

An algorithm for computing perturbation series of dynamical mean field theory

Corentin Bertrand,^{1,*} Michel Ferrero,^{2,3} and Olivier Parcollet^{1,4}

¹*Center for Computational Quantum Physics, Flatiron Institute, 162 5th Avenue, New York, NY 10010, USA*

²*CPHT, CNRS, Ecole Polytechnique, Institut Polytechnique de Paris, 91128 Palaiseau, France*

³*Collège de France, Université PSL, 11 place Marcelin Berthelot, 75005 Paris, France*

⁴*Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS, CEA, Institut de Physique Théorique, 91191, Gif-sur-Yvette, France*

(Dated: October 2, 2024)

We show how to use diagrammatic techniques to compute the weak-coupling perturbation series of the self-consistent solution to a Dynamical Mean Field Theory (DMFT) problem. This approach constitutes an alternative to using diagrammatic techniques directly as an impurity solver. It allows one to bypass the need of multiple perturbative series resummations within the DMFT self-consistency loop. It can be applied at or out of equilibrium, with any diagrammatic formalism, such as real times, imaginary times, or Matsubara frequencies formalisms. As a proof of principle, we illustrate our method with the half-filled Hubbard model on the Bethe lattice in the DMFT approximation, using Quantum Quasi-Monte Carlo (QPMC) to obtain the impurity perturbation series on the real time axis.

I. INTRODUCTION

Solving models of strongly correlated electrons on a lattice is notoriously difficult, both analytically and numerically. Embedding techniques, such as Dynamical Mean Field Theory (DMFT) [1–3] reduce the full lattice problem to a self-consistent quantum impurity problem, which is significantly simpler to solve. At equilibrium, efficient numerical impurity solvers have been developed using the imaginary time or Matsubara frequencies formalism, such as various continuous time quantum Monte Carlo algorithms [4]. However, there is an increasing demand for solvers using a real time formalism, for two main reasons. First, experimentally accessible quantities, such as the spectral function or the optical conductivity lie on the real frequency axis, and their evaluation from Matsubara frequencies is an ill-conditioned problem [5], which requires extremely precise data [6]. Second, non-equilibrium physics is only accessible from the real time axis, and recent experimental developments have opened important questions in this field, e.g. non-equilibrium phases transitions in strongly correlated materials [7, 8] or high temperature transport in strange metals [9, 10]. While approximate real-time solvers have been used for embedding techniques for some years [11], only a few of them are controlled, including tensor network techniques [12, 13], the inchworm algorithm [14–17] and real-time diagrammatic methods [18–23].

In this work, we focus on diagrammatic methods, and more specifically the weak coupling diagrammatic expansion. Perturbative techniques have recently made remarkable progresses in this area, in two directions: the precise computation of relatively high perturbation orders [18, 20–22], and methods to sum the perturbative series into strong coupling regimes, beyond their weak coupling radius of convergence [18, 19]. Tensor networks

(tensor cross interpolation) are for example now able to compute up to 30 perturbation orders for a simple quantum dot model, with a much faster convergence than previous Monte Carlo, or quasi-Monte Carlo techniques [22]. Many approaches have been discussed to sum the series, see e.g. conformal transformations [18, 19, 24] or Padé approximants [21, 25] and generalizations [24], or the more recent cross-extrapolation technique [26]. While they are in some cases very successful [19, 26], they have not yet been made robust enough to make a black box algorithm suitable for use in a self-consistent DMFT loop. As a result, the application of these diagrammatic techniques as DMFT impurity solvers has proven difficult until now.

In this work, we propose to address this issue from another angle. We present a simple algorithm to compute the perturbation series of the DMFT *self-consistent solution* order by order, instead of using the diagrammatic approach just as an impurity solver for a fixed bath. Given any weak coupling diagrammatic technique for the quantum impurity model, we show how to extend it to simultaneously solve the impurity model and the DMFT self-consistency condition, order by order. This brings several advantages. First, we only need to perform one resummation of the perturbative series, eliminating the need for a series resummation at each DMFT iteration. Second, it allows for a direct study of the analytical structure of the self-consistent solution, which contains for instance information on phase transitions through the location of singularities.

This paper is organized as follows. Section II recalls the basic DMFT equations and some notations. Sec. III describes the algorithm. As a proof of principle, we then illustrate it on the Hubbard model in the Bethe lattice in equilibrium in Sec. IV. Finally we conclude in Sec. V.

* corentin.bertrand@eviden.com

II. DMFT EQUATIONS

We consider a DMFT problem, described as the combination of an impurity problem and a self-consistency relation between the impurity and its bath. We denote by U the interaction on the impurity, by G the Green function of the impurity, and \mathcal{G} the Weiss field [1], i.e. the Green function of the impurity for $U = 0$. The impurity self-energy Σ is defined from the Dyson equation $\Sigma \equiv \mathcal{G}^{-1} - G^{-1}$. We will also use the improved estimator $F \equiv \Sigma G$ [27]. These quantities (G , \mathcal{G} , F and Σ) may be functions of Matsubara frequencies, or real frequencies and indices representing branches of the Keldysh contour, depending on which formalism is preferred. They are in general matrix-valued.

We assume that we have a impurity solver that, given the Weiss field \mathcal{G} , produces the perturbative expansion of G , F or Σ . To be specific, we will assume here that it produces the improved estimator F . We can use e.g. Monte Carlo [18, 19, 21], quasi-Monte Carlo [20] or tensor cross interpolation [22]. In this work, we will use quasi-Monte Carlo.

The improved estimator F is a functional of \mathcal{G} and a series in U . It is the sum of Feynman diagrams with each vertex contributing a factor U and with the bare propagator \mathcal{G} . Grouping the diagrams with the same number n of vertices into functionals $\mathcal{I}_n[\mathcal{G}]$ yields

$$F = \sum_{n \geq 1} U^n \mathcal{I}_n[\mathcal{G}] \quad (1)$$

Note that $\mathcal{I}_0 = 0$, since F has no order zero contribution by definition (the same is true for the self-energy). This will be crucial in the following.

The DMFT self-consistency condition relates the Weiss field to the impurity F (or the self-energy Σ). It can be written as a functional \mathcal{S} such that

$$\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{S}[F]. \quad (2)$$

\mathcal{S} depends on the details of the non-interacting model.

The system of equations formed by (1) and (2) defines the DMFT problem to solve. We wish to solve this problem order-by-order in U , i.e. to compute the perturbation series for $F(U)$ and $\mathcal{G}(U)$:

$$\mathcal{G}(U) = \sum_{n \geq 0} U^n \mathcal{G}_n \quad (3a)$$

$$F(U) = \sum_{n \geq 1} U^n F_n \quad (3b)$$

From F and \mathcal{G} , the impurity Green function is obtained using $G(U) = \mathcal{G}(U)(F(U)+1)$. We also define the partial sums:

$$\mathcal{G}^{(m)}(U) \equiv \sum_{n=0}^m U^n \mathcal{G}_n \quad (4a)$$

$$F^{(m)}(U) \equiv \sum_{n=1}^m U^n F_n \quad (4b)$$

Throughout the rest of the paper we will use $[\dots]_m$ to denote the order m coefficient of the series between brackets.

III. ALGORITHM

We *simultaneously* compute the perturbation series of F and \mathcal{G} , order by order, starting from the knowledge of \mathcal{G}_0 , up to some order N . Our method directly produces the exact perturbative solution of the self-consistent DMFT solution: there is no iteration in the usual DMFT sense.

A. Mathematical preliminaries

Our method relies on the ability to extract the coefficient of a polynomial of known maximum degree from its evaluations on roots of unity in the complex plane.

Consider a polynomial P of degree at most d

$$P(U) = \sum_{k=0}^d P_k U^k \quad (5)$$

and define the root of unity

$$\xi_d = \exp\left(\frac{2i\pi}{d+1}\right). \quad (6)$$

The coefficients P_k of P are related to the evaluation of P on the $d+1$ roots of unity $1, \xi_d, \xi_d^2, \dots, \xi_d^d$ by an inverse Discrete Fourier Transform (DFT):

$$P_k = \frac{1}{d+1} \sum_{l=0}^d P(\xi_d^l) \xi_d^{-kl} \quad (7)$$

For numerical stability, it may be advantageous to evaluate P at points with a modulus lower or higher than one. This is done by rescaling the complex plane. Introducing a scaling factor $r > 0$, observe that $P(U)$ is also a polynomial in the variable $V = U/r$ with coefficients $r^k P_k$. Using the same relation on the transformed polynomial leads to

$$P_k = \frac{r^{-k}}{(d+1)} \sum_{l=0}^d P(r\xi_d^l) \xi_d^{-kl} \quad (8)$$

Here, P is evaluated on the circle of radius r .

B. Algorithm

We work recursively on the order N of the expansion of \mathcal{G} and F . At step N , we know $\mathcal{G}_0, \dots, \mathcal{G}_{N-1}$ and F_1, \dots, F_{N-1} and we compute F_N and \mathcal{G}_N .

1. Computing F_N

We start by using Eq. (1) to get F_N . Extracting the order N coefficient of Eq. (1) gives a finite sum:

$$F_N = \sum_{n=1}^N [\mathcal{I}_n[\mathcal{G}(U)]]_{N-n} \quad (9)$$

Since $\mathcal{I}_n[\mathcal{G}(U)]$ is a sum of diagrams of finite order, it is a polynomial in the propagator $\mathcal{G}(U)$ whose coefficients are independent of U . As such, once seen as a polynomial in U , its coefficient in U^{N-n} cannot involve \mathcal{G}_k for $k > N - n$. As a result, we can replace $\mathcal{G}(U)$ by its partial sum $\mathcal{G}^{(N-n)}(U)$:

$$[\mathcal{I}_n[\mathcal{G}(U)]]_{N-n} = \left[\mathcal{I}_n \left[\mathcal{G}^{(N-n)}(U) \right] \right]_{N-n} \quad (10)$$

This shows that F_N can be obtained from the knowledge of $\mathcal{G}_0, \dots, \mathcal{G}_{N-1}$ only. Crucially, F_N does not depend on \mathcal{G}_N , as its diagrams contain at least one vertex (the same is true for the self-energy).

The right-hand side of Eq. (10) is evaluated using the relation of Sec. III A. $\mathcal{I}_n[\mathcal{G}^{(N-n)}(U)]$ is indeed a polynomial in U (since it is a polynomial in the propagator $\mathcal{G}^{(N-n)}(U)$, which itself is a polynomial in U). Moreover, order n diagrams for F have $2n$ propagators¹, and each contributes a power in U up to $N - n$. So $\mathcal{I}_n[\mathcal{G}^{(N-n)}(U)]$ is a polynomial in U of degree at most $d_{n,N} \equiv 2n(N - n)$.

Each term of Eq. (9) can therefore be obtained by applying the result of Sec. III A. This gives an explicit formula for F_N :

$$F_N = \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{r^{-(N-n)}}{d_{n,N} + 1} \sum_{l=0}^{d_{n,N}} \mathcal{I}_n \left[\mathcal{G}^{(N-n)}(r\xi_{d_{n,N}}^l) \right] \xi_{d_{n,N}}^{-(N-n)l} \quad (11)$$

for any choice of $r > 0$. The root of unity method avoids the need of enumerating all diagrams contributing to \mathcal{I}_n , and then looking up all choices of propagators among $\{\mathcal{G}_0, \dots, U^{N-n}\mathcal{G}_{N-n}\}$ that produce a contribution proportional to U^{N-n} . Here, we perform this selection analytically, without enumerating diagrams, in a way that is independent on how \mathcal{I}_n is computed (enumerating diagrams explicitly, or using determinants algorithms). Finally, let us emphasize that for each order, the Weiss field is a polynomial in U , so its evaluation at complex U is well defined.

2. Computing \mathcal{G}_N

We now compute \mathcal{G}_N from the self-consistency condition Eq. (2). Since the form of the self-consistency condition \mathcal{S} depends on the DMFT problem under study, and

on the formalism (real, imaginary, Matsubara, etc) used, each case should be derived separately.

However, we will assume that the self-consistency condition does not depend on U , and $\mathcal{S}[F]$ is analytic around $F = 0$. We are not aware of DMFT problems that break these assumptions. Therefore, we have

$$\mathcal{G}_N = \left[\mathcal{S} \left[F^{(N)} \right] \right]_N. \quad (12)$$

Therefore, computing \mathcal{G}_N requires only the knowledge of F_1, \dots, F_N , which we obtained previously.

We now give a more precise formulation in two usual cases: a Bravais lattice and the Bethe lattice, in a real frequency formalism, at equilibrium, and limiting ourselves to single-site DMFT for simplicity. Equilibrium implies it is sufficient to write the self-consistency condition for the retarded quantities. Generalization to non-equilibrium with the Keldysh formalism is straightforward.

In a Bravais lattice, using the non-interacting Hamiltonian in momentum space $h_0(\mathbf{k})$, a self-consistency condition relates the retarded Weiss function with the retarded self-energy (in real frequencies):

$$\mathcal{G} = \left[\left(\int_{\text{BZ}} d\mathbf{k} [\omega + \mu - h_0(\mathbf{k}) - \Sigma]^{-1} \right)^{-1} + \Sigma \right]^{-1} \quad (13)$$

where \int_{BZ} denotes the normalized integral over the first Brillouin Zone. To see how to obtain \mathcal{G}_N , let's break down Eq. (13) as

$$\mathcal{G} = [G^{-1} + \Sigma]^{-1} \quad (14a)$$

$$G = \int_{\text{BZ}} d\mathbf{k} g(\mathbf{k}) \quad (14b)$$

$$g(\mathbf{k}) = [\omega + \mu - h_0(\mathbf{k}) - \Sigma]^{-1} \quad (14c)$$

Let us assume that we already have G_0, \dots, G_{N-1} and $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_{N-1}$. Σ_N is then computed by developing $\Sigma = FG^{-1}$, using $G_0 = \mathcal{G}_0$:

$$\Sigma_N = \left(F_N - \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \Sigma_k G_{N-k} \right) \mathcal{G}_0^{-1} \quad (15)$$

Using Eq. (14c), we get

$$g_N(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} g_k(\mathbf{k}) \Sigma_{N-k} g_0(\mathbf{k}) \quad (16)$$

with $g_0(\mathbf{k}) = [\omega + \mu - h_0(\mathbf{k})]^{-1}$. From Eq. (14b) we then obtain

$$G_N = \int_{\text{BZ}} d\mathbf{k} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} g_k(\mathbf{k}) \Sigma_{N-k} g_0(\mathbf{k}) \quad (17)$$

We now have Σ and G up to order N , which finally gives \mathcal{G}_N using Eq. (14a).

¹ Assuming the interaction vertex is four-legged.

In the Bethe lattice, developing the self-consistency condition order by order leads to this explicit recursive relation (again, between retarded quantities):

$$\mathcal{G}_N = \frac{t^2}{\omega + \mu - 2t^2\mathcal{G}_0} \left[\left(\mathcal{G}^{(N-1)} \right)^2 \left(1 + F^{(N)} \right) \right]_N \quad (18)$$

A derivation is given in App. A.

C. Computational cost

Most of the computational cost of the algorithm originates from \mathcal{I}_n , i.e. the perturbative solution of the impurity problem. For a standalone impurity problem, obtaining the perturbation series for F requires one call to \mathcal{I}_n for each order n . Let us now compute the number of calls to \mathcal{I}_n needed to obtain the series of DMFT solution for F .

During the N th step of our algorithm (i.e. the step computing \mathcal{G}_N and F_N), calls to every \mathcal{I}_n for $n = 1, \dots, N$ must be made. For a given n , \mathcal{I}_n is called $d_{n,N} + 1 = 2n(N - n) + 1$ times. Cumulating over all steps up to N_{\max} , \mathcal{I}_n must be called a total number of times

$$\sum_{N=n}^{N_{\max}} [2n(N - n) + 1] = (1 + n(N_{\max} - n))(N_{\max} - n + 1) \quad (19)$$

This number of calls is illustrated in Fig. 1 upper panel. The total number of calls to \mathcal{I}_n , for a fixed n , is thus quadratic in N_{\max} .

It is expected that a call to \mathcal{I}_n has a complexity in time that increases exponentially with n , as is the case for example using Quantum Quasi-Monte Carlo (QQMC) [20] or CDet [28]. We illustrate the computational cost, making the simplified assumption that a call to \mathcal{I}_n costs 2^n , and ignoring any potential parallelization, in Fig. 1 lower panel. The overall cost is exponential in N_{\max} , as expected.

Surprisingly, the computation time is not dominated by the last order, but by the last few orders before it. Indeed $\mathcal{I}_{N_{\max}}$ is called only once, because diagrams of order N_{\max} with bare propagators \mathcal{G}_0 already contribute to the power $U^{N_{\max}}$, so that higher orders in the propagator are not needed. The coefficient extraction is then trivial and a single root of unity is used.

Many calls to \mathcal{I}_n are independent. Indeed, evaluation over each set of roots of unity form a batch of independent calculations. Therefore, there is an opportunity for parallelization, especially in the case the impurity solver is not easily made parallel. In our illustration of Sec. IV we use QQMC, which is already parallel, so we do not make use of this opportunity.




Figure 1. Upper panel: number of calls to the impurity solver at perturbation order n so as to compute the DMFT solution up to order N_{\max} (Eq. (19)). Lower panel: computational cost assuming a call to \mathcal{I}_n costs 2^n . Most of the cost lies in the last few orders. The overall cost is exponential in N_{\max} , as expected.

D. Precaution against the sign/phase problem

In the real or imaginary times formalism, computing \mathcal{I}_n with diagrammatic Monte Carlo generally implies high dimensional integrals. For example, algorithms recently developed for the real-time Keldysh formalism [18–20, 22] (including QQMC [20] which we employ in Sec. IV) compute \mathcal{I}_n by summing an n -dimensional integral:

$$\mathcal{I}_n[\mathcal{G}] = \int d\mathbf{u} \mathcal{F}_n[\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{u}] \quad (20)$$

Here the integral runs over the hypercube $[0, t_M]^n$ with a large t_M . Definitions of \mathcal{F}_n can be found in Refs. [21, 29] for example.

It is a legitimate concern that the introduction of complex roots of unity and nonphysical Weiss functions may bring a sign or phase problem to the evaluation of such integrals. In addition, large cancellations may occur when taking the inverse DFT, bringing in more difficulties to its numerical evaluation.

These problems can be avoided by performing the DFT under the integral. This means that instead of extracting the coefficients of the integral $\mathcal{I}_n[\mathcal{G}(U)]$, we extract those of the integrand $\mathcal{F}_n[\mathcal{G}(U), \mathbf{u}]$. This way, the integrand is the same as if we selected the correct diagrams from an exhaustive enumeration, so that no additional sign/phase problem is introduced by the coefficient extraction tech-

nique.

IV. ILLUSTRATION ON THE BETHE LATTICE

As a proof of principle, we illustrate our algorithm on the DMFT solution of the half-filled equilibrium Hubbard model on the Bethe lattice. As we already mentioned however, the same algorithm can be applied to more realistic lattices, and out of equilibrium.

A. Model

We consider the single band Fermi-Hubbard model on the Bethe lattice, whose Hamiltonian is

$$H = H_0 + UH_{\text{int}} \quad (21a)$$

$$H_0 = -\mu \sum_i \sum_{\sigma} n_{i,\sigma} - t \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \sum_{\sigma} c_{i,\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{j,\sigma} \quad (21b)$$

$$H_{\text{int}} = \sum_i (n_{i\uparrow} - 1/2)(n_{i\downarrow} - 1/2) \quad (21c)$$

where $c_{i,\sigma}$ and $c_{i,\sigma}^{\dagger}$ are respectively the annihilation and creation operators for an electron of spin σ on site i , $n_{i,\sigma} = c_{i,\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{i,\sigma}$ is the number operator, $\mu = 0$ is the chemical potential at half-filling, t the hopping energy, $\langle i, j \rangle$ denotes all pairs of neighboring sites. U is the perturbative parameter. We work in unit of the hopping i.e. $t = 1$.

In the non-interacting case, the self-consistency condition leads to a semi-circular density of states with half-bandwidth $D = 2t$. In order to avoid the numerical issue of having singular band edges we add a weak dissipation term $\eta = t \times 10^{-2}$ on every site of the lattice. Equivalently, we add a small imaginary self-energy to the chemical potential, $\mu \rightarrow \mu + i\eta$, which gives the following non-interacting retarded Weiss function [1]:

$$\mathcal{G}_0(\omega) = \begin{cases} \omega + i\eta + \sqrt{(\omega + i\eta)^2 - D^2}, & \omega < -D, \\ \omega + i\eta - i\sqrt{D^2 - (\omega + i\eta)^2}, & |\omega| \leq D, \\ \omega + i\eta - \sqrt{(\omega + i\eta)^2 - D^2}, & \omega > D. \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

The other (Keldysh) components are obtained from equilibrium fluctuation-dissipation relations.

B. Results: perturbative series

We apply our algorithm to compute the perturbation series of the corresponding single-site DMFT problem. We work in real frequencies and we use QPMC [21] to compute \mathcal{I}_n and obtain the perturbation series of the (retarded) F . We apply the self-consistency condition between F and the Weiss function from Eq. (18). Details on the implementation and error estimation can be found in App. B.




Figure 2. Perturbation series of the DMFT self-energy for the Hubbard model on the Bethe lattice at half filling. Negative frequencies can be deduced from particle-hole symmetry and odd orders are zero. Shaded areas are error bars. The singular behavior at $\omega = D$ is a numerical artifact (see main text).

Figure 2 shows the perturbation series of the self-energy of the DMFT solution, up to order 8. The temperature is $T = t/5$. The shaded areas represent integration error bars, using the standard randomized quasi-Monte Carlo approach [20, 30, 31].

The sharp features appearing at the band edge $\omega = D$ are numerical artifacts that we explain as follows. In the $\eta = 0$ case, the non-interacting Green function \mathcal{G}_0 has singularities at the band edges. At small $U > 0$ however, the Green function G and the Weiss function \mathcal{G} are smooth in ω . Their perturbation coefficients must then have singularities at the band edges. On the other hand, the self-energy is zero at $U = 0$ and smooth at small $U > 0$, so its perturbation series has no such singularities. As a result, in the Dyson equation the singularities of G and \mathcal{G} must cancel each other. The band edge features of Fig. 2 are numerical inaccuracies in this cancellation between very large values. For a small $\eta > 0$, singularities are replaced with high peaks, and similar cancellations between large values occurs.




Figure 3. Height of the quasiparticle peak as a function of interaction strength (plain lines) compared to NRG results from Ref. [27] (dashed lines). Even with as few as 6 orders of perturbation, the critical U at which the quasiparticle peak vanishes can be located within an error bar $\sim 0.1D$. The two lowest temperatures (red and purple) are below the critical temperature.

C. Metallic solution

We resum the perturbative expansion, starting from $U = 0$, in the metallic DMFT solution, and we compare our result to a numerically exact Numerical Renormalization Group (NRG) solution of Bulla et al. [27].

In Figure 3, we present the quasiparticle peak height, defined as the spectral function at the Fermi level:

$$A(\omega = 0) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im}[G(\omega = 0)] \quad (23)$$

as a function of U/D . The series for $A(\omega = 0)$ was computed up to order 6 and resummed using Padé approximants [25]. We present different temperatures, above (blue, orange and green lines) and below (red and purple lines) the DMFT critical temperature $T_c \approx 0.04D$, and compare them to the NRG calculation [27].

Above T_c , as U increases, the quasiparticle peak height drops to zero. The inflection point locates the crossover region between metal and insulator. Our results match well the NRG calculations until the crossover region. There, the resummed series keep the same curvature and end up changing sign. The point where $A(\omega = 0)$ becomes negative give an approximate location of the crossover region, accurate within $\sim 0.1D$. Below T_c , the crossover becomes a phase transition, and the quasiparticle height should vanish at $U = U_{c2}(T)$. Our result is still accurate below the transition, and gives the location of U_{c2} with an error of about $0.1D$ (red line).

This benchmark shows that, even with only 6 orders in perturbation theory (note that odd orders are zero by symmetry), the direct perturbative expansion of the

DMFT solution, when properly resummed, has the potential to describe the metallic solution, up to $U \approx U_{c2}$, and the related finite temperature crossovers. We expect that the precision could be significantly improved by using our method with more sophisticated perturbative impurity solver [22], which would yield more perturbative orders and a higher precision.

V. CONCLUSION

We presented a simple algorithm to extend any weak coupling diagrammatic technique for quantum impurity model to directly compute, order by order, the perturbative expansion of a DMFT solution, by expanding simultaneously the solution of the impurity solver and the self-consistency condition. Our approach constitutes an alternative to the straightforward application of diagrammatic technique to the impurity solver, at fixed bath. It avoids the need of resummation of the perturbative series within the DMFT self-consistency iterations. The approach is independent of the type of weak coupling diagrammatic impurity solver used, be it in real times, real or Matsubara frequencies, at or out of equilibrium. It can also be applied directly to several flavors of embedding techniques, such as cluster DMFT or the Dynamical Cluster Approximation (DCA) [32]. We benchmarked it on an explicit computation of a standard DMFT solution on the Bethe lattice in equilibrium.

This work is mainly a proof of concept, and its applications still have to be developed further, for example for out-of-equilibrium solutions of DMFT for which solvers are much less developed than their equilibrium counterparts. At high temperature, it could provides a controlled way to study crossover lines above quantum critical points, or the problem of transport in high temperature strange metals [9, 10]. Indeed, the physics far from a phase transition is a natural target for diagrammatic techniques. Furthermore, the analytical structure of the solution of an embedding theory can be studied directly from the perturbative expansion. In particular, the location of singularities close to or on the real axis of U provides indications about crossovers or phase transitions, even with a low number of orders.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Flatiron Institute is a division of the Simons Foundation.

Appendix A: Order-by-order self-consistency condition on the Bethe lattice

Here we derive the order-by-order self-consistency condition for single-site DMFT in the Bethe lattice. We work

in real frequencies. We will use $[\dots]_N$ to denote the N th order coefficient of the series enclosed in brackets.

Denoting μ the chemical potential and t the hopping energy, the self-consistency condition reads

$$\mathcal{G} = [\omega + \mu - t^2 \mathcal{G}(F + 1)]^{-1}. \quad (\text{A1})$$

We want to isolate \mathcal{G}_N and write it as a function of F_1, \dots, F_N and $\mathcal{G}_0, \dots, \mathcal{G}_{N-1}$.

Extracting the order N coefficient gives

$$(\omega + \mu)\mathcal{G}_N = t^2 [\mathcal{G}^2]_N + t^2 [\mathcal{G}^2 F]_N \quad (\text{A2})$$

The two terms on the right-hand side can be written as

$$[\mathcal{G}^2]_N = 2\mathcal{G}_0\mathcal{G}_N + \left[\left(\mathcal{G}^{(N-1)} \right)^2 \right]_N \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$[\mathcal{G}^2 F]_N = \left[\left(\mathcal{G}^{(N-1)} \right)^2 \left(F^{(N)} \right) \right]_N \quad (\text{A4})$$

In the last line we used the fact that the $F_0 = 0$.

It is now easy to isolate \mathcal{G}_N , which finally gives

$$\mathcal{G}_N = \frac{t^2}{\omega + \mu - 2t^2\mathcal{G}_0} \left[\left(\mathcal{G}^{(N-1)} \right)^2 \left(1 + F^{(N)} \right) \right]_N \quad (\text{A5})$$

Note that the denominator $\omega + \mu - 2t^2\mathcal{G}_0 = \sqrt{(\omega + \mu)^2 - 4t^2}$ (using Eq. (A1) at $U = 0$). We therefore expect singular behavior at the band edges $\omega = -\mu \pm 2t$.

Appendix B: Implementation details

In this appendix, we present some implementation details for the results of Sec. IV.

a. Impurity solver We used the “full kernel” QQMC algorithm of Ref. 21 to obtain perturbation series of (retarded) F in real times. We use a maximum integration time $t_M = 10^3$. Very little modifications are needed to the original implementation, as only the integrand is changed. The warping technique and the model function are defined in the same way, with the updated integrand. We found that the model function is as good at capturing the new integrand as the original one, and we witness an improved convergence scaling when compared to Monte Carlo.

Integration errors are estimated using the standard randomized quasi-Monte Carlo approach [20, 30, 31]. In this work we use $N_{\text{sh}} = 100$ randomly shifted Sobol’ sequences. We estimate the integration error by $\sigma/\sqrt{N_{\text{sh}}}$ with σ the standard deviation over the N_{sh} samples. Propagation of error from one order to the next is not taken into account, but it has been checked that it is negligible compared to the integration error at current order.

b. Self-consistency We apply the self-consistency condition between the retarded F and Weiss function in real frequencies from Eq. (18), and derived in App. A. Lesser and greater Weiss functions are obtained from the retarded one using fluctuation-dissipation relations. The fast Fourier transform algorithm is used to switch back and forth between real times and real frequencies.

c. Resummation The quasiparticle peak heights shown in Fig. 3 are obtained from the perturbation series of the spectral weight up to order 6, using Padé approximants. For all temperatures except the highest ($T/D = 0.147$), the (2, 1) and (1, 2) approximants in the variable U^2 , are shown and match almost perfectly within the interaction range displayed. For the highest temperature, we had to fall back to the (1, 1) approximant.

-
- [1] A. Georges, G. Kotliar, W. Krauth, and M. J. Rozenberg, Dynamical mean-field theory of strongly correlated fermion systems and the limit of infinite dimensions, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **68**, 13 (1996).
- [2] G. Kotliar, S. Y. Savrasov, K. Haule, V. S. Oudovenko, O. Parcollet, and C. A. Marianetti, Electronic structure calculations with dynamical mean-field theory, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **78**, 865 (2006).
- [3] A. Georges, The beauty of impurities: Two revivals of Friedel’s virtual bound-state concept, *Comptes Rendus Physique* **17**, 430 (2016).
- [4] E. Gull, A. J. Millis, A. I. Lichtenstein, A. N. Rubtsov, M. Troyer, and P. Werner, Continuous-time Monte Carlo methods for quantum impurity models, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **83**, 349 (2011).
- [5] M. Jarrell and J. E. Gubernatis, Bayesian inference and the analytic continuation of imaginary-time quantum Monte Carlo data, *Physics Reports* **269**, 133 (1996).
- [6] J. Fei, C.-N. Yeh, and E. Gull, Nevanlinna analytical continuation, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 056402 (2021).
- [7] C. Giannetti, M. Capone, D. Fausti, M. Fabrizio, F. Parmigiani, and D. Mihailovic, Ultrafast optical spectroscopy of strongly correlated materials and high-temperature superconductors: A non-equilibrium approach, *Advances in Physics* **65**, 58 (2016).
- [8] H. Hedayat, C. J. Sayers, A. Ceraso, J. van Wezel, S. R. Clark, C. Dallera, G. Cerullo, E. D. Como, and E. Carpene, Investigation of the non-equilibrium state of strongly correlated materials by complementary ultrafast spectroscopy techniques, *New Journal of Physics* **23**, 033025 (2021).
- [9] P. T. Brown, D. Mitra, E. Guardado-Sanchez, R. Nourafkan, A. Reymbaut, C.-D. Hébert, S. Bergeron, A.-M. S. Tremblay, J. Kokalj, D. A. Huse, P. Schauf,

- and W. S. Bakr, Bad metallic transport in a cold atom Fermi-Hubbard system, *Science* **363**, 379 (2019).
- [10] E. W. Huang, R. Sheppard, B. Moritz, and T. P. Devereaux, Strange metallicity in the doped Hubbard model, *Science* **366**, 987 (2019).
- [11] H. Aoki, N. Tsuji, M. Eckstein, M. Kollar, T. Oka, and P. Werner, Nonequilibrium dynamical mean-field theory and its applications, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **86**, 779 (2014).
- [12] D. Bauernfeind, M. Zingl, R. Triebl, M. Aichhorn, and H. G. Evertz, Fork tensor-product states: Efficient multiorbital real-time DMFT solver, *Phys. Rev. X* **7**, 031013 (2017).
- [13] X. Cao, Y. Lu, E. M. Stoudenmire, and O. Parcollet, Dynamical correlation functions from complex time evolution, *Phys. Rev. B* **109**, 235110 (2024).
- [14] G. Cohen, E. Gull, D. R. Reichman, and A. J. Millis, Taming the dynamical sign problem in real-time evolution of quantum many-body problems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 266802 (2015).
- [15] A. Erpenbeck, E. Gull, and G. Cohen, Quantum Monte Carlo in the steady-state, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, 186301 (2022), [arXiv:2207.07547 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.07547).
- [16] D. Goldberger, Y. Fridman, E. Gull, E. Eidelstein, and G. Cohen, Dynamical mean field theory of the bilayer Hubbard model with inchworm Monte Carlo, *Phys. Rev. B* **109**, 085133 (2024).
- [17] A. Erpenbeck, T. Blommel, L. Zhang, W.-T. Lin, G. Cohen, and E. Gull, Steady-state properties of multi-orbital systems using quantum Monte Carlo, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **161**, 094104 (2024).
- [18] R. E. V. Profumo, C. Groth, L. Messio, O. Parcollet, and X. Waintal, Quantum Monte Carlo for correlated out-of-equilibrium nanoelectronic devices, *Phys. Rev. B* **91**, 245154 (2015).
- [19] C. Bertrand, S. Florens, O. Parcollet, and X. Waintal, Reconstructing nonequilibrium regimes of quantum many-body systems from the analytical structure of perturbative expansions, *Phys. Rev. X* **9**, 041008 (2019), [arXiv:1903.11646](https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.11646).
- [20] M. Maćek, P. T. Dumitrescu, C. Bertrand, B. Triggs, O. Parcollet, and X. Waintal, Quantum quasi-Monte Carlo technique for many-body perturbative expansions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 047702 (2020).
- [21] C. Bertrand, D. Bauernfeind, P. T. Dumitrescu, M. Maćek, X. Waintal, and O. Parcollet, Quantum quasi-Monte Carlo algorithm for out-of-equilibrium Green functions at long times, *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, 155104 (2021).
- [22] Y. Núñez Fernández, M. Jeannin, P. T. Dumitrescu, T. Kloss, J. Kaye, O. Parcollet, and X. Waintal, Learning Feynman diagrams with tensor trains, *Phys. Rev. X* **12**, 041018 (2022).
- [23] M. Vanhovecke and M. Schirò, Diagrammatic Monte Carlo for dissipative quantum impurity models, *Phys. Rev. B* **109**, 125125 (2024).
- [24] F. Šimkovic IV and E. Kozik, Determinant Monte Carlo for irreducible Feynman diagrams in the strongly correlated regime, *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 121102(R) (2019).
- [25] G. Baker and P. Graves-Morris, *Padé Approximants*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications (Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- [26] M. Jeannin, Y. Núñez Fernández, T. Kloss, O. Parcollet, and X. Waintal, Cross-extrapolation reconstruction of low-rank functions and application to quantum many-body observables in the strong coupling regime, *Phys. Rev. B* **110**, 035124 (2024).
- [27] R. Bulla, T. A. Costi, and D. Vollhardt, Finite-temperature numerical renormalization group study of the Mott transition, *Physical Review B* **64**, 045103 (2001).
- [28] R. Rossi, Determinant diagrammatic Monte Carlo algorithm in the thermodynamic limit, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 045701 (2017).
- [29] C. Bertrand, O. Parcollet, A. Maillard, and X. Waintal, A quantum Monte Carlo algorithm for out-of-equilibrium Green's functions at long times, *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 125129 (2019), [1903.11636](https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.11636).
- [30] J. Dick, F. Y. Kuo, and I. H. Sloan, High-dimensional integration: The quasi-Monte Carlo way, *Acta Numerica* **22**, 133 (2013).
- [31] P. L'Ecuyer, Randomized quasi-Monte Carlo: An introduction for practitioners, in *Monte Carlo and Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods*, edited by A. B. Owen and P. W. Glynn (Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2018) pp. 29–52.
- [32] T. Maier, M. Jarrell, T. Pruschke, and M. H. Hettler, Quantum cluster theories, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **77**, 1027 (2005).