

The unreasonable accuracy of the Jastrow approach in many-body physics

Niels R. Walet* and R. F. Bishop†

Department of Physics, UMIST, P.O. Box 88, Manchester M60 1QD, UK

(Dated: 20th November 2018)

We investigate in a simple model whether a Jastrow-based approach for a many-body system containing two-body interactions can be exact. By comparison with recent assertions to the contrary, we find that in general the exact wave function is *not* purely two-body correlated. Nonetheless, we show that the energy estimate obtained from the calculations is as accurate as it can possibly be, suggesting why Jastrow wave functions are such a good choice.

PACS numbers: 31.15.Pf, 71.10.-w, 31.10.+Z, 31.25.Eb

A long-standing and ongoing fundamental problem in quantum physics is the search for general methods to provide accurate descriptions of strongly interacting systems with many degrees of freedom, starting from a microscopic Hamiltonian. One of the first such broadly based techniques, which is still in widespread use, was introduced by Feenberg [1]. He generalized a similar variational approach of Jastrow [2], the basic idea of which is that in a strongly correlated N -body system the wave function may be approximated as the product of two parts. The first is a simple “uncorrelated” part which incorporates the correct quantum statistics (e.g., a Slater determinant for fermions). The second describes the correlations and is a product of pairwise Jastrow factors, which depends only on the interparticle separations.

Many, if not most, of the key methods in modern quantum many-body theory are based on similar ideas, but often with simple but subtle differences which have deep implications, as we elaborate below. For example, the variational Monte Carlo (VMC) method often employs a parametrized Jastrow-correlated wave function which is optimized using a statistical approach. Although the VMC method is not intrinsically tied to Jastrow wave functions, their usefulness has been proven empirically by the high level of accuracy that can be reached with such a simple form of trial wave function in many applications in nuclear physics and elsewhere [3]. Many authors in many different fields have attempted to understand the surprisingly accurate results obtained by Jastrow trial wave functions. For example, Gaudoin *et al.* [4] have shown how by generalizing the random phase approximation of the electron gas to the inhomogeneous case, a Slater-Jastrow trial wave function arises rather naturally. They also showed how the uncorrelated Slater determinant contains optimal orbitals which are close both to standard Hartree-Fock orbitals and to orbitals obtained from density-functional theory within the local density approximation, even though neither of these latter approaches includes Jastrow factors *a priori*.

Although the use of such simple Jastrow-correlated many-body wave functions has been seen to give a large part of the correlation energy in many diverse applications, one would also like to improve the method. Sev-

eral such refinements have been widely used. Firstly, one may extend the two-body correlations to depend also on internal quantum numbers such as spin. This is particularly important in cases where the interactions are state-dependent, such as in nuclear physics. State-dependence in the two-body correlators turns them effectively into operators. The fact that the parameters of a given particle occur in many of the Jastrow factors then leads to them not commuting between themselves, and hence the product of $N(N-1)/2$ correlation operators needs to be symmetrized. This considerably complicates the formalism, and the Fermi hypernetted chain (FHNC) method [5] is one approach that deals with it. It is based on a cluster expansion of the Jastrow correlations, and the method has proven to be quite accurate. An alternative to the FHNC method for Hamiltonians which include tensor and other spin-dependent interactions has been developed by Schmidt and Fantoni [6], using a purely numerical approach. A second extension of the simplest Jastrow scheme is the inclusion of the product of all 3-body scalar cluster correlation functions, $\prod_{i<j<k} f(r_{ij}, r_{jk}, r_{ki})$, and similar products of n -body cluster correlation functions with $n > 3$, as well as the Jastrow product of all 2-body correlation functions, $\prod_{i<j} f(r_{ij})$. Thirdly, the more general method of correlated basis functions (CBF) [1, 5, 7], which employs a correlated basis rather than a single trial wave function as above, is one of the two most successful universal many-body methods available today. The correlation operator in CBF calculations is commonly taken as a product of a state-dependent part and a scalar Jastrow-Feenberg part.

The main competitor to the many-body techniques outlined above is the coupled cluster method (CCM) [8]. It is based on describing the correlations in terms of exponentiated *independent* excitations, which are parametrized as multiconfigurational creation operators with respect to some suitable reference state. The CCM thereby completely avoids the complications arising from the overlapping products of correlation functions inherent in the Jastrow method. A huge advantage is that it is now much easier to deal with state dependence, since the issue of non-commutativity of the correlation operators never arises. A corresponding disadvantage is

that it is much more difficult to deal with such extreme correlations as arise in hard-core systems in the second-quantized representation that provides the natural framework for the CCM than it is in the first-quantized representation in which the Jastrow and CBF methods are most naturally expressed.

Both the CBF method and the CCM have been widely applied in many different areas of quantum many-body physics outside the field of nuclear physics to which both can trace their origins. For example, the CCM has found many applications in quantum chemistry, where it is the method of first choice for very accurate descriptions of highly correlated atoms and molecules (see, e.g., Ref. [9]). Recently, in this context, an attempt was made [10] to extend the CCM to include more general excitations than those generated by exponentiated *independent* two-particle/two-hole excitations.

This extension is tantamount to the use of state-dependent Jastrow wave functions, although the equations to be solved differ slightly from the usual variational ones, as discussed more fully below. There are now claims in the literature that this method can give the *exact* ground state wave function for systems interacting via pairwise forces [10, 11]. We shall argue here that although the method can certainly be extremely accurate, it is *not* in general exact.

Our fundamental concern is thus twofold: why is the Jastrow method so accurate, and what limits its accuracy? One obvious such limit is clearly any constraint on the parametrisation of the correlation functions. However, the key issue is that even if we use the most general parametrisation possible, can the Jastrow method be exact? In view of our earlier discussion, it would clearly be surprising if it were always exact, but in recent papers Nooijen [10] and Piecuch and his collaborators [11] have claimed that this is the case. Their basic idea is to work in a finite part of occupation-number space, and obtain equations for the coefficients in a second-quantized two-body operator that specifies the correlations. Although there are an equal number of unknowns and equations, in practice there seems to be a large degeneracy to the solutions. Nevertheless, by tackling semi-realistic problems they find such a high accuracy that the method *seems* exact. In this letter we analyse their method, and we argue that such high accuracy is intrinsic to the Jastrow approach underlying their calculations. In particular, we analyse a simple model with the aim of shedding some light on the issues raised above.

In the original Jastrow approach a correlated N -particle wave function is decomposed as

$$\Psi_\alpha(\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_N) = \left(\prod_{i < j} f(r_{ij}) \right) \Phi_\alpha(\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_N) \quad , \quad (1)$$

where $f(r_{ij})$ incorporates the effects of short-range correlations between the particles, and Φ is a “simple” wave function, typically Hartree or Hartree-Fock, which also

incorporates internal quantum numbers such as spin, etc., which we collectively denote by the label “ α ”.

We now rewrite the product of correlation functions in terms of a sum, by means of an exponential representation,

$$\prod_{i < j} f(r_{ij}) = \exp \left(\sum_{i < j} u(r_{ij}) \right). \quad (2)$$

The sum in the exponent can be recognized as a special case of a general two-body operator. If we look at state-dependent correlations which involve internal degrees of freedom as well as relative coordinates, the correlated wave function is characterized by a Jastrow *operator*,

$$|\Psi\rangle = \exp(\hat{T}_2) |\Phi\rangle, \quad (3)$$

where the correlator \hat{T}_2 is a general two-body operator.

In the work of Nooijen [10] it has been argued that Eq. (3) represents the exact ground state for *any* two-body Hamiltonian. Although the examples studied recently [11, 12] provide numerical support for this method, they are neither rigorous nor transparent. This is partially because they involve realistic or semi-realistic applications, where the limitations and successes of the approach are less evident, and partially because, as in most quantum-chemistry problems, the results are largely perturbative, and thus do not provide a rigorous test of the general method.

We can easily derive the form of Jastrow’s method introduced by Nooijen for use in a finite configuration space. This starts from a general Jastrow operator in the form $\hat{T} = \sum_i t_i \hat{O}_i$, where \hat{O}_i is a complete set of two-body operators (we shall also include one-body operators in our analysis, but the principle remains the same). We label a complete normalised basis in the space by $|n\rangle$, with $|0\rangle = |\Phi\rangle$. The ground-state wave function is assumed to take the form

$$|\Psi\rangle = e^{\hat{T}} |\Phi\rangle, \quad \hat{H} |\Psi\rangle = E |\Psi\rangle \quad , \quad (4)$$

where $|\Phi\rangle$ is a simple reference state. One then evaluates the energy using a technique similar to that used in the coupled cluster method,

$$E = \langle \Phi | e^{-\hat{T}} \hat{H} e^{\hat{T}} | \Phi \rangle \quad . \quad (5)$$

We now use the fact that if $e^{\hat{T}} |0\rangle$ is an eigenstate of the Hamiltonian, it must satisfy the equations [13]

$$0 = \langle \Phi | e^{\hat{T}^\dagger} \hat{O}_i \hat{H} e^{\hat{T}} | \Phi \rangle - E \langle \Phi | e^{\hat{T}^\dagger} \hat{O}_i e^{\hat{T}} | \Phi \rangle \quad . \quad (6)$$

Actually, very similar equations follow from the variational approach to the Jastrow problems. By minimising the energy

$$E = \frac{\langle \Phi | e^{\hat{T}^\dagger} \hat{H} e^{\hat{T}} | \Phi \rangle}{\langle \Phi | e^{\hat{T}^\dagger} e^{\hat{T}} | \Phi \rangle} \quad , \quad (7)$$

and using hermiticity, we get Eq. (6), apart from the fact we must use Eq. (7) for E rather than the similarity transformed expression in Eq. (5).

Finally, one can use the energy relation (5) combined with completeness to write the basic equations (6) in the form derived in Nooijen's original work

$$\sum_{n \neq 0} \langle \Phi | e^{\hat{T}^\dagger} \hat{O}_i e^{\hat{T}} | n \rangle \langle n | e^{-\hat{T}} \hat{H} e^{\hat{T}} | \Phi \rangle = 0 \quad . \quad (8)$$

Since the number of equations in Eqs. (6,8) equals the number of unknowns in the operator \hat{T} , one might expect that these equations have a solution. Since the equations are highly non-linear, there is no general proof of this assertion, and its validity must depend on the nature of the Hamiltonian. One may argue that if $|\Phi\rangle$ is close to an eigenfunction of \hat{H} , a perturbative argument will show that there may well be a solution to the problem.

One of the reasons to believe that the Jastrow method may be exact is based on the technique of Euclidean filtering, as discussed in Refs. [10, 11]. This starts from the fact that the wave function

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = e^{-\hat{H}t} |\Phi\rangle / \langle \Phi | e^{-2\hat{H}t} | \Phi \rangle^{1/2} \quad (9)$$

approaches the exact one as $t \rightarrow \infty$, and that it is obviously a two-body correlated wave function for all *finite* t . If, in the limit $t \rightarrow \infty$, the wave function $|\psi(t)\rangle$ remains a two-body wave function, it must be a solution to Eqs. (6). For this argument to be correct, it is a necessary and sufficient condition that the set of two-body-correlated wave functions is complete. The non-trivial nature of such a statement can be seen from the fact that we try to find a set of finite parameters in the operator \hat{T} that can describe the same physics as obtained by the limit $t \rightarrow \infty$ in Eq. (9). Actually, what we shall do below is provide an indirect proof that the exact solution for a simple problem, which by the filtering argument must also be the limit of $|\psi(t)\rangle$, is *not* two-body correlated.

A standard test-bed for many-body calculations is the Lipkin model. This is a two-level model, where fermions can occupy either of two levels. If we denote by $a_{\pm,i}^\dagger$ the creation operator of a fermion in state i in either the upper (+) or lower level (−), the Hamiltonian of this model can be written in the form

$$\hat{H} = J_0 + \lambda (J_+^2 + J_-^2) \quad , \quad (10)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J_0 &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{\Omega} (a_{+,i}^\dagger a_{+,i} - a_{-,i}^\dagger a_{-,i}) \quad , \\ J_+ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\Omega} a_{+,i}^\dagger a_{-,i} \quad , \quad J_- = J_+^\dagger \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The fact that only $SU(2)$ generators appear means that we can diagonalise states within different irreps of this

algebra; here we shall concentrate on the one with $J = \Omega/2$. Hence we shall only be considering the states

$$|M = -J + n\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{(2J-n)!}{n!(2J)!}} (J_+)^n \prod_{i=1}^{2J} a_{-,i}^\dagger |0\rangle \quad . \quad (12)$$

There are only a small number of two-body operators in the relevant space, and most of these do not respect the $SU(2)$ dynamical symmetry of the Hamiltonian. This leads to the only allowed two-body operators being J_+^2 , J_-^2 , $J_+ J_-$, $J_- J_+$, and J_0^2 . The last three operators are overcomplete. Thus, when acting in the basis of Eq. (12,) all three of them correspond to a quadratic function in n . From the combination we can then construct a constant, linear and quadratic piece. The constant part is irrelevant for time-independent problems, and we only need the linear and quadratic parts. These can be reached with the operators J_0^2 and J_0 as well, which are what we shall use. The single-particle operator J_0 does not seem to play a key role. We see no *a priori* reason why this operator is irrelevant in the current calculation, apart from the fact that in the Jastrow method one-body operators correspond to a general modification of the single particle wave functions.

We now attempt to investigate perturbatively whether the result from Nooijen's method agrees with the exact result. We write

$$t_i = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} t_i^{(n)} \lambda^n \quad , \quad (13)$$

and use as our reference state $|\Phi\rangle = |M = -J\rangle$, the exact eigenstate for $\lambda = 0$. There are three ways to solve the problem. Firstly, we can solve Eqs. (5) and (8) order by order in λ , which we shall refer to as “the solution to Nooijen's equations”. Alternatively, we can either combine Eq. (8) with Eq. (7) to “solve the variational problem”, or we can write down the exact wave function in Rayleigh-Schrödinger perturbation theory, including all the arbitrary constants related to its normalisation, and require that $e^{\hat{T}} |0\rangle$ is equal to this wave function order by order in λ (equality of wave functions). All three approaches only involve matrix algebra, which can easily be done with a computer-algebra package. The result in each case is very instructive.

We look at these solutions as we vary J from 1 to 8, i.e., we look at even particle numbers only. The number of wave functions mixing in the ground state is easily seen to be $J+1$, so the number of parameters in the wave function changes from larger than the number of components, to much less than the number of components. Let us first study the equality of the wave functions.

For $J = 1, 2, 3$ we have no problems, and all indications are that the wave function is exact. For all the other cases investigated we can only have equality of the wave functions up to 7th order in λ . If we insert this

wave function in the energy expressions of Eqs. (5,7) we find that the energy for the similarity transformed result is accurate to the same order, whereas the variational estimate using the wave function is actually accurate to 14th order [14].

The solution to Nooijen's equations is equally illuminating. First of all there appears to be an enormous degeneracy to these equations. An obvious source for such degeneracy is in the choice of normalisation of the wave function. Indeed, using intermediate normalisation drastically reduces the number of independent variables, but it doesn't fully lift the degeneracy. We seem to be able to choose the coefficient of J_0 to equal zero, without any loss of generality. We can also impose the requirements that the coefficients of J_+^2 and J_-^2 are odd in λ , and those of J_0^2 even. [The problems cited above are totally independent of this choice, as has been checked for a few representative cases.] An interesting observation is that these equations have two solutions at order λ^8 , one of which leads to an inconsistent set of equations at the next order; the other continues. In the cases $J \leq 3$ it continues forever, as far as we can see, and when $J > 3$ the solutions terminate at order λ^{13} where we again get an inconsistent set of equations. Surprisingly, this leads to a more accurate energy than above, up to order λ^{12} (which is almost, but not quite, as accurate as the Jastrow method). Note, however, that the lack of a solution to Nooijen's equations gives rise to some problems. The deviations from zero may actually be hard to see if λ is small enough, which may be an indication that for almost perturbative problems this is not such a bad approach after all.

Finally we can also solve the variational equations. It comes as no surprise that, whatever the number of particles, we can solve this problem. When $J > 3$ the variational energy starts deviating from the exact result at order λ^{16} , as expected.

From the simple model discussed here we can draw some conclusions on the use of a Jastrow-like method in configuration space. We have disproven the idea that it can be generally exact, but to our surprise it seems to be exact when the number of parameters in the correlation operator is larger than the number of parameters in a general wave function. Due to the non-linearity of the method, this is already a highly nontrivial statement. When the method breaks down the wave function is still correct to seventh order in perturbation theory, which leads to a fourteenth-order accuracy for the Jastrow method. If we input this wave function into an estimate of the energy based on a similarity transform of the Hamiltonian, we get a result that is only correct to the same order as the wave function is correct. If we determine the coefficients by what we called "Nooijen's equations" the accuracy of the energy can be improved to twelfth order - only a little less accurate than

the benchmark variational estimate! Nonetheless, if one deals carefully with the enormous degeneracy, numerical solution of the equations can be a valid approximation to a many-body system. The problem is that there is only an approximate solution to the equations, and so the method only works if the residual interaction is small in one sense or another, as is often the case in quantum-chemical calculations.

In conclusion, on the one hand we have the disappointing result that the Jastrow wave function is not in general exact for many-body systems interacting via two-body forces, in contrast to recent claims to the contrary. However, the Jastrow wave functions proposed in the new method may well be so accurate that in numerical approximations they are sufficient to obtain energies of the accuracy required, for example, in quantum chemistry calculations. It is surprising that the energy estimate of Eq. (5) is *almost* as accurate as the optimal variational estimate of Eq. (7). We see no intrinsic reason for this. Nevertheless, even when the parameters are derived from a solution to Nooijen's equations, it is more accurate to use the variational estimate Eq. (7).

* Electronic address: Niels.Walet@umist.ac.uk

† Electronic address: R.F.Bishop@umist.ac.uk

- [1] J. W. Clark and E. Feenberg, Phys. Rev. **113**, 388 (1959); E. Feenberg, *Theory of Quantum Fluids* (Academic press, New York, 1969).
- [2] R. Jastrow, Phys. Rev. **98**, 1479 (1955).
- [3] D. M. Ceperley and M. H. Kalos, in *Monte Carlo Methods in Statistical Physics*, ed. K. Binder (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1979).
- [4] R. Gaudoin *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 115115 (2001).
- [5] J. W. Clark, in *Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics* **2**, ed. D. H. Wilkinson (Pergamon, Oxford, 1979).
- [6] K. E. Schmidt and S. Fantoni, Phys. Lett. B **446**, 99 (1999).
- [7] S. Fantoni and V. R. Pandharipande, Phys. Rev. C **37**, 1697 (1988).
- [8] R. F. Bishop, Theor. Chim. Acta **80**, 95 (1991); in: "*Microscopic Quantum Many-Body Theories and Their Application*," J. Navarro and A. Polls (eds.), Lecture Notes in Physics **510**, (Springer, Berlin, 1998), p. 1.
- [9] R. J. Bartlett, J. Phys. Chem. **93**, 1697 (1989).
- [10] M. Nooijen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2108 (2000).
- [11] P. Piecuch *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 113001 (2003).
- [12] T. Van Voorhis and M. Head-Gordon, J. Chem. Phys. **115**, 5033 (2001); M. Nooijen and V. Lotrich, J. Chem. Phys. **113**, 4549 (2000).
- [13] H. Nakatsuji, Phys. Rev. A **14**, 41 (1976); J. Chem. Phys. **115**, 2465 (2001); J. Chem. Phys. **116**, 1811 (2002).
- [14] It is quite straightforward to understand this using a standard perturbative argument which can be used to show that the deviation of the energy is quadratic in any small fluctuation around the exact solution.