DFG-Schwerpunktprogramm 1324

Multiconfigurational time-dependent Hartree method for describing particle loss due to absorbing boundary conditions

S. Kvaal

DFG-Schwerpunktprogramm 1324

Multiconfigurational time-dependent Hartree method for describing particle loss due to absorbing boundary conditions

S. Kvaal

The consecutive numbering of the publications is determined by their chronological order.

Multiconfigurational time-dependent Hartree method for describing particle loss due to absorbing boundary conditions

Simen Kvaal[1,2,∗]

[1]*Matematisches Institut, Universität Tübingen, Auf der Morgenstelle 10, D-72076 Tübingen, Germany*
[2]*Centre of Mathematics for Applications, University of Oslo, N-0316 Oslo, Norway*

Absorbing boundary conditions in the form of a complex absorbing potential are routinely introduced in the Schrödinger equation to limit the computational domain or to study reactive scattering events using the multi-configurational time-dependent Hartree method (MCTDH). However, it is known that a pure wave-function description does not allow the modeling and propagation of the remnants of a system of which some parts are removed by the absorbing boundary. It was recently shown [S. Selstø and S. Kvaal, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **43** (2010), 065004] that a master equation of Lindblad form was necessary for such a description. We formulate a multiconfigurational time-dependent Hartree method for this master equation, usable for any quantum system composed of any mixture of species. The formulation is a strict generalization of pure-state propagation using standard MCTDH for identical particles and mixtures. We demonstrate the formulation with a numerical experiment.

I. INTRODUCTION

Today, the *de facto* standard approach in *ab initio* quantum-mechanical many-particle propagation is the multiconfigurational time-dependent Hartree method (MCTDH) and its variations [1–7]. Already for $N = 2$ electrons in three dimensions, the full six-dimensional time-dependent Schrödinger equation is very hard to solve and can only be handled on supercomputers. With MCTDH for identical particles the exponential scaling of the Hilbert space dimension with respect to N is "postponed" to higher number of particles, and the $N = 2$ propagation can be done on a single desktop computer. Current implementations can handle $N \leq 8$ electrons in cylindrical geometries reliably [8, 9]. For bosons, the Pauli exclusion principle is absent, and MCTDH can treat hundreds [10] and even thousands [11] of particles in one-dimensional geometries, and recent multi-layer MCTDH techniques allow *distinguishable* dimensions in the *thousands* with relative ease [7], showing great promise of extending the domain of application of MCTDH methods.

The MCTDH class of methods is derived using the time-dependent variational principle [12, 13]. As such, it is energy conserving, unitary and quasi-optimal in the sense that the growth of the error in the 2-norm is locally minimized.

Ab initio dynamical problems in quantum mechanics are formulated on an infinite domain which must be truncated for numerical calculations. The numerical reflections implied by the truncations are usually dealt with using absorbing boundary conditions of some sort. The most common approach is to introduce a complex absorbing potential (CAP) in a region around the truncated domain [14]. That is, the Hamiltonian H is mapped to $H - i\Gamma$, where $\Gamma \geq 0$ is a local one-body potential vanishing on the domain of interest, and only taking nonzero values outside the domain. This approach is also used in order to calculate properties like reaction and ionization probabilities, and CAPs are routinely implemented in MCTDH

codes [4, 8, 15–17].

Other absorbing operators are also common, such as the so-called transformative CAP (TCAP) [18], which is more or less equivalent with the non-local CAP obtained using smooth exterior scaling [19] or perfectly matched layers [20]. While *exact* and space-local absorbing boundary conditions may be formulated [21], they are in general non-local in time, and therefore impractical. In this work, we focus solely on a local CAP for simplicity, but any absorbing operator can be used.

Given a system of N particles, the wave-function Ψ_N is normalized to the probability of finding *all* particles within the computational domain. With a CAP, Ψ_N evolves according to the non-Hermitian Schrödinger equation

$$i\frac{d}{dt}\Psi_N = (H - i\Gamma)\Psi_N. \qquad (1)$$

An elementary calculation gives $\frac{d}{dt}\|\Psi_N\|^2 = -2\langle\Psi_N|\Gamma|\Psi_N\rangle$ for the probability derivative. Consequently, if the wave-function overlaps the CAP, the whole wave-function decays and eventually vanishes; it does *not* approach a wave-function with a different number of particles. In other words, even with an absorbing boundary, one is stuck with an N-particle description. Information like ionization probabilities and reaction rates may be obtained from evolving Eq. (1) alone, but if the *remainder* of the system is desired, i.e., a description of the $N - 1$, $N - 2$ particle systems, etc, one is at loss.

In a recent article it was argued that the solution is a density operator approach [22] because the loss of particles is an irreversible process; $H - i\Gamma$ is a non-Hermitian operator implying a preferred direction of time. The necessity of the quantum dynamical semigroup describing the evolution to be trace-preserving, Markovian and completely positive implies the applicability of the famous theorems due to Lindblad and Gorini and coworkers [23–25], giving a master equation on so-called Lindblad form. The resulting equation is

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho_n = -i[H, \rho_n] - \{\Gamma, \rho_n\} + 2\int \Gamma(x)\psi(x)\rho_{n+1}\psi(x)^\dagger \, dx, \qquad (2)$$

where ρ_n is the density operator for the *n*-particle subsystem, $0 \leq n \leq N$. The integral is over all discrete and continuous

─────────
[∗]Electronic address: `simen.kvaal@cma.uio.no`

degrees of freedom. It should be noted that the non-Hermitian Schrödinger equation (1) is equivalent to the von Neumann equation

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\rho_n = -\mathrm{i}[H,\rho_n] - \{\Gamma,\rho_n\}$$

for each n-particle system. The original formulation of the N-particle problem is not changed, but extended to yield $n \leq N$ particle systems as a by-product. Importantly, nowhere is an *ad hoc* hypothesis introduced.

Let us point out, that Eq. (2) does not address other general and important problems concerning the CAP approach to absorbing boundary conditions, such as missing correlation effects. Such arise if, say, the computational domain is too small, so that particles can be removed "prematurely" by the CAP. This correlation information is lost forever, and cannot be "built into" the fewer-particle systems.

Equation (2) describes the evolution of a *mixed state* due to irreversibility. The mixedness has two main sources: Firstly, as the probability tr(ρ_N) of having N particles present is gradually reduced, the probability of $N' < N$ particles increases. In this intermediate stage ρ is a mixed state [22]. Secondly, the block $\rho_{N'}$ alone may be non-pure in the limit $t \to \infty$, as information about the absorbed particles is thrown away, and since the exact N-body wave-function depends on *all* particle coordinates. This limits the information that can be extracted from the decayed $N' < N$-body systems compared to a *full* evolution of the total wave-function—a feature inherent in the the CAP approach to absorbing boundaries.

In this article, we formulate a MCTDH method for Eq. (2) for identical particles and mixtures. It is based on a so-called type II density operator manifold [3, 26] and is fully variational. Such methods are usually called ρ-MCTDH methods (as opposed to Ψ-MCTDH for pure states), and ours can be viewed as a special case since the dissipative operators are on a very special form. On the other hand our point of view is more general as the problem is formulated in Fock space which is not considered for standard ρ-MCTDH; indeed the dissipative operators change the number of particles. The method, which we call ρ-CAP-MCTDH, turns out to be exactly trace-preserving and a strict generalization of Ψ-MCTDH for pure states evolving according to the non-Hermitian Schrödinger equation with a CAP (1). The method is first formulated for identical fermions and bosons, and then extended to arbitrary mixtures of species. We use the acronym ρ-CAP-MCTDH for all variations for clarity, instead of the distinction between MCTDHF (for fermions) and MCTDHB (for bosons), and so on. The derivation for identical particles is done in Sec. III, while the generalization is done in Sec. V, after a numerical experiment on a system of identical fermions is presented in Sec. IV. Not surprisingly, the resulting formulation is a direct generalization of the pure state MCTDH treatment of mixtures [27].

To prepare for the ρ-CAP-MCTDH method, we give a brief derivation of Eq. (2) in Sec. II that underlines the inevitability and uniqueness of the master equation on Lindblad form. We also show how the probability interpretation of $\|\Psi_N\|^2$, which is not purely quantum mechanical, can be interpreted in terms of measurements performed continuously in time.

II. LINDBLAD EQUATION FOR SYSTEMS WITH A CAP

A. Classical probabilities from a CAP

The evolution of Ψ_N under the non-Hermitian Schrödinger equation (1) is irreversible. It introduces a preferred direction in time, which is easily seen from the fact that the evolution cannot be reversed: eventually $\|\Psi_N\| > 1$, and the backward propagation may be non-existent, even mathematically.

We now give an interpretation of the square norm $\|\Psi_N\|^2$ in terms of measurements performed continuously in time, thereby exposing the irreversibility. We stress that this is meant as an *illustration* and a helpful device for understanding the dynamics due to a CAP, and has no bearing on the mathematical discussion leading up to the Lindblad master equation (2). To this end, consider first a closed single-particle system, described by the Hamiltonian H—without a CAP—in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_1$. Quantum mechanically, the squared norm $\|\Psi_1\|^2$ of the wave-function is the probability of finding the particle *somewhere* in configuration space. Equivalently, it is the probability of obtaining the value 1 upon measurement of trivial observable I (the identity operator).

Adding a CAP $-\mathrm{i}\Gamma$ to the Hamiltonian and keeping the probability interpretation of $\|\Psi_1\|^2$ has non-trivial implications. The description is obviously no longer in accordance with the basic postulates of quantum mechanics, since

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\|\Psi_1\|^2 = -2\langle\Psi_1|\Gamma|\Psi_1\rangle \leq 0,$$

that is to say, total probability is *not conserved*.

Suppose we perform a single measurement on the observable P given by

$$P = \int_\Omega |x\rangle\langle x|\mathrm{d}x,$$

i.e., of the projection operator P onto Ω, the truncated computational domain. It has two eigenvalues, 0 and 1, corresponding to finding the particle outside or inside Ω, respectively. We will obtain the answer 0 with probability $1 - \|\Psi_1\|_\Omega^2 = 1 - \langle\Psi_1|P|\Psi_1\rangle$ and the answer 1 with probability $\|\Psi_1\|_\Omega^2$. After measurement, the wave-function collapses onto $(I - P)\Psi_1$ in the former case, and $P\Psi_1$ in the latter (up to normalization constants). Note that the wave-function collapse is irreversible, as the original wave-function cannot be reconstructed after the event.

Suppose we perform many experiments at short time intervals $t = n\tau$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. Each experiment yields certain information about the system after the measurement: we know with certainty if the particle is in Ω or not. After n experiments, all giving 1 as answer, the wave function is readily computed to be

$$\Psi_1(n\tau) = \frac{[Pe^{-\mathrm{i}\tau H}]^n\Psi_1(0)}{\|[Pe^{-\mathrm{i}\tau H}]^n\Psi_1(0)\|},$$

and the probability that n positive answers have been given is

$$p_n = \|[Pe^{-i\tau H}]^n \Psi_1(0)\|^2.$$

This probability is classical in the sense that it is a probability description of the history of our macroscopic measurement device, or of its print-out on a sheet of paper if one prefers.

Let us define $\tilde{\Psi}_1(n\tau) = \sqrt{p_n}\Psi_1(n\tau) = [Pe^{-i\tau H}]^n\Psi_1(0)$, so that $\|\tilde{\Psi}_1(n\tau)\|^2 = p_n$. If we allow the approximation

$$P \approx \exp(-\tau\Gamma),$$

which dampens Ψ_1 strongly outside Ω, we get

$$Pe^{-i\tau H} \approx e^{-\tau\Gamma}e^{-i\tau H} = e^{-i\tau(H-i\Gamma)} + O(\tau^2).$$

In the limit of small τ, we see that $\tilde{\Psi}_1(t)$ is the solution to the Schrödinger equation with a CAP. $\|\tilde{\Psi}_1(t)\|^2$ is then the probability of finding the measurement apparatus in the state "the particle has not yet been detected outside Ω" at time t.

Our discussion is immediately suggestive of interpreting the CAP as an actual model for some external detecting device, which was already pointed out in the first paper on CAPs in quantum mechanics [14]. Although it is likely that Eq. (2) can be derived in such a way, it is not relevant here, as the Schrödinger equation with a CAP is our starting point. The above discussion is only intended as a means for understanding the irreversibility of the non-Hermitian dynamics. Whatever interpretation we use, we see that the single-particle system undergoes a transition to a zero-particle state (i.e., zero particles in Ω) in an irreversible way, and that the probability of having $n = 1$ or $n = 0$ particles is not quantum mechanical.

A complete specification of the quantum state of the $n \leq 1$-particle system is a density operator in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_0$, where $\mathcal{H}_n$ is the Hilbert space of n particles. In this case, the density operator is, on block form,

$$\rho = \begin{pmatrix} |\tilde{\Psi}_1\rangle\langle\tilde{\Psi}_1| & 0 \\ 0 & (1 - \langle\tilde{\Psi}_1|\tilde{\Psi}_1\rangle) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{H}_0$ is one-dimensional, and the lower right block is just a non-negative real number, the probability of zero particles in Ω.

For a rigorous treatment of the above limiting process, see Chapter 7.4 in Ref. [28].

Generalizing the discussion to N particles is analogous to our discussion, approximating $P \approx \exp(-i\Gamma)$ in the same way. $\|\tilde{\Psi}_N\|^2$ is then the probability of the measurement apparatus showing that all particles are inside Ω.

B. N-fermion systems with a CAP

Suppose a complete set of fermionic or bosonic creation operators $\{c_j^\dagger\}$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots$, are given. An important formal property of $c_j^\dagger$ is that it defines a map from $\mathcal{H}_n$ to $\mathcal{H}_{n+1}$, the Hilbert spaces of n and $n + 1$ fermions, respectively, and that they fulfill the (anti-)commutator relation

$$\{c_j^\dagger, c_k\}_\pm \equiv c_j^\dagger c_k \pm c_k c_j^\dagger = \delta_{jk} \tag{3}$$

with the plus sign for fermions, and the minus sign for bosons.

For us, it is natural to work within Fock space $\mathcal{H}$, defined by

$$\mathcal{H} \equiv \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{H}_n,$$

containing all possible states with any number of particles. As operators in $\mathcal{H}$, the c_j are orthogonal in the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product,

$$\langle c_j, c_k \rangle = \text{tr}(c_j^\dagger c_k) = 0, \quad j \neq k,$$

and traceless,

$$\text{tr}(c_j) = 0.$$

Given an n-particle Hamiltonian on first-quantized form, viz,

$$H_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} h(i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} u(i, j),$$

(where the indices i and j in the operators indicate which particles' degrees of freedom they act on) we may write it compactly on n-independent form using the expression

$$H = \sum_{jk} h_{jk} c_j^\dagger c_k + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{jklm} u_{jklm} c_j^\dagger c_k^\dagger c_m c_l, \tag{4}$$

where h_{jk} and u_{jklm} are the usual one- and two-particle integrals, respectively.

Adding a cap $\Gamma = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Gamma(i)$ amounts to modifying the single-particle coefficients since

$$\Gamma = \sum_{jk} \Gamma_{jk} c_j^\dagger c_k. \tag{5}$$

It is important to note, that given the set $\{c_j^\dagger\}$, the second-quantized expressions of H and Γ are unique, and vice versa.

C. The Lindblad equation

We now discuss the master equation (2), introduced in Ref. [22], for a system of identical particles. We underline that the master equation *follows uniquely* from the probability interpretation of $\|\Psi_n\|^2$ for an n-particle wave-function, and the requirement of a Markovian, trace-preserving and completely positive evolution. We also address some mathematical points omitted in Ref. [22].

Describing a system with a variable number of particles, we work with states in Fock space. Our starting point, the non-Hermitian Schrödinger equation with a given CAP, then reads

$$i\frac{d}{dt}\Psi = (H - i\Gamma)\Psi. \tag{6}$$

FIG. 1: Illustration of the block structure of the density operator in Fock space with at most N identical particles. In general, each block is infinite dimensional (except for ρ_0 which is 1×1). The diagonal blocks are emphasized, as for pure state initial conditions $\rho = |\Psi_N\rangle\langle\Psi_N|$ the density operator turns out to be block diagonal.

With an initial condition with exactly N particles, i.e. $\Psi(0) = \Psi_N \in \mathcal{H}_N$, this equation is equivalent to Eq. (1), which we repeat here for convenience:

$$i\frac{d}{dt}\Psi_N = (H - i\Gamma)\Psi_N. \tag{7}$$

This description is valid for all particle numbers N.

As Eq. (6) is irreversible, it is not possible to find some new Hamiltonian H' in Fock space that generates a unitary evolution which describes a decreasing number of particles and also reproduces Eq. (7). Instead, one must turn to a density operator description. For a density operator $\rho \in \text{TC}(\mathcal{H})$, the trace-class operators in Fock space [25, 28], Eq. (6) is equivalent to the non-trace conserving von Neumann-equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho = -i[H, \rho] - \{\Gamma, \rho\}, \tag{8}$$

which is verified by a simple computation. The density operator ρ has a natural block structure. Letting P_n be the orthogonal projector onto $\mathcal{H}_n$, we have the resolution of the identity

$$I = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} P_n.$$

Applying this to either side of ρ gives the decomposition

$$\rho = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\rho_{n,m}, \quad \rho_{n,m} \equiv P_n\rho P_m.$$

This block structure is depicted in Fig. 1. Projecting Eq. (8) from the left and right with P_n, we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho_{n,n} = -i[H, \rho_{n,n}] - \{\Gamma, \rho_{n,n}\}, \tag{9}$$

which is equivalent to Eq. (7).

We wish obtain a master equation for ρ that *does* preserve total probability. At all times, there is a probability $\text{tr}(\rho_n)$ of

having n particles (we define $\rho_n \equiv \rho_{n,n}$), and these should add up to $\text{tr}(\rho) = \sum_n \text{tr}(\rho_n) = 1$. Since the von-Neumann equation is local in time, we require the master equation to be Markovian. Our master equation must reproduce (9) for $n = N$, where N is the number of particles initially present. Of course, for $n < N$ the master equation will end up with some source terms. This must hold for all N, i.e., our master equation should not depend on N; only the initial condition depends on N.

We also require the master equation to describe a physical system which in turn may interact with other quantum systems. A minimal requirement for such master equations is that its quantum semigroup is *completely positive*. Complete positivity roughly states that if our system is described together with a different system with Hilbert space $\mathcal{V}$, so that the combined state is $\sigma \in \text{TC}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{V})$, then the semigroup of σ preserves the self-adjoint positive-semidefiniteness of σ. Surprisingly, requiring this property on the flow of ρ alone is not enough [24, 25].

Let us for the moment assume that Fock space has *finite dimension*, i.e., it is defined by finite number L of creation operators. The theorem by Gorini and coworkers is now applicable [24]: Any trace-preserving, Markovian and completely positive quantum dynamical semigroup has a master equation on the form

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho = -i[H, \rho] + \mathcal{D}(\rho), \tag{10}$$

where the dissipative terms have the generic form

$$\mathcal{D}(\rho) = \sum_{\alpha\beta} d_{\alpha\beta}(2L_\beta\rho L_\alpha^\dagger - \{L_\alpha^\dagger L_\beta, \rho\}). \tag{11}$$

The operators L_α form a traceless, orthogonal set with the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product $\langle\rho, \sigma\rangle = \text{tr}(\rho^\dagger\sigma)$ (the operators are then linearly independent in $\text{TC}(\mathcal{H})$), and $[d_{\alpha\beta}]$ is a Hermitian positive semi-definite matrix. Importantly, the quantum dynamical semigroup generated by Eq. (10) is uniquely given by H and $\mathcal{D}$ and vice versa.

The L_α play the rôle of a basis in $\text{TC}(\mathcal{H})$, which is of dimension $\dim(\mathcal{H})^2$. It is of course not unique, but given a choice of basis, the coefficients $[d_{\alpha\beta}]$ are unique. Notice that the trace of the anti-commutator term in Eq. (11) is equal to but of opposite magnitude compared to the term where ρ is sandwiched between L_β and $L_\alpha^\dagger$.

The von-Neumann equation is *almost* of the form (10); it lacks the "sandwiched terms" responsible for a compensation of the trace decrease due to the anti-commutator, i.e.,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho = -i[H, \rho] - \sum_{jk}\Gamma_{jk}\{c_j^\dagger c_k, \rho\}.$$

As the operators $\{c_j\}$ are indeed traceless and orthogonal, it is immediately clear that the correct master equation is obtained by simply adding the sandwiched terms, i.e.,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho = -i[H, \rho] - \sum_{jk}\Gamma_{jk}\{c_j^\dagger c_k, \rho\} + 2\sum_{jk}\Gamma_{jk}c_k\rho c_j^\dagger. \tag{12}$$

If the dissipative terms are not chosen on *exactly* this form, Eq. (9) will not be reproduced for all N.

Indeed, consider an initial condition on the form

$$\rho(0) = |\Psi_N\rangle\langle\Psi_N|. \qquad (13)$$

Projecting Eq. (12) from the left and right with P_n and P_m, respectively, we obtain the differential equation obeyed by the block $\rho_{n,m}$,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho_{n,m} = -i[H,\rho_{n,m}] - \{\Gamma, \rho_{n,m}\} + 2\sum_{jk}\Gamma_{jk}c_k\rho_{n+1,m+1}c_j^\dagger. \qquad (14)$$

We see that the off-diagonal blocks $\rho_{n,m}$ with $n \neq m$ are identically zero with the initial condition (13). The compensating sandwich terms are seen to be responsible for transporting probability from the N-particle system into the $N-1$ particle system, and so on, downwards along the diagonal blocks in Fig. 1. Moreover, the evolution of $\rho_{N,N}$ is equivalent to Eq. (7). Modifying the coefficients Γ_{jk} or adding more linearly independent operators to the set $\{c_j\}$ will void this for some N.

The theorem by Gorini and coworkers is only valid in a finite dimensional Hilbert space. For infinite dimensional spaces, Lindblad discovered a generalization for norm-continuous semigroups [23], for which H and Γ are necessarily bounded operators. This is rarely the case, but a Lindblad-type theorem for the general unbounded cases is simply not known [25]. On the other hand, all known examples of completely positive semigroups in infinite dimensional spaces have generators on the generic form (11), with possibly unbounded H or $[d_{\alpha\beta}]$.

It now seems reasonable to remove the restriction of a finite-dimensional Fock space, which does not change the formal appearance of the Lindblad equation (12). Using the relation

$$\psi(x)^\dagger \equiv \sum_j \overline{\varphi_j(x)}c_j^\dagger$$

for the field creation operators (creating a particle at x), where $\{\varphi_j(x)\}$ is the orthonormal single-particle basis functions associated with $\{c_j^\dagger\}$, we arrive at the master equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho = -i[H,\rho] - \{\Gamma, \rho\} + 2\int \Gamma(x)\psi(x)\rho\psi(x)^\dagger \, dx, \qquad (15)$$

which on block form becomes

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho_n = -i[H,\rho_n] - \{\Gamma, \rho_n\} + 2\int \Gamma(x)\psi(x)\rho_{n+1}\psi(x)^\dagger \, dx. \qquad (16)$$

where we have assumed an N-particle initial condition $\rho(0) = \rho_N$.

We stress that the Lindblad equation (16) followed *only* from the probability interpretation of $\|\Psi_N\|^2$ and from the requirement that the master equation generates a Markovian, trace-preserving and completely positive semigroup.

III. MCTDH FORMULATION FOR IDENTICAL PARTICLES

A. The ρ-CAP-MCTDH manifold

We now derive the ρ-CAP-MCTDH approximation to the Lindblad equation (15). This method is in a sense a combination of Ψ-MCTDH for identical particles [4–6, 27], using second quantization, and ρ-MCTDH [3, 26] for general density operators. Our method is necessarily formulated in Fock space and describes a variable number of particles. To the best of our knowledge, the general ρ-MCTDH has not been formulated using second quantization in the literature. Moreover, the global variational principle employed in Ψ-MCTDH (the action integral point of view) is *not* applicable for dissipative systems, since $\mathcal{D}(\rho)$ is not self-adjoint. The second-quantization techniques used here are therefore somewhat different from the one usually taken in the pure-state approach. As the particular properties of the equations of motion for the present problem are more easily exposed in a thorough investigation, we choose to do a detailed derivation.

We repeat the Lindblad equation (15) for convenience:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho = \mathcal{L}(\rho)$$
$$= -i[H,\rho] + \mathcal{D}(\rho)$$
$$= -i[H,\rho] - \{\Gamma, \rho\} + 2\int \Gamma(x)\psi(x)\rho\psi(x)^\dagger \, dx. \qquad (17)$$

Here, $\rho \in \mathrm{TC}(\mathcal{H})$ is a Fock space density operator, which (in the exact equation) is block diagonal. $\psi(x)$ destroys a particle at the configuration-space point $x \in X$. Typically $X = \mathbb{R}^3 \times \{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$ for a spin-1/2 fermion, i.e., $x = (\vec{r}, m)$, although our derivations are completely independent of X.

For all $t \geq 0$, $\rho(t)$ is approximated by an element in a manifold $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathrm{TC}(\mathcal{H})$, with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ inherited from $\mathrm{TC}(\mathcal{M})$. (Strictly speaking, the inner product is inherited from the Hilbert space of Hilbert-Schmidt operators, in which $\mathrm{TC}(\mathcal{H})$ is dense. Not all Hilbert-Schmidt operators are trace-class.) An approximate variational differential equation on $\mathcal{M}$ is sought. The time-dependent variational principle [2, 12, 13] chooses the time derivative $\dot{\rho} = d\rho/dt$ to minimize the local error in the norm induced by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ as follows:

$$\langle \delta\rho, \dot{\rho} - \mathcal{L}(\rho) \rangle = 0, \quad \forall \delta\rho \in T_\rho\mathcal{M}, \qquad (18)$$

where $T_\rho\mathcal{M}$ is the tangent space at ρ, i.e., the space of all possible time derivatives of ρ. Consequently, the right-hand-side $\mathcal{L}(\rho)$ of Eq. (17) is projected orthogonally onto $T_\rho\mathcal{M}$, and we have

$$\dot{\rho} = \underset{\sigma \in T_\rho\mathcal{M}}{\mathrm{argmin}} \|\sigma - \mathcal{L}\rho\|.$$

We choose $\mathcal{M}$ as the so-called "type II" density operator manifold [3, 17, 26], albeit with a slight generalization as we consider Fock space instead of a fixed number of particles. There is an alternate way of defining a variational manifold, the "type I" manifold, but it does not reduce to the usual MCTDH in the case of a pure state.

The manifold $\mathcal{M}$ is defined as follows. Given a finite set φ of L single-particle functions (SPFs) $\varphi_j \in \mathcal{H}_1$, $1 \le j \le L$ and their corresponding creation operators $c_j^\dagger$,

$$c_j^\dagger = \int_X \varphi_j(x)\psi(x)^\dagger \, \mathrm{d}x,$$

we consider the subspace $\mathcal{V}_n$ of $\mathcal{H}_n$ spanned by all possible linearly independent n-body functions built using products of $c_j^\dagger$,

$$\Phi_{J[n]} = c_{j_1}^\dagger c_{j_2}^\dagger \cdots c_{j_n}^\dagger \Phi_{\mathrm{vac}}.$$

The notation $J[n]$ means an ordered tuple $(j_1, j_2, \cdots, j_n)$ of n single-particle indices, i.e., $j_1 \le j_2 \le \cdots \le j_n$. For fermions $\Phi_{J[n]}$ is a Slater determinant and $j_1 < j_2 < \cdots < j_n$, while for bosons it is a permanent. We then consider the subspace $\mathcal{V}$ of Fock space,

$$\mathcal{V} = \bigoplus_{n=0}^{N} \mathcal{V}_n$$

spanned by all the Φ_J, where J means a ordered tuple with n indeterminate. As we describe at most N particles, we truncate at $n \le N$ in order to ensure a finite-dimensional space. (For bosons any number of particles may occupy each φ_j, creating an infinite dimensional space if we do not truncate the sum, even with L finite.)

Each $\rho \in \mathcal{M}$ is now defined as an arbitrary linear operator in $\mathcal{V}$, viz,

$$\rho = \sum_{JK} |\Phi_J\rangle B_{JK}\langle\Phi_K|, \quad B_{JK} \in \mathbb{C}.$$

We see that ρ is a matrix with respect to a time-dependent orthonormal basis. We denote by $\mathbf{B}$ the matrix formed by the B_{JK}, i.e., the Galerkin matrix. To sum up, ρ is parametrized in terms of an arbitrary matrix $\mathbf{B}$ with respect to the basis generated by an arbitrary set of L SPFs φ.

The set φ may *formally* be extended to a *complete* orthonormal basis $\tilde{\varphi}$ for $\mathcal{H}_1$, a (usually infinite) set of functions φ_s, $s > L$, such that the second-quantized Hamiltonian is given by Eq. (4), and the CAP by Eq. (5), but where the expansion coefficients in general will depend on the particular value for φ and $\tilde{\varphi}$. This will be of use later on.

B. Parametric redundancy and tangent space

For a given $\rho \in \mathcal{M}$, the parameters φ and B are not unique. Since $\mathcal{V}$ is determined only by the subspace spanned by φ, not the individual φ_j, any unitary change

$$\varphi_j \longrightarrow \sum_k \varphi_k G_{kj}, \quad G = \mathsf{U}(L)$$

where $\mathsf{U}(L)$ is the unitary group of $L \times L$ matrices, yields the same space $\mathcal{V}$, and therefore the same operators ρ can be

parametrized. Under the group element G, the basis functions transform as

$$\Phi_{J[n]} \longrightarrow \sum_{k_1} \cdots \sum_{k_n} G_{k_1 j_1} \cdots G_{k_n j_n} \Phi_{K[n]} \equiv \sum_{K[N]}' \mathcal{G}_{K[n], J[n]} \Phi_{K[n]},$$

where the sum $\sum_{K[n]}'$ is over *all* multi-indices of length n, and not only ordered ones. Defining the transformation of $\mathbf{B}$ by

$$B_{JK} \longrightarrow \sum_{J'K'}' \mathcal{G}_{J'J}^* B_{J'K'} \mathcal{G}_{K'K},$$

we see that

$$\rho \longrightarrow \rho.$$

Moreover, B_{JK} are all independent parameters, showing that $\mathsf{U}(L)$ is in fact the *largest* group of transformations leaving ρ invariant.

The non-uniqueness of φ and B implies that given a derivative (tangent vector) $\dot{\rho} \in T_\rho\mathcal{M}$, the derivatives $\dot{\varphi}$ and $\dot{\mathbf{B}}$ are not unique. This phenomenon arises in all MCTDH-type methods, and we give a somewhat more mathematical description than the usual one.

Suppose $\rho(t) \in \mathcal{M}$ is a given smooth path. There exists $\varphi_0(t)$ and $\mathbf{B}_0(t)$ such that $\rho(t) = \rho(\varphi_0(t), \mathbf{B}_0(t))$. By the considerations above, *any* other possible parameter path is on the form $(\varphi(t), \mathbf{B}(t)) = (\varphi_0(t)G(t), \mathcal{G}(t)^\dagger \mathbf{B}_0 \mathcal{G}(t))$, where $\varphi_0(t)G(t)$ stands for the transformation

$$\varphi_{0,j}(t) \longrightarrow \varphi_j(t) = \sum_k \varphi_{0,k}(t)G_{kj}(t).$$

(We consider φ a "matrix" whose columns are φ_j.) All derivatives of φ_0 are of the form

$$\dot{\varphi}_0 = \varphi_0\eta + \chi, \quad \langle\varphi_{0,j}|\chi_k\rangle = 0.$$

The functions χ_j are all independent. Since $GG^\dagger = I_L$, we find that $\dot{G} = gG$, with $-g^\dagger = g \in \mathsf{u}(L)$, the Lie algebra of the Lie group $\mathsf{U}(L)$. The transformed $\varphi = \varphi_0 G$ then has the derivative

$$\dot{\varphi} = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\varphi_0 G = [\varphi_0(\eta + g) + \chi]G,$$

and it is seen that if we choose $g = -\eta$, then φ is in fact unique, since $\dot{G} = \eta G$ uniquely specifies $G(t)$. This is equivalent to the condition

$$\langle\varphi_j|\dot{\varphi}_k\rangle = 0, \quad \forall j, \, k.$$

This condition is the standard one in all MCTDH-type methods, and is described already in the earliest publication [1].

In this way, there is a there is a one-to-one map between triples $(\dot{\varphi}, \dot{\mathbf{B}}, g)$ and $\dot{\rho}$, with $g \in \mathsf{u}(L)$. The element g is then called a *gauge choice*, and the gauge choice induces a unique parametrization $(\varphi(t), \mathbf{B}(t))$ of $\rho(t)$. This kind of differential geometrical structure is called a principal bundle [29], and is familiar in quantum field theory—but it arises in a completely different way!

It is easily verified that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\Phi_J = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}c_{j_1}^\dagger \cdots c_{j_n}^\dagger \Phi_{\mathrm{vac}} = D\Phi_J.$$

where D is the operator

$$D \equiv \sum_{j=1}^{L} \dot{c}_j^\dagger c_j$$

and where $\dot{c}_j^\dagger$ is as the operator that creates the single-particle function $\dot{\varphi}_j$. We observe that for *any two* single-particle functions u and v, not necessarily normalized, the relation

$$\{c(u), c^\dagger(v)\}_\pm \equiv c(u)c^\dagger(v) \pm c^\dagger(v)c(u) = \langle u|v \rangle$$

is obtained by expanding each operator in the field creation operators.

We are now ready to consider an arbitrary time derivative of an element $\rho(t) \in \mathcal{M}$:

$$\dot{\rho} = \sum_{J,K} |\dot{\Phi}_J\rangle B_{J,K}\langle\Phi_K| + |\Phi_J\rangle \dot{B}_{J,K}\langle\Phi_K| + |\Phi_J\rangle B_{J,K}\langle\dot{\Phi}_K|$$

$$= D\rho + \rho D^\dagger + \sum_{J,K} |\Phi_J\rangle \dot{B}_{J,K}\langle\Phi_K|. \tag{19}$$

In order to perform the projections in Eq. (18), we must identify all linearly independent tangent vectors, i.e., all independent admissible infinitesimal variations of ρ. This amounts to varying the $B_{J,K}$ independently, and the φ_j independently, but according to a specific choice of gauge. For simplicity, we consider the choice $\langle\varphi_j|\dot{\varphi}_k\rangle = 0$, which generates the simplest equations and are also the most common in MCTDH theory.

From this it follows that the admissible time derivatives of φ_j are arbitrary functions $\vartheta = Q\vartheta$, where

$$Q \equiv I - \sum_k |\varphi_k\rangle\langle\varphi_k|.$$

Moreover,

$$\langle\Phi_J|\dot{\Phi}_K\rangle = \langle\Phi_J|D|\Phi_K\rangle = 0, \quad \forall J, K.$$

Now, the independent variations of ρ can be divided into two groups: For each pair J, K, the matrix element $B_{J,K}$ can be changed, giving a tangent vector

$$\delta\rho = |\Phi_J\rangle\langle\Phi_K|. \tag{20}$$

An arbitrary change $\vartheta = Q\vartheta$ in φ_j consistent with the gauge choice gives

$$\delta\rho = c^\dagger(\vartheta)c_j\rho + \rho c_j^\dagger c(\vartheta). \tag{21}$$

Inserting these two expressions into the variational principle will yield a complete set of differential equations for **B** in the first case, and φ in the latter.

C. Equations of motion

We use the notation $\widetilde{\sum}_j$ to indicate a sum over the *complete* set of SPFs. We let **H** be the Galerkin matrix of H, i.e.,

$$H_{JK} \equiv \langle\Phi_J|H|\Phi_K\rangle,$$

and analogously define **G** to be the Galerkin matrix of Γ. We let $\mathbf{c}_j$ be the Galerkin matrix of c_j, which in fact is independent of φ:

$$(c_j)_{JK} = \langle\Phi_J|c_j|\Phi_K\rangle = \langle\Phi_J'|c_j'|\Phi_K'\rangle. \tag{22}$$

The primed quantities corresponds to *any* other choice of SPFs. The independence follows from the (anti-)commutator (3) which only depends on orthonormality.

The Galerkin matrices of H and Γ can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{H} = \sum_{jk} h(\varphi)_{jk}\mathbf{c}_j^\dagger\mathbf{c}_k + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{jklm} u(\varphi)_{jklm}\mathbf{c}_j^\dagger\mathbf{c}_k^\dagger\mathbf{c}_m\mathbf{c}_l \tag{23}$$

$$\mathbf{G} = \sum_{jk} \Gamma(\varphi)_{jk}\mathbf{c}_j^\dagger\mathbf{c}_k \tag{24}$$

The expansion coefficients are dependent on φ at time t, but the creation- and annihilation matrices are not. The Galerkin matrices are naturally expressed using some fixed, abstract basis due to Eq. (22). Existing methodology for computing matrix-vector and matrix-matrix products can be re-used by referring to this basis.

To derive the equations of motion, we begin by inserting $\delta\rho$ from Eq. (20) into the variational principle (18). For the term $\langle\delta\rho, \dot{\rho}\rangle$ and the term containing $[H,\rho]$, and for the sandwich term, we obtain, respectively,

$$\langle|\Phi_J\rangle\langle\Phi_K|, \sum_{J'K'} \dot{B}_{J'K'}|\Phi_{J'}\rangle\langle\Phi_{K'}| + D\rho + \rho D^\dagger\rangle = \text{tr}\left[|\Phi_K\rangle\langle\Phi_J|\left(\sum_{J'K'} |\Phi_{J'}\rangle\dot{B}_{J'K'}\langle\Phi_{K'}| + D\rho + \rho D^\dagger\right)\right] = \dot{B}_{JK} \tag{25}$$

$$\langle|\Phi_J\rangle\langle\Phi_K|, -i[H,\rho]\rangle = -i\,\text{tr}\left[|\Phi_K\rangle\langle\Phi_J|\left(H\sum_{J'K'} |\Phi_{J'}\rangle B_{J'K'}\langle\Phi_{K'}| - \sum_{J'K'} |\Phi_{J'}\rangle B_{J'K'}\langle\Phi_{K'}|H\right)\right] = (-i[\mathbf{H},\mathbf{B}])_{JK} \tag{26}$$

$$\langle|\Phi_J\rangle\langle\Phi_K|, \widetilde{\sum_{jk}}\Gamma_{jk}c_k\rho c_j^\dagger\rangle = \text{tr}\left[|\Phi_K\rangle\langle\Phi_J|\left(\widetilde{\sum_{jk}}\Gamma_{jk}c_k\sum_{J'K'} |\Phi_{J'}\rangle B_{J'K'}\langle\Phi_{K'}|c_j^\dagger\right)\right] = \sum_{jk}\Gamma_{jk}(\mathbf{c}_k\mathbf{B}\mathbf{c}_j^\dagger)_{JK}. \tag{27}$$

In Eq. (25) the terms containing D vanish since $\langle\varphi_j|\dot{\varphi}_k\rangle = \{c_j, \dot{c}_k^\dagger\}_\pm = 0$. A similar calculation as Eq. (26) yields

$$\langle|\Phi_J\rangle\langle\Phi_K|, \{\Gamma,\rho\}\rangle = (\{\mathbf{G},\mathbf{B}\})_{JK}. \tag{28}$$

Assembling Eqs. (25) through (28), we get the equation of motion for $\mathbf{B}$:

$$\dot{\mathbf{B}} = -\mathrm{i}[\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{B}] - \{\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{B}\} + 2\sum_{jk}\Gamma_{jk}\mathbf{c}_k\mathbf{B}\mathbf{c}_j^\dagger.$$

We now make the observation that $\dot{\mathbf{B}}^\dagger = \dot{\mathbf{B}}$, showing that $\rho^\dagger =$

ρ is preserved during evolution, which we may use when we turn to the projection onto the tangent vector in Eq. (21). Let F be an arbitrary operator, and calculate

$$\langle\delta\rho, F\rho + \rho F^\dagger\rangle = \mathrm{tr}\left\{[c(\vartheta)^\dagger c_j\rho + \rho c_j^\dagger c(\vartheta)](F\rho + \rho F^\dagger)\right\} = \mathrm{tr}\left[c(\vartheta)^\dagger c_j\rho F\rho + c(\vartheta)^\dagger c_j\rho^2 F^\dagger + \rho c_j^\dagger c(\vartheta)F\rho + \rho c_j^\dagger c(\vartheta)\rho F^\dagger\right]$$
$$= 2\,\mathrm{Re}\,\mathrm{tr}[c_j^\dagger c(\vartheta)F\rho^2],$$

since $c(\vartheta)\rho \equiv 0$, as $c(\vartheta)$ annihilates a function orthogonal to all the φ_j.

Setting $F = D = \sum_k \dot{c}_k^\dagger c_k$ we obtain

$$\langle\delta\rho, D\rho + \rho D^\dagger\rangle = \sum_k 2\,\mathrm{Re}\,\mathrm{tr}[c_j^\dagger c(\vartheta)\dot{c}_k^\dagger c_k\rho^2]$$
$$= \sum_k 2\,\mathrm{Re}\langle\vartheta|\dot\varphi_k\rangle\,\mathrm{tr}(c_j^\dagger c_k\rho^2),$$

and we note in passing that $\langle\delta\rho, |\Phi_J\rangle\dot{B}_{JK}\langle\Phi_K|\rangle = 0$, again since $c(\vartheta)|\Phi_J\rangle = 0$.

The "sandwich" term in the master equation also gives zero contribution, since

$$\mathrm{tr}\left[c(\vartheta)^\dagger c_j\rho c_l\rho c_m^\dagger\right] = \mathrm{tr}[\rho c_m^\dagger c(\vartheta)^\dagger c_j\rho] = 0,$$

since $c(\vartheta)c_m|\Phi_J\rangle = 0$.

In these calculations $\vartheta = Q\vartheta$ was arbitrary. Choosing $-\mathrm{i}\vartheta$ instead turns "Re" into "Im", so we may drop taking the real part. Assembling this, we get the equation

$$\mathrm{i}\sum_k\langle\vartheta|\dot\varphi_k\rangle\,\mathrm{tr}(c_j^\dagger c_k\rho^2) = \mathrm{tr}[c_j^\dagger c(\vartheta)F\rho^2], \qquad (29)$$

with $F = H - \mathrm{i}\Gamma$, and the equation must hold for all ϑ and all j.

We now compute the right-hand-side of Eq. (29) for arbitrary single-particle and two-particle operators F. Suppose at first

$$F = \widetilde{\sum_{jk}}f_{jk}c_j^\dagger c_k, \quad f_{jk} = \langle\varphi_j|f|\varphi_k\rangle.$$

Upon insertion in Eq. (29), we find

$$\mathrm{tr}[c_j^\dagger c(\vartheta)F\rho^2] = \widetilde{\sum_{kl}}f_{kl}\,\mathrm{tr}[c_j^\dagger c(\vartheta)c_k^\dagger c_l\rho^2]$$
$$= \widetilde{\sum_k}\sum_l\langle\vartheta|\varphi_k\rangle\langle\varphi_k|f|\varphi_l\rangle\,\mathrm{tr}(c_j^\dagger c_l\rho^2)$$
$$= \sum_l\langle\vartheta|f|\varphi_l\rangle\,\mathrm{tr}(c_j^\dagger c_l\rho^2)$$

In the last calculation, we used $\widetilde{\sum}_j|\varphi_j\rangle\langle\varphi_j| = I$.

Second, suppose F is a two-particle operator, viz,

$$F = \frac{1}{2}\widetilde{\sum_{jklm}}f_{jklm}c_j^\dagger c_k^\dagger c_m c_l, \quad f_{jklm} = \langle\varphi_j\varphi_k|f|\varphi_l\varphi_m\rangle,$$

where we assume $f_{jklm} = f_{kjml}$. The inner product is on $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_1$, i.e., the brackets are not antisymmetrized. Now the right-hand-side of Eq. (29) becomes

$$\mathrm{tr}[c_j^\dagger c(\vartheta)F\rho^2] = \frac{1}{2}\widetilde{\sum_{klmn}}f_{klmn}\,\mathrm{tr}[c_j^\dagger c(\vartheta)c_k^\dagger c_l^\dagger c_n c_m\rho^2] = \frac{2}{2}\widetilde{\sum_k}\sum_{lmn}\langle\vartheta|\varphi_k\rangle\langle\varphi_k\varphi_l|f|\varphi_m\varphi_n\rangle\,\mathrm{tr}(c_j^\dagger c_l^\dagger c_n c_m\rho^2)$$
$$= \sum_{lmn}\langle\vartheta\varphi_l|f|\varphi_m\varphi_n\rangle\,\mathrm{tr}(c_j^\dagger c_l^\dagger c_n c_m\rho^2)$$

In the first step, we used the symmetry of f_{klmn} and the (anti-)commutator relation for the creation operators operators, the result being the same regardless of particle statistics.

Three-particle operators, or even higher, are computed in similar fashion. For a three-body operator

$$F = \frac{1}{3!}\widetilde{\sum_{jkl}}\widetilde{\sum_{pqr}}f_{jklpqr}c_j^\dagger c_k^\dagger c_l^\dagger c_r c_q c_p$$

we obtain the right-hand side

$$\mathrm{tr}[c_j^\dagger c(u)F\rho^2] = \frac{1}{2!}\sum_{klpqr}\langle\vartheta\varphi_k\varphi_l|f|\varphi_p\varphi_q\varphi_r\rangle\,\mathrm{tr}(c_j^\dagger c_k^\dagger c_l^\dagger c_r c_q c_p\rho^2)$$

Generally, the combinatorial factor $n!^{-1}$ in front of the n-body operator becomes $(n-1)!^{-1}$ due to symmetry properties.

The matrix

$$S_{jk} \equiv \mathrm{tr}(c_j^\dagger c_k\rho^2) = \mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{c}_j^\dagger\mathbf{c}_k\mathbf{B}^2) \tag{30}$$

defines the ρ-CAP-MCTDH analogue of the *reduced one-body density matrix* entering at the same location in standard Ψ-MCTDH theory. Similarly, the analogue of the reduced two-body density matrix is defined by

$$S_{jklm}^{(2)} \equiv \mathrm{tr}(c_j^\dagger c_k^\dagger c_m c_l\rho^2) = \mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{c}_j^\dagger\mathbf{c}_k^\dagger\mathbf{c}_m\mathbf{c}_l\mathbf{B}^2), \tag{31}$$

and so on.

We may now assemble the various one- and two-body contributions to the SPF equation of motion:

$$\mathrm{i}\sum_k\langle\vartheta|\dot\varphi_k\rangle S_{jk} = \sum_k\langle\vartheta|(h-\mathrm{i}\Gamma)|\varphi_k\rangle S_{jk} + \sum_{klm}\langle\vartheta\varphi_k|u|\varphi_l\varphi_m\rangle\varphi_l S_{jklm}^{(2)},$$

which holds for *all* $\vartheta = Q\vartheta$. Since $\dot\varphi_j = Q\dot\varphi_j$, we arrive at the final single-particle equations of motion:

$$\mathrm{i}\sum_k\dot\varphi_k S_{jk} = Q\sum_k(h-\mathrm{i}\Gamma)\varphi_k S_{jk} + \sum_{klm}Q\langle\,\cdot\,\varphi_k|u|\varphi_l\varphi_m\rangle\varphi_l S_{jklm}^{(2)}$$

$$= Q\sum_k(h-\mathrm{i}\Gamma)\varphi_k S_{jk} + \sum_{klm}QU_{km}\varphi_l S_{jklm}^{(2)},$$

where

$$\langle\,\cdot\,\varphi_k|u|\varphi_l\varphi_m\rangle \equiv \int\overline{\varphi_k(y)}u(x,y)\varphi_l(x)\varphi_m(y)\,\mathrm{d}y,$$

and where the mean-field potentials U_{km} are defined by

$$U_{km}(x) \equiv \int\overline{\varphi_k(y)}u(x,y)\varphi_m(y)\,\mathrm{d}y. \tag{32}$$

Assuming $u(x,y)$ to be a local potential, $U_{km}(x)$ is also a local one-body potential.

D. Discussion

Let us sum up the equations of motion for the density operator ρ. The Galerkin matrix elements $B_{J,K}$ evolves according to

$$\dot{\mathbf{B}} = -\mathrm{i}[\mathbf{H},\mathbf{B}] - \{\mathbf{G},\mathbf{B}\} + 2\sum_{jk}\Gamma_{jk}\mathbf{c}_k\mathbf{B}\mathbf{c}_j^\dagger, \tag{33}$$

while the SPFs evolve according to

$$\mathrm{i}\sum_k\dot\varphi_k S_{jk} = Q\sum_k(h-\mathrm{i}\Gamma)\varphi_k S_{jk} + \sum_{klm}QU_{km}\varphi_l S_{jklm}^{(2)}, \tag{34}$$

where S_{jk}, $S_{jklm}^{(2)}$ and $U_{km}(x)$ were defined in Eqs. (30), (31) and (32), respectively.

Eq. (34) is virtually identical to the standard Ψ-MCTDH equation of motion for the SPFs. The only difference lies in the definitions of S and $S^{(2)}$. As for Eq. (33), we see that the main difference lies in the evolution of a *matrix* $\mathbf{B}$ instead of a coefficient vector.

Eq. (34) is typically discretized using discrete-variable representation (DVR) techniques, FFT methods, finite differences or similar [17], and the single-particle operator $h - \mathrm{i}\Gamma$ is then represented correspondingly. Equivalently, the single-particle space $\mathcal{H}_1$ is approximated by the finite-dimensional space dictated by the discretization, inducing a finite-dimensional Fock space to begin with. Note that even though $h - \mathrm{i}\Gamma$ is non-Hermitian, orthonormality of φ is conserved during evolution.

Like standard Ψ-MCTDH, the matrix S needs to be inverted to evaluate the SPF differential equation; a well-known issue with MCTDH-type methods. It may happen that S becomes singular for some reason, in which case a regularization approach is needed [17]. In most applications, this happens very rarely; typically at $t = 0$ due to the choice of initial conditions, but experience suggests it does not affect the final results. This is, however, not trivial from a mathematical point of view, and for the sake of definiteness in the present work, we shall check that S is non-singular for our numerical experiment in Sec. IV.

Eq. (33) should be compared with the original Lindblad equation (12). Also, if $\dot\varphi \equiv 0$, we obtain the variational equation of motion in a fixed linear basis, i.e., what is obtained using a full configuration-interaction type approach. However, the Galerkin matrices defined in Eqs. (23) and (24) have time-dependent coefficients h_{jk}, u_{jklm}, and Γ_{jk} which must be computed along the flow. This is a non-trivial task in general, and techniques common for Ψ-MCTDH can be employed to deal with this in approximate ways [8, 17].

Note that $\mathbf{B}$ retains the natural block structure with respect to the number of particles, cf. Eq. (14). Eq. (33) can be written as

$$\dot{\mathbf{B}}_n = -\mathrm{i}[\mathbf{H},\mathbf{B}_n] - \{\mathbf{G},\mathbf{B}_n\} + 2\sum_{jk}\Gamma_{jk}\mathbf{c}_k\mathbf{B}_{n+1}\mathbf{c}_j^\dagger$$

and this is the most memory-economical representation, since the off-diagonal blocks vanish if $\rho(0)$ is a pure state with N particles. In that case, $\mathbf{B}_N$ can furthermore be represented by a vector $\Psi_N \in \mathcal{V}_N$ at all times, and there is no need to propagate the full block. Due to the presence of *all* the blocks in the definition of S and $S^{(2)}$, however, this pure state cannot be evolved with Ψ-MCTDH independently of the other blocks.

If the dissipative terms vanish (i.e., if $\Gamma = 0$), and if $\rho(0)$ is a pure state, the evolution is easily seen to be equivalent to a Ψ-MCTDH calculation. In ρ-MCTDH, $\mathrm{tr}(\rho)$ is not in general conserved [17], but it is so for closed systems, i.e., when $\mathcal{D}(\rho) \equiv 0$. However, it is easily checked in the present case that, indeed,

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathrm{tr}(\rho) = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{B}) = 0.$$

Also, energy $\mathrm{tr}(H\rho)$ is exactly conserved if $\mathrm{tr}(\Gamma\rho) = 0$, that is to say, whenever the system does not touch the CAP.

For the actual implementation of the evolution equations, it is useful to employ a generic enumeration scheme for the many-body basis states. In many-body codes, the Galerkin matrices (other than **B**) are rarely constructed in memory; instead the single- and double-particle integrals are kept in memory and the explicit action of H is computed using Eq. (23), for which the action of $\mathbf{c}_j$ and $\mathbf{c}_j^\dagger$ are implemented for example via mapping techniques as suggested in Ref. [30]; or simply using binary integers to represent a fermion state, and bitwise manipulations to define the action of $\mathbf{c}_j$ etc.; a common technique in many-body nuclear physics calculations [31].

As for choosing initial conditions, we observe that as a generalization of Ψ-MCTDH capable of treating particle loss, a pure state $\rho(0) = |\Psi_N\rangle\langle\Psi_N|$ will be the usual choice. In that case, experience from Ψ-MCTDH can be applied [17]. Typical choices are single determinants/permanents or stationary states computed by imaginary time propagation, or combinations thereof as in the numerical experiment below.

IV. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENT

We present a numerical experiment for a model problem consisting of spin-polarized fermions in one spatial dimension. We will study a situation where the initial state is a pure state with $N = 3$ particles whose norm gradually decreases due to a CAP. The situation is similar to the study in Ref. [9].

We truncate the domain $\mathbb{R}$ to $[-R, +R]$, where $R = 20$. The single-particle Hamiltonian of our model is

$$h = T + V(x) = -\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + V(x)$$

where the one-body potential is of Gaussian shape

$$V(x) = -8\exp[-1.25x^2].\qquad(35)$$

Numerically we find that $V(x)$ supports 4 bound one-body states. We choose a very simple CAP of standard power-form:

$$\Gamma(x) = \theta(|x| - R')(|x| - R')^2,\qquad(36)$$

where $\theta(x)$ is the Heaviside function. The particles are unaffected by the CAP in the region $[-R', R']$, where we we set $R' = 16$. We have verified that in the energy ranges of the calculations, very little reflection or transmission is generated by Γ. Fig. 2 shows the Gaussian well and the absorber.

The particles interact via a smoothed Coulomb potential,

$$u(x_1, x_2) = 2[(x_1 - x_2)^2 + 0.1^2]^{-1/2},$$

which is long-ranged.

For discretizing the one-body space, we choose the standard fast Fourier transform based method with $N_{\text{grid}} = 128$ equidistant points with spacing $\Delta x = 2R/N_{\text{grid}}$ [32].

For propagating the master equation, we choose a variational splitting scheme [29, 33], propagating the equations of motion with $H' = T$, i.e., kinetic energy only for a time step $\tau/2$, and then $H' = H - T$ for a time step τ, and finally $H' = T$


FIG. 2: Single-particle trap potential $V(x)$ and complex absorbing potential $\Gamma(x)$ used in the numerical experiment. The trap potential is Gaussian, see Eq. (35), and the absorber is quadratic outside $[-16, 16]$, see Eq. (36).

for a time step $\tau/2$ again. This constitutes the propagation of a complete time step τ. While being simple, the scheme has the advantage of having local error $O(\tau^3)$, that the T-propagation is numerically exact, and that the time step is not restricted to be $\tau = O(\Delta x^2)$. The potential step is integrated using a standard explicit fourth-order Runge-Kutta method for simplicity, which is sufficient for our purposes.

The initial condition is chosen as follows. Let $\Psi_2(x_1, x_2)$ be the two-body ground state of the CAP-less Hamiltonian. This is computed numerically by propagating the *standard* Ψ-MCTDH equations in imaginary time $t = -is$ using $L = 4$ single-particle states. It follows, that this state is also a stationary for the present ρ-CAP-MCTDH method with a CAP as long as the overlap with the CAP is negligible. We have checked that this is indeed the case: Propagating the master equation with the two-body state as initial condition leads to an absorption probability of 2.7×10^{-10} at $t = t_{\text{final}} = 30$ which can safely be ignored.

We act upon Ψ_2 with a creation operator $c(g)^\dagger$, where $g(x)$ is a Gaussian of the form

$$g(x) = QC\exp[-(x + 2)^2/0.75 + i3x],$$

where Q projects away the 4 SPFs in the initial condition. $g(x)$ describes an incoming particle of momentum $k = 3$ starting out at $x_0 = -2$. The final three-body initial state is then

$$\rho(0) = c^\dagger(g)|\Psi_2\rangle\langle\Psi_2|c(g).$$

The initial φ then consists of the $L = 5$ functions consisting of the 4 SPFs from the ground-state computation, and the single state $g(x)$.

Using this initial condition, we propagate $\rho(t)$ for $t \leq t_{\text{final}} = 30$. Fig. 3 shows a space-time graph of the particle density $n(x, t)$ given by

$$n(x, t) \equiv \text{tr}[\psi^\dagger(x)\psi(x)\rho(t)].$$

FIG. 3: Space-time graph of square root $\sqrt{n(x,t)}$ of particle density in numerical experiment. Darker areas have higher density. The square root enhances contrast, but exaggerates low densities. From the plot, we can see that a single-particle function of Gaussian form is scattered off a bound two-particle state in a Gaussian well. The reflected and transmitted parts are absorbed by the CAP, revealing an oscillating trapped function of fewer particles.


FIG. 4: Plot of the probabilities $p_n = \text{tr}(\rho_n)$ of having n particles in the system as function of t. The absorption events seen in Fig. 3 is seen to correspond to marked changes in the probabilities. p_0 is too small to merit an interesting plot.

As expected, the plot shows the initial advance of the Gaussian wavepacket and its scattering off the well and the two-particle ground state. It is seen that scattering occurs both in the forward and backward direction. The scattered probability is absorbed upon entering the region $|x| \geq R'$, and a system composed of less than three particles is seen to remain. Superficially, it is an oscillating two-particle system. The system's energy is $E \approx -7.355$.

However, the process is more complex, and by computing the probabilities $p_n(t) = \text{tr}[\rho_n(t)]$ of having n particles in the system we may see what happens in more detail. In Fig. 4 p_n is plotted for each $1 \leq n \leq 3$. As the scattered prob-


FIG. 5: Smallest eigenvalue of the matrix S which needs to be inverted at each t. As one particle is almost entirely absorbed, the smallest eigenvalue falls off rapidly. It peters out at $\approx 1.57 \times 10^{-4}$, safely away from zero.

ability density is absorbed, the probability of having $n = 3$ particles decreases and the probability of $n = 2$ increases correspondingly. However, especially the absorption of the back-scattered wave reveals something interesting: the probability of having $n = 1$ particle in the system clearly becomes significant in this process: the bound two-particle system has a significant probability of being ionized by the collision, leaving a single particle. By inspecting the probability density $n_1(x, t) = \text{tr}[\psi^\dagger(x)\psi(x)\rho_1(t)]$ we verify that it corresponds to a bound one-body state superimposed on the two-body state. The probability $p_0 \approx 3.43 \times 10^{-4}$ at $t = t_{\text{final}}$, showing a very small probability of all particles vanishing. It is therefore not plotted.

Although the initial bound two-particle state had negligible overlap with the CAP, there may still be errors introduced by a placing the CAP too close to the interacting system. For example, if a particle is absorbed prematurely, the remaining system may miss some correlations. Moreover, there seems to be a finite remaining probability of having three particles in the system. This is most likely due to reflections off or transmissions through the non-ideal absorber Γ (which only was chosen for illustrative purposes), and not a bound three-body state. We have not investigated this in detail for the present experiment.

Finally, we address the non-singularity of the matrix S in Eq. (34). In Fig. 5 the smallest eigenvalue of S is plotted as function of t. At the very last leg of the evolution, this eigenvalue σ_{min} drops off quickly.

A sharp fall-off of σ_{min} is to be expected when a particle is almost entirely absorbed. This may be understood in terms of a non-interacting system. If interactions are not present, the whole system may be described by the SPFs alone, each evolving according to the non-Hermitian Schrödinger equation under the single-particle Hamiltonian $h - i\Gamma$. Thus, the eigenvalues σ_j only change because of the CAP. As a particle is absorbed, one eigenvalue goes to zero.

Usually, small eigenvalues σ_j give very rapidly changing SPFs. However, we have observed that the natural orbital corresponding to $\sigma_{\min}$, which we observe resides in the CAP region and thus represents the absorbed particle, does not change significantly in the last leg of the evolution. This indicates that the SPF no longer becomes relevant for the description in in the sense that the right-hand side of (34) de-couples from this SPF. In this way, the near-singularity of S stemming from particle absorption may in fact have no impact at all on the evolution. This may be related to the simple fact that for a pure two-fermion system, the single-particle reduced density matrix is singular whenever L is an odd number. (It is easy to show that the eigenvalues are zero or of multiplicity 2 in the two-fermion case.) We cannot draw any firm conclusions concerning this from our simple experiment, except for pointing out that S becoming singular may have different causes and consequences compared to pure state-MCTDH.

V. MIXTURES OF SPECIES

The ρ-CAP-MCTDH formulation for identical particles is readily generalized to mixtures of arbitrary number of species of particles, such as mixtures of ^{3}He and ^{4}He (fermions and bosons). Using second quantization, the derivation becomes analogous to the treatment in Sec. III and Ref. [27], so we only state the main results here.

As Ref. [27] we consider two different species of particles A and B for simplicity, as the generalization to K species follows immediately. Each species have a Fock space $\mathcal{H}^{(i)}$, $i = A, B$. The total Hilbert space is the product space

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}^{(A)} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{(B)}.$$

Each species is assigned a set $\varphi^{(i)}$ of single-particle states $\varphi^{(A)}(x)$ and $\varphi^{(B)}(y)$, but they have no *a priori* connection, as the single-particle spaces may be very different. Consequently, the operators $a_j^{(\dagger)}$ (for species A) and $b_k^{(\dagger)}$ (for species B) all commute since the species are distinguishable from each other. As previously, the creation operators are used to construct finite-dimensional Fock spaces $\mathcal{V}^{(i)}$ with determinant or permanent basis functions $\Phi_J^{(i)}$. For the product space, the basis functions are

$$\Phi_{J[n]}^{(A)} \otimes \Phi_{K[m]}^{(B)} = a_{j_1}^\dagger \cdots a_{j_n}^\dagger \, b_{k_1}^\dagger \cdots b_{k_m}^\dagger \Phi_{\text{vac}}.$$

Note that as the particles are distinguishable, we speak of (n, m)-particle states. Fock space is divided into subspaces with n particles of species A, and m particles of species B. The density operator ρ will then be block diagonal with respect to the particle numbers:

$$\rho = \sum_{n=0}^{N_A} \sum_{m=0}^{N_B} \rho_{n,m}$$

where N_i are the maximum number of particles in the system, determined by the initial condition.

Each species has its internal Hamiltonian, but for the equations not to separate into the previously studied case, we need an interaction. A generic two-body inter-species interaction may be written as

$$W = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m w(x_i, y_j) = \sum_{j,l=1}^{L^{(A)}} \sum_{k,m=1}^{L^{(B)}} w_{jklm} a_j^\dagger a_l b_k^\dagger b_m$$

in first and second quantization form, respectively. Here,

$$w_{jklm} = \langle \varphi_j^{(A)} \varphi_k^{(B)} | w(x, y) | \varphi_l^{(A)} \varphi_m^{(B)} \rangle.$$

The usual factor $1/2$ is not present, since the particles are not identical.

Each species also has its own absorber $\Gamma^{(i)}$, which need not have any *a priori* relation.

Working through the equations of motion, noting that each species' SPFs are independent from each other, we obtain the following equation for the Galerkin matrix blocks $\mathbf{B}_{n,m}$:

$$\dot{\mathbf{B}}_{n,m} = -\mathrm{i}[\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{B}_{n,m}] - \{\mathbf{G}^{(A)} + \mathbf{G}^{(B)}, \mathbf{B}_{n,m}\}$$
$$+ 2 \sum_{jk} \Gamma_{jk}^{(A)} \mathbf{a}_k \mathbf{B}_{n+1,m} \mathbf{a}_j^\dagger + 2 \sum_{jk} \Gamma_{jk}^{(B)} \mathbf{b}_k \mathbf{B}_{n,m+1} \mathbf{b}_j^\dagger$$

with $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{H}^{(A)} + \mathbf{H}^{(B)} + \mathbf{W}$ and an otherwise obvious notation.

We obtain an SPF equation of motion for each species. They will contain species-specific analogues $S^{(i)}$ of S, and of the mean fields $U^{(i)}$ of U, and also *inter species* analogues of the reduced two-body density matrix elements $S^{(AB,2)}$ and mean fields due to W, exactly as in the Ψ-MCTDH method [27]. These are defined by

$$S_{jklm}^{(AB,2)} \equiv S_{kjml}^{(BA,2)} \equiv \mathrm{tr}(\rho^2 a_j^\dagger a_l b_k^\dagger b_m),$$
$$W_{km}^{(A)} \equiv \int \overline{\varphi^{(B)}(y)} w(x, y) \varphi^{(B)}(y) \, \mathrm{d}y,$$

and

$$W_{km}^{(B)} \equiv \int \overline{\varphi^{(A)}(x)} w(x, y) \varphi^{(A)}(x) \, \mathrm{d}x,$$

respectively. We get the SPF equations of motion

$$i \sum_j \dot{\varphi}_j^{(A)} S_{kj}^{(A)} = Q^{(A)} \Big[\sum_j (h^{(A)} - i\Gamma^{(A)}) \varphi_j^{(A)} S_{kj}^{(A)} + \sum_{klm} U_{km}^{(A)} \varphi_l^{(A)} S_{jklm}^{(A,2)} + \sum_{klm} W_{km}^{(A)} \varphi_l^{(A)} S_{jklm}^{(AB,2)} \Big]$$

$$i \sum_j \dot{\varphi}_j^{(B)} S_{kj}^{(B)} = Q^{(B)} \Big[\sum_j (h^{(B)} - i\Gamma^{(B)}) \varphi_j^{(B)} S_{kj}^{(B)} + \sum_{klm} U_{km}^{(B)} \varphi_l^{(B)} S_{jklm}^{(B,2)} + \sum_{klm} W_{km}^{(B)} \varphi_l^{(B)} S_{lmjk}^{(AB,2)} \Big].$$

These equations have an obvious symmetry with respect to particle species interchange. These equations are identical to those given in Ref. [27], except for the reduced density matrices being defined in terms of a density operator and not a pure state.

The generalization to K species is straightforward, and we refrain from going into further detail. Note however, that one interesting special case is obtained when the number of species equals the number of initial particles, so that the initial state is a density operator in the space

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1^{(1)} \otimes \mathcal{H}_1^{(2)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_1^{(K)}.$$

In this case it seen that, as all particles in the system are in fact distinguishable, we have obtained the usual ρ-MCTDH method for distinguishable degrees of freedom, but with a CAP. Of course, the same can be said of pure-state MCTDH for mixtures of particles – as we approach $K = N$ species, where N is the number of particles, we are back at plain MCTDH for distinguishable particles, and the circle is closed: MCTDH for identical particles can be viewed as MCTDH with (anti-)symmetry constraints on the coefficients, and plain MCTDH can be viewed as N-species MCTDH for mixtures.

VI. CONCLUSION

A system of N particles described by a Hamiltonian with a CAP evolves irreversibly in time. In order to describe the remaining particles as some are lost to the absorber, a master equation on Lindblad form in Fock space is needed, as first demonstrated in Ref. [22]. This equation was discussed at length, and a Fock space ρ-MCTDH method, ρ-CAP-MCTDH, was presented that is a strict generalization of standard pure-state MCTDH evolution for identical particles or mixtures. A numerical experiment on a simple system of $N = 3$ spin-polarized fermions was reported.

[1] H.-D. Meyer, U. Manthe, and L. Cederbaum, Chem. Phys. Lett. **165**, 73 (1990).

[2] M. H. Beck, A. Jäckle, G. A. Worth, and H. D. Meyer, Physics Reports **324**, 1 (2000).

[3] A. Raab and H.-D. Meyer, Theor. Chem. Acc. **104**, 258 (2000).

[4] J. Zanghellini, M. Kitzler, C. Fabian, T. Brabec, and A. Scrinzi, Laser Physics **13**, 1064 (2003).

[5] O. E. Alon, A. I. Streltsov, and S. Cederbaum, J. Chem. Phys. **127**, 154103 (2007).

[6] O. E. Alon, A. I. Streltsov, and L. S. Cederbaum, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 033613 (2008).

[7] O. Vendrell and H.-D. Meyer, J. Chem. Phys. **134**, 044135 (2011).

[8] J. Caillat, J. Zanghellini, M. Kitzler, O. Koch, W. Kreuzer, and A. Scrinzi, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 012712 (2005).

[9] M. Nest and T. Klamroth, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 012710 (2005).

[10] K. Sakmann, A. Streltsov, O. Alon, and L. Cederbaum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 220601 (2009).

[11] A. Streltsov, K. Sakmann, O. Alon, and L. Cederbaum, arXiv:0910.5916v1.

[12] C. Lubich, Math. Comp. **74**, 765 (2005).

[13] J. Broeckhove, L. Lathouwers, E. Kesteloot, and P. Van Leuven, Chemical Physics Letters **149**, 547 (1988).

[14] R. Kosloff and D. Kosloff, J. Comp. Phys. **63**, 363 (1986).

[15] A. Jäckle and H.-D. Meyer, J. Chem. Phys. **105**, 6778 (1996).

[16] J. Muga, J. Palao, B. Navarro, and I. Egusquiza, Phys. Rep. **395**, 357 (2004).

[17] H.-D. Meyer, F. Gatti, and G. A. Worth, eds., *Multidimensional Quantum Dynamics: MCTDH Theory and Applications* (Wiley, Weinheim, Germany, 2009).

[18] U. Riss and H.-D. Meyer, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **31**, 2279 (1998).

[19] N. Moiseyev, Journal of Physics B: Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics **31**, 1431 (1998).

[20] A. Nissen, H. Karlsson, and G. Kreiss, J. Chem. Phys. **133**, 054306 (2010).

[21] A. Arnold, VLSI Design **6**, 313 (1998).

[22] S. Selstø and S. Kvaal, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **43**, 065004 (2010).

[23] G. Lindblad, Commun. Math. Phys. **48**, 119 (1976).

[24] V. Gorini, A. Kossakowski, and E. Sudarshan, J. Math. Phys. **17**, 821 (1976).

[25] R. Alicki and K. Lendi, *Quantum Dynamical Semigroups and Applications*, vol. 717 of *Lecture Notes in Physics* (Springer, Heidelberg, Germany, 2007), ISBN 978-3-540-70860-5.

[26] A. Raab, I. Burghardt, and H.-D. Meyer, J. Chem. Phys. **111**, 8759 (1999).

[27] O. E. Alon, A. I. Streltsov, and S. Cederbaum, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 062501 (2007).

[28] E. Davies, *Quantum Theory of Open Systems* (Academic Press,

London, United Kingdom, 1976), ISBN 0-12-206150-0.

[29] C. Lubich, *From Quantum to Classical Molecular Dynamics: Reduced Models and Numerical Analysis* (European Mathematical Society, 2008).

[30] A. I. Streltsov, O. E. Alon, and L. S. Cederbaum, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 022124 (2010).

[31] R. Whitehead, A. Watt, B. Cole, and I. Morrison, Adv. Nucl. Phys. **9**, 123 (1977).

[32] H. Tal-Ezer and R. Kosloff, J. Chem. Phys. **81**, 3967 (1984).

[33] C. Lubich, Appl. Numer. Math. **48**, 355 (2004).

Preprint Series DFG-SPP 1324

http://www.dfg-spp1324.de

Reports

[1] R. Ramlau, G. Teschke, and M. Zhariy. A Compressive Landweber Iteration for Solving Ill-Posed Inverse Problems. Preprint 1, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2008.

[2] G. Plonka. The Easy Path Wavelet Transform: A New Adaptive Wavelet Transform for Sparse Representation of Two-dimensional Data. Preprint 2, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2008.

[3] E. Novak and H. Woźniakowski. Optimal Order of Convergence and (In-) Tractability of Multivariate Approximation of Smooth Functions. Preprint 3, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2008.

[4] M. Espig, L. Grasedyck, and W. Hackbusch. Black Box Low Tensor Rank Approximation Using Fibre-Crosses. Preprint 4, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2008.

[5] T. Bonesky, S. Dahlke, P. Maass, and T. Raasch. Adaptive Wavelet Methods and Sparsity Reconstruction for Inverse Heat Conduction Problems. Preprint 5, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2009.

[6] E. Novak and H. Woźniakowski. Approximation of Infinitely Differentiable Multivariate Functions Is Intractable. Preprint 6, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2009.

[7] J. Ma and G. Plonka. A Review of Curvelets and Recent Applications. Preprint 7, DFG-SPP 1324, February 2009.

[8] L. Denis, D. A. Lorenz, and D. Trede. Greedy Solution of Ill-Posed Problems: Error Bounds and Exact Inversion. Preprint 8, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.

[9] U. Friedrich. A Two Parameter Generalization of Lions' Nonoverlapping Domain Decomposition Method for Linear Elliptic PDEs. Preprint 9, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.

[10] K. Bredies and D. A. Lorenz. Minimization of Non-smooth, Non-convex Functionals by Iterative Thresholding. Preprint 10, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.

[11] K. Bredies and D. A. Lorenz. Regularization with Non-convex Separable Constraints. Preprint 11, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.

[12] M. Döhler, S. Kunis, and D. Potts. Nonequispaced Hyperbolic Cross Fast Fourier Transform. Preprint 12, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.

[13] C. Bender. Dual Pricing of Multi-Exercise Options under Volume Constraints. Preprint 13, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.

[14] T. Müller-Gronbach and K. Ritter. Variable Subspace Sampling and Multi-level Algorithms. Preprint 14, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2009.

[15] G. Plonka, S. Tenorth, and A. Iske. Optimally Sparse Image Representation by the Easy Path Wavelet Transform. Preprint 15, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2009.

[16] S. Dahlke, E. Novak, and W. Sickel. Optimal Approximation of Elliptic Problems by Linear and Nonlinear Mappings IV: Errors in L_2 and Other Norms. Preprint 16, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2009.

[17] B. Jin, T. Khan, P. Maass, and M. Pidcock. Function Spaces and Optimal Currents in Impedance Tomography. Preprint 17, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2009.

[18] G. Plonka and J. Ma. Curvelet-Wavelet Regularized Split Bregman Iteration for Compressed Sensing. Preprint 18, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2009.

[19] G. Teschke and C. Borries. Accelerated Projected Steepest Descent Method for Nonlinear Inverse Problems with Sparsity Constraints. Preprint 19, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2009.

[20] L. Grasedyck. Hierarchical Singular Value Decomposition of Tensors. Preprint 20, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2009.

[21] D. Rudolf. Error Bounds for Computing the Expectation by Markov Chain Monte Carlo. Preprint 21, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2009.

[22] M. Hansen and W. Sickel. Best m-term Approximation and Lizorkin-Triebel Spaces. Preprint 22, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2009.

[23] F.J. Hickernell, T. Müller-Gronbach, B. Niu, and K. Ritter. Multi-level Monte Carlo Algorithms for Infinite-dimensional Integration on $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$. Preprint 23, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2009.

[24] S. Dereich and F. Heidenreich. A Multilevel Monte Carlo Algorithm for Lévy Driven Stochastic Differential Equations. Preprint 24, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2009.

[25] S. Dahlke, M. Fornasier, and T. Raasch. Multilevel Preconditioning for Adaptive Sparse Optimization. Preprint 25, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2009.

[26] S. Dereich. Multilevel Monte Carlo Algorithms for Lévy-driven SDEs with Gaussian Correction. Preprint 26, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2009.

[27] G. Plonka, S. Tenorth, and D. Roşca. A New Hybrid Method for Image Approximation using the Easy Path Wavelet Transform. Preprint 27, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2009.

[28] O. Koch and C. Lubich. Dynamical Low-rank Approximation of Tensors. Preprint 28, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.

[29] E. Faou, V. Gradinaru, and C. Lubich. Computing Semi-classical Quantum Dynamics with Hagedorn Wavepackets. Preprint 29, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.

[30] D. Conte and C. Lubich. An Error Analysis of the Multi-configuration Time-dependent Hartree Method of Quantum Dynamics. Preprint 30, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.

[31] C. E. Powell and E. Ullmann. Preconditioning Stochastic Galerkin Saddle Point Problems. Preprint 31, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.

[32] O. G. Ernst and E. Ullmann. Stochastic Galerkin Matrices. Preprint 32, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.

[33] F. Lindner and R. L. Schilling. Weak Order for the Discretization of the Stochastic Heat Equation Driven by Impulsive Noise. Preprint 33, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.

[34] L. Kämmerer and S. Kunis. On the Stability of the Hyperbolic Cross Discrete Fourier Transform. Preprint 34, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2009.

[35] P. Cerejeiras, M. Ferreira, U. Kähler, and G. Teschke. Inversion of the noisy Radon transform on $SO(3)$ by Gabor frames and sparse recovery principles. Preprint 35, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2010.

[36] T. Jahnke and T. Udrescu. Solving Chemical Master Equations by Adaptive Wavelet Compression. Preprint 36, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2010.

[37] P. Kittipoom, G. Kutyniok, and W.-Q Lim. Irregular Shearlet Frames: Geometry and Approximation Properties. Preprint 37, DFG-SPP 1324, February 2010.

[38] G. Kutyniok and W.-Q Lim. Compactly Supported Shearlets are Optimally Sparse. Preprint 38, DFG-SPP 1324, February 2010.

[39] M. Hansen and W. Sickel. Best m-Term Approximation and Tensor Products of Sobolev and Besov Spaces – the Case of Non-compact Embeddings. Preprint 39, DFG-SPP 1324, March 2010.

[40] B. Niu, F.J. Hickernell, T. Müller-Gronbach, and K. Ritter. Deterministic Multilevel Algorithms for Infinite-dimensional Integration on $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$. Preprint 40, DFG-SPP 1324, March 2010.

[41] P. Kittipoom, G. Kutyniok, and W.-Q Lim. Construction of Compactly Supported Shearlet Frames. Preprint 41, DFG-SPP 1324, March 2010.

[42] C. Bender and J. Steiner. Error Criteria for Numerical Solutions of Backward SDEs. Preprint 42, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2010.

[43] L. Grasedyck. Polynomial Approximation in Hierarchical Tucker Format by Vector-Tensorization. Preprint 43, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2010.

[44] M. Hansen und W. Sickel. Best m-Term Approximation and Sobolev-Besov Spaces of Dominating Mixed Smoothness - the Case of Compact Embeddings. Preprint 44, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2010.

[45] P. Binev, W. Dahmen, and P. Lamby. Fast High-Dimensional Approximation with Sparse Occupancy Trees. Preprint 45, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2010.

[46] J. Ballani and L. Grasedyck. A Projection Method to Solve Linear Systems in Tensor Format. Preprint 46, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2010.

[47] P. Binev, A. Cohen, W. Dahmen, R. DeVore, G. Petrova, and P. Wojtaszczyk. Convergence Rates for Greedy Algorithms in Reduced Basis Methods. Preprint 47, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2010.

[48] S. Kestler and K. Urban. Adaptive Wavelet Methods on Unbounded Domains. Preprint 48, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2010.

[49] H. Yserentant. The Mixed Regularity of Electronic Wave Functions Multiplied by Explicit Correlation Factors. Preprint 49, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2010.

[50] H. Yserentant. On the Complexity of the Electronic Schrödinger Equation. Preprint 50, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2010.

[51] M. Guillemard and A. Iske. Curvature Analysis of Frequency Modulated Manifolds in Dimensionality Reduction. Preprint 51, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2010.

[52] E. Herrholz and G. Teschke. Compressive Sensing Principles and Iterative Sparse Recovery for Inverse and Ill-Posed Problems. Preprint 52, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.

[53] L. Kämmerer, S. Kunis, and D. Potts. Interpolation Lattices for Hyperbolic Cross Trigonometric Polynomials. Preprint 53, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.

[54] G. Kutyniok and W.-Q Lim. Shearlets on Bounded Domains. Preprint 54, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.

[55] A. Zeiser. Wavelet Approximation in Weighted Sobolev Spaces of Mixed Order with Applications to the Electronic Schrödinger Equation. Preprint 55, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.

[56] G. Kutyniok, J. Lemvig, and W.-Q Lim. Compactly Supported Shearlets. Preprint 56, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.

[57] A. Zeiser. On the Optimality of the Inexact Inverse Iteration Coupled with Adaptive Finite Element Methods. Preprint 57, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.

[58] S. Jokar. Sparse Recovery and Kronecker Products. Preprint 58, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2010.

[59] T. Aboiyar, E. H. Georgoulis, and A. Iske. Adaptive ADER Methods Using Kernel-Based Polyharmonic Spline WENO Reconstruction. Preprint 59, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2010.

[60] O. G. Ernst, A. Mugler, H.-J. Starkloff, and E. Ullmann. On the Convergence of Generalized Polynomial Chaos Expansions. Preprint 60, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2010.

[61] S. Holtz, T. Rohwedder, and R. Schneider. On Manifolds of Tensors of Fixed TT-Rank. Preprint 61, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2010.

[62] J. Ballani, L. Grasedyck, and M. Kluge. Black Box Approximation of Tensors in Hierarchical Tucker Format. Preprint 62, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2010.

[63] M. Hansen. On Tensor Products of Quasi-Banach Spaces. Preprint 63, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2010.

[64] S. Dahlke, G. Steidl, and G. Teschke. Shearlet Coorbit Spaces: Compactly Supported Analyzing Shearlets, Traces and Embeddings. Preprint 64, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2010.

[65] W. Hackbusch. Tensorisation of Vectors and their Efficient Convolution. Preprint 65, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2010.

[66] P. A. Cioica, S. Dahlke, S. Kinzel, F. Lindner, T. Raasch, K. Ritter, and R. L. Schilling. Spatial Besov Regularity for Stochastic Partial Differential Equations on Lipschitz Domains. Preprint 66, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2010.

[67] E. Novak and H. Woźniakowski. On the Power of Function Values for the Approximation Problem in Various Settings. Preprint 67, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2010.

[68] A. Hinrichs, E. Novak, and H. Woźniakowski. The Curse of Dimensionality for Monotone and Convex Functions of Many Variables. Preprint 68, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2010.

[69] G. Kutyniok and W.-Q Lim. Image Separation Using Shearlets. Preprint 69, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2010.

[70] B. Jin and P. Maass. An Analysis of Electrical Impedance Tomography with Applications to Tikhonov Regularization. Preprint 70, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.

[71] S. Holtz, T. Rohwedder, and R. Schneider. The Alternating Linear Scheme for Tensor Optimisation in the TT Format. Preprint 71, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.

[72] T. Müller-Gronbach and K. Ritter. A Local Refinement Strategy for Constructive Quantization of Scalar SDEs. Preprint 72, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.

[73] T. Rohwedder and R. Schneider. An Analysis for the DIIS Acceleration Method used in Quantum Chemistry Calculations. Preprint 73, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.

[74] C. Bender and J. Steiner. Least-Squares Monte Carlo for Backward SDEs. Preprint 74, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.

[75] C. Bender. Primal and Dual Pricing of Multiple Exercise Options in Continuous Time. Preprint 75, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.

[76] H. Harbrecht, M. Peters, and R. Schneider. On the Low-rank Approximation by the Pivoted Cholesky Decomposition. Preprint 76, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.

[77] P. A. Cioica, S. Dahlke, N. Döhring, S. Kinzel, F. Lindner, T. Raasch, K. Ritter, and R. L. Schilling. Adaptive Wavelet Methods for Elliptic Stochastic Partial Differential Equations. Preprint 77, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.

[78] G. Plonka, S. Tenorth, and A. Iske. Optimal Representation of Piecewise Hölder Smooth Bivariate Functions by the Easy Path Wavelet Transform. Preprint 78, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.

[79] A. Mugler and H.-J. Starkloff. On Elliptic Partial Differential Equations with Random Coefficients. Preprint 79, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.

[80] T. Müller-Gronbach, K. Ritter, and L. Yaroslavtseva. A Derandomization of the Euler Scheme for Scalar Stochastic Differential Equations. Preprint 80, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.

[81] W. Dahmen, C. Huang, C. Schwab, and G. Welper. Adaptive Petrov-Galerkin methods for first order transport equations. Preprint 81, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.

[82] K. Grella and C. Schwab. Sparse Tensor Spherical Harmonics Approximation in Radiative Transfer. Preprint 82, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.

[83] D.A. Lorenz, S. Schiffler, and D. Trede. Beyond Convergence Rates: Exact Inversion With Tikhonov Regularization With Sparsity Constraints. Preprint 83, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.

[84] S. Dereich, M. Scheutzow, and R. Schottstedt. Constructive quantization: Approximation by empirical measures. Preprint 84, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.

[85] S. Dahlke and W. Sickel. On Besov Regularity of Solutions to Nonlinear Elliptic Partial Differential Equations. Preprint 85, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.

[86] S. Dahlke, U. Friedrich, P. Maass, T. Raasch, and R.A. Ressel. An adaptive wavelet method for parameter identification problems in parabolic partial differential equations. Preprint 86, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.

[87] A. Cohen, W. Dahmen, and G. Welper. Adaptivity and Variational Stabilization for Convection-Diffusion Equations. Preprint 87, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.

[88] T. Jahnke. On Reduced Models for the Chemical Master Equation. Preprint 88, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.

[89] P. Binev, W. Dahmen, R. DeVore, P. Lamby, D. Savu, and R. Sharpley. Compressed Sensing and Electron Microscopy. Preprint 89, DFG-SPP 1324, March 2011.

[90] P. Binev, F. Blanco-Silva, D. Blom, W. Dahmen, P. Lamby, R. Sharpley, and T. Vogt. High Quality Image Formation by Nonlocal Means Applied to High-Angle Annular Dark Field Scanning Transmission Electron Microscopy (HAADF-STEM). Preprint 90, DFG-SPP 1324, March 2011.

[91] R. A. Ressel. A Parameter Identification Problem for a Nonlinear Parabolic Differential Equation. Preprint 91, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2011.

[92] G. Kutyniok. Data Separation by Sparse Representations. Preprint 92, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2011.

[93] M. A. Davenport, M. F. Duarte, Y. C. Eldar, and G. Kutyniok. Introduction to Compressed Sensing. Preprint 93, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2011.

[94] H.-C. Kreusler and H. Yserentant. The Mixed Regularity of Electronic Wave Functions in Fractional Order and Weighted Sobolev Spaces. Preprint 94, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2011.

[95] E. Ullmann, H. C. Elman, and O. G. Ernst. Efficient Iterative Solvers for Stochastic Galerkin Discretizations of Log-Transformed Random Diffusion Problems. Preprint 95, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2011.

[96] S. Kunis and I. Melzer. On the Butterfly Sparse Fourier Transform. Preprint 96, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2011.

[97] T. Rohwedder. The Continuous Coupled Cluster Formulation for the Electronic Schrödinger Equation. Preprint 97, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2011.

[98] T. Rohwedder and R. Schneider. Error Estimates for the Coupled Cluster Method. Preprint 98, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2011.

[99] P. A. Cioica and S. Dahlke. Spatial Besov Regularity for Semilinear Stochastic Partial Differential Equations on Bounded Lipschitz Domains. Preprint 99, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2011.

[100] L. Grasedyck and W. Hackbusch. An Introduction to Hierarchical (H-) Rank and TT-Rank of Tensors with Examples. Preprint 100, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2011.

[101] N. Chegini, S. Dahlke, U. Friedrich, and R. Stevenson. Piecewise Tensor Product Wavelet Bases by Extensions and Approximation Rates. Preprint 101, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2011.

[102] S. Dahlke, P. Oswald, and T. Raasch. A Note on Quarkonial Systems and Multilevel Partition of Unity Methods. Preprint 102, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2011.

[103] A. Uschmajew. Local Convergence of the Alternating Least Squares Algorithm For Canonical Tensor Approximation. Preprint 103, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2011.

[104] S. Kvaal. Multiconfigurational time-dependent Hartree method for describing particle loss due to absorbing boundary conditions. Preprint 104, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2011.