On the Nature of Valence Charge and Spin Excitations via Multi-Orbital Hubbard Models for Infinite-Layer Nickelates
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Building upon the recent progress on the intriguing underlying physics for the newly discovered infinite-layer nickelates, in this article we review an examination of valence charge and spin excitations via multi-orbital Hubbard models as way to determine the fundamental building blocks for Hamiltonians that can describe the low energy properties of infinite-layer nickelates. We summarize key results from density-functional approaches, and apply them to the study of x-ray absorption to determine the valence ground states of infinite-layer nickelates in their parent form, and show that a fundamental $d^9$ configuration as in the cuprates is incompatible with a self-doped ground state having holes in both $d_{x^2−y^2}$ and a rare-earth-derived axial orbital. When doped, we determine that the rare-earth-derived orbitals empty and additional holes form low spin ($S = 0$) $d^8$ Ni states, which can be well-described as a doped single-band Hubbard model. Using exact diagonalization for a 2-orbital model involving Ni and rare-earth orbitals, we find clear magnons at 1/2 filling that persist when doped, albeit with larger damping, and with a dependence on the precise orbital energy separation between the Ni- and rare-earth-derived orbitals. Taken together, a full two-band model for infinite-layer nickelates can well describe the valence charge and spin excitations observed experimentally.
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1 INTRODUCTION

The discovery of experimental superconductivity in infinite-layer nickelates [1], 20 years after they were theoretically proposed [2], has unveiled new territory to probe the unknowns of unconventional superconductivity. The comparison between the superconducting nickelates to the cuprates has proven to be a rich area of inquiry. Significant progress has been made in the last 2 years, but many mysteries about this novel superconducting family remain unsolved. As pointed out early on [3], the bandstructure for LaNiO$_2$ while being primarily $3d$ Ni near the Fermi level has additional small Fermi pockets of largely axial character involving Ni $3d_{x^2−y^2}$ and La $5d_{x^2−y^2}$ orbitals. Including a Hubbard $U$ on nickel splits the $d^9$ states but still leaves itinerant states at the Fermi level, indicating that the parent compound for infinite-layer nickelate is not analogous to undoped CuO$_2$ as an antiferromagnetic Mott insulator. Moreover, the location of the centroid of the oxygen states in...
LaNiO$_2$ lies at lower energies than CuO$_2$ compounds, moving them closer to the boundary between Mott-Hubbard systems and charge-transfer insulators in the Zaanen-Sawatzky-Allen scheme [4]. While there is scant evidence that LaNiO$_2$ is antiferromagnetic, resonant inelastic x-ray scattering (RIXS) has clearly revealed propagating magnons, yielding a spin exchange energy $\sim 60$ meV in the parent compound [5]. These excitations persist when doped, albeit with larger damping [5], in a way that is not too dissimilar to paramagnon excitations in doped cuprates [6–8].

Thus there already is a rich amount of information from which an estimate for a fundamental low energy model Hamiltonian can be obtained and used to model the phase diagram of infinite-layer nickelates. In this article we review efforts to combine density functional approaches with cluster exact diagonalization to determine such a model. Specifically we utilize x-ray absorption (XAS) as a tool to determine valence charge states in the undoped and doped infinite-layer nickelates, arriving at a low-energy 2-orbital model Hamiltonian for monovalent NiO$_2$ containing 3$d$ orbitals and 6 oxygen orbitals per unit cell in the atomic core, with hybridization obtained for NdNiO$_2$ is shown in Figures 1A, B.

To obtain a microscopic Hamiltonian and understand the atomic energy levels, we downfolded the bandstructure as implemented in Wannier90 [11] to obtain the tight-binding model parameters $t_{i,j}$ as shown in Eq. 2 below. Two types of Wannier downfolding have been calculated: (Eq. 1) a 12-orbital model downfolding, which includes five Ni 3$d$ orbitals, one $R$ 5$d$ orbital and six O 2$p$ orbitals; and (Eq. 2) a 6-orbital model downfolding, which includes five Ni 3$d$ orbitals and one $R$ 5$d$ orbital. For NdNiO$_2$, the bandstructure corresponding to the 6-orbital model spans an energy range from $\sim -3.5$ eV to $\sim 2$ eV, covering the most prominent low energy features. The bands below $\sim -3.5$ eV for NdNiO$_2$ have predominantly oxygen orbital content. Figure 1C summarizes the atomic energy level diagram, which shows the on-site energies from the Wannier downfolding for a series of RNiO$_2$ materials ($R = \text{La, Pr, Nd, Eu or Dy}$).

### 2.2 X-Ray Absorption from Multi-Orbital Hubbard Hamiltonians

We focus on the Ni L-edge (2$p \rightarrow 3$d) XAS utilizing a cluster model for monovalent NiO$_2$ containing five Ni 3$d$ orbitals and six O 2$p$ orbitals in a square-planar geometry, and three Ni 2$p$ orbitals per unit cell in the atomic core, with hybridization parameters obtained from Wannier downfolding as described in the previous section. We evaluate the XAS $\kappa$ for the absorption of a photon having momentum and polarization $k_0$, $e_i$, respectively, as

$$\kappa_{k_0, e_i} (\omega) = \frac{1}{NZ} \sum_{i,v} e^{-|\epsilon_i|/\delta} \delta (\omega - (E_i - E_v)).$$

Here, Z is the partition function, $E_i$ are the eigenstates of the initial (ground state) and XAS final states, respectively, obtained from exact diagonalization of the

#### 2 METHODS

### 2.1 Density Functional Theory

The electronic structure of the infinite-layer nickelates R NiO$_2$ have been evaluated using density functional theory (DFT) in the generalized gradient approximation (GGA) for the exchange-correlation functional as implemented in Quantum Espresso [9, 10]. The band structure near the Fermi energy that was obtained for NdNiO$_2$ is shown in Figures 1A, B.

To obtain a microscopic Hamiltonian and understand the atomic energy levels, we downfolded the bandstructure as implemented in Wannier90 [11] to obtain the tight-binding model parameters $t_{i,j}$ as shown in Eq. 2 below. Two types of Wannier downfolding have been calculated: (Eq. 1) a 12-orbital model downfolding, which includes five Ni 3$d$ orbitals, one $R$ 5$d$ orbital and six O 2$p$ orbitals; and (Eq. 2) a 6-orbital model downfolding, which includes five Ni 3$d$ orbitals and one $R$ 5$d$ orbital. For NdNiO$_2$, the bandstructure corresponding to the 6-orbital model spans an energy range from $\sim -3.5$ eV to $\sim 2$ eV, covering the most prominent low energy features. The bands below $\sim -3.5$ eV for NdNiO$_2$ have predominantly oxygen orbital content. Figure 1C summarizes the atomic energy level diagram, which shows the on-site energies from the Wannier downfolding for a series of RNiO$_2$ materials ($R = \text{La, Pr, Nd, Eu or Dy}$).
The multi-orbital Hubbard model can be compactly written as

\[ H = \sum_{i,j,k} t_{ij} \delta_{\sigma,\sigma'} c_{i,j,\sigma}^\dagger c_{j,k,\sigma} + U \sum_{i,k,\sigma} n_{i,k,\sigma} n_{i,k,\sigma'} + \sum_{i,k,\sigma} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu' \neq \mu, \sigma'} U_{\mu,\mu'} n_{i,k,\sigma} n_{i,k,\sigma'} \]

\[ + \sum_{\mu,\sigma} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,k,\sigma} t_{\mu,\sigma} c_{i,k,\sigma}^\dagger \pi_{\mu,\sigma} d_{i,k,\sigma} \]

where \( c_k \) (\( c_k^\dagger \)) operators represent the dispersive R 5d band and the \( d_k \) (\( d_k^\dagger \)) operators represent the Hubbard-like Ni 3d band.

\[ \mathcal{H} = \sum_{k,\sigma} \left( \varepsilon_k c_k^\dagger c_{k,\sigma} + \varepsilon_k^R d_k^\dagger d_{k,\sigma} \right) + \frac{U}{N} \sum_{k,\sigma} n_{k,\sigma} n_{k,\sigma'} + \sum_{k,\sigma} \left( \varepsilon_k^R - \varepsilon_k \right) c_k^\dagger c_{k,\sigma}^{\dagger} d_{k,\sigma}^{\dagger} d_{k,\sigma} + H.c. \]

This hybridization results in the “self-doped” nature of the nickelates.

We evaluate the dynamic spin structure factor, \( S(\mathbf{q}, \omega) \), for the 2-orbital nickelate model using exact diagonalization (ED) on an 8-site (diamond-shaped) Betts cluster [15] with periodic boundary conditions, which suffers from finite-size effects but is sufficient for determining the magnon spectrum on the antiferromagnetic Brillouin zone boundary at \((\pi/2, \pi/2)\). We take the value of the Hubbard \( U = 8 \) eV so that we get a reasonable estimate of \( J \sim 80 \) meV. The eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the ED calculations were found using the Implicitly Restarted Lanczos Method from the ARnoldi PACKage (ARPACK), as implemented in SciPy Linalg library [16], RRID: SCR_008058. The biconjugate gradient stabilized method was used to calculate \( S(\mathbf{q}, \omega) \).

3 RESULTS

3.1 X-Ray Absorption Spectroscopy

3.1.1 Single-Site

The single site XAS is simulated using techniques mentioned in Sec. 2.2, where the Hilbert space is determined using only the 3d (valence) and 2p (core) orbitals of the Ni transition metal ion, without ligand 2p orbitals, and with open boundary conditions. The eigenenergies are obtained by diagonalizing the Hamiltonian and the XAS cross section is evaluated using Eq. (1).

We first calculate the multiplet XAS of the \( d^9 \) electronic configuration of the Ni ion where the Slater-Condon, spin orbit coupling and crystal-field splitting parameters are taken from Ref. [17]. The results are plotted in Figure 3. Since the single site calculation does not include ligand orbitals in the Hilbert space, direct measurements of crystal field splitting of \( d \) orbitals energy levels are used without hybridization parameters obtained by Wannier downfolding from Ref. [18]. Although hybridization with ligands is not considered in this single-site calculation, it can still capture the difference in XAS between high-spin and low-spin ground state as described below. The Coulomb interaction for \( d^9 \) ions is less relevant and the spectral lineshape is dominated by the spin orbit coupling of the core levels, showing a single peak for both the \( \text{L}_1 \) and \( \text{L}_2 \) edges with light polarization along the \( x \)-direction, and no absorption with light polarization along the \( z \)-direction, due to the orbital \( d_{x^2-y^2} \) character of the holes in the \( d^9 \) configuration. We then
calculated the multiplet XAS on the \( d^8 \) ion using the same parameters for a spin singlet \((S = 0)\) and a spin triplet \((S = 1)\) ground state. Similar to previous reports by Ref. \([17]\), with light polarized along the \( z \)-direction, the intensity of the XAS peaks decrease in the low spin state, while the intensity remains the same order of magnitude for the high spin state. With light polarized along the \( x \)-direction, the high-spin ground state displays stronger intensity across a wide range of absorption energies, with more dipole-allowed transitions to excited states, compared to the singly degenerate, low-spin ground state.

We also simulated doped spectra as a linear combination of the \( d^9 \) and \( d^8 \) spectra, with the results plotted in Figure 4. Clearly, the high-spin \( d^8 \) state produces spectra with a wide energy spread and additional multiplet peaks. A better comparison to experiment \([17]\) can be made if the \( d^8 \) ion is in the low-spin configuration, producing a less pronounced shoulder in addition to the main absorption peak from the dominant \( d^9 \) configuration.

### 3.1.2 Two-Site

The two-site XAS is simulated with a two-site, multi-orbital Hubbard model as described in Sec. 2.2 with periodic boundary conditions in contrast to section Sec. 3.1.1, with 11 orbitals for each site (unit cell NiO\(_2\)) in the initial state that includes six oxygen \( 2p \) orbitals and the five nickel \( 3d \) orbitals, and 14 orbitals for one of the cells in the final state, which includes an additional three core-level nickel \( 2p \) orbitals for the target atom. The eigenenergies and eigenstates are obtained by exact diagonalization of the model Hamiltonian and the XAS spectra are calculated using Eq. (1). Including the oxygen ligand orbitals in the model allows hybridization and charge transfer effects between oxygen \( 2p \) and Nickel \( 3d \) orbitals. The Ni-O hybridization will affect not only the effective energy levels of the Nickel \( 3d \) orbitals, but this also changes the effective band character, with oxygen ligand \( p \) orbital contributions to the valance and conduction bands, which will result in changes to the XAS lineshape compared to the single-site calculation in Sec. 3.1.1.

---

**FIGURE 3** | Multiplet XAS calculations for the single-site nickel ion. The absorption energy is measured with respect to the ground state of \( d^9 \) ion. The solid line is the spectra measured with \( x \)-polarized light, and the dashed line is the spectra measured with \( z \)-polarized light. From left to right are spectra of (A) the \( d^9 \) ion, (B) the \( d^8 \) high-spin ion, and (C) the \( d^8 \) low-spin ion.

**FIGURE 4** | XAS spectra for the undoped \( d^9 \) ion (solid line) and with 20\% of the hole-doped \( d^8 \) ion (dashed line) calculated for \( x \)-polarization. Panel (A) shows the results for doping with the \( d^8 \) high-spin state, and panel (B) shows the results for doping with the \( d^8 \) low-spin state.
We performed multiplet calculations for a two-site, two-hole (nominally $d^9$ nickel) and a two-site, three-hole (doped NiO$_2$ planes) cluster using effective parameters described in Sec. 3.1.1, and hopping parameters ($t_{pzd}$, $t_{pdxz}$, $t_{pdyz}$ are 1.2, 0.3, 0.7, 0.8 and 0.8 eV, respectively) obtained by Wannier downfolding as described in Sec. 2.1. The inclusion of hybridization parameters allow us to modulate the strength of electron hopping between each orbital and the onsite energy, with the electrons distributed between the different orbitals based on the model Hamiltonian as described in Ref. [18]. These XAS spectra are shown in Figure 5. The two-site, two-hole XAS spectrum with $x$-polarization is similar to the single-site, $d^9$ model, which was described in the previous section. When doped with one hole, the $L_3$ and $L_2$ edges split into three peaks due to Ni-O hybridization. These results are consistent with both the single-site calculation and the experimental results [17].

3.2 Spin Structure Factor
Results for the dynamical spin structure factor calculated via exact diagonalization are plotted in Figure 6, showing a comparison of the 2-orbital model with two different values of the energy difference between Ni and $R$ orbitals $\varepsilon_R^k - \varepsilon_{Ni}^k \equiv \Delta$. Figure 6A shows the doped curves (purple) in panels (B) and (C) which correspond to 25% doping of the nickel layer, highlighting the “self-doping” influence of the rare-earth layer when $\Delta$ is small.

For the 2-orbital model, tuning the energy difference between Ni and $R$ sites, $\Delta$, plays a major role in the occupation of the $R$ orbital, and hence the “self-doping” of the Ni layer. In Figure 6A, $\Delta \sim 1$ eV results in approximately two electrons occupying the $R$-sites at both overall half-filling and ~25% doping, meaning the Ni layer retains a 25% “self-doping” offset. In contrast, panel Figure 6B shows the results for the 2-orbital model with a large offset of $U/2 = 4$ eV added to $\Delta$, resulting in $\Delta \sim 5$ eV. Here, the $R$-site is almost completely empty and $S(q, \omega)$ looks very similar to results from the 1-orbital calculation shown in Figure 6C.
Obviously, the infinite-layer nickelates live between these two extremes and Figure 6 gives us some clues as to how $S(q, \omega)$ is affected by the occupation of the $R$ sites, with $S(q, \omega)$ extremely sensitive to the $R$ and Ni occupations.

4 DISCUSSION

In this paper we explored numerical simulations using DFT and ED to determine the underlying band structure, valence configuration, and dynamical spin response of model Hamiltonians aimed to describe infinite-layer nickelates. DFT for various $R$ substituted nickelates was used to determine the parameters of an effective 2-orbital model including Ni $3d_{\sigma}$ and $R 5d$ “axial” orbitals, where the effect of lower-lying oxygen orbitals is to modify the inter-orbital hybridizations. Cluster multiplet ED was used to determine that undoped nickelate has predominantly $3d^{\pi}$ valence which upon doping involves low-spin nickel $3d^{\delta}$ valence holes. These results indicate that undoped infinite-layer nickelate is “self-doped” away from half-filling Ni $3d^{\delta}$ via the presence of a finite electron concentration in the $R$ layer compensating the holes in the Ni layer, the physics of doped nickelates may be described simply from the point of view of a one-band Hubbard-like model. Our consideration of the spin response indicates a close similarity of the paramagnon energies and intensities to one-band systems, in close analogy with the behavior seen in the cuprates.

Our ED calculations are limited to small clusters and therefore the effect of long-wavelength physics remains beyond our level of investigation. This may be particularly relevant to a discussion of the root cause of superconductivity and the competition between superconductivity and other intertwined phases, such as spin and/or charge stripes that are prevalent in both cuprate phase diagrams and numerical simulations of the single-band Hubbard model [19, 20]. Reference [21] reports density matrix renormalization group (DMRG) simulations of a similar 2-orbital model, and finds Luther-Emery behavior - coexistence of long-range superconducting and charge-density wave order - away from half-filling as in the 1D Hubbard model, while the undoped model does not contain long-range antiferromagnetic order, different than single-band Hubbard and more closely in-line with infinite-layer nickelates. The spin dynamics may be investigated using t-DMRG or other techniques, such as determinant quantum Monte Carlo [22]. This remains a topic of future interest.
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