

Hierarchies of quantum chemical descriptors induced by statistical analyses of domain occupation number operators

Guillaume Acke*, Stijn De Baerdemacker†, Ángel Martín Pendás‡, Patrick Bultinck*

Article Type:

Advanced Review

Abstract

As approximations to the wave functions governing quantum chemical systems are becoming more and more complex, it is becoming increasingly important to devise descriptors that help understand the practical results of those approximations by condensing information in insightful ways. Quantum chemical descriptors that are able to capture the statistical signatures of quantum chemical interactions provide such conceptual building blocks. Central to an understanding of these descriptors is the concept of a ‘domain occupation number operator’, which allows the so-called ‘real space’ and Hilbert space partitionings to be treated on the same footing. Many of the existing descriptors can be expressed as the (central) densities and density cumulants associated with the domain operators. These densities can be obtained by successive differentiation of generating functions, effectively structuring domain associated densities into hierarchies. Not only do the resulting hierarchies indicate how many of the previously reported descriptors are related, they also show which areas have not yet been explored.

*Department of Chemistry, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

†Department of Chemistry, University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, Canada

‡Departamento Química Física y Analítica, University of Oviedo, Oviedo, Spain

GRAPHICAL TABLE OF CONTENTS




Figure 1: The statistics of (domain) occupation numbers operators induces a hierarchy of quantum chemical descriptors.

INTRODUCTION

The field of quantum chemistry continues to make important advances in devising increasingly accurate approximations to the wave functions of ever larger systems. These approximations are aimed at modeling as accurately as possible the joint behavior of all electrons. However, as these approximations become more complex, it has become more difficult to gain insight into the wave functions that arise from actual computations. As the approximate wave functions are constantly being loaded with more and more information, it is increasingly important to devise descriptors that condense information and in this way provide conceptual building blocks that can be used in ‘chemical reasoning’.

In this review we demonstrate that a large part of the existing quantum chemical descriptors are based on the concepts of ‘domains’ and ‘occupation numbers’. A ‘domain’ is defined as a collection of orbitals. This definition allows domains defined in position space (also called ‘real space’), domains defined on non-orthogonal orbitals (leading to e.g. Mulliken descriptions) and domains defined in terms of orthogonal orbitals (for e.g. the abstract

Hubbard model) to be described on the same footing. ‘Occupation numbers’ indicate to what extent a given single-particle subspace, be it an orbital or a domain, is filled by particles of a quantum-chemical system consisting of many identical particles. By extending the occupation numbers to domain occupation numbers, one can describe to what extent domains are filled with particles. By treating the resulting occupation as a statistical random variable, one can use generating functions to generate (central) ‘moments’ and ‘cumulants’. It are these statistical quantities that provide insightful interpretations of wave functions. As a result, the generating functions establish a natural hierarchy or framework into which many reported quantum chemical descriptors fit. Furthermore, this framework provides a structure that offers a consistent interpretation while also pointing to those descriptors that have not yet been explored.

ORBITAL AND DOMAIN OCCUPATION

Many quantum chemical descriptors are based on the premise that chemical knowledge is encoded in the extent to which domains are filled by electrons. Among others, this is the basis behind a plethora of population analysis methods that will be discussed below. In order to elucidate the framework behind these descriptors, we first have to introduce operators that probe the occupation of domains. For this, we start from operators that probe the occupation of a single orbital. These operators are most efficiently formulated in terms of second quantized operators. A short recapitulation of the necessary second quantized machinery is provided in the appendix.

Orbital occupation

The occupation number of a single orbital indicates to what extent that orbital is filled by particles of the quantum chemical system consisting of many identical particles. In an orthonormal spin-orbital basis, the second quantized occupation-number operator $\hat{n}(I)$ associated with the occupation of the spin-orbital ϕ_I is given by

$$\hat{n}(I) := \hat{\phi}_I^+ \hat{\phi}_I^- , \tag{1}$$

where $\hat{\phi}_I^+$ and $\hat{\phi}_I^-$ are respectively the creation and annihilation operators associated with that spin-orbital. By acting on the antisymmetric many-particle state $|\phi_{k_1} \dots \phi_{k_N}\rangle = |\mathbf{k}\rangle$, with $\mathbf{k} = \{k_1, \dots, k_N\}$ a unique set of spin-orbital indices, the occupation-number operator $\hat{n}(I)$ determines to what extent the orbital ϕ_I is filled in $|\phi_{k_1} \dots \phi_{k_N}\rangle$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{n}(I) |\phi_{k_1} \dots \phi_{k_N}\rangle &= \hat{\phi}_I^+ \hat{\phi}_I^- |\phi_{k_1} \dots \phi_{k_N}\rangle \\ &= \mathbf{k}_I |\phi_{k_1} \dots \phi_{k_N}\rangle \\ &= \begin{cases} 0 |\phi_{k_1} \dots \phi_{k_N}\rangle & \text{if } I \text{ not in } \mathbf{k} \\ 1 |\phi_{k_1} \dots \phi_{k_N}\rangle & \text{if } I \text{ in } \mathbf{k} \end{cases} . \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where \mathbf{k}_I is the eigenvalue associated with the eigenvector $|\phi_{k_1} \dots \phi_{k_N}\rangle$.

For a multi-determinant wave function $|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}} |\mathbf{k}\rangle$, this reduces to

$$\hat{n}(I) \sum_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}} |\mathbf{k}\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}} \hat{n}(I) |\mathbf{k}\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{k}_I |\mathbf{k}\rangle , \quad (3)$$

in which those states $|\mathbf{k}\rangle$ in which spin-orbital ϕ_I is unoccupied are projected out.

In the specific case of the orthonormal spin-position orbital basis $|\mathbf{x}\rangle = |\mathbf{r}, \sigma\rangle$, the occupation-number operator can be written in terms of field operators

$$\hat{n}(\mathbf{x}) = \hat{\psi}^+(\mathbf{x}) \hat{\psi}^-(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{IJ} \phi_I^*(\mathbf{x}) \phi_J(\mathbf{x}) \hat{\phi}_I^+ \hat{\phi}_J^- . \quad (4)$$

In a non-orthogonal basis χ_I , the occupation-number operator can be written as (Surján, 1989)

$$\hat{n}(\chi_I) = \hat{\chi}_I^+ \hat{\phi}_I^- = \sum_J \hat{\phi}_I^+ \hat{\phi}_J^- \Sigma_{IJ} , \quad (5)$$

where Σ_{IJ} is the overlap matrix for that non-orthogonal spin-orbital basis and ϕ_I is the bi-orthogonal basis for which the usual anticommutation rules are valid (see appendix)

$$[\hat{\chi}_I^+, \hat{\phi}_J^-]_+ = \delta_{IJ} . \quad (6)$$

Domain occupation

If we consider a domain to be a weighted collection of orbitals, then we can construct an associated domain occupation-number operator as

$$\hat{n}(\Omega) = \sum_I w_{\Omega}(I) \hat{n}(I) , \quad (7)$$

where $w_\Omega(I)$ is the weight factor of domain Ω associated with spin-orbital I . This approach is a second quantized application of the ‘atomic decomposition of the identity’, which was introduced by Mayer (Mayer & Hamza, 2005; Mayer, 2016). In spin-position space, this definition reduces to

$$\hat{n}(\Omega) = \int w_\Omega(\mathbf{x}) \hat{n}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} , \quad (8)$$

and for a non-orthogonal spin-orbital basis to (Mayer, 1983, 1985)

$$\hat{n}(\Omega) = \sum_I w_\Omega(\chi_I) \hat{n}(\chi_I) = \sum_{IJ} w_\Omega(\chi_I) \hat{\chi}_I^+ \hat{\varphi}_I^- = \sum_{IJ} w_\Omega(\chi_I) \hat{\varphi}_I^+ \hat{\varphi}_J^- \Sigma_{IJ} . \quad (9)$$

In practice, the domain itself is mostly defined on the spin-independent part of the basis. In this case, the domain occupation-number operator $\hat{n}(\Omega)$ associated with a domain Ω is given by a weighted summation over all spin-independent occupation-number operators associated with a spin-independent single particle basis $\{|i\rangle\}$

$$\hat{n}(\Omega) = \sum_i w_\Omega(i) \hat{n}(i) = \sum_i w_\Omega(i) [\hat{n}(i, \alpha) + \hat{n}(i, \beta)] . \quad (10)$$

If we take multiple domains into consideration, we can define domain operators associated with an exhaustive d domain *partition* $\Omega = (\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_d)$, which consists of d domains

$$\forall a \leq d : \hat{n}(\Omega_a) = \sum_i w_{\Omega_a}(i) \hat{n}(i) , \quad (11)$$

where the following relations are obeyed

$$\sum_{a=1}^d w_{\Omega_a}(i) = 1 \quad (12)$$

$$w_{\Omega_a}(i) \geq 0 . \quad (13)$$

As such, a domain partition ensures that every orbital is included in at least one domain. We note that even if we only take one domain Ω in account, we are in fact describing a domain partition as we also implicitly consider the complement $\bar{\Omega}$ of the domain Ω .

An important subclass of these domain operators are those for which the weights are equal to generalized Dirac delta type functions, such as

$$\hat{n}(\Omega_a) = \sum_I \delta(I \in \Omega_a) \hat{n}(I) . \quad (14)$$

An application of these Dirac delta type domains is that of the non-orthogonal Mulliken partitioning scheme. In this scheme, a domain is associated with a given nucleus A and contains all spin-orbitals centered on that nucleus

$$\hat{n}(\Omega_A) = \sum_{IJ} \delta(I \in \Omega_A) \hat{n}(\chi_I) \Sigma_{IJ} . \quad (15)$$

In spin-position space, Dirac delta type weight functions $w_{\Omega_a}(i) = \delta(i \in \Omega_a)$ lead to the domain operators proposed by Ziesche (Ziesche, 2000)

$$\hat{n}(\Omega) = \sum_{\sigma} \int \delta(\mathbf{r} \in \Omega) \hat{\psi}^+(\mathbf{r}, \sigma) \hat{\psi}^-(\mathbf{r}, \sigma) d\mathbf{r} , \quad (16)$$

which are the second quantized analogs of the population operators as introduced by Diner and Claverie (Diner & Claverie, 1975). The domains obtained by topological analysis of the electron density (the ‘Quantum Theory of Atoms in Molecules’) (R. F. Bader, 1990; Popelier, 2000; Matta & Boyd, 2007) belong to this category, as do the domains obtained from a topological analysis of any other quantum chemical scalar field such as the ‘Electron Localization Function’ (Becke & Edgecombe, 1990; Silvi, 2004).

Other partitions are obtained by optimizing the shape of domains with respect to a certain objective function. In the ‘loge’ theory, developed by Daudel and coworkers (Aslangul, Constanciel, Daudel, & Kottis, 1972), that objective function is a missing information function (Aslangul, Constanciel, Daudel, Esnault, & Ludena, 1974). In the theory of ‘Maximum Probability Domains’, devised by Savin (Savin, 2001), the resulting domains maximize the probability to find ν and only ν electrons inside themselves.

A domain partition that deviates from these Dirac delta type weights is the Hirshfeld domain partition (Hirshfeld, 1977; Bultinck, Van Alsenoy, Ayers, & Carbó-Dorca, 2007). In this partition, the weights $w_{\Omega_a}(\mathbf{r})$ are associated with ‘atomic’ domains and are determined by reference to a promolecule constructed from superimposing the isolated density functions ρ_a^{pro} of the M atoms that comprise the molecule

$$w_{\Omega_a}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\rho_a^{\text{pro}}(\mathbf{r})}{\sum_i^M \rho_i^{\text{pro}}(\mathbf{r})} . \quad (17)$$

As in principle the weight function is non-zero over the entire position space, such domain partitions are also called ‘fuzzy’.

ORBITAL AND DOMAIN DENSITIES

The domains formulated above are ‘Open Quantum Systems’ (Breuer & Petruccione, 2002; Martín Pendás & Francisco, 2018b). These open systems interact with an external environment, which can be its complement or a collection of other domains. As the wave function is in general not an eigenfunction of the corresponding domain occupation number operator, this forces the occupation to fluctuate. As such, we have to resort to a statistical analysis of this occupation number operator. In this section, we focus on the average values of these operators, as they determine the resulting average occupations or densities.

Orbital densities

In the classical theory of statistics, the first moment (also called the average or the expectation value) $\langle X \rangle$ of a stochastic variable X is given by

$$\langle X \rangle := \int x P(X = x) dx , \quad (18)$$

and the d -th order moment by

$$\langle X^d \rangle := \int x^d P(X = x) dx , \quad (19)$$

where $P(X)$ is the continuous probability distribution associated with the stochastic variable X (Wasserman, 2013).

In quantum statistics, the first moment of an operator is the expectation value of that operator. As such, the first moment $\langle \hat{n}(I) \rangle$ of the occupation-number operator $\hat{n}(I) = \hat{\phi}_I^\dagger \hat{\phi}_I^-$ is given by

$$\langle \hat{n}(I) \rangle = \langle \Psi | \hat{n}(I) | \Psi \rangle \quad (20)$$

As shown by Kong and Valeev (Kong & Valeev, 2011) and Hanauer and Köhn (Hanauer & Köhn, 2012), we can assign an interpretation to these moments of occupation-number operators by first considering the moment of the orbital occupation-number operator $\hat{n}(I)$ for an expansion $|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}} |\mathbf{k}\rangle$, where $|\mathbf{k}\rangle$ denotes an antisymmetric many-particle state. The first moment is then given by

$$\langle \hat{n}(I) \rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}} c_{\mathbf{k}}^* c_{\mathbf{l}} \langle \mathbf{k} | \hat{n}(I) | \mathbf{l} \rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}} c_{\mathbf{k}}^* c_{\mathbf{l}} \langle \mathbf{k} | \mathbf{k}_I | \mathbf{l} \rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{k}_I |c_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 . \quad (21)$$

As $|c_{\mathbf{k}}|^2$ is the statistical weight or probability of the single Slater determinant $|\mathbf{k}\rangle$ (with $\sum_{\mathbf{k}} |c_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 = 1$), $\langle \hat{n}(I) \rangle$ represents the average occupation-number of orbital ϕ_I . As pointed out by Hanauer (Hanauer & Köhn, 2012), this is equivalent to regarding the occupation numbers k_I as stochastic variables, which can only take two values, one or zero. We can attach the same interpretation to $\langle \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle$: for the position-space orbital $|\mathbf{r}\rangle$, $\langle \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle$ represents the average occupation of that position-space orbital.

The first moment $\langle \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle$ of the occupation-number operator $\hat{n}(\mathbf{r})$ is also called the ‘electron density’ $\rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r})$ of orbital $|\mathbf{r}\rangle$. Not only does this descriptor form the main crux behind Density Functional Theory (Parr & Yang, 1989; Engel & Dreizler, 2011), its response to changes in number of electrons and/or external potential forms the basis of Conceptual Density Functional Theory (Geerlings, De Proft, & Langenaeker, 2003) and its analysis in terms of itself and its gradient leads to descriptors such as the Electron Localization Function (Savin, Nesper, Wengert, & Fässler, 1997; Silvi & Savin, 1994), the Electron Localizability Indicator (Kohout, 2004), the Non-Covalent Interactions index (Johnson et al., 2010) and the Density Overlap Region Indicator (De Silva & Corminboeuf, 2014).

The corresponding d -th moments of the occupation-number operators are then given by

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{(d)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_d) &= \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}_1) \dots \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}_d) \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \prod_{i=1}^d \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}_i) \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \hat{\psi}^+(\mathbf{r}_1) \dots \hat{\psi}^+(\mathbf{r}_d) \hat{\psi}^-(\mathbf{r}_d) \dots \hat{\psi}^-(\mathbf{r}_1) \right\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where we have used the operator $\hat{\mathcal{N}}$ ensure normal order (Ziesche, 2000) (see the appendix for more details). This normal operator ensures that products of d occupation-number operators actually describe simultaneous occupation of d orbitals. Indeed, this normal-ordering operator allows us to reorder the respective creation and annihilation operators to the form needed by the d -th order density. At the same time, this normal ordering also removes same site elements

$$\hat{\mathcal{N}} \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) |\Psi\rangle = \hat{\psi}^+(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\psi}^+(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\psi}^-(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\psi}^-(\mathbf{r}) |\Psi\rangle = 0, \quad (23)$$

instead of allowing for effective removal of occupation-number operators due to their idem-

potency

$$\hat{n}(\mathbf{r})\hat{n}(\mathbf{r})|\Psi\rangle = \hat{n}(\mathbf{r})|\Psi\rangle . \quad (24)$$

As such, the respective d -th moments describe the average occupation-number of a set of d orbitals (Kong & Valeev, 2011)

$$\rho^{(d)}(I, \dots, L) = \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \underbrace{\hat{n}(I) \dots \hat{n}(L)}_{d \text{ terms}} \right\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \underbrace{k_I \dots k_L}_{d \text{ terms}} |c_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 . \quad (25)$$

We note that this normal operator often is neglected (Diner & Claverie, 1975; Silvi, 2004). This introduces spurious single orbital occupation number operators $\hat{n}(\mathbf{r}_1)$

$$\hat{n}(\mathbf{r}_1)\hat{n}(\mathbf{r}_2) = \hat{\mathcal{N}}\hat{n}(\mathbf{r}_1)\hat{n}(\mathbf{r}_2) + \delta(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2)\hat{n}(\mathbf{r}_1) , \quad (26)$$

for which one has to correct if one is to describe occupancy statistics. The far-reaching conceptual problems associated with introducing such ‘unphysical self-pairing’ have been discussed in detail by Kutzelnigg (Kutzelnigg, 2003).

Starting from the N -th order reduced density $\rho^{(N)}$, we can obtain lower order densities by taking normalized partial traces

$${}^p_q\downarrow := \frac{(N-p)!}{(N-q)!} \text{tr}_{q+1, \dots, p} , \quad (27)$$

such that

$${}^p_q\downarrow \rho^{(p)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_q, \dots, \mathbf{r}_p) = \rho^{(q)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_q) . \quad (28)$$

This corresponds to the McWeeny normalization convention (McWeeny, 1960), where each d -th order reduced density is normalized to $\frac{N!}{(N-d)!}$. Note the contrast with the Löwdin normalization convention (Löwdin, 1955c, 1955b, 1955a), where the p -th order density matrix is normalized to the number of unique combinations $\binom{N}{p}$. The latter convention leads to an easier notation for energetic expectation values, but is less suited for elucidating the underlying statistics. Hence, we will exclusively use the McWeeny normalization convention in this review.

Domain densities

In the case of the domain occupation-number operator $\hat{n}(\Omega_a)$, the first moment $\rho^{(1)}(\Omega_a)$ is given by

$$\rho^{(1)}(\Omega_a) = \langle \hat{n}(\Omega_a) \rangle = \int w_{\Omega_a}(\mathbf{r}) \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} , \quad (29)$$

and is equal to the average number of electrons in the domain Ω_a (also called its population).

The second moments $\rho^{(2)}(\Omega_a, \Omega_a)$ and $\rho^{(2)}(\Omega_a, \Omega_b)$ are then given by

$$\rho^{(2)}(\Omega_a, \Omega_a) = \langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \hat{n}(\Omega_a)^2 \rangle = \int \int w_{\Omega_a}(\mathbf{r}_1) w_{\Omega_a}(\mathbf{r}_2) \rho^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 \quad (30)$$

$$\rho^{(2)}(\Omega_a, \Omega_b) = \langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \hat{n}(\Omega_a) \hat{n}(\Omega_b) \rangle = \int \int w_{\Omega_a}(\mathbf{r}_1) w_{\Omega_b}(\mathbf{r}_2) \rho^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 , \quad (31)$$

where $\rho^{(2)}(\Omega_a, \Omega_a)$ is the average number of electron pairs in Ω_a and $\rho^{(2)}(\Omega_a, \Omega_b)$ is the average number of pairs that can be formed between the electrons in Ω_a and Ω_b (R. Bader & Stephens, 1975).

We note that there exists a widespread confusion between reduced densities and probabilities, which leads to questionable interpretations when generalized to domains. Indeed, McWeeny (McWeeny, 1960) states that

“ $\rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_1)$ is the probability of finding a particle with variables in the range $d\mathbf{x}_1$ at point \mathbf{x}_1 in configuration space.”

although he immediately adds

“It should be noted that $\rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_1)$ integrates to N (not 1), and that it is therefore the ‘number density’.”

As pointed out by Diner and Claverie (Claverie & Diner, 1975) and restated by Savin (Savin, 2004) many years later, this distinction becomes particularly relevant when considering probabilities defined over domains for systems containing more than one electron:

“The belief that the probability of finding one electron in a given region Ω , $p(1, N - 1)$, is given by the population of this region, or the average number of electrons in Ω , $\rho^{(1)}(\Omega)$ is wrong, however, when the total number of electrons in

the system, $N > 1$. This can be seen most easily when considering the case when Ω corresponds to the whole space yielding $\int \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r})d\mathbf{r} = N$; this is impossible as the probability must lie between 0 and 1.”

Quantities $p^{(d)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_d)$ that integrate to one *can* be obtained by forcing normalization upon $\rho^{(d)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_d)$

$$p^{(d)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_d) = \frac{(N-d)!}{N!} \rho^{(d)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_d) . \quad (32)$$

These normalized quantities should then be interpreted as the probability that *at least* d electrons are at the positions $\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}_d$ and *not* as the probability that d electrons are at the positions $\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}_d$. However, in most cases this normalization factor is neglected. As such, contrary to widespread perception,

$$\rho^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}_1)\rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}_2) \quad (33)$$

does *not* indicate that the constituent electrons can be considered as statistically independent (Kutzelnigg, 2003). Furthermore, as we will show later, even if this normalization is taken into account, the statistics of these normalized quantities are frequently dealt with too freely, which results in questionable interpretations.

Reduced density generating function

We can define the moment generating function $\mathcal{M}(t)$ of the stochastic variable X as the moment of the stochastic variable e^{tX} with $t \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\mathcal{M}(t) := \langle e^{tX} \rangle = \left\langle 1 + tX + \frac{t^2 X^2}{2!} + \dots \right\rangle . \quad (34)$$

Since the generating function gathers all moments as coefficients of a series expansion, all orders of moments can be obtained by successive differentiation of this generating function

$$\langle X^n \rangle = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{d^n \mathcal{M}(t)}{dt^n} . \quad (35)$$

The variable t acts as a ‘probe’ variable, in the sense that this variable only appears as a dummy variable for the differentiation and does not appear in the final expression for the moments, which is obtained formally in the limit of t going to zero.

By considering occupation numbers as random variables (Hanauer & Köhn, 2012), we can construct an associated generating function. If we take d domains into account, this generating function is given by (Ziesche, 2000)

$$\mathcal{M}[g, \mathbf{t}] := \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \exp \left(\int g(\mathbf{r}) \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} + \sum_{a=1}^d t_a \hat{n}(\Omega_a) \right) \right\rangle, \quad (36)$$

where $g(\mathbf{r})$ is a function that gathers all probe variables related to orbitals and $\mathbf{t} = [t_a, \dots, t_d]$ is a vector that gathers all probe variables related to domains. As such, the partial derivative with respect to the probe variable $g(\mathbf{r}_1)$ leads to the first-order reduced density of orbital $|\mathbf{r}_1\rangle$

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\substack{g \rightarrow 0 \\ \mathbf{t} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{M}[g, \mathbf{t}]}{\partial g(\mathbf{r}_1)} &= \lim_{\substack{g \rightarrow 0 \\ \mathbf{t} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}}} \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \left(\int \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_1) d\mathbf{r} \right) \exp \left(\int g(\mathbf{r}) \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} + \sum_{a=1}^d t_a \hat{n}(\Omega_a) \right) \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}_1) \right\rangle = \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}_1), \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where $g \rightarrow 0$ is used to denote $\forall \mathbf{r} : g(\mathbf{r}) \rightarrow 0$ and $\mathbf{t} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$ is used to denote $\forall a : t_a \rightarrow 0$. In general, we can obtain the d -th order reduced density $\rho^{(d)}$ by successive differentiation

$$\rho^{(d)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_d) = \lim_{\substack{g \rightarrow 0 \\ \mathbf{t} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}}} \frac{\partial^d \mathcal{M}[g, \mathbf{t}]}{\partial g(\mathbf{r}_d) \dots \partial g(\mathbf{r}_1)}. \quad (38)$$

In the case of domains, taking the partial derivative with respect to t_a leads to moments associated with domains. As such, the first partial derivative leads to the population of domain Ω_a

$$\lim_{\substack{g \rightarrow 0 \\ \mathbf{t} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{M}[g, \mathbf{t}]}{\partial t_a} = \lim_{\substack{g \rightarrow 0 \\ \mathbf{t} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}}} \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \hat{n}(\Omega_a) \right\rangle = \rho^{(1)}(\Omega_a). \quad (39)$$

Taking two partial derivatives leads to the average number of pairs inside domains

$$\lim_{\substack{g \rightarrow 0 \\ \mathbf{t} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}}} \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{M}[g, \mathbf{t}]}{\partial t_a^2} = \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \hat{n}(\Omega_a)^2 \right\rangle = \rho^{(2)}(\Omega_a, \Omega_a) \quad (40)$$

$$\lim_{\substack{g \rightarrow 0 \\ \mathbf{t} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}}} \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{M}[g, \mathbf{t}]}{\partial t_b \partial t_a} = \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \hat{n}(\Omega_a) \hat{n}(\Omega_b) \right\rangle = \rho^{(2)}(\Omega_a, \Omega_b). \quad (41)$$

In general, we can obtain the d -th order reduced density $\rho^{(d)}$ over domains by successive differentiation

$$\rho^{(d)}(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_d) = \lim_{\substack{g \rightarrow 0 \\ \mathbf{t} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}}} \frac{\partial^d \mathcal{M}[g, \mathbf{t}]}{\partial t_1 \dots \partial t_d}. \quad (42)$$

We can also define an average over k -sites and l -domains by taking the following partial derivatives

$$\rho^{(d)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_k, \Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_d) = \lim_{\substack{g \rightarrow 0 \\ \mathbf{t} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}}} \frac{\partial^{k+l} \mathcal{M}[g, \mathbf{t}]}{\partial g(\mathbf{r}_1) \dots \partial g(\mathbf{r}_k) \partial t_1 \dots \partial t_l} . \quad (43)$$

In position space, these quantities have been coined the ‘Coarse-Grained Densities’ (Martín Pendás, Francisco, & Blanco, 2007c), where the indices that are not associated with domains are also called ‘free’.

We again reiterate the importance of including normal ordering into the definitions of the respective moments. If the normal ordering operator $\hat{\mathcal{N}}$ is not used to project out diagonal elements (Silvi, 2004; Poater, Duran, Solá, & Silvi, 2005), one does not always determine the occupations of the intended number of orbitals/domains. Indeed, the corresponding moment generating function is then given by

$$\mathcal{M}_{\cancel{\mathcal{N}}}[g, \mathbf{t}] = \left\langle \exp \left(\int g(\mathbf{r}) \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} + \sum_{a=1}^d t_a \hat{n}(\Omega_a) \right) \right\rangle , \quad (44)$$

so the second order domain averaged density becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\substack{g \rightarrow 0 \\ \mathbf{t} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}}} \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{M}_{\cancel{\mathcal{N}}}[g, \mathbf{t}]}{\partial t_a \partial t_b} &= \langle \hat{n}(\Omega_a) \hat{n}(\Omega_b) \rangle = \int \int w_{\Omega_a}(\mathbf{x}_1) w_{\Omega_b}(\mathbf{x}_2) \langle \hat{n}(\mathbf{x}_1) \hat{n}(\mathbf{x}_2) \rangle d\mathbf{x}_1 d\mathbf{x}_2 \\ &= \int \int w_{\Omega_a}(\mathbf{x}_1) w_{\Omega_b}(\mathbf{x}_2) \left\langle \hat{\psi}^+(\mathbf{x}_1) \hat{\psi}^-(\mathbf{x}_1) \hat{\psi}^+(\mathbf{x}_2) \hat{\psi}^-(\mathbf{x}_2) \right\rangle d\mathbf{x}_1 d\mathbf{x}_2 \\ &= \int \int w_{\Omega_a}(\mathbf{x}_1) w_{\Omega_b}(\mathbf{x}_2) \\ &\quad \left\langle \hat{\psi}^+(\mathbf{x}_1) \hat{\psi}^+(\mathbf{x}_2) \hat{\psi}^-(\mathbf{x}_2) \hat{\psi}^-(\mathbf{x}_1) - \delta(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2) \hat{\psi}^+(\mathbf{x}_1) \hat{\psi}^-(\mathbf{x}_2) \right\rangle d\mathbf{x}_1 d\mathbf{x}_2 \\ &= \lim_{\substack{g \rightarrow 0 \\ \mathbf{t} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}}} \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{M}[\mathbf{t}]}{\partial t_a \partial t_b} - \int w_{\Omega_a}(\mathbf{x}_1) w_{\Omega_b}(\mathbf{x}_1) \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_1) d\mathbf{x}_1 . \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

Only in the case where an idempotent (Dirac delta type) weight factor is used, does this reduce to the form proposed by Silvi (Silvi, 2004)

$$\langle \hat{n}(\Omega_a) \hat{n}(\Omega_b) \rangle = \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \hat{n}(\Omega_a) \hat{n}(\Omega_b) \right\rangle + \langle \delta_{ab} \hat{n}(\Omega_a) \rangle . \quad (46)$$

From a statistical point of view, the addition of this spurious one-site operator has little to do with determining the pair occupation of two orbitals/domains and is a direct consequence of not imposing normal ordering on the operator string.




Figure 2: Overview of the $k + l$ -th order orbital and domain densities $\rho^{(k+l)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_k, \Omega_a, \dots, \Omega_l)$ that can be derived from the reduced density generating function $\mathcal{M}[g, \mathbf{t}]$. Solid arrows indicate successive differentiations of that generating function, whereas dotted arrows indicate multiple successive differentiations. The respective successive differentiation is listed next to these arrows. Curly lines are used to indicate commonly used names for the resulting descriptors.

As all moments can be generated from $\mathcal{M}[g, \mathbf{t}]$, this generating function forms the basis for many quantum chemical descriptors. Successive differentiations of the reduced density generating function generate a hierarchy of descriptors that characterize the average occupations of domains and orbitals (see Figure 2). On the bottom layer of this hierarchy we find quantities where there are as many occupation number operators as there are electrons. As such, these quantities can be normalized to probabilities of finding all electrons at certain positions or domains, whereas quantities on a higher level can only be interpreted in terms of finding *at least* a given number of electrons. As the former descriptors have seen significant advancements in recent years, we will discuss these probabilities further in the next section.

DOMAIN PROBABILITIES

In the previous section, we defined the probability of finding *at least* d electrons in a domain. In this section, we define the probability of finding *exactly* d electrons in a domain or a partition of electrons (ν_1, \dots, ν_d) over a partition of domains. Such partitions can be specified

as

$$[\boldsymbol{\nu}, \boldsymbol{\Omega}] = [(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_d), (\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_d)] . \quad (47)$$

The collection of all probabilities $p[(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_d), \boldsymbol{\Omega}]$ associated with a domain partition $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ has been called the ‘Electron number Distribution Function’ or EDF. This EDF has a rich history in conceptual quantum chemistry. Already in the 1950s, Daudel and coworkers tried to ‘localize’ electrons - that are physically inherently delocalized - by deforming domains (Daudel, Brion, & Odier, 1955; Daudel, Bader, Stephens, & Borrett, 1974). Daudel et al. argued that in view of the success of Lewis’s model, there should be some molecule-dependent ‘best’ decomposition in regions (also called ‘loges’). They proposed a minimization of the missing information function I by deforming the domain Ω (and necessarily, its complement $\bar{\Omega}$)

$$I(\nu, \Omega) = - \sum_{\nu} p[(\nu, N - \nu), (\Omega, \bar{\Omega})] \ln p[(\nu, N - \nu), (\Omega, \bar{\Omega})] , \quad (48)$$

The best ‘loges’, meaning those domains that minimize the missing information function, exhibit a high degree of similarity with the structures that follow from Lewis’s theory (Daudel et al., 1955). Unfortunately, these partitions are computationally very difficult to obtain (Aslangul et al., 1972) and the method remains applicable only to the smallest model systems.

However, many years later Savin (Savin, 2001) was able to show that chemical interpretations can be given to a *single* domain whose shape has been optimized so that the probability of finding ν *and only* ν electrons inside it (with ν typically chosen to be equal to two, as a reference to the electron pair proposed by Lewis) is *maximal*. The resulting domains were coined ‘Maximum Probability Domains’ or MPDs (Savin, 2001). Thanks to further theoretical work by Cancès (Cancès, Keriven, Lodier, & Savin, 2004), obtaining MPDs in position space for general quantum chemical methods became a possibility. Unfortunately, the development of actual implementations has been severely hampered by the sheer complexity of the shape optimization algorithms needed for such a program. Despite numerous efforts (Scemama, Caffarel, & Savin, 2007; Causà & Savin, 2011; Causà & Savin, 2011; Lopes Jr, Braïda, Causa, & Savin, 2012; Causà, D’Amore, Garzillo, Gentile, & Savin, 2013; Menéndez & Martín Pendás, 2014; Menéndez, Martín Pendás, Braïda, & Savin, 2015; Agostini, Ciccotti, Savin, & Vuilleumier, 2015; Causà, D’Amore, Gentile, Menéndez, & Ca-

latayud, 2015; Acke et al., 2016; Turek, Braïda, & De Proft, 2017), the question of whether MPDs provide a mathematical bridge between chemical concepts and quantum mechanics remains unanswered to this day.

Simultaneously, the interpretative power behind the EDF for a *given* set of domains Ω has been used to provide a probabilistic view of chemical bonds in position space (Savin, 2001; Cancès et al., 2004; Savin, 2005; Gallegos, Carbó-Dorca, Lodier, Cancès, & Savin, 2005; Bochicchio, Ponec, Lain, & Torre, 2000; Bochicchio, Ponec, Torre, & Lain, 2001; Martín Pendás et al., 2007c; Francisco, Martín Pendás, & Blanco, 2007; Martín Pendás, Francisco, & Blanco, 2007d, 2007b, 2007a; Francisco, Martín Pendás, & Blanco, 2008, 2011; Francisco & Martín Pendás, 2014). This view is based on ‘resonance structures’, where each resonance structure is a localization of N electrons in position space domains. As such, concepts such as electron pair shairing, polarity, charge transfer, and multiple bonding have been shown to be recovered from the statistical properties of $p[\nu, \Omega]$. However, we must stress that this approach uses ‘precomputed’ domains and in no way optimizes those domains to obtain optimal probabilistic descriptions.

Probability operators

We can define domain probabilities as those probabilities that can be obtained by associating *all* electrons with certain domains. If we focus exclusively on domains, the generating function $\mathcal{M}[g, \mathbf{t}]$ reduces to

$$\mathcal{M}[\mathbf{t}] := \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \exp \left(\sum_{a=1}^d t_a \hat{n}(\Omega_a) \right) \right\rangle. \tag{49}$$

The probabilities detailed above can then be obtained by selecting only those terms containing N occupation-number operators from the generating function $\mathcal{M}[\mathbf{t}]$. This is done by using the operator $\hat{\mathcal{N}}_N$, which ensures normal ordering and destroys operator strings with

an occupation number operator count different than N

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}}_N \exp \left(\sum_{a=1}^d t_a \hat{n}(\Omega_a) \right) \right\rangle &= \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}}_N \prod_{a=1}^d \exp (t_a \hat{n}(\Omega_a)) \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}}_N \prod_{a=1}^d \sum_{\nu_a=0}^{\infty} \frac{t_a^{\nu_a}}{\nu_a!} \hat{n}(\Omega_a)^{\nu_a} \right\rangle \\
&= \sum_{\substack{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_d \\ \sum_{a=1}^d \nu_a = N}}^{\infty} \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \prod_{a=1}^d \frac{t_a^{\nu_a}}{\nu_a!} \hat{n}(\Omega_a)^{\nu_a} \right\rangle \\
&= \sum_{\nu \vdash N} \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \prod_{a=1}^d \frac{t_a^{\nu_a}}{\nu_a!} \hat{n}(\Omega_a)^{\nu_a} \right\rangle, \tag{50}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used $\nu \vdash N$ as a shorthand for the summation over all partitions of N electrons over the domains (Andrews, 1998). Based on the form of the generating function, we can postulate that the probability operators $\hat{p}[(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_d), \mathbf{\Omega}]$ associated with a domain partition $\mathbf{\Omega} = (\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_d)$ are given by

$$\hat{p}[(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_d), \mathbf{\Omega}] := \hat{\mathcal{N}} \prod_{a=1}^d \frac{\hat{n}(\Omega_a)^{\nu_a}}{\nu_a!}, \tag{51}$$

and reformulate the moment generating function as

$$\left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}}_N \exp \left(\sum_{a=1}^d t_a \hat{n}(\Omega_a) \right) \right\rangle = \sum_{\nu \vdash N} \langle \hat{p}[(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_d), \mathbf{\Omega}] \rangle t_1^{\nu_1} \dots t_d^{\nu_d}. \tag{52}$$

If we use the following notation for a multinomial coefficient

$$\binom{N}{\nu_1 \dots \nu_d} = \frac{N!}{\nu_1! \dots \nu_d!}, \tag{53}$$

we can show that the moments of the probability operators $\hat{p}[(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_d), \mathbf{\Omega}]$ are equivalent to the original probability expressions as used by Bader (R. Bader & Stephens, 1975) and

Savin (Savin, 2001)

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \hat{p}[(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_d), \mathbf{\Omega}] \rangle &= \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \prod_{a=1}^d \frac{\hat{n}(\Omega_a)^{\nu_a}}{\nu_a!} \right\rangle \\
&= \frac{1}{\nu_1! \dots \nu_d!} \underbrace{\int \dots \int}_N w_{\Omega_1}(\mathbf{x}_1) \dots w_{\Omega_1}(\mathbf{x}_{\nu_1}) \dots \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \hat{n}(\mathbf{x}_1) \dots \hat{n}(\mathbf{x}_N) \right\rangle d\mathbf{x}_1 \dots d\mathbf{x}_N \\
&= \binom{N}{\nu_1 \dots \nu_d} \underbrace{\int \dots \int}_N w_{\Omega_1}(\mathbf{x}_1) \dots w_{\Omega_1}(\mathbf{x}_{\nu_1}) \dots |\Psi(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N)|^2 d\mathbf{x}_1 \dots d\mathbf{x}_N \\
&= p[(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_d), \mathbf{\Omega}] .
\end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

As such, our interpretation of $\hat{p}[(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_d), \mathbf{\Omega}]$ as a domain probability operator is correct.

We note that, as we have defined the probability operators solely in terms of occupation-number operators, the framework derived above is valid for any underlying one-electron spin-basis, with the generating function $\mathcal{M}[\mathbf{t}]$ representing a compact codification of the information contained in the EDF. As such, the EDF framework is not restricted to the most commonly used position space perspective and can also be applied to e.g. the abstract site basis of the Hubbard model (Acke et al., 2016).

Procedure to calculate domain probabilities

In spin-position space, the domain associated number operator (for a domain defined in position space) is given by

$$\hat{n}(\Omega_a) = \int w_{\Omega_a}(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\psi}^+(\mathbf{x}) \hat{\psi}^-(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \sum_{IJ} \left(\int \phi_I^*(\mathbf{x}) w_{\Omega_a}(\mathbf{r}) \phi_J(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \right) \hat{\phi}_I^+ \hat{\phi}_J^- , \tag{55}$$

where we have used the transformations of field operators that are discussed in the appendix. If we define the spin-orbital domain overlap matrix Σ^{Ω_a} over the domain Ω_a as

$$\Sigma_{IJ}^{\Omega_a} := \int \phi_I^*(\mathbf{x}) w_{\Omega_a}(\mathbf{r}) \phi_J(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} , \tag{56}$$

and a matrix of generalized occupation-number operators $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ as

$$\hat{\mathbf{n}}_{IJ} = \hat{\phi}_J^+ \hat{\phi}_I^- , \tag{57}$$

then the domain associated number operators $\hat{n}(\Omega_a)$ can be expressed as

$$\hat{n}(\Omega_a) = \text{tr} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\Omega_a} \hat{\mathbf{n}} \right) . \quad (58)$$

As such, we obtain the following form of the probability generating function

$$\sum_{\nu \vdash N} p [(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_d), \boldsymbol{\Omega}] t_1^{\nu_1} \dots t_d^{\nu_d} = \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}}_N \exp \left[\text{tr} \left(\left(\sum_{a=1}^d t_a \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\Omega_a} \right) \hat{\mathbf{n}} \right) \right] \right\rangle . \quad (59)$$

Since the trace is linear and

$$\exp (\text{tr}(\mathbf{X})) = \det (\exp(\mathbf{X})) , \quad (60)$$

we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\nu \vdash N} p [(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_d), \boldsymbol{\Omega}] t_1^{\nu_1} \dots t_d^{\nu_d} &= \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}}_N \det \left[\exp \left(\left(\sum_{a=1}^d t_a \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\Omega_a} \right) \hat{\mathbf{n}} \right) \right] \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}}_N \det \left[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} \left(\sum_{a=1}^d t_a \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\Omega_a} \right)^k \hat{\mathbf{n}}^k \right] \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}}_N \det \left[\mathbf{I} + \left(\sum_{a=1}^d t_a \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\Omega_a} \right) \hat{\mathbf{n}} \right] \right\rangle , \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

where in the last step we have used the fact that the $\hat{\mathcal{N}}_N$ operator destroys all operator strings with an occupation number operator count different than N. The moment of the matrix $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ is determined by which orbitals are occupied in the respective Slater determinants in which the wave function can be expanded. As such, if we want to compute the moment between two Slater determinants $|\mathbf{k}\rangle$ and $|\mathbf{l}\rangle$, the above expression reduces to

$$\sum_{\nu \vdash N} p^{kl} [(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_d), \boldsymbol{\Omega}] t_1^{\nu_1} \dots t_d^{\nu_d} = \det \left(\sum_{a=1}^d t_a \boldsymbol{\Sigma}'^{kl, \Omega_a} \right) , \quad (62)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}'^{kl, \Omega_a}$ contains only those domain overlaps between the orbitals that are occupied in the respective Slater determinants. Although this connection has previously been determined by an explicit Slater determinant decomposition in first quantization (Francisco et al., 2007, 2008; Francisco, Martín Pendás, & Costales, 2014), the current derivation clearly illustrates the power of the generating function perspective. Indeed, the complicated explicit decomposition can be replaced by the easier second quantized algebraic rules, allowing one to focus more on the statistical ideas behind such a derivation, as will be shown in the case of two domains.

The special case of two domains

If one considers only one domain Ω , one is also implicitly taking its complement $\bar{\Omega}$ into account. As this situation allows for far-reaching simplifications, we focus on the theory behind partitions consisting of two domains in this section. If we have only two domains Ω_a and Ω_b , then necessarily Ω_b is the complement of Ω_a and the following relation is valid

$$\hat{n}(\Omega_a) = \hat{n} - \hat{n}(\Omega_b) . \quad (63)$$

If we presume that the wave function is an eigenfunction of the number operator with eigenvalue N

$$\hat{n} |\Psi\rangle = N |\Psi\rangle , \quad (64)$$

we can focus solely on the action of one domain associated number-operator, say $\hat{n}(\Omega_a)$, which we will write as $\hat{n}(\Omega)$ (with $\hat{n}(\Omega_b)$ equal to $\hat{n}(\bar{\Omega})$). In this case, the generating function is given by

$$\hat{\mathcal{N}}_N \exp [t_\Omega \hat{n}_\Omega + t_{\bar{\Omega}} \hat{n}_{\bar{\Omega}}] = \sum_{\nu=0}^N \hat{p} [(\nu, N - \nu), (\Omega, \bar{\Omega})] t_\Omega^\nu t_{\bar{\Omega}}^{N-\nu} , \quad (65)$$

with

$$\hat{p} [(\nu, N - \nu), (\Omega, \bar{\Omega})] = \frac{1}{\nu!(N - \nu)!} \hat{\mathcal{N}} \hat{n}(\Omega)^\nu \hat{n}(\bar{\Omega})^{N-\nu} . \quad (66)$$

The m -th order domain condensed density matrix can be expressed in terms of the associated probability distribution as (Ziesche, 2000)

$$\rho^{(m)}(\Omega, \dots, \Omega) = \sum_{\nu=m}^N \frac{\nu!}{(\nu - m)!} p [(\nu, N - \nu), (\Omega, \bar{\Omega})] . \quad (67)$$

In turn, the ν -th probability can be expressed in terms of the domain condensed density matrices (Ziesche, 2000)

$$\begin{aligned}
p [(\nu, N - \nu), (\Omega, \bar{\Omega})] &= \langle \hat{p} [(\nu, N - \nu), (\Omega, \bar{\Omega})] \rangle \\
&= \left\langle \frac{1}{\nu!(N - \nu)!} \hat{\mathcal{N}} \hat{n}(\Omega)^\nu (\hat{n} - \hat{n}(\Omega))^{N-\nu} \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle \frac{1}{\nu!(N - \nu)!} \hat{\mathcal{N}} \sum_{k=0}^{N-\nu} \binom{N - \nu}{k} (-1)^k \hat{n}(\Omega)^{k+\nu} \hat{n}^{N-(k+\nu)} \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle \frac{1}{\nu!} \hat{\mathcal{N}} \sum_{k=0}^{N-\nu} \frac{1}{k!(N - (k + \nu))!} (-1)^k \hat{n}(\Omega)^{k+\nu} \hat{n}^{N-(k+\nu)} \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \sum_{k=\nu}^N \frac{1}{\nu!(k - \nu)!} (-1)^{k-\nu} \hat{n}(\Omega)^k \frac{1}{(N - k)!} \hat{n}^{N-k} \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \sum_{k=\nu}^N \frac{1}{\nu!(k - \nu)!} (-1)^{k-\nu} \hat{n}(\Omega)^k \right\rangle \\
&= \sum_{k=\nu}^N \frac{(-1)^{k-\nu}}{\nu!(k - \nu)!} \rho^{(k)}(\Omega, \dots, \Omega) . \tag{68}
\end{aligned}$$

This equation shows how one can formally obtain $p [(\nu, N - \nu), (\Omega, \bar{\Omega})]$ by “eliminating those contributions that can be attributed to intrusion of more than ν particles in the domain Ω ” (Savin, 2001, 2004).

However, note that the above relationship was already derived in the 1970s in the context of fluctuation theorems for statistical mechanical purposes (equation 13b in (Vezzetti, 1975)). This derivation was based on the fact that the probability that a domain of ‘space’ contains exactly ν particles can be expressed in terms of distribution functions (the reduced densities, also called Janossy probability densities (Daley & Vere-Jones, 2002)). A few years later, Truskett (Truskett, Torquato, & Debenedetti, 1998) realized that the underlying framework is essentially that of a ‘stochastic spatial point process’ (in our case ‘stochastic site process’ would be a better designation). A point process is a type of stochastic process, for which any realization consists of a set of elements in the relevant space (in our case, the space of sites) (Daley & Vere-Jones, 2002, 2008). This interpretation will have important consequences for the single determinant case.

If there are only two domains Ω and $\bar{\Omega}$ and the one-electron spin-basis is orthonormal,

then

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^\Omega + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\bar{\Omega}} = \mathbf{I} , \quad (69)$$

from which follows that

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\bar{\Omega}} = \mathbf{I} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^\Omega . \quad (70)$$

This connection allows all probabilities to be expressed in terms of quantities that are only related to the domain Ω . Again, we can express the domain associated number operators in the one-electron spin-basis

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{n}(\Omega) &= \int w_\Omega(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\psi}^+(\mathbf{x}) \hat{\psi}^-(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \sum_{IJ}^N \left(\int \phi_I^*(\mathbf{x}) w_\Omega(\mathbf{x}) \phi_J(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \right) \hat{\phi}_I^+ \hat{\phi}_J^- \\ &= \sum_{IJ}^N \hat{\phi}_I^+ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{IJ}^\Omega \hat{\phi}_J^- , \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

$$\hat{n}(\bar{\Omega}) = \sum_{IJ}^N \hat{\phi}_I^+ (\mathbf{I} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{IJ}^\Omega) \hat{\phi}_J^- . \quad (72)$$

Given that $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^\Omega$ is Hermitian, we can diagonalize the matrix

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^\Omega = \mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \mathbf{X}^\dagger \quad (73)$$

and use the eigenvectors to rotate the creation and annihilation operators unitarily, both for the domain Ω

$$\hat{n}(\Omega) = \sum_{IJ}^N \hat{\phi}_I^+ (\mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \mathbf{X}^\dagger)_{IJ} \hat{\phi}_J^- = \sum_{I=1}^N \lambda_I \hat{\phi}_I^+ \hat{\phi}_I^- = \sum_{I=1}^N \lambda_I \hat{n}(\tilde{I}) , \quad (74)$$

and its complement $\bar{\Omega}$

$$\hat{n}(\bar{\Omega}) = \sum_{I=1}^N (1 - \lambda_I) \hat{n}(\tilde{I}) , \quad (75)$$

where we have used the notation \tilde{I} to distinguish between the original basis and the rotated basis.

Hence, the probability generating function for two domains becomes

$$\sum_{\nu=0}^N p [(\nu, N - \nu), (\Omega, \bar{\Omega})] t_\Omega^\nu t_{\bar{\Omega}}^{N-\nu} = \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}}_N \exp \left(\sum_{I=1}^N [t_\Omega \lambda_I + t_{\bar{\Omega}} (1 - \lambda_I)] \hat{n}(\tilde{I}) \right) \right\rangle . \quad (76)$$

Because the $\hat{\mathcal{N}}_N$ operator automatically destroys operator strings with an occupation number operator count different than N , we can simplify this expression by setting $t_{\bar{\Omega}} = 1$ and $t_{\Omega} = t$

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\nu=0}^N p [(\nu, N - \nu), (\Omega, \bar{\Omega})] t^\nu &= \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}}_N \exp \left(\sum_{I=1}^N [t\lambda_I + (1 - \lambda_I)] \hat{n}(\tilde{I}) \right) \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}}_N \prod_{I=1}^N \exp \left([(t - 1)\lambda_I + 1] \hat{n}(\tilde{I}) \right) \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \prod_{I=1}^N \left([(t - 1)\lambda_I + 1] \hat{n}(\tilde{I}) \right) \right\rangle \tag{77}
\end{aligned}$$

In the last expression, we have used the fact that only first-order terms of the exponential can survive due to the action of $\hat{\mathcal{N}}_N$ (since this operator removes diagonal elements and only retains terms with in total N occupation-number operators). As the occupation numbers of the molecular orbitals of a single Slater determinant are invariant under unitary rotations, we obtain the following for a single Slater determinant

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\nu=0}^N p [(\nu, N - \nu), (\Omega, \bar{\Omega})] t^\nu &= \prod_{I=1}^N [(t - 1)\lambda_I + 1] \\
&= \det[\mathbf{I} + (t - 1)\mathbf{\Lambda}] \\
&= \det(\mathbf{X}) \det[\mathbf{I} + (t - 1)\mathbf{\Lambda}] \det(\mathbf{X}^\dagger) \\
&= \det [\mathbf{I} + (t - 1)\mathbf{\Sigma}^\Omega] \ . \tag{78}
\end{aligned}$$

This result is equivalent to what was obtained by an explicit determinant decomposition by Cancès (Cancès et al., 2004). Again, in our approach no such decomposition is needed and the link with the original work of Ziesche (Ziesche, 2000) that allowed Savin to propose the theory of MPDs (Savin, 2001) is clear.

Note that one can interpret the associated eigenvalues by recognizing the domains as ‘Open Quantum Systems’ (Breuer & Petruccione, 2002; Martín Pendás & Francisco, 2018b). As an Open Quantum System, the domains interact with an external environment, which can be its complement or a collection of other domains. As a complete description of the domain is only possible by recognizing that it is embedded into its environment, the resulting description can be framed in the terminology of the ‘Density Matrix Embedding Theory’ or DMET (Knizia & Chan, 2013). In this theory, for a single Slater determinant, the overlap

matrix Σ^Ω , which is defined as the overlap of the orbitals *projected onto the fragment* Ω , is diagonalized. The eigenvectors of Σ^Ω define a rotation of the orbitals that divides them in three sets, depending on their eigenvalues. Eigenvalues of one and zero are associated with ‘pure fragment orbitals’ (in our case ‘pure domain’) and ‘pure environment orbitals’ (in our case ‘pure complementary domain’) respectively. Eigenvalues in between zero and one are called ‘entangled orbitals’ (in our case ‘shared orbitals’).

Cancès et al. also noted that the probabilities can be expressed as (Cancès et al., 2004),

$$p [(\nu, N - \nu), (\Omega, \bar{\Omega})] = a_\nu^N, \quad (79)$$

where the a_ν^N are defined by the recursion

$$\begin{cases} a_0^0 = 1 \\ a_0^k = \alpha_k a_0^{k-1} \\ a_j^k = \beta_k a_{j-1}^{k-1} + \alpha_k a_j^{k-1}, 1 \leq j < k - 1 \\ a_k^k = \beta_k a_{k-1}^{k-1} \end{cases} \quad (80)$$

with

$$\alpha_k = 1 - \lambda_k \quad (81)$$

$$\beta_k = \lambda_k. \quad (82)$$

On the one hand, this allows for an efficient computation of the probabilities in the case of a single Slater determinant and two domains. On the other hand, this recursive scheme indicates that in the case of a single determinant wave function, the underlying framework is that of a determinantal point process (Macchi, 1975; Soshnikov, 2000). In a determinantal point process, the distribution of the number of points is equal to the distribution of the sum of independent Bernoulli(λ_j) random variables (a Poisson binomial distribution), where $0 < \lambda_j \leq 1$ are the nonzero eigenvalues of the ‘kernel’ of the determinantal process (in our case Σ^Ω) (Gottlieb, 2005).

Note that the interpretation as a determinantal point process is different from the interpretation of Francisco et al. (Francisco, Martín Pendás, & Blanco, 2009), where each electron is considered to be statistically independent from the others, lying either inside Ω

or its complement with respective probabilities λ_k or $1 - \lambda_k$. The latter interpretation is at odds with the standard interpretation of statistical independence as a factorization of the probability density $|\Psi(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N)|^2$, which can never be achieved when using a single Slater determinant (Kutzelnigg, 2003). Indeed, according to the interpretation presented above, the statistical independence is related to the process of counting the number of particles in a domain, and not to the behavior of the particles themselves in spin-position space.

ORBITAL AND DOMAIN DENSITY FLUCTUATIONS

In the previous sections, we showed how the moment generating function can be used to generate moments of the (domain) occupation number operator. In a similar way, we can generate the ‘central moments’ of this (domain) occupation number operator, where the central moment is the moment of a random variable around its mean. By defining an occupation number fluctuation operator $\delta\hat{n}(\mathbf{r})$ (Fulde, 2012)

$$\delta\hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) := \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) - \langle \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle , \quad (83)$$

we can center the occupation-number operator $\hat{n}(\mathbf{r})$ around its mean $\langle \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle$ (Yamasaki & Goddard, 1998; Yamasaki, Mainz, & Goddard, 2000). In analogy with the moment generating function $\mathcal{M}[g, \mathbf{t}]$, we can then construct a ‘central moment’ generating function $\mathcal{M}'[g, \mathbf{t}]$

$$\mathcal{M}'[g, \mathbf{t}] := \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \exp \left(\int g(\mathbf{r}) \delta\hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} + \sum_{a=1}^d t_a \delta\hat{n}(\Omega_a) \right) \right\rangle , \quad (84)$$

where

$$\delta\hat{n}(\Omega_a) := \hat{n}(\Omega_a) - \langle \hat{n}(\Omega_a) \rangle . \quad (85)$$

The first three central moments $\rho'^{(1)}(\mathbf{r})$, $\rho'^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)$ and $\rho'^{(3)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_3)$ are then given by the derivatives of \mathcal{M}' with respect to $g(\mathbf{r})$

$$\rho'^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) = \lim_{\substack{g \rightarrow 0 \\ \mathbf{t} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{M}'[g, \mathbf{t}]}{\partial g(\mathbf{r})} = \langle \delta\hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle = 0 \quad (86)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho'^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) &= \lim_{\substack{g \rightarrow 0 \\ \mathbf{t} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{M}'[g, \mathbf{t}]}{\partial g(\mathbf{r}_1) \partial g(\mathbf{r}_2)} = \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \delta \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}_1) \delta \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}_2) \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} (\hat{n}(\mathbf{r}_1) - \langle \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}_1) \rangle) (\hat{n}(\mathbf{r}_2) - \langle \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}_2) \rangle) \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}_1) \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}_2) \right\rangle - \langle \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}_1) \rangle \langle \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}_2) \rangle \\
&= \rho^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) - \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}_1) \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}_2)
\end{aligned} \tag{87}$$

$$\rho'^{(3)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_3) = \rho^{(3)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_3) - \hat{S} \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}_1) \rho^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_3) + 2 \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}_1) \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}_2) \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}_3), \tag{88}$$

where \hat{S} is a symmetrizer (Ziesche, 2000).

While the reduced densities describe the average occupation numbers of the relevant position space orbitals, the reduced central densities describe the statistical correlation between the fluctuations of the occupation numbers. For instance, the second-order reduced central density $\rho'^{(2)}(i, j)$ defined in the orbital basis $\{\phi_i\}$ describes the covariance between the orbital occupation numbers $n(i)$ and $n(j)$ (Kong & Valeev, 2011). Due to the fact that the above derivations are solely based on the concept of occupation-number operators, independent of the underlying orbital basis, a similar statement is valid for the position basis.

$\rho'^{(2)}$ is also called the exchange-correlation hole (Slater, 1951) and has been studied extensively in Density Functional Theory (Parr & Yang, 1989). However, we note that the central moments treat occupied and non-occupied sites on the same footing (Hanauer & Köhn, 2012): *all* fluctuations of the site occupations are taken into account. This implies that the central density $\rho'^{(2)}(I, J)$ does not really describe “the hole associated with a reference electron in spin-orbital I ”, but rather describes all correlations between the occupation-number fluctuations that occur at the given orbitals. If we assume that the wave function can be written as $|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}} |\mathbf{k}\rangle$, we can see this more clearly as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho'^{(2)}(I, J) &= \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \delta \hat{n}(I) \delta \hat{n}(J) \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \hat{n}(I) \hat{n}(J) \right\rangle - \langle \hat{n}(I) \rangle \langle \hat{n}(J) \rangle \\
&= \sum_k |c_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 \left(\left\langle \mathbf{k} \left| \hat{\mathcal{N}} \hat{n}(I) \hat{n}(J) \right| \mathbf{k} \right\rangle - \langle \hat{n}(I) \rangle \langle \hat{n}(J) \rangle \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

Hence, even an Slater determinant $|\mathbf{l}\rangle$ in which neither I nor J are occupied (i.e. there is no ‘reference electron’ as such) contributes a term $-|c_{\mathbf{l}}|^2 \rho^{(1)}(I)\rho^{(1)}(J)$ to the central density.

The second-order domain central densities $\rho'^{(2)}(\Omega_a, \Omega_a)$ and $\rho'^{(2)}(\Omega_a, \Omega_b)$ are given by

$$\rho'^{(2)}(\Omega_a, \Omega_a) = \rho^{(2)}(\Omega_a, \Omega_a) - \rho^{(1)}(\Omega_a)\rho^{(1)}(\Omega_a) \quad (90)$$

$$\rho'^{(2)}(\Omega_a, \Omega_b) = \rho^{(2)}(\Omega_a, \Omega_b) - \rho^{(1)}(\Omega_a)\rho^{(1)}(\Omega_b) \quad (91)$$

and are also called the ‘localization’ and the ‘delocalization’ indices respectively (R. F. Bader & Stephens, 1974; Angyan, Loos, & Mayer, 1994; Fradera, Austen, & Bader, 1999; Fradera, Poater, Simon, Duran, & Solà, 2002; Baranov & Kohout, 2011). By interpreting the domain indices a and b as indices of a matrix $\rho'_2(\Omega_a, \Omega_b)$, we obtain the ‘Localization-Delocalization Matrix’ or LDM (Matta, Sumar, Cook, & Ayers, 2016). Taking further derivatives with respect to \mathbf{t} leads to M -th order central densities, which also have been called ‘multicenter bonding indices’ (Giambiagi, de Giambiagi, & Mundim, 1990). These quantities and derivatives thereof have been used extensively to quantify aromaticity (Ponec, Bultinck, & Saliner, 2005; Bultinck, Ponec, & Van Damme, 2005; Feixas, Matito, Poater, & Solà, 2015).

Descriptors that ‘mix’ the orbital and domain perspective have also received significant attention from the conceptual quantum chemistry community. As such, the second-order orbital and domain central density $\rho'^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}, \Omega)$

$$\rho'^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}, \Omega) = \rho^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}, \Omega) - \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r})\rho^{(1)}(\Omega_a) \quad (92)$$

is also called the ‘Domain Averaged Fermi Hole’ or DAFH (Ponec, 1997, 1998; Poater, Sola, Duran, & Fradera, 2002; Ponec, Cooper, & Savin, 2008; Cooper & Ponec, 2008; Ponec & Feixas, 2009; Bultinck, Cooper, & Ponec, 2010). In position space, $\hat{n}(\Omega)$ can be expressed in terms of orbitals that have been unitarily rotated by the eigenvectors of the domain overlap matrix \mathbf{S}^Ω . As such, for a single Slater determinant wave function, we can reduce

the second-order central density $\rho^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}, \Omega)$ to

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}, \Omega) &= \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) \hat{n}(\Omega) \right\rangle - \langle \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle \langle \hat{n}(\Omega) \rangle \\
&= \sum_{ijk} \lambda_k \tilde{\phi}_i^*(\mathbf{r}) \tilde{\phi}_j(\mathbf{r}) \left[\left\langle \hat{\phi}_i^+ \hat{\phi}_k^+ \hat{\phi}_k^- \hat{\phi}_j^- \right\rangle - \left\langle \hat{\phi}_i^+ \hat{\phi}_j^- \right\rangle \left\langle \hat{\phi}_k^+ \hat{\phi}_k^- \right\rangle \right] \\
&= \sum_{ijk} \lambda_k \tilde{\phi}_i^*(\mathbf{r}) \tilde{\phi}_j(\mathbf{r}) [\delta_{ij} - \delta_{ik} \delta_{jk} - \delta_{ij}] \\
&= - \sum_k \lambda_k \left| \tilde{\phi}_k(\mathbf{r}) \right|^2, \tag{93}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that $\hat{n}(\mathbf{r})$ can be expressed in the basis of the rotated orbitals $\{\tilde{\phi}_j\}$ as

$$\hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{ij} \tilde{\phi}_i^*(\mathbf{r}) \tilde{\phi}_j(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\phi}_i^+ \hat{\phi}_j^-, \tag{94}$$

and the fact that the occupation-numbers of a single Slater determinant are invariant under unitary rotations. As such, for a single Slater determinant wave function, the orbitals that have been rotated according to the domain orbital overlap matrix \mathbf{S}^Ω are also called the ‘DAFH orbitals’ or ‘Domain Natural Orbitals’ (DNOs) and the eigenvalues of \mathbf{S}^Ω the ‘DAFH orbital occupation number’ (Francisco et al., 2009). Furthermore, if we define the first-order conditional density $\rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}_1|\mathbf{r}_2)$ as

$$\rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}_1|\mathbf{r}_2) = \frac{\rho^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)}{\rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}_2)}, \tag{95}$$

we can express $\rho^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}, \Omega)$ for multi-determinant wave function as

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}, \Omega) &= \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) \hat{n}(\Omega) \right\rangle - \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) \langle \hat{n}(\Omega) \rangle \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j \left[\left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) \hat{n}(\tilde{j}) \right\rangle - \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) \langle \hat{n}(\tilde{j}) \rangle \right] \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j \rho^{(1)}(\tilde{j}) \left[\frac{\rho^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}, \tilde{j})}{\rho^{(1)}(\tilde{j})} - \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) \right] \\
&= - \sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j \rho^{(1)}(\tilde{j}) [\rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) - \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}|\tilde{j})], \tag{96}
\end{aligned}$$

As such, $\rho^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}, \Omega)$ provides a decomposition of the excluded density lying in the region over which the central moment is calculated (Francisco et al., 2014).

In a similar way as can be done for the moment generating function, we can generate a hierarchy of descriptors by taking successive derivatives of the central moment generating function (see Figure 3). We note that most of the higher order quantities in this hierarchy are still left largely unexplored. In view of the insights that have already been gleaned from lower order descriptors, we believe that many more important chemical insights can be revealed by using the currently unexplored descriptors in this hierarchy.

However, we must note that one has to be careful in assigning additional chemical interpretations to these central densities, beyond their statistical meaning. For example, according to Mayer (Mayer, 2007), the second-order central density is inadequate for defining bond orders as it leads to results that are not chemical. Bochicchio et al. (Bochicchio, Lain, & Torre, 2003) point out that bond orders that are defined on the fluctuation of electron populations should be restricted to uncorrelated wave functions. In further support of both findings, we have recently shown that increased covalent contributions lead to reductions in the second-order domain central density (Acke & Bultinck, 2018; Martín Pendás & Francisco, 2018a). As such, we believe that many of the additional ‘chemical interpretations’ that have been historically associated with central densities – such as ‘bonds’, ‘bond orders’ and related terms – are worth revisiting.

ORBITAL AND DOMAIN DENSITY CUMULANTS

Next to (central) moments, we can also generate the so-called ‘cumulants’. Many theoretical problems are simpler to tackle when formulated in terms of cumulants. In particular, the cumulant of two random variables gives an indication of their mutual statistical dependence, with completely independent variables resulting in a zero cumulant.

In classical statistics, the cumulants $\langle X^n \rangle_c$ of a stochastic variable X are obtained through successive differentiation of the cumulant-generating function $\mathcal{C}(t)$, which is defined as the logarithm of the moment generating function $\mathcal{M}(t)$

$$\mathcal{C}(t) = \ln \mathcal{M}(t) = \ln \langle e^{tX} \rangle . \tag{97}$$




Figure 3: Overview of the $k + l$ -th order fluctuation densities $\rho^{(k+l)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_k, \Omega_a, \dots, \Omega_l)$ that can be derived from the reduced central density generating function $\mathcal{M}'[g, \mathbf{t}]$. Solid arrows indicate successive differentiations of that generating function, whereas dotted arrows indicate multiple successive differentiations. The respective successive differentiation is listed next to these arrows. Curly lines are used to indicate commonly used names for the resulting descriptors.

For instance, the second cumulant of X is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle X^2 \rangle_c &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{d^2 \mathcal{C}(t)}{dt^2} \\
&= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{d^2 \ln \mathcal{M}(t)}{dt^2} \\
&= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{M}(t)} \frac{d\mathcal{M}(t)}{dt} \right) \\
&= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \left(-\frac{1}{\mathcal{M}(t)^2} \frac{d\mathcal{M}(t)}{dt} \frac{d\mathcal{M}(t)}{dt} + \frac{1}{\mathcal{M}(t)} \frac{d^2 \mathcal{M}(t)}{dt^2} \right) \\
&= \langle X^2 \rangle - \langle X \rangle^2, \tag{98}
\end{aligned}$$

and is also called the variance of X or $\text{var}(X)$. We can also generate multi-variable cumulants from $\mathcal{C}(t_X, t_Y)$, which depend on the multi-variable moment generating function $\mathcal{M}(t_X, t_Y)$

$$\mathcal{M}(t_X, t_Y) = \langle e^{t_X X + t_Y Y} \rangle. \tag{99}$$

As such, the second ‘mixed’ cumulant of X and Y is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}(t_X, t_Y) &= \lim_{t_X, t_Y \rightarrow 0} \frac{d^2 \mathcal{C}(t_X, t_Y)}{dt_X dt_Y} \\ &= \lim_{t_X, t_Y \rightarrow 0} \left(-\frac{1}{\mathcal{M}(t_X, t_Y)^2} \frac{d\mathcal{M}(t_X, t_Y)}{dt_X} \frac{d\mathcal{M}(t_X, t_Y)}{dt_Y} + \frac{1}{\mathcal{M}(t_X, t_Y)} \frac{d^2 \mathcal{M}(t_X, t_Y)}{dt_X dt_Y} \right) \\ &= \langle XY \rangle - \langle X \rangle \langle Y \rangle ,\end{aligned}\tag{100}$$

and is also called the covariance of X and Y or $\text{cov}(X, Y)$. A related quantity is the Pearson correlation coefficient $\rho_{X,Y}$

$$\rho_{X,Y} = \frac{\text{cov}(X, Y)}{\sqrt{\text{var}(X)}\sqrt{\text{var}(Y)}} .\tag{101}$$

Here, $\rho_{X,Y} = 1$ or $\rho_{X,Y} = -1$ indicates perfect positive or negative statistical correlation, while $\rho_{X,Y} = 0$ indicates an absence of statistical correlation between X and Y (which does not necessarily equate to the statistical independence of X and Y) (Wasserman, 2013).

As was initially shown by Kubo (Kubo, 1962), we can construct a quantum statistical cumulant generating function $\mathcal{C}[g, \mathbf{t}]$ from the moment generating function

$$\mathcal{M}[g, \mathbf{t}] := \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{N}} \exp \left(\int g(\mathbf{r}) \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} + \sum_{a=1}^d t_a \hat{n}(\Omega_a) \right) \right\rangle ,\tag{102}$$

as follows

$$\mathcal{C}[g, \mathbf{t}] = \ln(\mathcal{M}[g, \mathbf{t}]) .\tag{103}$$

As such, the first order cumulant $k^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}_1)$ for the position space orbital basis is equal to the first moment

$$\kappa^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}_1) = \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}_1) ,\tag{104}$$

while the second and third order cumulants $\kappa^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)$ and $\kappa^{(3)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_3)$ are equal to the central moments

$$\kappa^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \rho^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) - \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}_1)\rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}_2) = \rho'^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)\tag{105}$$

$$\kappa^{(3)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_3) = \rho^{(3)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_3) - \hat{S}\rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}_1)\rho^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_3) + \frac{1}{2}\rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}_1)\rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}_2)\rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}_3) = \rho'^{(3)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_3) ,\tag{106}$$




Figure 4: Overview of the $k + l$ -th order density cumulants $\kappa^{(k+l)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_k, \Omega_a, \dots, \Omega_l)$ that can be derived from the reduced density cumulant generating function $\mathcal{C}[g, \mathbf{t}]$. Solid arrows indicate successive differentiations of that generating function, whereas dotted arrows indicate multiple successive differentiations. The respective successive differentiation is listed next to these arrows. Curly lines are used to indicate commonly used names for the resulting descriptors.

with \hat{S} a symmetrizer (Ziesche, 2000). Although fourth and higher order cumulants are not equal to (central) moments, they can be constructed from them (Ziesche, 2000).

We can obtain the $k + l$ -order reduced density cumulant by successive differentiations of the cumulant generating function

$$\kappa_{k+l}(\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_k, \Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_l) = \lim_{\substack{g \rightarrow 0 \\ \mathbf{t} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}}} \frac{\partial^{k+l} \mathcal{C}[g, \mathbf{t}]}{\partial g(\mathbf{r}_1) \dots \partial g(\mathbf{r}_k) \partial t_1 \dots \partial t_l}, \quad (107)$$

with k the number of derivatives with respect to $g(\mathbf{r})$ and l the number of derivatives with respect to \mathbf{t} . In this way, the cumulant generating function can be used to generate a hierarchy of descriptors, as visualized in Figure 4.

Of particular interest in this hierarchy are the quantities obtained by differentiating only once with respect to $g(\mathbf{r})$ and l times with respect to \mathbf{t} . They provide an effective one-electron description of a l -domain integrated cumulant density. In position space, these quantities have been coined the ‘Natural Adaptive Orbitals’ or NAdOs by Francisco et al. (Francisco,

Martín Pendás, García-Revilla, & Álvarez Boto, 2013; Menéndez, Álvarez Boto, Francisco, & Martín Pendás, 2015), as they can be used to extend the applicability of concepts based on orbital models to correlated levels of theory. In this theory, the resulting one-electron functions are considered to provide at each point in spin-position space an indication of the interaction of domains with that position. These one-electron functions are contained inside those domains, if no $(l + 1)$ -center interactions exist (Menéndez, Álvarez Boto, et al., 2015).

We note that most of the hierarchy detailed in Figure 4 is still largely unexplored. In view of the insights that have already been gained through the use of NAdOs (Casals-Sainz, Jiménez-Grávalos, Costales, Francisco, & Martín Pendás, 2018; Menéndez-Crespo, Costales, Francisco, & Martín Pendás, 2018; Casals-Sainz, Jara-Cortés, Hernández-Trujillo, Francisco, & Martín Pendás, 2019), we believe that more chemical insights can be revealed by using these currently underutilized descriptors.

As cumulants are equal to zero for independent occupations, the l -th order cumulant $\kappa^{(l)}(\Omega_a, \dots, \Omega_l)$ measures the dependencies in the occupations that are *genuinely* of l -body type. For instance, if $\kappa^{(2)}(\Omega_a, \Omega_b) = 0$, then

$$\rho^{(2)}(\Omega_a, \Omega_b) = \rho^{(1)}(\Omega_a)\rho^{(1)}(\Omega_b) . \tag{108}$$

In this case, there is no *genuine* 2-body type dependency that contributes to the pair occupation. As such, the pair occupation is entirely determined by the single occupations of the respective domains. We must note that, as already stated in the section on reduced densities, a probabilistic interpretation of reduced densities can lead to erroneous interpretations of the derived cumulants. As stated by McWeeny (McWeeny, 1960):

“To a first approximation it would be expected that the motion of one electron would be independent of the instantaneous positions of the others, though the form of $\rho^{(1)}$ would certainly reflect the average effect of the $N - 1$ electrons. In this case, where the particles might be described as quasi-independent, we should have $\rho^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}_1)\rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}_2)$.”

However, as indicated by Bader and Kutzelnigg (R. F. Bader & Stephens, 1974; Kutzelnigg, 2003), a pair density can never be equal to a product of one electron densities and in a

probabilistic interpretation this quasi-independence should be reflected by

$$\rho_{\text{ind}}^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \frac{N-1}{N} \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}_1) \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}_2) , \tag{109}$$

where the prefactor can at best be justifiably neglected for extended systems. This renormalization factor is related to the fact that the electrons are countable particles and is independent of the particle statistics (Kutzelnigg, 1973). As such, assuming that the cumulant is the difference between a correlated second-order reduced density and (quasi)-independent first-order reduced densities does not lead to consistent interpretations.

CONCLUSIONS

We have reviewed the statistical theory of occupancy by constructing (domain) occupation number operators and determining their (central) moments and cumulants through a suitable generating function. Many of the existing quantum chemical descriptors can be matched to a statistical quantity in the resulting hierarchy. This hierarchy connects seemingly unrelated concepts and provides a unified interpretation for all these descriptors. Furthermore, it points to quantum chemical concepts that have not yet been explored. The resulting framework also provides a ‘common language’ for conceptual quantum chemists and theoretical quantum physicists. We hope that by elucidating this language, the present review will stimulate further research into these quantum chemical descriptors through such interdisciplinary collaborations.

APPENDIX: SECOND QUANTIZED MACHINERY

Creation and annihilation operators

The quantum chemistry of electrons is described more succinctly when allowing for varying particle number (Helgaker, Jørgensen, & Olsen, 2000; Surján, 1989). Relations between states of varying particle number can be described in Fock space \mathcal{F} , which is the direct sum

of the $i = 0$ - to $i = \infty$ -particle Hilbert spaces

$$\mathcal{F} = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{H}_i . \quad (110)$$

We can define a creation operator in \mathcal{F} by its action on an antisymmetric N -particle state (which is essentially equivalent to a single Slater determinant)

$$\hat{\phi}_I^+ |\phi_1 \dots \phi_N\rangle := \left(\prod_{J=1}^N (1 - \delta_{IJ}) \right) |\phi_I \phi_1 \dots \phi_N\rangle . \quad (111)$$

in which an electron is ‘created’ in orbital ϕ_I . The factors $(1 - \delta_{IJ})$ make sure that a particle cannot be created more than once. The associated annihilation operator can be defined as

$$\hat{\phi}_I^- |\phi_I \phi_1 \dots \phi_N\rangle := |\phi_1 \dots \phi_N\rangle , \quad (112)$$

and ‘annihilates’ the electron in orbital ϕ_I . Whenever there is no electron in orbital ϕ_I , the operator $\hat{\phi}_I^-$ annihilates the state altogether

$$\hat{\phi}_I^- |\phi_1 \dots \phi_N\rangle := 0 . \quad (113)$$

In this review, we will employ Longuet-Higgins notation (Longuet-Higgins, 1966), which explicitly incorporates the identity of the underlying single-particle basis in the notation of the operators. In particular, we will employ the following notations

$$\hat{\chi}_I^+ |0\rangle = |\chi_I\rangle \quad \text{finite, non-orthogonal spin-orbital basis} \quad (114)$$

$$\hat{\phi}_I^+ |0\rangle = |\phi_I\rangle = |I\rangle \quad \text{finite, orthonormal spin-orbital basis} \quad (115)$$

$$\hat{\psi}^+(\mathbf{x}) |0\rangle = |\mathbf{x}\rangle \quad \text{spin-position orbital creation operator (field operator)} , \quad (116)$$

where an orthonormal spin-orbital basis is characterized by

$$\langle \phi_I | \phi_J \rangle = \int \phi_I^*(\mathbf{x}) \phi_J(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \delta_{IJ} , \quad (117)$$

and a non-orthogonal spin-orbital basis by (Surján, 1989)

$$\langle \chi_I | \chi_J \rangle = \int \chi_I^*(\mathbf{x}) \chi_J(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \Sigma_{IJ} \neq \delta_{IJ} , \quad (118)$$

with Σ the spin-orbital overlap matrix. For an orthonormal single-particle basis, the associated annihilation operator is also the Hermitian conjugate of the creation operator

$$\hat{\phi}_I^- = (\hat{\phi}_I^+)^\dagger , \quad (119)$$

and can hence be used to create particles in the dual vector. The creation and annihilation operators codify the Pauli antisymmetry principle into their anticommutation relations (where $[\hat{A}, \hat{B}]_+ = \hat{A}\hat{B} + \hat{B}\hat{A}$)

$$[\hat{\phi}_I^+, \hat{\phi}_J^+]_+ = 0 \quad (120)$$

$$[\hat{\phi}_I^-, \hat{\phi}_J^-]_+ = 0 \quad (121)$$

$$[\hat{\phi}_I^+, \hat{\phi}_J^-]_+ = \delta_{IJ} = [\hat{\phi}_J^-, \hat{\phi}_I^+]_+ . \quad (122)$$

For non-orthogonal spin-orbitals, these anticommutation relations are replaced by

$$[\hat{\chi}_I^+, \hat{\chi}_J^+]_+ = 0 \quad (123)$$

$$[\hat{\chi}_I^-, \hat{\chi}_J^-]_+ = 0 \quad (124)$$

$$[\hat{\chi}_I^+, \hat{\chi}_J^-]_+ = \Sigma_{IJ} . \quad (125)$$

We can restore the usual anticommutation relations by constructing a bi-orthogonal basis $\{\varphi_I\}$ (Surján, 1989) as

$$\hat{\varphi}_I^- = \sum_J \Sigma_{IJ}^{-1} \hat{\chi}_J^- \quad (126)$$

for which

$$[\hat{\chi}_I^+, \hat{\varphi}_J^-]_+ = \delta_{IJ} . \quad (127)$$

Although this condition allows us to use any result derived for the orthogonal case (Surján, 1989), it does not solve the problem that the annihilation operator $\hat{\chi}_I^-$ is no longer the Hermitian conjugate of the creation operator $\hat{\chi}_I^+$. As such, the construction of bra wave functions is only possible by means of the inverse transformation

$$\hat{\chi}_I^- = \sum_J \Sigma_{IJ} \hat{\varphi}_J^- , \quad (128)$$

which reintroduces the need to take the overlap matrix Σ explicitly into account when using non-orthogonal orbitals.

In non-relativistic theory, spin-orbitals $\{\phi_I\}$ are commonly of the following form (Helgaker et al., 2000)

$$\phi_{i\sigma}(\mathbf{r}, m_s) = \phi_i(\mathbf{r})\sigma(m_s) . \quad (129)$$

Hence, we may separate out spin from spatial parts of the creation and annihilation operators, giving

$$[\hat{\phi}_{i\sigma}^+, \hat{\phi}_{j\sigma'}^+]_+ = 0 \quad (130)$$

$$[\hat{\phi}_{i\sigma}^-, \hat{\phi}_{j\sigma'}^-]_+ = 0 \quad (131)$$

$$[\hat{\phi}_{i\sigma}^+, \hat{\phi}_{j\sigma'}^-]_+ = \delta_{ij}\delta_{\sigma\sigma'} , \quad (132)$$

where the M spin-orbitals $\{\phi_I\}$ can be expressed in terms of m spatial orbitals $\{\phi_i\}$.

Field operators

Given a certain basis, we can express this basis in an alternative basis with the aid of the single-particle completeness relations. If we start from the complete set of eigenvectors of the operator $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} |\mathbf{x}\rangle = \mathbf{x} |\mathbf{x}\rangle , \quad (133)$$

the corresponding basis transformations are given by

$$|\phi_I\rangle = \int |\mathbf{x}\rangle \langle \mathbf{x} | \phi_I \rangle d\mathbf{x} = \int \phi_I(\mathbf{x}) |\mathbf{x}\rangle d\mathbf{x} \quad (134)$$

$$|\mathbf{x}\rangle = \sum_I |\phi_I\rangle \langle \phi_I | \mathbf{x} \rangle = \sum_I \phi_I^*(\mathbf{x}) |\phi_I\rangle . \quad (135)$$

From this, we can derive the transformation for the associated creation operator

$$\hat{\psi}^+(\mathbf{x}) |0\rangle = |\mathbf{x}\rangle = \sum_I |\phi_I\rangle \langle \phi_I | \mathbf{x} \rangle = \sum_I \phi_I^*(\mathbf{x}) |\phi_I\rangle = \sum_I \phi_I^*(\mathbf{x}) \hat{\phi}_I^+ |0\rangle \quad (136)$$

In a similar way, the inverse transformation is given by

$$\hat{\phi}_I^+ = \int \phi_I(\mathbf{x}) \hat{\psi}^+(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} , \quad (137)$$

and the following transformation rules for annihilation operators can be derived

$$\hat{\psi}^-(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_I \phi_I(\mathbf{x}) \hat{\phi}_I^- \quad (138)$$

$$\hat{\phi}_I^- = \int \phi_I^*(\mathbf{x}) \hat{\psi}^-(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} . \quad (139)$$

The operator $\hat{\psi}^+(\mathbf{x})$ is called a ‘field operator’ and acts as a hybrid between first and second quantization (Fetter & Walecka, 2003; Engel & Dreizler, 2011; Lancaster & Blundell, 2014). As such, it is very convenient for porting first quantized expressions into second quantization.

Normal ordering

Given a sequence of second quantized operators \hat{O} , the normal ordered form $\hat{\mathcal{N}}\hat{O}$ with respect to the vacuum state $|0\rangle$ corresponds to moving all creation operators to the left and all annihilation operators to the right as if they all anticommuted (Saue, 2015). Hence,

$$\hat{\mathcal{N}}\hat{\phi}_I^-\hat{\phi}_J^- = \hat{\phi}_I^-\hat{\phi}_J^- \quad (140)$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{N}}\hat{\phi}_I^+\hat{\phi}_J^+ = \hat{\phi}_I^+\hat{\phi}_J^+ \quad (141)$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{N}}\hat{\phi}_I^+\hat{\phi}_J^- = \hat{\phi}_I^+\hat{\phi}_J^- \quad (142)$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{N}}\hat{\phi}_I^-\hat{\phi}_J^+ = -\hat{\phi}_I^+\hat{\phi}_J^- \quad (143)$$

Note that the action of the normal ordered form of a collection of operators \hat{O} that contains duplicate creation or annihilation operators on an arbitrary state $|\mathbf{K}\rangle$ is such that the state is annihilated

$$\hat{\mathcal{N}}\hat{\phi}_I^+\hat{\phi}_I^-\hat{\phi}_I^+\hat{\phi}_I^-|\mathbf{K}\rangle = -\hat{\phi}_I^+\hat{\phi}_I^+\hat{\phi}_I^-\hat{\phi}_I^-|\mathbf{K}\rangle = 0 . \quad (144)$$

A term related to the idea of normal ordering, is a ‘contraction’. This contraction is defined as the difference between the operator string itself and its normal ordered form

$$\overline{\hat{\phi}_I^+\hat{\phi}_J^-} = \hat{\phi}_I^+\hat{\phi}_J^- - \hat{\mathcal{N}}\hat{\phi}_I^+\hat{\phi}_J^- . \quad (145)$$

This difference can only give rise to zero or a complex number times the identity (Fetter & Walecka, 2003). As such, these contractions play a central role in Wick’s theorem, which states that any operator string can be written as a linear combination of normal-ordered strings, where only fully contracted terms contribute to expectation values with respect to vacuum $|0\rangle$.

References

- Acke, G., & Bultinck, P. (2018). The influence of correlation on (de)localization indices from a valence bond perspective. *Journal of Molecular Modeling*, *24*(10), 275.
- Acke, G., De Baerdemacker, S., Claeys, P. W., Van Raemdonck, M., Poelmans, W., Van Neck, D., & Bultinck, P. (2016). Maximum Probability Domains for Hubbard models. *Molecular Physics*, *114*, 1392-1405.

- Agostini, F., Ciccotti, G., Savin, A., & Vuilleumier, R. (2015). Maximum Probability Domains for the analysis of the microscopic structure of liquids. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, *142*(6), 064117.
- Andrews, G. E. (1998). *The theory of partitions* (No. 2). Cambridge University Press.
- Angyan, J. G., Loos, M., & Mayer, I. (1994). Covalent bond orders and atomic valence indices in the topological theory of atoms in molecules. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry*, *98*(20), 5244–5248.
- Aslangul, C., Constanciel, R., Daudel, R., Esnault, L., & Ludena, E. (1974). The loge theory as a starting point for variational calculations. I. General formalism. *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry*, *8*(4), 499–522.
- Aslangul, C., Constanciel, R., Daudel, R., & Kottis, P. (1972). Aspects of the localizability of electrons in atoms and molecules: Loge theory and related methods. *Advances in Quantum Chemistry*, *6*, 93–141.
- Bader, R., & Stephens, M. (1975). Spatial localization of the electronic pair and number distributions in molecules. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, *97*(26), 7391–7399.
- Bader, R. F. (1990). *Atoms in Molecules: a Quantum Theory*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Bader, R. F., & Stephens, M. E. (1974). Fluctuation and correlation of electrons in molecular systems. *Chemical Physics Letters*, *26*(3), 445–449.
- Baranov, A. I., & Kohout, M. (2011). Electron localization and delocalization indices for solids. *Journal of Computational Chemistry*, *32*(10), 2064–2076.
- Becke, A. D., & Edgecombe, K. E. (1990). A simple measure of electron localization in atomic and molecular systems. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, *92*(9), 5397–5403.
- Bochicchio, R., Lain, L., & Torre, A. (2003). On the definition of bond orders at correlated level. *Chemical Physics Letters*, *374*(5-6), 567–571.
- Bochicchio, R., Ponec, R., Lain, L., & Torre, A. (2000). Pair population analysis within AIM theory. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, *104*(40), 9130–9135.
- Bochicchio, R., Ponec, R., Torre, A., & Lain, L. (2001). Multicenter bonding within the AIM theory. *Theoretical Chemistry Accounts*, *105*(4-5), 292–298.

- Breuer, H.-P., & Petruccione, F. (2002). *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems*. Oxford University Press.
- Bultinck, P., Cooper, D. L., & Ponec, R. (2010). Influence of atoms-in-molecules methods on shared-electron distribution indices and domain-averaged fermi holes. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, *114*(33), 8754–8763.
- Bultinck, P., Ponec, R., & Van Damme, S. (2005). Multicenter bond indices as a new measure of aromaticity in polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. *Journal of Physical Organic Chemistry*, *18*(8), 706–718.
- Bultinck, P., Van Alsenoy, C., Ayers, P. W., & Carbó-Dorca, R. (2007). Critical analysis and extension of the Hirshfeld atoms in molecules. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, *126*(14), 144111.
- Cancès, E., Keriven, R., Lodier, F., & Savin, A. (2004). How electrons guard the space: shape optimization with probability distribution criteria. *Theoretical Chemistry Accounts*, *111*(2-6), 373–380.
- Casals-Sainz, J. L., Jara-Cortés, J., Hernández-Trujillo, J., Francisco, E., & Martín Pendás, Á. (2019). Exotic bonding regimes uncovered in excited states. *Chemistry—A European Journal*.
- Casals-Sainz, J. L., Jiménez-Grávalos, F., Costales, A., Francisco, E., & Martín Pendás, Á. (2018). Beryllium bonding in the light of modern quantum chemical topology tools. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, *122*(3), 849–858.
- Causà, M., D’Amore, M., Garzillo, C., Gentile, F., & Savin, A. (2013). The bond analysis techniques (ELF and Maximum Probability Domains) application to a family of models relevant to bio-inorganic chemistry. In *Applications of Density Functional Theory to Biological and Bioinorganic Chemistry* (pp. 119–141). Springer.
- Causà, M., D’Amore, M., Gentile, F., Menéndez, M., & Calatayud, M. (2015). Electron Localization Function and Maximum Probability Domains analysis of semi-ionic oxides crystals, surfaces and surface defects. *Computational and Theoretical Chemistry*, *1053*, 315–321.
- Causà, M., & Savin, A. (2011). Maximum Probability Domains in crystals: the rock-salt structure. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, *115*(45), 13139–13148.

- Causà, M., & Savin, A. (2011). Maximum probability domains in the solid-state structures of the elements: the diamond structure. *Zeitschrift für Anorganische und Allgemeine Chemie*, 637(7-8), 882–884.
- Claverie, P., & Diner, S. (1975). Statistical and stochastic aspects of the delocalization problem in quantum mechanics. In O. Chalvet, R. Daudel, S. Diner, & J. P. Malrieu (Eds.), *Localization and Delocalization in Quantum Chemistry: Volume II* (Vol. 2, p. 395-448). D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Cooper, D. L., & Ponec, R. (2008). A one-electron approximation to domain-averaged Fermi hole analysis. *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, 10(9), 1319–1329.
- Daley, D. J., & Vere-Jones, D. (2002). *An Introduction to the Theory of Point Processes: Volume I: Elementary Theory and Methods (Second Edition)* (J. Gani, C. C. Heyde, P. Jagers, & T. G. Kurtz, Eds.). Springer.
- Daley, D. J., & Vere-Jones, D. (2008). *An Introduction to the Theory of Point Processes: Volume II: General Theory and Structure (Second Edition)* (J. Gani, C. C. Heyde, P. Jagers, & T. G. Kurtz, Eds.). Springer.
- Daudel, R., Bader, R., Stephens, M., & Borrett, D. (1974). The electron pair in chemistry. *Canadian Journal of Chemistry*, 52(8), 1310–1320.
- Daudel, R., Brion, H., & Odier, S. (1955). Localizability of electrons in atoms and molecules - application to the study of the notion of shell and of the nature of chemical bonds. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 23(11), 2080–2083.
- De Silva, P., & Corminboeuf, C. (2014). Simultaneous visualization of covalent and noncovalent interactions using regions of density overlap. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation*, 10(9), 3745–3756.
- Diner, S., & Claverie, P. (1975). Static and dynamical aspects of delocalization. Electrons and orbitals. In O. Chalvet, R. Daudel, S. Diner, & J. P. Malrieu (Eds.), *Localization and Delocalization in Quantum Chemistry: Volume II* (Vol. 2, p. 461-464). D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Engel, E., & Dreizler, R. M. (2011). *Density Functional Theory: an Advanced Course*. Springer.
- Feixas, F., Matito, E., Poater, J., & Solà, M. (2015). Quantifying aromaticity with electron

- delocalisation measures. *Chemical Society Reviews*, 44(18), 6434–6451.
- Fetter, A. L., & Walecka, J. D. (2003). *Quantum Theory of Many-Particle Systems*. Courier Corporation.
- Fradera, X., Austen, M. A., & Bader, R. F. (1999). The Lewis model and beyond. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, 103(2), 304–314.
- Fradera, X., Poater, J., Simon, S., Duran, M., & Solà, M. (2002). Electron-pairing analysis from localization and delocalization indices in the framework of the atoms-in-molecules theory. *Theoretical Chemistry Accounts*, 108(4), 214–224.
- Francisco, E., & Martín Pendás, Á. (2014). Electron number distribution functions from molecular wavefunctions. Version 2. *Computer Physics Communications*.
- Francisco, E., Martín Pendás, Á., & Blanco, M. (2007). Electron number probability distributions for correlated wave functions. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 126(9), 094102.
- Francisco, E., Martín Pendás, Á., & Blanco, M. (2008). EDF: Computing electron number probability distribution functions in real space from molecular wave functions. *Computer Physics Communications*, 178(8), 621–634.
- Francisco, E., Martín Pendás, Á., & Blanco, M. (2009). A connection between domain-averaged Fermi hole orbitals and electron number distribution functions in real space. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 131(12), 124125.
- Francisco, E., Martín Pendás, Á., & Blanco, M. A. (2011). Generalized electron number distribution functions: real space versus orbital space descriptions. *Theoretical Chemistry Accounts*, 128(4-6), 433–444.
- Francisco, E., Martín Pendás, Á., & Costales, A. (2014). On the interpretation of domain averaged Fermi hole analyses of correlated wavefunctions. *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, 16(10), 4586–4597.
- Francisco, E., Martín Pendás, A., García-Revilla, M., & Álvarez Boto, R. (2013). A hierarchy of chemical bonding indices in real space from reduced density matrices and cumulants. *Computational and Theoretical Chemistry*, 1003, 71–78.
- Fulde, P. (2012). *Correlated Electrons in Quantum Matter*. World Scientific.
- Gallegos, A., Carbó-Dorca, R., Lodier, F., Cancès, E., & Savin, A. (2005). Maximal Probabil-

- ity Domains in linear molecules. *Journal of Computational Chemistry*, 26(5), 455–460.
- Geerlings, P., De Proft, F., & Langenaeker, W. (2003). Conceptual Density Functional Theory. *Chemical Reviews*, 103(5), 1793–1874.
- Giambiagi, M., de Giambiagi, M. S., & Mundim, K. C. (1990). Definition of a multicenter bond index. *Structural Chemistry*, 1(5), 423–427.
- Gottlieb, A. D. (2005). Introduction to determinantal point processes from a quantum probability viewpoint. *arXiv preprint math/0511334*.
- Hanauer, M., & Köhn, A. (2012). Meaning and magnitude of the reduced density matrix cumulants. *Chemical Physics*, 401, 50–61.
- Helgaker, T., Jørgensen, P., & Olsen, J. (2000). *Molecular Electronic-Structure Theory*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Hirshfeld, F. L. (1977). Bonded-atom fragments for describing molecular charge densities. *Theoretica Chimica Acta*, 44(2), 129–138.
- Johnson, E. R., Keinan, S., Mori-Sánchez, P., Contreras-García, J., Cohen, A. J., & Yang, W. (2010). Revealing noncovalent interactions. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 132(18), 6498–6506.
- Knizia, G., & Chan, G. K.-L. (2013). Density matrix embedding: A strong-coupling quantum embedding theory. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation*, 9(3), 1428–1432.
- Kohout, M. (2004). A measure of electron localizability. *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry*, 97(1), 651–658.
- Kong, L., & Valeev, E. F. (2011). A novel interpretation of reduced density matrix and cumulant for electronic structure theories. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 134(21), 214109.
- Kubo, R. (1962). Generalized cumulant expansion method. *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan*, 17(7), 1100–1120.
- Kutzelnigg, W. (1973). Electron correlation and electron pair theories. In *New Concepts I* (pp. 31–73). Springer.
- Kutzelnigg, W. (2003). Theory of electron correlation. In J. Rychlewski (Ed.), *Explicitly Correlated Wave Functions in Chemistry and Physics: Theory and Applications*. Springer.

- Lancaster, T., & Blundell, S. J. (2014). *Quantum Field Theory for the Gifted Amateur*. OUP Oxford.
- Longuet-Higgins, H. (1966). *Quantum Theory of Atoms, Molecules and the Solid State* (P.-O. Löwdin, Ed.). Academic Press, New York.
- Lopes Jr, O. M., Braïda, B., Causa, M., & Savin, A. (2012). Understanding Maximum Probability Domains with simple models. In *Advances in the Theory of Quantum Systems in Chemistry and Physics* (pp. 173–184). Springer.
- Löwdin, P.-O. (1955a). Quantum theory of many-particle systems. III. Extension of the Hartree-Fock scheme to include degenerate systems and correlation effects. *Physical Review*, *97*(6), 1509–1520.
- Löwdin, P.-O. (1955b). Quantum theory of many-particle systems. II. Study of the ordinary Hartree-Fock approximation. *Physical Review*, *97*(6), 1490.
- Löwdin, P.-O. (1955c). Quantum theory of many-particle systems. I. Physical interpretations by means of density matrices, natural spin-orbitals, and convergence problems in the method of configurational interaction. *Physical Review*, *97*(6), 1474.
- Macchi, O. (1975). The coincidence approach to stochastic point processes. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 83–122.
- Martín Pendás, Á., & Francisco, E. (2018a). Decoding real space bonding descriptors in valence bond language. *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, *20*(18), 12368–12372.
- Martín Pendás, Á., & Francisco, E. (2018b). Quantum chemical topology as a theory of open quantum systems. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation*, *15*(2), 1079–1088.
- Martín Pendás, Á., Francisco, E., & Blanco, M. (2007b). An electron number distribution view of chemical bonds in real space. *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, *9*(9), 1087–1092.
- Martín Pendás, Á., Francisco, E., & Blanco, M. (2007c). Pauling resonant structures in real space through electron number probability distributions. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, *111*(6), 1084–1090.
- Martín Pendás, Á., Francisco, E., & Blanco, M. (2007d). Spin resolved electron number distribution functions: How spins couple in real space. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, *127*(14), 144103.

- Martín Pendás, Á., Francisco, E., & Blanco, M. A. (2007a). Charge transfer, chemical potentials, and the nature of functional groups: answers from quantum chemical topology. *Faraday Discussions*, *135*, 423–438.
- Matta, C. F., & Boyd, R. J. (2007). *The Quantum Theory of Atoms in Molecules: from Solid State to DNA and Drug Design*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Matta, C. F., Sumar, I., Cook, R., & Ayers, P. W. (2016). Localization-delocalization matrices and electron density-weighted adjacency/connectivity matrices: A bridge between the quantum theory of atoms in molecules and chemical graph theory. In *Applications of Topological Methods in Molecular Chemistry* (pp. 53–88). Springer.
- Mayer, I. (1983). Charge, bond order and valence in the ab initio SCF theory. *Chemical Physics Letters*, *97*(3), 270–274.
- Mayer, I. (1985). Charge, bond order and valence in the ab initio SCF theory (Addendum). *Chemical Physics Letters*, *117*(4), 396.
- Mayer, I. (2007). Bond order and valence indices: a personal account. *Journal of Computational Chemistry*, *28*(1), 204–221.
- Mayer, I. (2016). *Bond Orders and Energy Components: Extracting Chemical Information from Molecular Wave Functions*. CRC Press.
- Mayer, I., & Hamza, A. (2005). Atomic decomposition of identity: General formalism for population analysis and energy decomposition. *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry*, *103*(6), 798–807.
- McWeeny, R. (1960). Some recent advances in density matrix theory. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, *32*(2), 335.
- Menéndez, M., Álvarez Boto, R., Francisco, E., & Martín Pendás, Á. (2015). One-electron images in real space: Natural adaptive orbitals. *Journal of Computational Chemistry*, *36*(11), 833–843.
- Menéndez, M., & Martín Pendás, Á. (2014). On the stability of some analytically solvable Maximum Probability Domains. *Theoretical Chemistry Accounts*, *133*(9), 1–8.
- Menéndez, M., Martín Pendás, Á., Braïda, B., & Savin, A. (2015). A view of covalent and ionic bonding from Maximum Probability Domains. *Computational and Theoretical Chemistry*, *1053*, 142–149.

- Menéndez-Crespo, D., Costales, A., Francisco, E., & Martín Pendás, Á. (2018). Real-space in situ bond energies: Toward a consistent energetic definition of bond strength. *Chemistry–A European Journal*, *24*(36), 9101–9112.
- Parr, R. G., & Yang, W. (1989). *Density-Functional Theory of Atoms and Molecules*. Oxford University Press.
- Poater, J., Duran, M., Solá, M., & Silvi, B. (2005). Theoretical evaluation of electron delocalization in aromatic molecules by means of atoms in molecules (AIM) and electron localization function (ELF) topological approaches. *Chemical Reviews*, *105*(10), 3911–3947.
- Poater, J., Sola, M., Duran, M., & Fradera, X. (2002). The calculation of electron localization and delocalization indices at the Hartree-Fock, density functional and post-Hartree-Fock levels of theory. *Theoretical Chemistry Accounts*, *107*(6), 362–371.
- Ponec, R. (1997). Electron pairing and chemical bonds. Chemical structure, valences and structural similarities from the analysis of the Fermi holes. *Journal of Mathematical Chemistry*, *21*(3), 323–333.
- Ponec, R. (1998). Electron pairing and chemical bonds. Molecular structure from the analysis of pair densities and related quantities. *Journal of Mathematical Chemistry*, *23*(1-2), 85–103.
- Ponec, R., Bultinck, P., & Saliner, A. G. (2005). Multicenter bond indices as a new means for the quantitative characterization of homoaromaticity. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, *109*(29), 6606–6609.
- Ponec, R., Cooper, D. L., & Savin, A. (2008). Analytic models of domain-averaged Fermi holes: A new tool for the study of the nature of chemical bonds. *Chemistry–A European Journal*, *14*(11), 3338–3345.
- Ponec, R., & Feixas, F. (2009). Domain averaged Fermi hole analysis for open-shell systems. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, *113*(19), 5773–5779.
- Popelier, P. L. (2000). *Atoms in Molecules: An Introduction*. Prentice Hall.
- Saue, T. (2015). Second Quantization. In *European Summerschool in Quantum Chemistry*.
- Savin, A. (2001). Probability distributions and valence shells in atoms. In K. D. Sen (Ed.), *Reviews in Modern Quantum Chemistry*. World Scientific.

- Savin, A. (2004). Phase transition in iodine: a chemical picture. *Journal of Physics and Chemistry of Solids*, 65(12), 2025–2029.
- Savin, A. (2005). On the significance of ELF basins. *Journal of Chemical Sciences*, 117(5), 473.
- Savin, A., Nesper, R., Wengert, S., & Fässler, T. F. (1997). ELF: The electron localization function. *Angewandte Chemie International Edition*, 36(17), 1808–1832.
- Scemama, A., Caffarel, M., & Savin, A. (2007). Maximum Probability Domains from Quantum Monte Carlo calculations. *Journal of Computational Chemistry*, 28(1), 442–454.
- Silvi, B. (2004). How topological partitions of the electron distributions reveal delocalization. *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, 6(2), 256–260.
- Silvi, B., & Savin, A. (1994). Classification of chemical bonds based on topological analysis of electron localization functions. *Nature*, 371(6499), 683–686.
- Slater, J. C. (1951). A simplification of the Hartree-Fock method. *Physical Review*, 81(3), 385.
- Soshnikov, A. (2000). Determinantal random point fields. *Russian Mathematical Surveys*, 55(5), 923–975.
- Surján, P. R. (1989). *Second Quantized Approach to Quantum Chemistry: an Elementary Introduction*. Springer-Verlag.
- Truskett, T. M., Torquato, S., & Debenedetti, P. G. (1998). Density fluctuations in many-body systems. *Physical Review E*, 58(6), 7369.
- Turek, J., Braïda, B., & De Proft, F. (2017). Bonding in heavier group 14 zero-valent complexes - a combined Maximum Probability Domain and valence bond theory approach. *Chemistry–A European Journal*, 23(58), 14604–14613.
- Veazzetti, D. J. (1975). A new derivation of some fluctuation theorems in statistical mechanics. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 16(1), 31–33.
- Wasserman, L. (2013). *All of Statistics: a Concise Course in Statistical Inference*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Yamasaki, T., & Goddard, W. A. (1998). Correlation analysis of chemical bonds. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, 102(17), 2919–2933.

Yamasaki, T., Mainz, D. T., & Goddard, W. A. (2000). Correlation analysis of chemical bonds (CACB) II: quantum mechanical operators for classical chemical concepts. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, 104(11), 2221–2229.

Ziesche, P. (2000). Cumulant expansions of reduced densities, reduced density matrices and green's functions. In C. Jerzy (Ed.), *Many-Electron Densities and Reduced Density Matrices*. Springer.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to acknowledge Paul Ayers, Benoît Braïda, Eric Cancès, Evelio Francisco, Andreas Savin and Dimitri Van Neck for stimulating discussions and collaborations. This work was supported by the Research Foundation Flanders (FWO) under Grants n° 11C3113N and 11C3115N.

FURTHER READING

The works that have been most influential in writing this review are:

- Daudel, R.; Chalvet, O.; Diner, S.; Malrieu, J. P. (1975) Localization and delocalization in quantum chemistry, Volumes 1 and 2, D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Ziesche, P. (2000). Cumulant expansions of reduced densities, reduced density matrices and Green's functions. In C. Jerzy (Ed.), *Many-electron densities and reduced density matrices*. Springer.
- Kutzelnigg, W. (2003). Theory of electron correlation. In J. Rychlewski (Ed.), *Explicitly correlated wave functions in chemistry and physics: theory and applications*. Springer.
- Herbert, J. M. (2003). Reconstructive approaches to one- and two-electron density matrix theory. PhD Thesis. University of Wisconsin-Madison.

- Mayer, I. (2016). Bond orders and energy components: Extracting chemical information from molecular wave functions. CRC Press.