_m^e \rangle \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{k \in \{i,j\}, l \in \{i,j\} \setminus k \\ c \in \{a,b\}, d \in \{a,b\} \setminus c}} t_k^c t_l^d \langle \phi_0, H\phi_0 \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

In the similar spirit we find for the triple commutator term

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \phi_{ij}^{ab}, [[[H, T], T], T]\phi_0 \rangle &= \langle \phi_{ij}^{ab}, HT^3\phi_0 \rangle - 3\langle \phi_{ij}^{ab}, THT^2\phi_0 \rangle + 3\langle \phi_{ij}^{ab}, T^2HT\phi_0 \rangle \\
&= \sum_{\substack{k \neq l \neq m \\ c \neq d \neq e}} t_k^c t_l^d t_m^e \langle \phi_{ij}^{ab}, H\phi_{klm}^{cde} \rangle + \sum_{\substack{k \neq l \neq m \neq n \\ c \neq d \neq e \neq f}} t_k^c t_l^d t_{m,n}^{ef} \langle \phi_{ij}^{ab}, H\phi_{klmn}^{cdef} \rangle \\
&\quad - 3 \sum_{\substack{k \in \{i,j\}, l \in \{i,j\} \setminus k \\ c \in \{a,b\}, d \in \{a,b\} \setminus c}} \sum_{m \neq n} t_k^c t_m^e t_n^f \langle \phi_l^d, H\phi_{mn}^{ef} \rangle \\
&\quad - 3 \sum_{\substack{k \in \{i,j\}, l \in \{i,j\} \setminus k \\ c \in \{a,b\}, d \in \{a,b\} \setminus c}} \sum_{m \neq n < o} t_k^c t_m^e t_{no}^{fg} \langle \phi_l^d, H\phi_{mno}^{efg} \rangle \\
&\quad + 3 \sum_{\substack{k \in \{i,j\}, l \in \{i,j\} \setminus k \\ c \in \{a,b\}, d \in \{a,b\} \setminus c}} \sum_{m,e} t_k^c t_l^d t_m^e \langle \phi_0, H\phi_m^e \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

For the quadruple commutator we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \phi_{ij}^{ab}, [[[[H, T], T], T], T] \phi_0 \rangle &= \langle \phi_{ij}^{ab}, HT^4 \phi_0 \rangle - 4 \langle \phi_{ij}^{ab}, THT^3 \phi_0 \rangle + 6 \langle \phi_{ij}^{ab}, T^2 HT^2 \phi_0 \rangle \\
&= \sum_{\substack{k \neq l \neq m \neq n \\ c \neq d \neq e \neq f}} t_k^c t_l^d t_m^e t_n^f \langle \phi_{ij}^{ab}, H \phi_{klmn}^{cdef} \rangle \\
&\quad - 4 \sum_{\substack{k \in \{i, j\}, l \in \{i, j\} \setminus k \\ c \in \{a, b\}, d \in \{a, b\} \setminus c}} \sum_{\substack{m \neq n \neq o \\ e \neq f \neq g}} t_k^c t_m^e t_n^f t_o^g \langle \phi_l^d, H \phi_{mnp}^{efg} \rangle \\
&\quad + 6 \sum_{\substack{k \in \{i, j\}, l \in \{i, j\} \setminus k \\ c \in \{a, b\}, d \in \{a, b\} \setminus c}} \sum_{\substack{m \neq n \\ e \neq f}} t_k^c t_l^d t_m^e t_n^f \langle \phi_0, H \phi_{mn}^{ef} \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. [Lemma 5.3] For any $v \in \mathcal{S}_5$ with non-zero entries in i, j, k there exists two vectors $v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{S}_7$ where $(v_1)_i = (v_2)_k = 2$ and $(v_1)_j = (v_2)_j = 1$, then, $v = 0.5v_1 + 0.5v_2$. Therefore \mathcal{S}_5 are not extremal points of the maximal polytope. \square

Proof. [Lemma 5.4] We show that $\nexists v_i \in \mathcal{S}_g$ s.t. $\exists(\alpha_j)$ with

$$v_i = \sum_{j \neq i} \alpha_j v_j$$

and $1 \geq \alpha_j \geq 0$ and $\sum_j \alpha_j = 1$ for $g \in \{2, 4, 6, 7\}$ and $v_j \in \mathcal{S}_g$. We investigate the individual cases:

$v_i \in \mathcal{S}_2$. Let $v_i \in \mathcal{S}_2$. Elements in \mathcal{S}_2 have exactly one entry; since convex combinations cannot remove entries, this set has to be extremal.

$v_i \in \mathcal{S}_4$. Let $v_i \in \mathcal{S}_4$. Then, since convex combinations cannot remove entries α_k has to be zero for vectors in \mathcal{S}_6 . Moreover, α_k has to be zero for vertices in \mathcal{S}_4 ; otherwise we would obtain vertices with at least three entries. Also, α_k has to be zero for vertices in \mathcal{S}_7 , since \mathcal{S}_7 has two single entries. Hence, the only possible linear combination is

$$v_i = \alpha_1 v_1 + \alpha_2 v_2$$

where $v_1 \in \mathcal{S}_2$ with the same non-zero double entry as v_i , and $v_2 \in \mathcal{S}_6$ with the same non-zero single entry as v_i . However, then $\alpha_2 = 1/2$ and $\alpha_1 = 1$ which is not convex.

$v_i \in \mathcal{S}_6$. Let $v_i \in \mathcal{S}_6$. Elements in \mathcal{S}_6 have exactly one entry which differs in position from the vectors in \mathcal{S}_2 . Again, since convex combinations cannot remove entries, this set has to be extremal.

$v_i \in \mathcal{S}_7$. Let $v_i \in \mathcal{S}_7$. Then, α_k has to be zero for vectors in \mathcal{S}_2 and \mathcal{S}_4 since those vectors have non-zero entries in the double component. Moreover, α_k has to be zero for vectors in \mathcal{S}_5 since vectors in \mathcal{S}_5 have three non-zero components. Hence, the only possible linear combination is

$$v_i = \alpha_1 v_1 + \alpha_2 v_2$$

where $v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{S}_6$ with the same non-zero single entries as v_i . However, then $\alpha_2 = 1/2$ and $\alpha_1 = 1$ which is not convex. \square

10.5. Two electrons in four Spin Orbitals. We shall here derive the individual polynomials for the two electrons in four spin orbitals example.

First polynomial. The first polynomial is given by

$$(10.9) \quad f_1(t) = \langle \phi_2^3, e^{-T} H e^T \phi_0 \rangle$$

Going through this term by term, only focusing on the degree of the individual monomials we get:

$$(10.10) \quad \langle \phi_2^3, H \phi_0 \rangle = C$$

which corresponds to $(0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$. The singly nested commutator yields the following

$$(10.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \phi_2^3, [H, T] \phi_0 \rangle &= t_2^3 \langle \phi_2^3, H \phi_2^3 \rangle + t_2^4 \langle \phi_2^3, H \phi_2^4 \rangle + t_1^3 \langle \phi_2^3, H \phi_1^3 \rangle \\ &\quad + t_1^4 \langle \phi_2^3, H \phi_1^4 \rangle + t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_2^3, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle - t_2^3 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_0 \rangle \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to:

$$(10.12) \quad (1, 0, 0, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1, 0, 0), (0, 0, 0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 0, 0, 1)$$

The doubly nested commutator yields

$$(10.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \phi_2^3, [[H, T], T] \phi_0 \rangle &= \langle \phi_2^3, HT^2 \phi_0 \rangle - 2 \langle \phi_2^3, THT \phi_0 \rangle + \langle \phi_2^3, T^2 H \phi_0 \rangle \\ &= (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) \langle \phi_2^3, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle - 2t_2^3 t_2^3 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_2^3 \rangle \\ &\quad - 2t_2^3 t_2^4 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_2^4 \rangle - 2t_2^3 t_1^3 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_1^3 \rangle \\ &\quad - 2t_2^3 t_1^4 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_1^4 \rangle - 2t_2^3 t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_0, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to:

$$(10.14) \quad \begin{aligned} &(1, 0, 0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1, 0, 0), (2, 0, 0, 0, 0), \\ &(1, 1, 0, 0, 0), (1, 0, 1, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0, 1, 0), (1, 0, 0, 0, 1) \end{aligned}$$

The triply nested commutator yields

$$(10.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \phi_2^3, [[[H, T], T], T] \phi_0 \rangle &= \langle \phi_2^3, HT^3 \phi_0 \rangle - 3 \langle \phi_2^3, THT^2 \phi_0 \rangle \\ &\quad - 3 \langle \phi_2^3, T^2 HT \phi_0 \rangle + \langle \phi_2^3, T^3 H \phi_0 \rangle \\ &= -3t_2^3 \langle \phi_0, HT^2 \phi_0 \rangle \\ &= -3t_2^3 (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) \langle \phi_0, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to:

$$(10.16) \quad (2, 0, 0, 1, 0), (1, 1, 1, 0, 0)$$

Overall the Newton polytope that corresponds to the first polynomial is given by

$$(10.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{New}_2^3 = \text{conv} &((0, 0, 0, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1, 0, 0), \\ &(0, 0, 0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 0, 0, 1), (1, 0, 0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1, 0, 0), \\ &(2, 0, 0, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0, 0, 0), (1, 0, 1, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0, 1, 0), \\ &(1, 0, 0, 0, 1), (2, 0, 0, 1, 0), (1, 1, 1, 0, 0)) \end{aligned}$$

The first polynomial can be then summarized as

$$(10.18) \quad \begin{aligned} f_1(t) &= \langle \phi_2^3, H \phi_0 \rangle + t_2^3 \langle \phi_2^3, H \phi_2^3 \rangle + t_2^4 \langle \phi_2^3, H \phi_2^4 \rangle \\ &\quad + t_1^3 \langle \phi_2^3, H \phi_1^3 \rangle + t_1^4 \langle \phi_2^3, H \phi_1^4 \rangle + t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_2^3, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \\ &\quad - t_2^3 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_0 \rangle + (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) \langle \phi_2^3, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle - 2t_2^3 t_2^3 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_2^3 \rangle \\ &\quad - 2t_2^3 t_2^4 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_2^4 \rangle - 2t_2^3 t_1^3 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_1^3 \rangle - 2t_2^3 t_1^4 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_1^4 \rangle \\ &\quad - 2t_2^3 t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_0, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle - 3t_2^3 (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) \langle \phi_0, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Second polynomial. The second polynomial is given by

$$(10.19) \quad f_2(t) = \langle \phi_2^4, e^{-T} H e^T \phi_0 \rangle$$

Going through this term by term, only focusing on the degree of the individual monomials we get:

$$(10.20) \quad \langle \phi_2^4, H \phi_0 \rangle = C$$

which corresponds to $(0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$. The singly nested commutator yields the following

$$(10.21) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \phi_2^4, [H, T] \phi_0 \rangle &= t_2^3 \langle \phi_2^4, H \phi_2^3 \rangle + t_2^4 \langle \phi_2^4, H \phi_2^4 \rangle + t_1^3 \langle \phi_2^4, H \phi_1^3 \rangle \\ &\quad + t_1^4 \langle \phi_2^4, H \phi_1^4 \rangle + t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_2^4, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle - t_2^4 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_0 \rangle \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to:

$$(10.22) \quad (1, 0, 0, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1, 0, 0), (0, 0, 0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 0, 0, 1)$$

The doubly nested commutator yields

$$(10.23) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \phi_2^4, [[H, T], T] \phi_0 \rangle &= \langle \phi_2^4, HT^2 \phi_0 \rangle - 2 \langle \phi_2^4, THT \phi_0 \rangle + \langle \phi_2^4, T^2 H \phi_0 \rangle \\ &= (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) \langle \phi_2^4, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle - 2 t_2^4 t_2^3 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_2^3 \rangle \\ &\quad - 2 t_2^4 t_2^4 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_2^4 \rangle - 2 t_2^4 t_1^3 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_1^3 \rangle \\ &\quad - 2 t_2^4 t_1^4 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_1^4 \rangle - 2 t_2^4 t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_0, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to:

$$(10.24) \quad \begin{aligned} &(1, 0, 0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0, 0, 0), \\ &(0, 2, 0, 0, 0), (0, 1, 1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 0, 0, 1) \end{aligned}$$

The triply nested commutator yields

$$(10.25) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \phi_2^4, [[[H, T], T], T] \phi_0 \rangle &= \langle \phi_2^4, HT^3 \phi_0 \rangle - 3 \langle \phi_2^4, THT^2 \phi_0 \rangle \\ &\quad - 3 \langle \phi_2^4, T^2 HT \phi_0 \rangle + \langle \phi_2^4, T^3 H \phi_0 \rangle \\ &= -3 t_2^4 \langle \phi_0, HT^2 \phi_0 \rangle \\ &= -3 t_2^4 (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) \langle \phi_0, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to:

$$(10.26) \quad (1, 1, 0, 1, 0), (0, 2, 1, 0, 0)$$

Overall the Newton polytope that corresponds to the second polynomial is given by

$$(10.27) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{New}_2^4 &= \text{conv}((0, 0, 0, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1, 0, 0), \\ &\quad (0, 0, 0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 0, 0, 1), (1, 0, 0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1, 0, 0), \\ &\quad (1, 1, 0, 0, 0), (0, 2, 0, 0, 0), (0, 1, 1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0, 1, 0), \\ &\quad (1, 0, 0, 0, 1), (1, 1, 0, 1, 0), (0, 2, 1, 0, 0)) \end{aligned}$$

The second polynomial can be then summarized as

$$(10.28) \quad \begin{aligned} f_2(t) &= \langle \phi_2^4, H \phi_0 \rangle + t_2^3 \langle \phi_2^4, H \phi_2^3 \rangle + t_2^4 \langle \phi_2^4, H \phi_2^4 \rangle \\ &\quad + t_1^3 \langle \phi_2^4, H \phi_1^3 \rangle + t_1^4 \langle \phi_2^4, H \phi_1^4 \rangle + t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_2^4, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \\ &\quad - t_2^4 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_0 \rangle + (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) \langle \phi_2^4, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle - 2 t_2^3 t_2^3 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_2^3 \rangle \\ &\quad - 2 t_2^4 t_2^4 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_2^4 \rangle - 2 t_2^4 t_1^3 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_1^3 \rangle - 2 t_2^4 t_1^4 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_1^4 \rangle \\ &\quad - 2 t_2^4 t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_0, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle - 3 t_2^4 (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) \langle \phi_0, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Third polynomial. The third polynomial is given by

$$(10.29) \quad f_3(t) = \langle \phi_1^3, e^{-T} H e^T \phi_0 \rangle$$

Going through this term by term, only focusing on the degree of the individual monomials we get:

$$(10.30) \quad \langle \phi_1^3, H \phi_0 \rangle = C$$

which corresponds to $(0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$. The singly nested commutator yields the following

$$(10.31) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \phi_1^3, [H, T] \phi_0 \rangle &= t_2^3 \langle \phi_1^3, H \phi_2^3 \rangle + t_2^4 \langle \phi_1^3, H \phi_2^4 \rangle + t_1^3 \langle \phi_1^3, H \phi_1^3 \rangle \\ &+ t_1^4 \langle \phi_1^3, H \phi_1^4 \rangle + t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_1^3, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle - t_1^3 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_0 \rangle \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to:

$$(10.32) \quad (1, 0, 0, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1, 0, 0), (0, 0, 0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 0, 0, 1)$$

The doubly nested commutator yields

$$(10.33) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \phi_1^3, [[H, T], T] \phi_0 \rangle &= \langle \phi_1^3, HT^2 \phi_0 \rangle - 2 \langle \phi_1^3, THT \phi_0 \rangle + \langle \phi_1^3, T^2 H \phi_0 \rangle \\ &= (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) \langle \phi_1^3, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle - 2 t_1^3 t_2^3 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_2^3 \rangle \\ &- 2 t_1^3 t_2^4 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_2^4 \rangle - 2 t_1^3 t_1^3 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_1^3 \rangle \\ &- 2 t_1^3 t_1^4 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_1^4 \rangle - 2 t_1^3 t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_0, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to:

$$(10.34) \quad (1, 0, 0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1, 0, 0), (1, 0, 1, 0, 0), \\ (0, 1, 1, 0, 0), (0, 0, 2, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1, 0, 1)$$

The triply nested commutator yields

$$(10.35) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \phi_1^3, [[[H, T], T], T] \phi_0 \rangle &= \langle \phi_1^3, HT^3 \phi_0 \rangle - 3 \langle \phi_1^3, THT^2 \phi_0 \rangle \\ &- 3 \langle \phi_1^3, T^2 HT \phi_0 \rangle + \langle \phi_1^3, T^3 H \phi_0 \rangle \\ &= -3 t_1^3 \langle \phi_0, HT^2 \phi_0 \rangle \\ &= -3 t_1^3 (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) \langle \phi_0, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to:

$$(10.36) \quad (1, 0, 1, 1, 0), (0, 1, 2, 0, 0)$$

Overall the Newton polytope that corresponds to the first polynomial is given by

$$(10.37) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{New}_1^3 &= \text{conv}((0, 0, 0, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1, 0, 0), \\ &(0, 0, 0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 0, 0, 1), (1, 0, 0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1, 0, 0), \\ &(1, 0, 1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 1, 0, 0), (0, 0, 2, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1, 1, 0), \\ &(0, 0, 1, 0, 1), (1, 0, 1, 1, 0), (0, 1, 2, 0, 0)) \end{aligned}$$

The third polynomial can be then summarized as

$$(10.38) \quad \begin{aligned} f_3(t) &= \langle \phi_1^3, H \phi_0 \rangle + t_2^3 \langle \phi_1^3, H \phi_2^3 \rangle + t_2^4 \langle \phi_1^3, H \phi_2^4 \rangle \\ &+ t_1^3 \langle \phi_1^3, H \phi_1^3 \rangle + t_1^4 \langle \phi_1^3, H \phi_1^4 \rangle + t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_1^3, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \\ &- t_1^3 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_0 \rangle + (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) \langle \phi_1^3, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle - 2 t_1^3 t_2^3 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_2^3 \rangle \\ &- 2 t_1^3 t_2^4 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_2^4 \rangle - 2 t_1^3 t_1^3 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_1^3 \rangle - 2 t_1^3 t_1^4 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_1^4 \rangle \\ &- 2 t_1^3 t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_0, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle - 3 t_1^3 (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) \langle \phi_0, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Fourth polynomial. The fourth polynomial is given by

$$(10.39) \quad f_4(t) = \langle \phi_1^4, e^{-T} H e^T \phi_0 \rangle$$

Going through this term by term, only focusing on the degree of the individual monomials we get:

$$(10.40) \quad \langle \phi_1^4, H \phi_0 \rangle = C$$

which corresponds to $(0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$. The singly nested commutator yields the following

$$(10.41) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \phi_1^4, [H, T] \phi_0 \rangle &= t_2^3 \langle \phi_1^4, H \phi_2^3 \rangle + t_2^4 \langle \phi_1^4, H \phi_2^4 \rangle + t_1^3 \langle \phi_1^4, H \phi_1^3 \rangle \\ &\quad + t_1^4 \langle \phi_1^4, H \phi_1^4 \rangle + t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_1^4, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle - t_1^4 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_0 \rangle \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to:

$$(10.42) \quad (1, 0, 0, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1, 0, 0), (0, 0, 0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 0, 0, 1)$$

The doubly nested commutator yields

$$(10.43) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \phi_1^4, [[H, T], T] \phi_0 \rangle &= \langle \phi_1^4, HT^2 \phi_0 \rangle - 2 \langle \phi_1^4, THT \phi_0 \rangle + \langle \phi_1^4, T^2 H \phi_0 \rangle \\ &= (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) \langle \phi_1^4, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle - 2 t_1^4 t_2^3 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_2^3 \rangle \\ &\quad - 2 t_1^4 t_2^4 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_2^4 \rangle - 2 t_1^4 t_1^3 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_1^3 \rangle \\ &\quad - 2 t_1^4 t_1^4 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_1^4 \rangle - 2 t_1^4 t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_0, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to:

$$(10.44) \quad \begin{aligned} &(1, 0, 0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0, 1, 0), \\ &(0, 1, 0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1, 1, 0), (0, 0, 0, 2, 0), (0, 0, 0, 1, 1) \end{aligned}$$

The triply nested commutator yields

$$(10.45) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \phi_1^4, [[[H, T], T], T] \phi_0 \rangle &= \langle \phi_1^4, HT^3 \phi_0 \rangle - 3 \langle \phi_1^4, THT^2 \phi_0 \rangle \\ &\quad - 3 \langle \phi_1^4, T^2 HT \phi_0 \rangle + \langle \phi_1^4, T^3 H \phi_0 \rangle \\ &= -3 t_1^4 \langle \phi_0, HT^2 \phi_0 \rangle \\ &= -3 t_1^4 (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) \langle \phi_0, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to:

$$(10.46) \quad (1, 0, 0, 2, 0), (0, 1, 1, 1, 0)$$

Overall the Newton polytope that corresponds to the second polynomial is given by

$$(10.47) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{New}_2^4 &= \text{conv}((0, 0, 0, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1, 0, 0), \\ &\quad (0, 0, 0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 0, 0, 1), (1, 0, 0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1, 0, 0), \\ &\quad (1, 0, 0, 1, 0), (0, 2, 0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1, 1, 0), (0, 0, 0, 2, 0), \\ &\quad (0, 0, 0, 1, 1), (1, 0, 0, 2, 0), (0, 1, 1, 1, 0)) \end{aligned}$$

The fourth polynomial can be then summarized as

$$(10.48) \quad \begin{aligned} f_4(t) &= \langle \phi_1^4, H \phi_0 \rangle + t_2^3 \langle \phi_1^4, H \phi_2^3 \rangle + t_2^4 \langle \phi_1^4, H \phi_2^4 \rangle \\ &\quad + t_1^3 \langle \phi_1^4, H \phi_1^3 \rangle + t_1^4 \langle \phi_1^4, H \phi_1^4 \rangle + t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_1^4, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \\ &\quad - t_1^4 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_0 \rangle + (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) \langle \phi_1^4, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle - 2 t_1^3 t_2^3 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_2^3 \rangle \\ &\quad - 2 t_1^4 t_2^4 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_2^4 \rangle - 2 t_1^4 t_1^3 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_1^3 \rangle - 2 t_1^4 t_1^4 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_1^4 \rangle \\ &\quad - 2 t_1^4 t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_0, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle - 3 t_1^4 (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) \langle \phi_0, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

fifth polynomial. The fifth polynomial is given by

$$(10.49) \quad f_5(t) = \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, e^{-T} H e^T \phi_0 \rangle$$

Going through this term by term, only focusing on the degree of the individual monomials we get:

$$(10.50) \quad \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, H \phi_0 \rangle = C$$

which corresponds to $(0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$. The singly nest commutator yields

$$(10.51) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, [H, T] \phi_0 \rangle &= t_2^3 \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, H \phi_2^3 \rangle + t_2^4 \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, H \phi_2^4 \rangle + t_1^3 \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, H \phi_1^3 \rangle \\ &\quad + t_1^4 \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, H \phi_1^4 \rangle + t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \\ &\quad - t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_0, H \phi_0 \rangle - t_1^3 \langle \phi_2^4, H \phi_0 \rangle - t_2^4 \langle \phi_1^3, H \phi_0 \rangle \\ &\quad + t_1^4 \langle \phi_2^3, H \phi_0 \rangle + t_2^3 \langle \phi_1^4, H \phi_0 \rangle \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to:

$$(10.52) \quad (1, 0, 0, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1, 0, 0), (0, 0, 0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 0, 0, 1)$$

The doubly nest commutator yields

$$(10.53) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, [[H, T], T] \phi_0 \rangle &= \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, HT^2 \phi_0 \rangle - 2 \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, THT \phi_0 \rangle + \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, T^2 H \phi_0 \rangle \\ &= (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \\ &\quad - 2(t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_0, HT \phi_0 \rangle + t_1^3 \langle \phi_2^4, HT \phi_0 \rangle + t_2^4 \langle \phi_1^3, HT \phi_0 \rangle \\ &\quad - t_1^4 \langle \phi_2^3, HT \phi_0 \rangle - t_2^3 \langle \phi_1^4, HT \phi_0 \rangle) \\ &\quad + (t_2^3 t_1^4 - t_1^3 t_2^4) \langle \phi_0, H \phi_0 \rangle \end{aligned}$$

The terms without T yield

$$(10.54) \quad (1, 0, 0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1, 0, 0)$$

We now expand each of the individual summands containing T :

$$(10.55) \quad \begin{aligned} t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_0, HT \phi_0 \rangle &= t_{12}^{34} t_2^3 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_2^3 \rangle + t_{12}^{34} t_2^4 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_2^4 \rangle \\ &\quad + t_{12}^{34} t_1^3 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_1^3 \rangle + t_{12}^{34} t_1^4 \langle \phi_0, H \phi_1^4 \rangle + t_{12}^{34} t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_0, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$(10.56) \quad (1, 0, 0, 0, 1), (0, 1, 0, 0, 1), (0, 0, 1, 0, 1), (0, 0, 0, 1, 1), (0, 0, 0, 0, 2)$$

Next we find

$$(10.57) \quad \begin{aligned} t_1^3 \langle \phi_2^4, HT \phi_0 \rangle &= t_1^3 t_2^3 \langle \phi_2^4, H \phi_2^3 \rangle + t_1^3 t_2^4 \langle \phi_2^4, H \phi_2^4 \rangle \\ &\quad + t_1^3 t_1^3 \langle \phi_2^4, H \phi_1^3 \rangle + t_1^3 t_1^4 \langle \phi_2^4, H \phi_1^4 \rangle + t_1^3 t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_2^4, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$(10.58) \quad (1, 0, 1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 1, 0, 0), (0, 0, 2, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1, 0, 1)$$

Next we find

$$(10.59) \quad \begin{aligned} t_2^4 \langle \phi_1^3, HT\phi_0 \rangle &= t_2^4 t_2^3 \langle \phi_1^3, H\phi_2^3 \rangle + t_2^4 t_2^4 \langle \phi_1^3, H\phi_2^4 \rangle \\ &\quad + t_2^4 t_1^3 \langle \phi_1^3, H\phi_1^3 \rangle + t_2^4 t_1^4 \langle \phi_1^3, H\phi_1^4 \rangle + t_2^4 t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_1^3, H\phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$(10.60) \quad (1, 1, 0, 0, 0), (0, 2, 0, 0, 0), (0, 1, 1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 0, 0, 1)$$

Next we find

$$(10.61) \quad \begin{aligned} t_1^4 \langle \phi_2^3, HT\phi_0 \rangle &= t_1^4 t_2^3 \langle \phi_2^3, H\phi_2^3 \rangle + t_1^4 t_2^4 \langle \phi_2^3, H\phi_2^4 \rangle \\ &\quad + t_1^4 t_1^3 \langle \phi_2^3, H\phi_1^3 \rangle + t_1^4 t_1^4 \langle \phi_2^3, H\phi_1^4 \rangle + t_1^4 t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_2^3, H\phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$(10.62) \quad (1, 0, 0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1, 1, 0), (0, 0, 0, 2, 0), (0, 0, 0, 1, 1)$$

Next we find

$$(10.63) \quad \begin{aligned} t_2^3 \langle \phi_1^4, HT\phi_0 \rangle &= t_2^3 t_2^3 \langle \phi_1^4, H\phi_2^3 \rangle + t_2^3 t_2^4 \langle \phi_1^4, H\phi_2^4 \rangle \\ &\quad + t_2^3 t_1^3 \langle \phi_1^4, H\phi_1^3 \rangle + t_2^3 t_1^4 \langle \phi_1^4, H\phi_1^4 \rangle + t_2^3 t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_1^4, H\phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$(10.64) \quad (2, 0, 0, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0, 0, 0), (1, 0, 1, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0, 1, 0), (1, 0, 0, 0, 1)$$

The triply nest commutator yields

$$(10.65) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, [[[H, T], T], T]\phi_0 \rangle &= \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, HT^3\phi_0 \rangle - 3\langle \phi_{12}^{34}, THT^2\phi_0 \rangle \\ &\quad - 3\langle \phi_{12}^{34}, T^2HT\phi_0 \rangle + \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, T^3H\phi_0 \rangle \\ &= -3(t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, TH\phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \\ &\quad - 3(t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) \langle \phi_0, HT\phi_0 \rangle \end{aligned}$$

We can now expand the summands containing T

$$(10.66) \quad \begin{aligned} (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) \langle \phi_0, HT\phi_0 \rangle &= (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) t_2^3 \langle \phi_0, H\phi_2^3 \rangle + (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) t_2^4 \langle \phi_0, H\phi_2^4 \rangle \\ &\quad + (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) t_1^3 \langle \phi_0, H\phi_1^3 \rangle + (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) t_1^4 \langle \phi_0, H\phi_1^4 \rangle \\ &\quad + (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_0, H\phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$(10.67) \quad \begin{aligned} &(2, 0, 0, 1, 0), (1, 1, 0, 1, 0), (1, 0, 1, 1, 0), (1, 0, 0, 2, 0), (1, 0, 0, 1, 1), \\ &(1, 1, 1, 0, 0), (0, 2, 1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 2, 0, 0), (0, 1, 1, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1, 0, 1) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(10.68) \quad \begin{aligned} (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, TH\phi_{12}^{34} \rangle &= (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_0, H\phi_{12}^{34} \rangle + (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) t_1^3 \langle \phi_2^4, H\phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \\ &\quad + (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) t_2^4 \langle \phi_1^3, H\phi_{12}^{34} \rangle - (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) t_1^4 \langle \phi_2^3, H\phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \\ &\quad - (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) t_2^3 \langle \phi_1^4, H\phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to:

$$(10.69) \quad \begin{aligned} & (2, 0, 0, 1, 0), (1, 1, 0, 1, 0), (1, 0, 1, 1, 0), (1, 0, 0, 2, 0), (1, 0, 0, 1, 1), \\ & (1, 1, 1, 0, 0), (0, 2, 1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 2, 0, 0), (0, 1, 1, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1, 0, 1) \end{aligned}$$

The quadruply nested commutator term yields

$$(10.70) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, [[[[H, T], T], T], T] \phi_0 \rangle &= 6 \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, T^2 H T^2 \phi_0 \rangle \\ &= 6(t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) (t_2^3 \langle \phi_1^3, H \phi_2^3 \rangle + t_2^4 \langle \phi_1^3, H \phi_2^4 \rangle \\ &\quad + t_1^3 \langle \phi_1^3, H \phi_1^3 \rangle + t_1^4 \langle \phi_1^3, H \phi_1^4 \rangle + t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_1^3, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle) \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to

$$(10.71) \quad \begin{aligned} & (2, 0, 0, 1, 0), (1, 1, 0, 1, 0), (1, 0, 1, 1, 0), (1, 0, 0, 2, 0), (1, 0, 0, 1, 1), \\ & (1, 1, 1, 0, 0), (0, 2, 1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 2, 0, 0), (0, 1, 1, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1, 0, 1) \end{aligned}$$

Overall the Newton polytope that corresponds to the first polynomial is given by

$$(10.72) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{New}_{12}^{34} = \text{conv} & \left((0, 0, 0, 0, 0), (2, 0, 0, 0, 0), (0, 2, 0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 2, 0, 0), \right. \\ & (0, 0, 0, 2, 0), (0, 0, 0, 0, 2), (1, 1, 0, 0, 0), (1, 0, 1, 0, 0), \\ & (1, 0, 0, 1, 0), (1, 0, 0, 0, 1), (0, 1, 1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0, 1, 0), \\ & (0, 1, 0, 0, 1), (0, 0, 1, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1, 0, 1), (0, 0, 0, 1, 1), \\ & (1, 1, 1, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1, 0, 1), \\ & (1, 0, 1, 1, 0), (1, 0, 0, 1, 1), (2, 0, 0, 1, 0), (1, 0, 0, 2, 0), \\ & \left. (0, 1, 2, 0, 0), (0, 2, 1, 0, 0) \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$(10.73) \quad \begin{aligned} f_5(t) &= \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, e^{-T} H e^T \phi_0 \rangle \\ &= C + t_2^3 \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, H \phi_2^3 \rangle + t_2^4 \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, H \phi_2^4 \rangle + t_1^3 \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, H \phi_1^3 \rangle + t_1^4 \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, H \phi_1^4 \rangle \\ &\quad + t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle - t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_0, H \phi_0 \rangle - t_1^3 \langle \phi_2^4, H \phi_0 \rangle - t_2^4 \langle \phi_1^3, H \phi_0 \rangle \\ &\quad + t_1^4 \langle \phi_2^3, H \phi_0 \rangle + t_2^3 \langle \phi_1^4, H \phi_0 \rangle + (t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle \\ &\quad - 2(t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_0, H T \phi_0 \rangle + t_1^3 \langle \phi_2^4, H T \phi_0 \rangle + t_2^4 \langle \phi_1^3, H T \phi_0 \rangle \\ &\quad \quad - t_1^4 \langle \phi_2^3, H T \phi_0 \rangle - t_2^3 \langle \phi_1^4, H T \phi_0 \rangle) + (t_2^3 t_1^4 - t_1^3 t_2^4) \langle \phi_0, H \phi_0 \rangle \\ &\quad - 3(t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) \langle \phi_{12}^{34}, T H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle - 3(t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) \langle \phi_0, H T \phi_0 \rangle \\ &\quad + 6(t_1^3 t_2^4 - t_2^3 t_1^4) (t_2^3 \langle \phi_1^3, H \phi_2^3 \rangle + t_2^4 \langle \phi_1^3, H \phi_2^4 \rangle \\ &\quad \quad + t_1^3 \langle \phi_1^3, H \phi_1^3 \rangle + t_1^4 \langle \phi_1^3, H \phi_1^4 \rangle + t_{12}^{34} \langle \phi_1^3, H \phi_{12}^{34} \rangle) \end{aligned}$$

In the following we shall list the coefficient matrices for indices $i \geq 2$ corresponding to the quadratic problem describing the CC equations for two electrons in four spin orbitals.

$$H(2) = \begin{pmatrix} h_{2,0} & h_{2,1} & h_{2,2} & h_{2,3} & h_{2,4} & h_{2,5} & -h_{2,5} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -h_{0,0} & -h_{0,1} & -h_{0,2} & -h_{0,3} & -h_{0,4} & -h_{0,5} & h_{0,5} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$H(3) = \begin{pmatrix} h_{3,0} & h_{3,1} & h_{3,2} & h_{3,3} & h_{3,4} & h_{3,5} & -h_{3,5} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -h_{0,0} & -h_{0,1} & -h_{0,2} & -h_{0,3} & -h_{0,4} & -h_{0,5} & h_{0,5} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$H(4) = \begin{pmatrix} h_{4,0} & h_{4,1} & h_{4,2} & h_{4,3} & h_{4,4} & h_{4,5} & -h_{4,5} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -h_{0,0} & -h_{0,1} & -h_{0,2} & -h_{0,3} & -h_{0,4} & -h_{0,5} & h_{0,5} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$H(5) = \begin{pmatrix} h_{5,0} & h_{5,1} & h_{5,2} & h_{5,3} & h_{5,4} & h_{5,5} & -h_{5,5} \\ h_{4,0} & h_{4,1} & h_{4,2} & h_{4,3} & h_{4,4} & h_{4,5} & h_{0,1} \\ -h_{3,0} & -h_{3,1} & -h_{3,2} & -h_{3,3} & -h_{3,4} & -h_{3,5} & h_{0,2} \\ -h_{2,0} & h_{2,1} & -h_{2,2} & -h_{2,3} & -h_{2,4} & -h_{2,5} & h_{0,3} \\ h_{1,0} & h_{1,1} & h_{1,2} & h_{1,3} & h_{1,4} & h_{1,5} & h_{0,4} \\ -h_{0,0} & -h_{0,1} & -h_{0,2} & -h_{0,3} & -h_{0,4} & -h_{0,5} & h_{0,5} \\ +h_{0,0} & -h_{4,5} & h_{3,5} & h_{2,5} & -h_{1,5} & h_{0,5} & h_{0,5} \end{pmatrix}$$