

# Supplementary Information to ‘Ground states of strongly-correlated materials on quantum computers using *ab initio* downfolding’

Antonios M. Alvertis,<sup>1,2,\*</sup> Abid Khan,<sup>3</sup> and Norm M. Tubman<sup>4,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*KBR, Inc., NASA Ames Research Center,  
Moffett Field, California 94035, United States*

<sup>2</sup>*Materials Sciences Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory,  
Berkeley, California 94720, United States*

<sup>3</sup>*Department of Physics, University of Illinois  
Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL, United States 61801*

<sup>4</sup>*NASA Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, California 94035, United States*

(Dated:)

## CONTENTS

S1. Details of VQE optimization	2
S2. Details of DFT and constrained RPA calculations	4
S3. Downfolded Hamiltonian parameters	5
A. $\text{Ca}_2\text{CuO}_3$	5
B. $\text{WTe}_2$	5
C. $\text{SrVO}_3$	6
References	7

---

\* [antoniosmarkos.alvertis@nasa.gov](mailto:antoniosmarkos.alvertis@nasa.gov)

† [norman.m.tubman@nasa.gov](mailto:norman.m.tubman@nasa.gov)

## S1. DETAILS OF VQE OPTIMIZATION

Following Ref. [1], we start by optimizing for the ground state of the non-interacting system ( $U = 0$ ). We use this state  $|\psi_o\rangle$  to generate the parameterized quantum circuit

$$|\psi_{\text{PQC}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\rangle = U_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n)\dots U_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1)|\psi_o\rangle \quad (1)$$

as the starting point for the optimization of the interacting case, representing the real material of interest. The initial parameters  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  are obtained randomly from a Gaussian distribution  $\mathcal{N}(0, 10^{-5})$  with zero mean and variance  $\sigma^2 = 10^{-5}$ . We perform an energy minimization, until one of three conditions is met: the energy tolerance (defined by the absolute difference between the energy at the final step and the penultimate step) reaches  $10^{-7}$ , the energy gradient reaches  $10^{-6}$ , or the optimization reaches 500 steps. The optimizations are performed using the L-BFGS method [2].

In order to obtain ground states with high fidelities, following the energy minimization described above, we use the resulting wave functions as a starting point for an overlap-based optimization, where the optimizer minimizes the loss function  $f = \log_{10}(1 - |\langle \Psi_{VQE} | \Psi_{DMRG} \rangle|^2)$  (the logarithm of the infidelity with respect to the DMRG ground state). We find that this hybrid optimization strategy yields the overall best results in terms of minimizing the energy and also producing a high-fidelity ground state. We perform ten independent optimizations following the above hybrid energy-/overlap-based minimization, and we take the state with the minimal energy among these ten as the ground state, which prevents the system from becoming stuck in local minima.

An important factor in the ground state optimization is the electron filling of the bands of the different materials studied here.  $\text{Ca}_2\text{CuO}_3$  and  $\text{SrVO}_3$  are metallic at the DFT level of theory, and we solve for their ground state at half-filling of the first electronic band included in the model.  $\text{WTe}_2$  is predicted to be a conventional band insulator at the Kohn-Sham level of theory, we therefore solve for the ground state of this system with an initial state where the two lower-energy bands in the active space (see Fig. 3 in main manuscript) are at full-filling, and the two upper bands are empty. Since here we work in the basis of Wannier functions, we populate the Wannier states with the greatest contribution from the two lower-energy Kohn-Sham states, averaged across the Brillouin zone, as can be deduced from the

Wannier rotation matrices obtained within wannier90 [3].

In Tables S1-S4 we give the VQE energies and fidelities obtained for  $\text{WTe}_2$  and  $\text{SrVO}_3$ , ranked from best to worst from right to left.

VQE 1	VQE 2	VQE 3	VQE 4	VQE 5	VQE 6	VQE 7	VQE 8	VQE 9	VQE 10
55.225 eV	55.313 eV	57.202 eV	61.064 eV	62.710 eV	63.854 eV	64.074 eV	70.980 eV	71.753 eV	77.582 eV
DMRG Energy: 55.103 eV									

Table S1. VQE energies of  $\text{WTe}_2$ .

VQE 1	VQE 2	VQE 3	VQE 4	VQE 5	VQE 6	VQE 7	VQE 8	VQE 9	VQE 10
90.5%	85.0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table S2. VQE fidelities of  $\text{WTe}_2$  with respect to DMRG reference.

VQE 1	VQE 2	VQE 3	VQE 4	VQE 5	VQE 6	VQE 7	VQE 8	VQE 9	VQE 10
-115.995 eV	-115.824 eV	-115.502 eV	-115.294 eV	-115.163 eV	-115.035 eV	-114.926 eV	-114.787 eV	-100.493 eV	-100.247 eV
DMRG Energy: -116.192 eV									

Table S3. VQE energies of  $\text{SrVO}_3$ .

VQE 1	VQE 2	VQE 3	VQE 4	VQE 5	VQE 6	VQE 7	VQE 8	VQE 9	VQE 10
76.8%	71.1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table S4. VQE fidelities of  $\text{SrVO}_3$  with respect to DMRG reference.

## S2. DETAILS OF DFT AND CONSTRAINED RPA CALCULATIONS

We perform all DFT calculations within the Quantum Espresso software package [4], within the generalized gradient approximation (GGA) of Perdew, Burke and Ernzerhof (PBE) [5]. We utilize scalar-relativistic optimized norm-conserving Vanderbilt pseudopotentials (ONCV) [6] with standard accuracy, as these are given in Pseudo Dojo [7].

For our DFT calculations on  $\text{Ca}_2\text{CuO}_3$  we employ a wave function cutoff of 80 Ry, and a  $6 \times 6 \times 6$  k-grid. We compute the dielectric function and the Coulomb integrals of the system within RESPACK [8], using a polarizability cutoff of 7 Ry and 100 bands, excluding a single band crossing the Fermi level within cRPA. For  $\text{WTe}_2$  we use a wave function cutoff of 80 Ry, and a  $6 \times 6 \times 1$  k-grid. We compute the dielectric function within cRPA by excluding the four bands around the Fermi level, with a polarizability cutoff of 5 Ry and 600 bands. For  $\text{SrVO}_3$  we use a wave function cutoff of 81 Ry, and a  $6 \times 6 \times 6$  k-grid. We compute the dielectric function within cRPA by excluding the three bands crossing the Fermi level, with a polarizability cutoff of 5 Ry and 600 bands, yielding Coulomb parameters in close agreement to those reported previously [8].

### S3. DOWNFOLDED HAMILTONIAN PARAMETERS

Here we give the parameters resulting from downfolding the electronic structure of the different materials onto the extended Hubbard Hamiltonian of eq. 1 of the main manuscript. Here we give the nearest-neighbor terms along the crystallographic direction where the maximal coupling and interactions occur, for each system.

#### A. $\text{Ca}_2\text{CuO}_3$

The hopping and Coulomb terms of this system are dominant along the crystallographic direction which aligns with chains of Cu atoms. We therefore construct a one-dimensional, single-band Hubbard model with the following parameters resulting from the Wannierization and downfolding procedures: hopping integral of  $t = -0.491$  eV, on-site Coulomb interaction of  $U = 3.578$  eV and off-site Coulomb repulsion of  $V = 0.903$  eV.

#### B. $\text{WTe}_2$

Within the subspace of four bands around the Fermi level of  $\text{WTe}_2$ , we find the hopping term

$$t_{i\mathbf{R}j\mathbf{R}'} = \begin{pmatrix} -0.201 & 0.178 & -0.398 & -0.128 \\ 0.108 & -0.144 & 0.072 & -0.071 \\ 0.398 & 0.003 & 0.387 & 0.025 \\ 0.019 & 0.071 & 0.057 & 0.124 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

with  $i = j$  the intra-band terms, and  $i \neq j$  the inter-band contributions, for  $\mathbf{R} \neq \mathbf{R}'$  and for nearest neighbors.

Similarly, for the on-site Coulomb interaction

$$U_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} 1.107 & 0.822 & 0.922 & 0.765 \\ 0.822 & 1.095 & 0.760 & 0.684 \\ 0.922 & 0.760 & 1.096 & 0.853 \\ 0.765 & 0.684 & 0.853 & 1.174 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

and the nearest-neighbor off-site terms:

$$V_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.924 & 0.822 & 0.841 & 0.765 \\ 0.754 & 0.917 & 0.715 & 0.672 \\ 0.841 & 0.760 & 0.855 & 0.853 \\ 0.721 & 0.672 & 0.762 & 0.860 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

### C. SrVO<sub>3</sub>

SrVO<sub>3</sub> has cubic symmetry, making the Hamiltonian parameters identical along the three crystallographic axes. We find within the subspace of the three electronic bands crossing the Fermi level that we have the following intra- and inter-band terms, where all values are given in eV. For the hopping term

$$t_{i\mathbf{R}j\mathbf{R}'} = \begin{pmatrix} -0.263 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -0.263 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -0.027 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5)$$

The on-site Coulomb interaction

$$U_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} 3.527 & 2.349 & 2.349 \\ 2.349 & 3.527 & 2.349 \\ 2.349 & 2.349 & 3.527 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

and the nearest-neighbor off-site terms:

$$V_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.649 & 0.635 & 0.555 \\ 0.635 & 0.649 & 0.555 \\ 0.555 & 0.555 & 0.492 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

- 
- [1] A. Khan, B. K. Clark, and N. M. Tubman, Pre-optimizing variational quantum eigensolvers with tensor networks (2023), [arXiv:2310.12965](https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.12965) [quant-ph].
- [2] J. Nocedal and S. J. Wright, *Numerical optimization* (Springer, 1999).
- [3] G. Pizzi, V. Vitale, R. Arita, S. Blügel, F. Freimuth, G. Géranton, M. Gibertini, D. Gresch, C. Johnson, T. Koretsune, J. Ibanez-Azpiroz, H. Lee, J. M. Lihm, D. Marchand, A. Marrazzo, Y. Mokrousov, J. I. Mustafa, Y. Nohara, Y. Nomura, L. Paulatto, S. Poncé, T. Ponweiser, J. Qiao, F. Thöle, S. S. Tsirkin, M. Wierzbowska, N. Marzari, D. Vanderbilt, I. Souza, A. A. Mostofi, and J. R. Yates, Wannier90 as a community code: New features and applications, *Journal of Physics Condensed Matter* **32**, [10.1088/1361-648X/ab51ff](https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-648X/ab51ff) (2020).
- [4] P. Giannozzi, S. Baroni, N. Bonini, M. Calandra, R. Car, C. Cavazzoni, D. Ceresoli, G. L. Chiarotti, M. Cococcioni, I. Dabo, A. Dal Corso, S. Fabris, G. Fratesi, S. de Gironcoli, R. Gebauer, U. Gerstmann, C. Gougoussis, A. Kokalj, M. Lazzeri, L. Martin-Samos, N. Marzari, F. Mauri, R. Mazzarello, S. Paolini, A. Pasquarello, L. Paulatto, C. Sbraccia, S. Scandolo, G. Sclauzero, A. P. Seitsonen, A. Smogunov, P. Umari, and R. M. Wentzcovitch, QUANTUM ESPRESSO: a modular and open-source software project for quantum simulations of materials, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **21**, 395502 (2009).
- [5] J. P. Perdew, K. Burke, and M. Ernzerhof, Generalized Gradient Approximation Made Simple, *Physical Review Letters* **77**, 3865 (1996).
- [6] D. R. Hamann, Optimized norm-conserving Vanderbilt pseudopotentials, *Physical Review B - Condensed Matter and Materials Physics* **88**, 1 (2013), [1306.4707](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.88.014107).
- [7] M. J. van Setten, M. Giantomassi, E. Bousquet, M. J. Verstraete, D. R. Hamann, X. Gonze, and G. M. Rignanese, The PSEUDODOJO: Training and grading a 85 element optimized norm-conserving pseudopotential table, *Computer Physics Communications* **226**, 39 (2018), [arXiv:1710.10138](https://arxiv.org/abs/1710.10138).
- [8] K. Nakamura, Y. Yoshimoto, Y. Nomura, T. Tadano, M. Kawamura, T. Kosugi, K. Yoshimi, T. Misawa, and Y. Motoyama, RESPACK: An ab initio tool for derivation of effective low-energy model of material, *Computer Physics Communications* **261**, 107781 (2021), [arXiv:2001.02351](https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.02351).