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We employ the resummation procedure of Ref. [1]: In order to resum a divergent diagrammatic series $\sum_{N} a_{N}$ for a quantity $Q$, we first construct a function $Q(z)$ whose Taylor series is $\sum_{N} a_{N} z^{N}$ and such that $Q(z=1)$ is the exact physical result. Taking into account the large-order behavior (to leading order, $\left.\left|a_{N}\right| \sim(N!)^{1 / 5}\right)$, we then take a generalized Borel transform $B(z)$, from which $Q(1)$ is retrieved by the inverse Borel transform $Q(1)=\int_{0}^{\infty} d t t^{4} e^{-t^{5}-b t^{4}-c t^{3}} B(t)(b$ being chosen as in Ref. [1]). The latter integral is evaluated using a conformal mapping taking into account the analytic properties of $Q(z)$ in the complex- $z$ plane.

In the moderately degenerate regime, we have crosschecked the bold scheme with the ladder scheme, see Fig. S1. In the strongly degenerate regime, the ladder scheme is not applicable, but we have cross-checked different variants of the bold scheme, see Fig. S2, where we show three choices: $Q(z)=\Sigma(z) / z$ resp. $\Pi(z) / z$ with $c=13$ (circles), the same $Q(z)$ with $c=60$ (diamonds), and $Q(z)=\Sigma(z)$ resp. $\Pi(z)$ with $c=60$ (squares). The error bars shown at each $N_{\text {max }}$ take into account the statistical error due to the Monte Carlo process, as well as the error due to the finite number of iterations in the bold case.

In our final results, the error bars also include the estimated systematic errors due to the finite $N_{\max }$ as well as the grids used in the numerics, so that all sources of errors are taken into account. We provide our data for the contact in Table S1, and for the momentum distribution in the ancillary files nk_betamu*.txt for several $\beta \mu$ values.

We used the ladder scheme for $\beta \mu=-1$ and -0.5 , and the bold scheme for all other $\beta \mu$ values. Our final results for the ladder-scheme cross-check at $\beta \mu=0$ are $\mathcal{C} \lambda^{4}=30.32(15)$ and $\mathcal{C} / k_{F}^{4}=0.0800(3)$.
We went up to diagram order $N_{\max }=10$ for $\beta \mu \leq-1$, $N_{\text {max }}=8$ for $\beta \mu=1.5$, and $N_{\text {max }}=9$ for all other $\beta \mu$ values. For the ladder scheme, we used $Q(z)=\mathcal{C}(z)$, with $c=12$ for $\beta \mu=-1$, and $c=10$ for $\beta \mu \in\{-0.5,0\}$. For the bold scheme, we used $Q(z)=\Sigma(z) / z$ resp. $\Pi(z) / z$, with $c=10$ for $0 \leq \beta \mu \leq 1, c=15$ for $\beta \mu=1.5, c=13$ for $\beta \mu=2$, and $c=12$ for all other cases.

For an accurate comparison with the virial expansion, we show in Fig. S3, as a function of the fugacity $\zeta=e^{\beta \mu}$, the apparent third-order virial coefficient $c_{3, \text { app }}(\zeta):=\left(\mathcal{C}-\mathcal{C}_{\text {virial } 2}\right) \lambda^{4} /\left(16 \pi^{2} \zeta^{3}\right)$. By construction, $c_{3, \text { app }}(\zeta) \rightarrow c_{3}$ in the non-degenerate limit $\zeta \rightarrow 0$. Our


FIG. S1: Resummed dimensionless contact vs. maximal diagram order $N_{\max }$ at $\beta \mu=0\left(T / T_{F} \approx 0.6\right)$. The two different diagrammatic schemes agree with each other in the large $N_{\text {max }}$ limit.


FIG. S2: Resummed dimensionless contact vs. maximal diagram order at $\beta \mu=2\left(T / T_{F} \approx 0.2\right)$. Three different variants of the conformal-Borel transformation are used (see text).
data for $c_{3, \mathrm{app}}(\zeta)$ do become fairly close to the accurate value of $c_{3}$ from $[2,3]$ but the slope of $c_{3, \mathrm{app}}(\zeta)$ has to change sign for $\zeta \lesssim 0.2$. The coefficient $c_{3}$ comes from the three-body propagator [2, 4] which has to be reconstructed in our framework by summing an infinite number of diagrams.

| $\beta \mu$ | $T / T_{F}$ | $\mathcal{C} \lambda^{4}$ | $\mathcal{C} / k_{F}^{4}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -1.5 | $1.9961(1)$ | $2.248(2)$ | $0.05671(4)$ |
| -1 | $1.3640(3)$ | $5.661(15)$ | $0.0667(2)$ |
| -0.5 | $0.9314(4)$ | $13.59(3)$ | $0.07470(9)$ |
| 0 | $0.6449(4)$ | $30.32(8)$ | $0.0799(2)$ |
| 0.5 | $0.4601(10)$ | $62.0(6)$ | $0.0831(6)$ |
| 1 | $0.3415(12)$ | $114.7(1.8)$ | $0.0848(10)$ |
| 1.5 | $0.2631(16)$ | $198(5)$ | $0.0869(15)$ |
| 2 | $0.2103(11)$ | $320(7)$ | $0.0895(18)$ |
| 2.25 | $0.1892(15)$ | $396(12)$ | $0.0898(18)$ |
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TABLE S1: The contact $\mathcal{C}$ as a function of temperature.


FIG. S3: Circles: Diagrammatic Monte Carlo data for the difference between the contact $\mathcal{C}$ and its 2 nd order virial expansion $\mathcal{C}_{\text {virial } 2}$, divided by an appropriate factor. This quantity must tend to the virial coefficient $c_{3}$ from [2,3] (square) in the zero fugacity limit $\zeta \rightarrow 0$.

