A second-quantized red herring in full configuration-interaction Monte Carlo

Michael Kolodrubetz[1], Bryan K. Clark[1,2]
[1]*Department of Physics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA.* [2]*Princeton Center for Theoretical Science.*
(Dated: February 4, 2014)

Full configuration-interaction quantum Monte Carlo (FCI-QMC, see [1]) is a Monte Carlo method that allows for exact solution of the ground state of fermionic Hamiltonians (albeit at exponential cost). FCI-QMC involves stochastic projection to the ground state, working in a basis of second-quantized determinants. While a Fermi sign problem still exists within FCI-QMC, it has been suggested that even without annihilation the sign problem is fundamentally distinct from that of more standard techniques such as diffusion Monte Carlo, as a result of working in determinant space [1, 2]. Furthermore, it is widely believed that this distinction is at least partially responsible for the success of FCI-QMC in mitigating the sign problem. In this paper, we show that second quantization is a red herring; the sign problem of FCI-QMC comes from the conventional instability to a bosonic ground state, and in fact FCI-QMC without annihilation can be equated step-by-step to a first-quantized algorithm where anti-symmetry comes only from initial conditions.

PACS numbers: 64.70.Tg, 05.30.Rt

arXiv:1202.0525v1 [physics.comp-ph] 2 Feb 2012

Solving the ground state of a fermionic Hamiltonian is very difficult due to the omnipresent fermion sign problem [3]. While solving a Hamiltonian with a sign problem is always exponentially hard in some parameter, a number of techniques exist to reduce the exponential prefactor (e.g. [4, 5]), with varying degrees of success. The recently introduced technique of full configuration-interaction quantum Monte Carlo (FCI-QMC) has shown promise in solving the ground state of all-electron problems in quantum chemistry [1, 6], although its applications in the realm of condensed systems have been limited [2, 7].

FCI-QMC is similar in spirit to DMC and other ground state projection techniques. For a given Hamiltonian H, one repeatedly applies the imaginary time operator $1-\tau H$ to project the initial state $|\psi_T\rangle$ onto the ground state of H. In FCI-QMC, the configuration space is a discrete set of signed determinants, and walkers that sit on the same determinant with opposite sign are annihilated.

It has been widely stated (c.f.e. [1, 2]) that, even in the absence of annihilation, the sign problem in FCI-QMC is fundamentally different than first-quantized approaches due to the use of a basis of fermionic determinants. In this paper, we show that this is not the case, and that in fact the FCI-QMC algorithm without annihilation can be mapped step-by-step to an algorithm that works in a first-quantized basis with distinguishable particles. We will not address the effects of annihilation in this paper.

The problem we consider is solving for the ground state of some generic Hamiltonian H. Although our proof applies generically, we will use as a concrete example fermions hopping on a 2D square lattice with nearest neighbor interactions, with the Hamiltonian

$$H = -\sum_{\langle ij\rangle}\left[c_i^\dagger c_j + c_j^\dagger c_i + u n_i n_j\right] , \qquad (1)$$

where $\langle ij\rangle$ denotes nearest neighbors, $c_i^\dagger$ creates a fermion on site i, and $n_i = c_i^\dagger c_i$ is the number operator. While our simulations with this Hamiltonian are done in real-space, our arguments are independent of basis choice.

We wish to consider a class of projector methods (which includes FCI-QMC) in which the operator $U = 1-\tau H$ is repeatedly applied stochastically to an initial wavefunction $|\psi_T\rangle$. Initially, a snapshot of the simulation is a stochastic sampling of $|\psi_T\rangle$. After N steps of the algorithm, a snapshot gives a stochastic sampling of $|\psi(\beta)\rangle = (1-\tau H)^N|\psi_i\rangle$, where the total imaginary time is $\beta = \tau N$. Each snapshot is represented by a set of basis elements D_j with probability proportional to $|\langle D_j|\psi\rangle|$ and sign equal to $\mathrm{sgn}[\langle D_j|\psi\rangle]$. We refer to each such signed basis element as a walker.

We consider this method in both first and second-quantized form. Additionally, in the first-quantized algorithm, we throw out all configurations containing two (distinguishable) particles in the same orbital; this is just an application of the Pauli exclusion principle for fermions, or a hard-core constraint for bosons. The primary difference between first and second-quantized algorithms then comes from how the anti-symmetry is implemented. In first-quantized notation, the Hamiltonian knows nothing about the symmetry; anti-symmetry comes entirely from initial conditions. Second quantization is precisely the opposite; anti-symmetry is built into the Hamiltonian, in particular the sign of the off-diagonal matrix elements.

For a first-quantized Hamiltonian (H_{FQ}), the sign problem arises as the "true" ground state is bosonic (symmetric under particle exchange) [8]. The simulation is started in an anti-symmetric configuration, where due to anti-symmetry half of the walkers are positive and half are negative. Therefore, if one only considers the positive or negative walkers in a given simulation, they each separately approach the bosonic ground state as the al-




FIG. 1: Comparison of first and second-quantized walkers step-by-step for two particles in a periodic 2D box of size $L = 4$, using H from eq. 1. Images show the probability distribution of positive (a,d) and negative (b,e) walkers separately, and the difference between them (c,f) at a few snapshots of β. While the positive and negative walkers individually converge to the bosonic ground state, their difference converges to the fermionic ground state (see text). All images are for $\tau = 0.1$ and $u = -1$, with particle positions encoded as $R_i = x_i + Ly_i$ for particle i at position (x_i, y_i). The data is obtained by analytically applying $1 - \tau H$ to the positive and negative walkers separately (a,b,d,e) and then subtracting the result (c,f).

gorithm progresses (see fig. 1a,b). The true fermionic answer comes from the (normalized) difference when the positive and negative walkers are added together (fig. 1c). Because the bosonic ground state has lower energy than the fermionic ground state, the bosonic noise grows faster than the fermionic signal; this is what is meant by the sign problem.

For a second-quantized Hamiltonian (H_{SQ}), the "true" ground state is fermionic, i.e. diagonalizing the matrix H_{SQ} gives the desired fermionic ground state. The simulation can be started in any configuration (e.g. all positive walkers), after which negative walkers will arise in the simulation from the positive off-diagonal terms in H_{SQ}. Again, the true fermionic answer comes from the difference when the positive and negative walkers are added together.

Given that the ground state of H_{SQ} is fermionic, one might expect that the positive and negative walkers don't separately approach the bosonic ground state. We now show that they do, in the process proving the stronger statement that the first-quantized algorithm is step-by-step identical to FCI-QMC.

The key to our proof is to note that, in first-quantized configuration space, there are a large number of configurations which are identical with respect to any physical observable. For example, if we have three orbitals α, β, and γ and three particles labeled $1-3$, then the configurations

$$\{|\alpha_1, \beta_2, \gamma_3\rangle, +\}, \{|\alpha_2, \beta_1, \gamma_3\rangle, -\}, \{|\alpha_2, \beta_3, \gamma_1\rangle, +\}, \ldots \tag{2}$$

are all equivalent, and can be mapped to the same second-quantized configuration $\{|\alpha, \beta, \gamma\rangle, +\}$. For the same orbitals, there is a second class of configurations,

$$\{|\alpha_1, \beta_2, \gamma_3\rangle, -\}, \{|\alpha_2, \beta_1, \gamma_3\rangle, +\}, \ldots, \tag{3}$$

which can be mapped to $\{|\alpha, \beta, \gamma\rangle, -\}$. The mapping can also be done in reverse, which is equivalent to taking the determinant $\{|\alpha, \beta, \gamma\rangle, +\}$, writing out all $(3 \times 3) = 9$ terms in its expansion, and then sampling the first-quantized configurations from this expansion with sign given by the sign of the second-quantized walker times the sign of the term in the expansion. This mapping, which we refer to as "unfolding" the determinant, is illustrated in fig. 2a.

After this mapping, probability distributions, after unfolding appropriately, of positive and negative walkers are completely equivalent for first and second-quantized algorithms at every step. This is illustrated for our model Hamiltonian in fig. 1. Note that for each value of β, the upper right triangle of the first and second-quantized walkers match exactly. The "missing" triangles can be reconstructed according to the unfolding procedure described above (see also fig. 2a). As a corollary to our proof that the algorithms sample from identical probability distributions at each step, the origin of the sign problem in each case is also identical. Therefore, despite its use of second quantization, FCI-QMC without annihilation has a sign problem due to the standard instability to the bosonic ground state.

Finally we note that, while we draw a different conclusion regarding the nature of the sign problem, our argument does not disagree with the analysis of FCI-QMC annihilation from Spencer et. al. [2]. Using a variant of their notation, and absorbing the shift $S = E_{\mathrm{GS}}$ such that the ground state of H_{SQ} has $E = 0$, we consider $H_{\mathrm{SQ}} = H_+ - H_-$, where H_+ (H_-) consists of all non-sign-violating (sign-violating) matrix elements of H_{SQ}. Then, denoting the vector of positive (negative) walkers in the determinant space as p (n), the FCI-QMC algo-




FIG. 2: a) Demonstration of the unfolding process to map between first and second-quantized configurations. Graphically, the procedure is to permute the particles (curved arrows) then flip the sign (straight arrows). b) Energy of the walkers from FCI-QMC (solid lines) compared against the ground state (bosonic g.s., red dot-dashed line) and first excited state (fermionic g.s., black dashed line) energies of H_{FQ}.

rithm without annihilation stochastically simulates

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}\begin{pmatrix} p \\ n \end{pmatrix} = -\begin{pmatrix} H_+ & H_- \\ H_- & H_+ \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} p \\ n \end{pmatrix} \tag{4}$$

The fixed point of $\begin{pmatrix} p \\ n \end{pmatrix}$ in (4) is that $|p\rangle$ and $|n\rangle$ each independently relaxes to the ground state of $H_B = H_+ + H_-$. We denote this H_B because it is just the bosonic Hamiltonian, as it has no sign-violating off-diagonal elements. To numerically exemplify that H_B has the same ground state as the first-quantized Hamiltonian, we compare the energy of just the positive walkers in FCI-QMC without annihilation (the vector $|p\rangle$) to the bosonic ground state of H_{FQ} (fig. 2b). For comparison, the anti-symmetric wavefunction of interest is $|\psi_{\mathrm{diff}}\rangle = |p\rangle - |n\rangle$. The energy of $|\psi_{\mathrm{diff}}\rangle$ is also shown in fig. 2b, where it can be seen to relax to the exact fermionic ground state of H_{FQ}.

An open question is why FCI-QMC has shown so much success compared to other annihilation-based methods (c.f.e. [4]); possibilities include the discretization of the orbital space removing the need for correlated annihilation [1, 4], the intelligent choice of single-particle basis to facilitate annihilation, and the sheer number of walkers allowed in a given simulation ($\sim 10^9$, see [1]). However, as we have shown in this paper, its effectiveness has nothing to do with working in a space of "anti-symmetric" determinants.

Acknowledgments - We would like to thank Garnet Chan for useful discussions.

[1] G. H. Booth, A. J. W. Thom, and A. Alavi, Journal of Chemical Physics **131**, 054106 (2009).
[2] J. S. Spencer, N. S. Blunt, and W. M. C. Foulkes, arXiv:1110.5479 (2011).
[3] D. M. Ceperley, in *CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS-ITALIAN PHYSICAL SOCIETY* (Editrice Compositori, 1996), vol. 49, pp. 443–482.
[4] M. H. Kalos and F. Pederiva, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 3547 (2000).
[5] E. Kozik, K. V. Houcke, E. Gull, L. Pollet, N. Prokof'ev, B. Svistunov, and M. Troyer, EPL (Europhysics Letters) **90**, 10004 (2010), ISSN 0295-5075.
[6] D. Cleland, G. H. Booth, and A. Alavi, Journal of Chemical Physics **132**, 041103 (2010).
[7] J. J. Shepherd, G. Booth, and A. Alavi, arXiv:1201.4691v1 (2012).
[8] We only explicitly consider here the case in which all off-diagonal elements of H_{FQ} are negative, i.e. it has no first-quantized sign problem. In certain bases, even a bosonic Hamiltonian can have a sign problem, such as the repulsive Bose-Hubbard model in momentum space. While not explicitly addressing this case, the exact mapping between first and second quantized walkers shows that even in this case, the ground state instability that yields the sign problem will be the same regardless of the choice of first vs. second quantization.