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Recently, competing electronic instabilities, including superconductivity and density-wave-like order, have been discovered in vanadium-based kagome metals \( \text{A}\text{V}_3\text{Sb}_5 \) (\( \text{A} = \text{K}, \text{Rb}, \text{Cs} \)) with a nontrivial band topology. This finding stimulates considerable interest to study the interplay of these competing electronic orders and possible exotic excitations in the superconducting state. Here, we performed \(^{51}\text{V}\) and \(^{133}\text{Cs}\) nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) measurements on a CsV\(_3\)Sb\(_5\) single crystal to clarify the nature of density-wave-like transition in these kagome superconductors. A first-order structural transition is unambiguously revealed below \( T_s \approx 94 \text{K} \) by observing the sudden splitting of Knight shift in \(^{51}\text{V}\) NMR spectrum. Moreover, combined with \(^{133}\text{Cs}\) NMR spectrum, the present result confirms a three-dimensional structural modulation. By further analyzing the anisotropy of Knight shift and \( 1/T_1 \) at \(^{51}\text{V}\) nuclei, we proposed that the orbital order is the primary electronic order induced by the first-order structural transition, which is supported by further analysis on electric field gradient at \(^{51}\text{V}\) nuclei. In addition, the evidence for possible orbital fluctuations is also revealed above \( T_s \). The present work sheds light on a rich orbital physics in kagome superconductors \( \text{A}\text{V}_3\text{Sb}_5 \).
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1 Introduction

In recent decades, the exotic electronic states in kagome lattice, which holds a particular geometric frustration, have stimulated considerable interest and become a new frontier in condensed matter physics [1-21]. In contrast to the firm coupling limit at half-filling [1,2], the exploration of correlated electronic states in kagome lattice with intermediate coupling is still limited [3-5]. Although some intriguing electronic orders (such as chiral $d$-wave/$f$-wave superconductivity) have been theoretically proposed for the kagome Hubbard model [3-5], their experimental realization remains unclear in the kagome materials, particularly for exotic superconductivity. Recently, the discovery of superconductivity in vanadium-based kagome metal $AV_3Sb_5$ ($A = \text{K, Rb, Cs}$) with the maximum superconducting temperature $T_c \sim 3 \text{K}$ has attracted considerable attention in the academic community [22-25], which provides a fertile playground to explore the correlation-driven exotic electronic states in kagome lattice.

Apart from superconductivity, a density-wave-like transition has been observed in these kagome metals with a transition temperature ($T_c$) ranging from 78 to 104 K [22]. Earlier X-ray scattering experiment has observed an in-plane translational symmetry breaking with a $2a \times 2a$ period below $T_c$, indicating a possible charge-density-wave (CDW) order [23]. Subsequently, scanning tunneling microscopy (STM) experiments have observed a $2a \times 2a$ charge modulation with a novel chiral anisotropy in $KV_3Sb_5$ [26]. In addition, recent STM and X-ray experiments have identified a three-dimensional (3D) charge modulation with a $2a \times 2a \times 2c$ period in Cs$V_3Sb_5$ [27,28]. Theoretically, density functional theory calculation also confirms a 3D CDW state and suggests a Peierls-instability-driven CDW picture [29]. Meanwhile, a chiral flux phase has been proposed as the possible ground state instead of the $2a \times 2a$ charge order [30], in which time-reversal symmetry should be broken. Apart from the in-plane $2a \times 2a$ charge order, an additional $4a$ unidirectional charge order has been observed on the surface by STM experiments in Cs$V_3Sb_5$ [31,32], whose underlying mechanism is still elusive. Furthermore, the interplay of superconductivity with CDW order has been explored by utilizing a high-pressure technique in Cs$V_3Sb_5$ [33-37]. Different from the usual competing phase diagram between superconductivity and CDW order, the pressure-dependent $T_c$ in Cs$V_3Sb_5$ exhibits a nonmonotonic behavior, whereas the density-wave-like transition is continuously suppressed with increasing pressure below 2 GPa [34], indicating an unusual interplay between superconductivity and CDW order. In addition to the abovementioned CDW ordering below $T_c$, a possible orbital order may emerge in this system below $T_c$. In general, given the coupling between the orbital and lattice degrees of freedom, orbital ordering would inevitably lead to a structural phase transition [38]. In these new kagome superconductors $AV_3Sb_5$, considering a distorted octahedral crystal field on vanadium (V) sites caused by six anionic coordination atoms (Figure 1(a)) and actual 3$d$ electron filling, nearly degenerate 3$d$ orbitals can be held in the ground state after crystal field splitting, which allows for a possible orbital ordering below $T_c$ [39]. Whether orbital ordering is really involved in the density-wave-like transition deserves further investigation. Here, we performed $^{51}$V and $^{133}$Cs nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) measurements on a Cs$V_3Sb_5$ single crystal to clarify the exact nature of density-wave-like transition in these kagome superconductors. The density-wave-like transition is clarified as a first-order structural transition with a 3D structural modulation. By measuring the angle-dependent full NMR spectrum and nuclear spin-lattice relaxation rate ($1/T_1$), the orbital order is considered as the primary electronic order induced by the first-order structural transition. Moreover, the evidence for possible orbital fluctuations is also revealed above $T_c$. The present work suggests rich orbital physics in these kagome superconductors.

2 Experimental methods

A commercial NMR spectrometer (Thamway Co., Ltd.) was used for NMR measurements. A magnet from Oxford Instruments, which can provide a uniform magnetic field up to 12 T, was used. The external magnetic field was calibrated by $^{63}$Cu NMR with the sample coil. All NMR spectra were acquired by a standard spin-echo method with an FFT sum. For $^{51}$V and $^{133}$Cs, their nuclear spin number is $I = 7/2$, and their gyromagnetic ratio $\gamma$ is 11.193 and 5.5844 MHz/T, respectively. In principle, their NMR spectra will split into a single central peak and six satellites under a strong magnetic field because of the nuclear quadrupole interaction. Considering only the first-order perturbation of quadrupole interaction, the resonance frequency of all transition lines are satisfied as follows [40]:

$$v = v_0 + v_0^{(1)} = v_0 + \frac{1}{2}v_0\left(m - \frac{1}{2}\right) \times (3\cos^2 \theta - 1 - \eta \sin^2 \theta \cos 2\phi),$$

(1)

where $v_0$ is the Larmor frequency of central peak; $v_0 = \frac{3eOV_{zz}}{2I(2I - 1)\hbar}$ is the quadrupole frequency in the $z$ principal axis of the electric field gradient (EFG) tensor; $m$ is the $z$-axis spin number; $\theta$ and $\phi$ are the Euler angles between external field $H_0$ and the principal axis of the EFG tensor; $\eta$ is the asymmetry parameter, defined as $\eta = \frac{|V_{xx} - V_{yy}|}{V_{zz}}$, where $|V_{xx}| \leq |V_{yy}| \leq |V_{zz}|$ are the three principal components of the EFG tensor. This equation can be used to calculate the fre-
quency interval between adjacent \( m \), which is
\[
\frac{1}{2} v_0 (3 \cos^2 \theta - 1 - \eta \sin^2 \theta \cos 2 \phi)
\]
 corresponds to the frequency interval of adjacent peaks in the NMR spectrum. All \( v_0 \) data were determined as the average frequency interval of adjacent peaks. The measurement of spin-lattice relaxation time \( T_1 \) used the inversed pulse method and saturated pulse method for \( ^{51}\text{V} \) and \( ^{133}\text{Cs} \), respectively. The relaxation curve was measured in the central peak of the \( ^{51}\text{V} \) spectrum and fitted by
\[
m(t) = m_0 + m \left[ \frac{1}{84} e^{\left( \frac{t}{\tau} \right)} + \frac{3}{44} e^{\left( \frac{t}{\tau} \right)} \right] + \frac{75}{364} e^{\left( \frac{15t}{\tau} \right)} + \frac{1225}{1716} e^{\left( \frac{29t}{\tau} \right)} \],
\]
where \( \tau \) is the inhomogeneous parameter. In the case of \( ^{133}\text{Cs} \), the central peak and all satellites were excited simultaneously; thus, the fitting function was simplified as follows:
\[
m(t) = m_0 + m e^{\left( \frac{t}{\tau} \right)}. \]

3 Results and discussion

As shown in Figure 1(a), the sublattice consisting of V atoms forms an intriguing two-dimensional (2D) kagome net, in which each V atom has six antimony (Sb) atoms as anionic coordination. The six coordinating Sb atoms can be further divided into two kinds of Sb sites at the high-temperature structural phase, including two in-plane Sb(1) sites and four out-of-plane Sb(2) sites. The cesium (Cs) atoms are on the top of Sb(1) sites, and they individually form an isolating layer between two neighboring \([\text{V}_3\text{Sb}_5]^−\) layers. Cs+ layers and \([\text{V}_3\text{Sb}_5]^−\) layers are alternatively stacked along the \( c \) axis, forming a layered structure with the space group of \( P\overline{6}/mmm \) [22]. In principle, NMR spectra are sensitive to the change of local structural environment around the measured nuclei. Here, we performed NMR measurements on \( ^{51}\text{V} \) and \( ^{133}\text{Cs} \) nuclei, both of which the nuclear spin number \( (I) \) is \( 7/2 \). Given the electric quadrupole interaction between nuclei with \( I > 1/2 \) and electrons, the single NMR spectrum of high-spin nuclei would split into \( 2I \) transition lines separated by a quadrupole frequency \( (v_{\text{q}}) \). As shown in Figure 1(c) and (d), the high-temperature NMR spectra of \( ^{51}\text{V} \) and \( ^{133}\text{Cs} \) only have one set of NMR transition lines with \( 2I \) equally separated peaks, which is consistent with only one structural site for V and Cs sublattices above \( T_s \) (Figure 1(a)). Below \( T_s \), the NMR spectra of both \( ^{51}\text{V} \) and \( ^{133}\text{Cs} \) split into two sets of NMR transition lines, indicating the two distinct structural sites for V and Cs sublattices. Considering a first-order ap-
proximation, the NMR spectrum of $^{51}$V would be only sensitive to the in-plane structural modulation. By contrast, apart from in-plane modulation, the NMR spectrum of interlaminar $^{133}$Cs is dependent on the structural modulation along the c axis. Based on previous STM and X-ray scattering experiments [27,28], the density-wave-like transition leads to a 3D structural modulation with a $2a \times 2a \times 2c$ period. Based on NMR spectral analysis, both NMR spectra of $^{51}$V and $^{133}$Cs should split into two sets of transition lines with equal spectral weight (see details in sect. S3 of Supplementary Materials). This finding is consistent with our present observations, which support a $2a \times 2a \times 2c$ period in bulk CsV$_3$Sb$_5$. Notably, our result of $^{133}$Cs NMR only puts a constrain with a π-phase shift between two neighboring layers to the 3D structural modulation, which is not necessary for calculating $2a \times 2a \times 2c$. Recently, a new 3D structural modulation with a $2a \times 2a \times 4c$ period has also been observed in X-ray scattering experiments on CsV$_3$Sb$_5$ [41]. Our present NMR results cannot distinguish the difference between $2a \times 2a \times 2c$ and $2a \times 2a \times 4c$.

Next, we will discuss the origin of the observed NMR splitting at $^{51}$V nuclei. In general, the magnetic and quadrupole interaction between nuclei and electrons can produce the splitting in the NMR spectrum below $T_s$. However, they would give different manifestations in the NMR spectrum. As shown in Figure 1(c), the splitting on each NMR transition line is almost the same, which indicates that the predominant contribution of splitting is not from the quadrupole interaction but magnetic interaction. We measured the splitting in great detail to extract the temperature dependence of the magnetic splitting on the central transition lines. As shown in Figure 2(a), the temperature-dependent central transition lines show a typical behavior for a first-order phase transition, which holds a narrow temperature range of approximately 2 K to exhibit two-phase coexistence. Moreover, the splitting of the NMR spectra shows a sudden jump at $T_s$, which is consistent with a first-order phase transition. The same results were confirmed by a recent NMR work on CsV$_3$Sb$_5$ [42]. In supplementary materials, we also measure the field dependence of splitting (see details in sect. S6 of Supplementary Materials), indicating that such magnetic splitting comes from a splitting of the Knight shift instead of a spontaneous internal field. Therefore, time-reversal symmetry is still preserved below $T_s$. This result is also consistent with the previous μSR experiment [43]. The temperature-dependent splitting of the Knight shift is plotted in Figure 2(b). After a sudden jump at $T_s$, the splitting shows a continuous increase and finally becomes saturated at low temperatures below 20 K.

Now the question is how to understand the sudden change of the Knight shift at $T_s$. In principle, the Knight shift has two major contributions, including spin shift ($K_{\text{spin}}$) and orbital shift ($K_{\text{orb}}$). The spin shift is proportional to spin susceptibility ($\chi_{\text{spin}}$), and the orbital shift is proportional to orbital susceptibility ($\chi_{\text{orb}}$). Here, the major splitting of the Knight shift is ascribed to the orbital shift (a major splitting caused by the orbital shift is also confirmed in $^{133}$Cs NMR, which is shown in sect. S3 of Supplementary Materials), suggesting a possible change in crystal field or orbital state below $T_s$. In general, the orbital momentum is quenched under the crystal field, and then the orbital susceptibility is primarily related to the Van Vleck orbital paramagnetism, which is proportional

![Figure 2](image-url)  
(Color online) First-order phase transition associated with orbital ordering by $^{51}$V NMR. (a) Temperature dependence of the central transition lines of $^{51}$V NMR with temperature cooling across $T_c$, (b) temperature dependence of the splitting of Knight shift ($\Delta K_c$), which is obtained by calculating the difference of Knight shift between V(I) and V(II) sites. The coexistence of high-temperature and low-temperature phases between 92 and 94.38 K. A sudden jump of $\Delta K_c$ manifests a first-order phase transition associated with an orbital ordering at $T_c$.
to $1/\Delta$ [39], where $\Delta$ is the energy gap between the ground state and excited states under a certain crystal field. The energy scale of $\Delta$ in 3$d$ transition metal can vary in a wide range of energy scales from $\sim 0.1$ to $\sim 1$ eV [39,44,45]. The change in the local structural environment could lead to a corresponding change in local $\Delta$ at different sites. Therefore, a slight change of orbital shift is expected across a structural phase transition. However, the orbital order is beyond such a trivial situation, leading to a reconstruction of orbital states similar to those in manganites [38]. In this study, the magnitude of the observed splitting from the orbital shift is high, which is close to one-third of the total Knight shift, and it is hard to explain using a weak structural phase transition without reconstruction of orbital states or a change of orbital population [44,45]. Therefore, the large splitting of the orbital shift suggests a possible orbital ordering at $T_s$. Next, we will show more evidences for orbital ordering by measuring the anisotropy of the Knight shift and $1/T_1$.

As shown in Figure 3, we systematically measure the temperature-dependent Knight shift and spin-lattice relaxation rate ($1/T_1$) under an external magnetic field along three principal axes ($X$, $Y$, and $Z$) of local EFG around $^{51}$V nuclei. Notably, the Knight shift and $1/T_1$ of $^{51}$V nuclei show distinct temperature-dependent behavior above $T_s$. For a Fermi liquid, $K_{\text{spin}}$ and $1/T_1$ hold a standard Korringa relation with $1/T_1 = K_{\text{spin}}$. In this study, $K_{\text{spin}}$ at $^{51}$V nuclei can be ascribed to two kinds of magnetic hyperfine interaction, including core polarization effect and magnetic dipole-dipole interaction. In addition, the anisotropy of $K_{\text{spin}}$ is determined by the magnetic dipole-dipole interaction, which usually depends on the occupation of orbital states [46-50]. If the temperature-dependent Knight shift primarily comes from $K_{\text{spin}}$, then the nearly isotropic temperature-dependent part above $T_s$ indicates that the core polarization effect is the predominant

Figure 3  (Color online) Temperature-dependent Knight shift and $1/T_1$ under the external magnetic field along the principal axes. (a)-(c) Temperature-dependent Knight shift with the external magnetic $H$ parallel to the $X$, $Y$, and $Z$ axes. Insert: sketch of the principal coordinate system of EFG, in which the crystal $c$ axis is chosen as the $X$ axis. (d)-(f) Temperature-dependence of $1/T_1$ with the external magnetic $H$ parallel to the $X$, $Y$, and $Z$ axes. The gray dash lines are a guide for the eye for the critical temperature $T_s$. (g)-(i) Temperature-dependent fluctuating hyperfine fields along the $X$, $Y$, and $Z$ axes. $1/T_1$ is the sum of contribution from transverse fluctuating hyperfine fields $((1/T_1)_{\text{H}0}^a$ with $1/T_1$). Following this relation, we could extract $1/T_1$ by a linear combination of $1/T_1$ ($a = X, Y, Z$).
magnetic hyperfine interaction. Then, we would expect a similar isotropic temperature-dependent $1/T_s T$. However, this is inconsistent with our present observation in $1/T_s T$. As shown in Figure 3(d)-(f), the temperature-dependent $1/T_s T$ shows a clear anisotropy above $T_s$. On the contrary, similar to most metals, an almost temperature-independent spin susceptibility is expected in our case, which is inferred from the results of recent STM experiments [26,27]. Therefore, the temperature-dependence of Knight shift should be ascribed to $K_{orb}$ instead of $K_{spin}$. Furthermore, the temperature dependence of the Knight shift at $^{133}$V sites is consistent with that of bulk susceptibility above $T_s$ (see the temperature-dependent bulk susceptibility in sect. S1 of Supplementary Materials), supporting a temperature-dependent $\chi_{orb}$.

How to understand the anisotropic $1/T_s T$ above $T_s$? In general, $1/T_s T$ measures the transverse fluctuating hyperfine fields, and it can be phenomenologically divided into two kinds of contribution with $1/T_s T = (1/T_s T)_{FL} + (1/T_s T)_{SF}$, where $(1/T_s T)_{FL}$ is related to the fluctuating hyperfine fields following Fermi liquid behavior. In addition, $(1/T_s T)_{SF}$ is related to the additional fluctuating hyperfine fields. Considering the temperature-independent spin susceptibility, temperature-dependent $1/T_s T$ suggests a significant contribution from fluctuating hyperfine fields beyond a Fermi liquid. As shown in Figure 3(g)-(i), each component of the fluctuating hyperfine field along the $X$, $Y$, and $Z$ axes can be extracted by a linear combination of $(1/T_s T)_{\alpha/\alpha} (\alpha = X, Y, Z)$. Notably, the $(1/T_s T)_{SF}$ is primarily originated from the fluctuating hyperfine field along the $Y$ direction. By contrast, the fluctuating hyperfine field along the $Z$ direction shows a temperature-independent behavior, which is quite consistent with temperature-independent spin susceptibility. The additional fluctuating hyperfine fields along the $Y$ direction are related to orbital fluctuations above $T_s$. Notably, such additional fluctuating hyperfine fields caused by orbital fluctuations are not found in $1/T_s T$ of $^{133}$Cs, indicating the major orbital fluctuations from the orbitals at V sites (see details in sect. S3 of Supplementary Materials). Below $T_s$, a sudden jump also appears in the fluctuating hyperfine field along the $Y$ direction but not the $Z$ direction, indicating the possible suppression of orbital fluctuations caused by orbital ordering. The missing jump for the fluctuating hyperfine field along the $Z$ direction indicates that the jump of the Knight shift at $T_s$ is related to the orbital shift instead of the spin shift. By monitoring the fluctuating hyperfine field along the $Z$ direction below $T_s$, we found that only V(I) sites exhibit a clear reduction of the density of states at Fermi energy, which is also supported by the $^{133}$Cs NMR results (see details in sect. S3 of Supplementary Materials). This finding is entirely consistent with a CDW gap observed by STM and angle-resolved photoemission spectroscopic (ARPES) experiments [26,27,51].

Below $T_s$, the distinct temperature dependence of the Knight shift among different magnetic field directions at V(I) sites indicates orbital ordering. As discussed above, the temperature dependence of the Knight shift is primarily related to the orbital shift, which exhibits the same temperature-dependent behavior along all directions above $T_s$. Below $T_s$, if we only consider a simple change of $\Delta$ caused by a crystal field, then the temperature dependence of the orbital shift should also exhibit the same temperature-dependent behavior along all directions. Therefore, the anisotropic temperature dependence of the Knight shift below $T_s$, if at V(I) is beyond a simple change of crystal field, which suggests a reconstruction of orbital states. By contrast, no significant reconstruction of orbital states is found at V(II) sites because of a nearly isotropic change of orbital shift below $T_s$. Apart from the orbital shift, the EFG parameters also indicate orbital ordering. In general, the charging order and orbital order can affect the EFG parameters [52,53]. As shown in Figure 4, the temperature-dependent quadrupole frequency ($\nu_Q$) and asymmetry parameter ($\eta$) are also extracted from the

---

**Figure 4** (Color online) Temperature-dependent EFG parameters. (a) Temperature-dependent quadrupole frequency ($\nu_Q$); (b) temperature-dependent asymmetry parameter ($\eta$).
full NMR spectrum along the three principal axes of the EFG tensor. The comprehensive effect from the change of crystal field, orbital order, and CDW order below $T_s$ leads to the same behavior of $v_0$ at both V(I) and V(II) sites. However, the temperature-dependent asymmetry parameter shows a sudden jump below $T_s$ only for V(I) sites, which is also consistent with the reconstruction of orbital states at V(I) sites. Considering the structural distortion in the proposed inverse Star of David (or Star of David) superlattice model [29], our results suggest that the orbital states of V sites in the triangle and hexagonal vanadium clusters are quite different. These results are similar to the orbital ordering caused by vanadium trimerization in LiVO$_3$ [48]. Thus, a large Van Vleck orbital susceptibility is observed, and the Knight shift and EFG parameters are affected by the orbital order. Furthermore, the recent ARPES experiment suggests a significant reconstruction of the band structure below $T_s$, which is beyond a simple Fermi surface nesting picture [54].

4 Conclusions

To date, our NMR results demonstrate the rich orbital physics in CsV$_3$Sb$_5$, including orbital order and relevant orbital fluctuations. However, the exact orbital physics needs more theoretical inputs on these new kagome superconductors to achieve a comprehensive understanding. In addition, the correlation between orbital ordering/fluuctuations and superconductivity must be explored in this system. Based on previous high-pressure studies on CsV$_3$Sb$_5$, superconductivity could be enhanced, and the transition temperature could reach a maximum when the density-wave-like transition is completely suppressed around 2.0 GPa [33,34]. Our present NMR results indicate that the orbital fluctuations might also be enhanced around this critical pressure. Whether the optimized superconductivity is related to a possible enhancement of orbital fluctuations deserves further exploration. In addition, an unconventional chiral charge order with chiral anisotropy has been observed by previous STM experiments [26]. Based on the present NMR results, the observed orbital order and secondary CDW order only break the translational symmetry and not the rotational symmetry. If the rotational symmetry is broken at low temperatures as suggested by the STM results, then a nematic phase transition below $T_s$ would be expected. In fact, the temperature-dependent $1/T_1 T$ shows kink behavior around $T^*\sim 35$ K, indicating a possible nematic phase transition related to rotational symmetry breaking. Conducting more experiments are desired in the future to uncover the possible nematic phase transition.
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