Resolving the VO$_2$ controversy: Mott mechanism dominates the insulator-to-metal transition

O. Nájera,$^1$ M. Civelli,$^1$ V. Dobrosavljević,$^2$ and M. J. Rozenberg$^1$

$^1$Laboratoire de Physique des Solides, CNRS-UMR8502, Université Paris-Sud, Orsay 91405, France
$^2$Department of Physics and National High Magnetic Field Laboratory, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306, USA

We consider a minimal model to investigate the metal-insulator transition in VO$_2$. We adopt a Hubbard model with two orbital per unit cell, which captures the competition between Mott and singlet-dimer localization. We solve the model within Dynamical Mean Field Theory, characterizing in detail the metal-insulator transition and finding new features in the electronic states. We compare our results with available experimental data obtaining good agreement in the relevant model parameter range. Crucially, we can account for puzzling optical conductivity data obtained within the hysteresis region, which we associate to a novel metallic state characterized by a split heavy quasiparticle band. Our results show that the thermal-driven insulator-to-metal transition in VO$_2$ is compatible with a Mott electronic mechanism, providing fresh insight to a long standing “chicken-and-egg” debate and calling for further research of “Mottronics” applications of this system.

Vanadium dioxide VO$_2$ and vanadium sesquioxide V$_2$O$_3$ remain at the center stage of condensed matter physics as they are prototypical examples of systems undergoing a strongly correlated metal-insulator transition (MIT). Their unusual electronic behavior makes them very attractive materials for novel electronic devices. In fact, they are intensively investigated in the emerging field of “Mottronics”, which aims to exploit the functionalities associated to the quantum Mott transitions. A key goal is to create fast and ultra-low power consumption transistors, which may be downsized to the atomic limit.

VO$_2$ and V$_2$O$_3$ have nominally partially filled bands, hence are expected to be metals. However, they undergo a first order metal to insulator transition upon cooling at $\sim 340K$ and $180K$, respectively. This phenomenon has been often associated to a Mott MIT, namely a transition driven by the competition between kinetic energy and Coulomb repulsion. Yet, that point of view has been questioned as often.

The case of VO$_2$, displaying a transition from a high- $\Gamma$ rutile (R) metal to a low- $\Gamma$ monoclinic (M1) insulator, is emblematic. The central issue is whether the transition is driven by a spin-Peierls structural instability, or by the electronic charge localization of the Mott-Hubbard type. This issue has been under scrutiny using electronic structure calculation based on the combination of density-functional theory in the local-density approximation with dynamical mean-field theory (LDA+DMFT). In the pioneering work of ref. Biermann et al. argued that the insulator should be considered as a renormalized Peierls insulator. Namely, a band-insulator where the opening of the bonding-antibonding gap is driven by dimerization and renormalized down by interactions. On the other hand, the calculations showed that within the metallic rutile phase, the Coulomb interaction failed to produce a MIT for reasonable values of the interaction. More recently, the problem was reconsidered by Biro et al. providing a rather different scenario. Biro et al. found a MIT within a second monoclinic (M$_2$) phase of VO$_2$ that only has half the dimerization of the standard M$_1$, for the same value of the Coulomb interaction. Hence, they argued that Mott localization must play the leading role in both MITs. Nevertheless, they also noted that the Mott insulator adiabatically connects to the singlet dimer insulator state, and therefore the transition should be considered as a Mott-Hubbard in the presence of strong inter-site exchange.

While those LDA+DMFT works provided multiple useful insights, the issue whether the first order MIT at 340K in VO$_2$ is electronically or structurally driven, still remains. Here we shall try to shed new light on this classic "chicken-and-egg" problem by adopting a different strategy. We shall trade the complications of the realistic crystal structures and orbital degeneracy of VO$_2$ for a model Hamiltonian, the Dimer Hubbard Model (DHM), that captures the key competition between Mott localization due to Coulomb repulsion and singlet dimerization, i.e. Peierls localization. This permits a detailed systematic study that may clearly expose the physical mechanisms at play. Importantly, in our study the underlying lattice stays put. Therefore, we can directly address the issue whether a purely electronic transition, having a bearing on the physics of VO$_2$, exists in this model. The specific questions that we shall address are the following: (i) Does this purely electronic model predict a first order metal-insulator transition as a function of the temperature within the relevant parameter region? (ii) What is the physical nature of the different states? (iii) Can they be related to key available experiments? These issues are relevant, since if this basic model fails to predict an electronic MIT consistent with the one observed in VO$_2$, then it would be mandatory to include the lattice degrees of freedom. In the present study we shall provide explicit answers to these questions. We show that the solution of the DHM brings the equivalent physical insight for VO$_2$ as the single band Hubbard model for V$_2$O$_3$, which is one
of the significant achievements of DMFT\textsuperscript{20,21,22,23,24}

The dimer Hubbard model is defined as
\[ H = -t \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle \alpha \sigma} c_{i \alpha \sigma}^\dagger c_{j \alpha \sigma} + t_\perp \sum_{i \sigma} c_{i \sigma}^\dagger c_{i \sigma} + h.c. \]
\[ + \sum_{i \sigma} U n_{i \alpha \uparrow} n_{i \alpha \downarrow} \]
(1)

where \( \langle i,j \rangle \) denotes n.n. lattice sites, \( \alpha = \{1,2\} \) denote the dimer orbitals, \( \sigma \) is the spin, \( t \) is the lattice hopping, \( t_\perp \) is the intra-dimer hopping, and \( U \) is the Coulomb repulsion. For simplicity, we adopt a semicircular approximation, note the dimer orbitals, of the significant achievements of DMFT

\[ \rho(\varepsilon) = \sqrt{4t^2 - \varepsilon^2}/(2\pi t^2). \]

The energy unit is set by \( t=1/2 \), which gives a full bandwidth of \( 4t=2D=2 \), where \( D \) is the half-bandwidth. This interesting model has surprisingly received little attention, and only partial solutions have been obtained within DMFT\textsuperscript{25,26}. The main results were the identification of the region of coexistent solutions at moderate \( U \) and small \( t_\perp \) at \( T=0 \) using the iterated perturbation theory (IPT) approximation\textsuperscript{23} and at finite \( T=0.025 \) by quantum Monte Carlo\textsuperscript{27,28} (QMC)\textsuperscript{29}. Here we obtain the detailed solution of the problem paying special attention to the MIT and the nature of the coexistent solutions. We solve for the DMFT equations with hybridization

\[ \Sigma(\omega_n) = \sum_{n} \rho(\omega_n) \]

where \( \Sigma(\omega_n) \) is the self-energy. The LDA estimate of the bandwidth of the metallic state of VO\textsubscript{2} is \( \approx 2\text{eV} \textsuperscript{17,38,39} \), which corresponds in our model to \( 4t \), hence \( t=0.5\text{eV} \). This is handy, since from our choice of \( t=0.5 \), we may simply read the numerical energy values of the figures directly in physical units (eV) and compare to experimental data of VO\textsubscript{2}. We notice that the coexistence region (with a 1st order transition line) extends up to \( T \approx 0.04 \text{eV} \approx 400\text{K} \), consistent with the experimental value \( \approx 340\text{K} \). We then set the value of \( t_\perp=0.3\text{eV} \), that approximately corresponds with LDA estimates for the (average) intra-dimer hopping amplitudes (cf Supplemental Material)\textsuperscript{26,36}. Thus, the coexistence region is centered around \( U \approx 2.5 - 3\text{eV} \), consistent with the values adopted in the LDA+DMFT studies\textsuperscript{17,38,39}.

We can make further interesting connections with experiments in VO\textsubscript{2}. The metallic state is unusual and it can be characterized as a bad metal. Namely, a metal with an anomalously high scattering rate that approaches (or may violate) the Ioffe-Regel limit\textsuperscript{11,12,13,14,15,16}. We observe that at low \( T \) there is a large coexistent region at moderate \( U \) and \( t_\perp \) below 0.48. This region gradually shrinks as \( T \) is increased, and fully disappears at \( T \approx 0.04 \). The lower panel shows the phase diagram in the \( U-T \) plane at fixed \( t_\perp \). At \( t_\perp=0 \) we recover the well known single-band Hubbard model result, where the coexistent region extends in a triangular region defined by the lines \( U_{\perp}(T) \) and \( U_{\parallel}(T) \textsuperscript{20} \). The triangle is tilted to the left, which indicates that upon warming the correlated metal undergoes a first order transition to a finite-\( T \) Mott insulator.

This behavior was immediately associated to the famous 1st order MIT observed in Cr-doped \( \text{V}_2\text{O}_3 \textsuperscript{30,31} \), which has been long considered a prime example of a Mott Hubbard transition\textsuperscript{32}. It is noteworthy that this physical feature has remained relevant even in recent LDA+DMFT studies, where the full complexity of the lattice and orbital degeneracy is considered\textsuperscript{85,86}. This underlines the utility of sorting the detailed behavior of basic model Hamiltonians. Significantly, as \( t_\perp \) is increased in the DHM, the tilt of the triangular region evolves towards the right. This signals that \( t_\perp \) fundamentally changes the stability of the groundstate. In fact, as shown in the lower right panel of Fig. [1] at \( t_\perp=0.3 \) we find that the MIT is reversed with respect to the previous case. Namely, upon warming, an insulator undergoes a 1st order transition to a (bad) correlated metal at finite-\( T \). We may connect several features of this MIT to VO\textsubscript{2}, both, qualitative and semi-quantitatively. We first consider the energy scales and compare the parameters of the DHM to those of electronic structure calculations. The LDA estimate of the bandwidth of the metallic state of VO\textsubscript{2} is \( \approx 2\text{eV} \textsuperscript{17,38,39} \), which corresponds in our model to \( 4t \), hence \( t=0.5\text{eV} \). This is handy, since from our choice of \( t=0.5 \), we may simply read the numerical energy values of the figures directly in physical units (eV) and compare to experimental data of VO\textsubscript{2}. We notice that the coexistence region (with a 1st order transition line) extends up to \( T \approx 0.04 \text{eV} \approx 400\text{K} \), consistent with the experimental value \( \approx 340\text{K} \). We then set the value of \( t_\perp=0.3\text{eV} \), that approximately corresponds with LDA estimates for the (average) intra-dimer hopping amplitudes (cf Supplemental Material)\textsuperscript{26,36}. Thus, the coexistence region is centered around \( U \approx 2.5 - 3\text{eV} \), consistent with the values adopted in the LDA+DMFT studies\textsuperscript{17,38,39}.

We can make further interesting connections with experiments in VO\textsubscript{2}. The metallic state is unusual and it can be characterized as a bad metal. Namely, a metal with an anomalously high scattering rate that approaches (or may violate) the Ioffe-Regel limit\textsuperscript{11,12,13,14,15,16}. We observe that at low \( T \) there is a large coexistent region at moderate \( U \) and \( t_\perp \) below 0.48. This region gradually shrinks as \( T \) is increased, and fully disappears at \( T \approx 0.04 \). The lower
tification for our simplified model of a lattice of dimers. This bad metal behavior is a hallmark of Mottness and also indicates that the MIT in VO2 should be characterized as a Mott transition. Additional insights on the mechanism driving the transition can be obtained from the behavior of the off-diagonal (intra-dimer) self-energy $\Sigma_{12}(\omega_n)$. From Eq. (2), we observe that the intra-dimer hopping amplitude is effectively renormalized as $\Sigma_{12}^{\text{eff}} = \Sigma_{12} + \Re[\Sigma_{12}]$. In Fig. 2 we show the behavior of this quantity across the transition. We see that in the metallic state it remains small, while it becomes large at low $T$ in the insulator. The physical interpretation is transparent. In the correlated metal, the two dimer sites are primarily Kondo screened by their lattice neighbors, as in the single band Hubbard model. Then these two bands get split into a bonding and anti-bonding pair by the small $t_{\perp}$. Hence, the low energy electronic structure is qualitatively similar to the non-interacting one, with a larger effective mass. As $T$ is lowered, the dramatic increase in $\Re[\Sigma_{12}]$ when the Mott gap opens at the 1st order transition signals that the intra-dimer interaction is boosted by $\Sigma_{12}^{\text{eff}} \sim \Re[\Sigma_{12}]$. Unlike the one-band Hubbard model, here the finite $t_{\perp}$ permits a large energy gain in the Mott insulator by quenching the degenerate entropy. This mechanism, already observed in other cluster-DMFT models, stabilizes the insulator within the coexistence region, leading to the change in the tilt seen in Fig. 1. Another way of rationalizing the transition is that at a critical $U$-dependent $t_{\perp}$ the Kondo screening in the metal breaks down in favor of the local dimer-singlet formation in the insulator. In this view, the large gap opening may be interpreted as a $U$-driven enhanced band splitting $\propto 2t_{\perp}^{\text{eff}}(U)$.

Further detail is obtained from the comparison of the electronic structure of the metal and the insulator within the coexistence region. In the correlated metallic state shown in Fig. 3 we find at high energies ($\sim \pm U/2$) the incoherent Hubbard bands, which are signatures of Mott physics. At lower energies, we also observe a pair of heavy quasiparticle bands crossing the Fermi energy at $\omega = 0$. Consistent with our previous discussion, this pair of quasiparticle bands can be thought of as the renormalization of the non-interacting bandstructure. Significantly, as we shall discuss later on, this feature may explain the puzzling optical data of Qazilbash et al. within the MIT region of VO2, which has remained unaccounted for so far. Unlike the single-band Hubbard model, the effective mass of these metallic bands does not diverge at the MIT at the critical $U$, even at $T = 0$. In fact, the finite $t_{\perp}$ cuts off the effective mass divergence as expected in a model that incorporates spin-fluctuations. In fact the DHM may be considered the simplest non-trivial cluster DMFT model. It is interesting to note that the realistic values $U = 2.5$ and $t_{\perp} = 0.3$ lead to Hubbard bands at $\approx \pm 1.5$ eV and a quasiparticle residue $Z \approx 0.4$, both consistent with photoemission experiments of Koethe et al.

In Fig. 3 we also show the results for insulator ele-
tronic dispersion at the same values of the parameters. The comparison of the insulator and the metal illustrate the significant changes that undergo at the 1st order MIT. We see that the metallic pair of quasiparticle bands suddenly open a large gap. More precisely, in contrast to the one-band case, here the Hubbard bands acquire a non-trivial structure, with sharp bands coexisting with incoherent ones. The coherent part dispersion can be traced to those of a lattice of singlet-dimers (see Sup. Mat.). Hence, the insulator can be characterized as a novel type of Mott-singlet state where the Hubbard bands have a mix character with both coherent and incoherent electronic-structure contributions. It is also interesting to note that the gap in the density of states is $\Delta \approx 0.6\text{eV}$, again consistent with the photoemission experiments.

In order to gain further insight and make further contact with key experiments, we now consider the optical conductivity response $\sigma(\omega)$ within the MIT coexistence region. A set of remarkable data was obtained in this regime by Qazilbash et al.\cite{12}, bearing directly on the issue of the driving force behind the transition. They systematically investigated the $\sigma(\omega)$ as a function of $T$ using nano-imaging spectroscopy. They clearly identified within the $T$ range of the MIT the electronic coexistence of insulator and metallic regions, characteristic of a 1st order transition. A crucial observation was that upon warming the insulator in the M1 phase, metallic puddles emerge with a $\sigma(\omega)$ that was significantly different from the signal of the normal metallic R phase. Thus, the data provided a strong indication of a purely electronic driven transition. Regarding this point we would like to mention also the works of Arcangeletti et al.\cite{13} and Laverock et al.\cite{14} that reported the observation of metallic states within the monoclinic phase under pressure and strain, respectively. Coming back to the experiment of Qazilbash et al., a key point that we want to emphasize here is that $\sigma(\omega)$ in the putative M1-metallic state was characterized by a intriguing mid-infra-red (MIR) peak $\omega_{\text{mir}} \approx 1800\text{ cm}^{-1} = 0.22\text{ eV}$, whose origin was not understood. From our results on the electronic structure within the coexistence region, we find a natural interpretation for the puzzling MIR peak: It corresponds to excitations between the split metallic quasiparticle bands. Since they are parallel, they would produce a significant contribution to $\sigma(\omega)$, which enabled its detection. In Fig. 4 we show the calculated optical conductivity response (see Sup. Mat. section 7) that corresponds to the spectra of Fig. 3. In the metal we see that, in fact, a prominent MIR peak is present at $\omega_{\text{mir}} \approx 0.22\text{ eV}$, in excellent agreement with the experimental value. On the other hand, the optical conductivity of the insulator shows a maximum at $\omega_{\text{ins}} \approx 2\text{ eV}$ in both, theory and experiment. Moreover, we also note the good agreement of the relative spectral strengths of the main features in the two phases.

In conclusion, we showed that the detailed solution of the dimer model treated within DMFT can account for a number of experimental features observed in VO$_2$. The minimal model has an impurity problem which is analogue to that of LDA+DMFT methods, yet the simplicity of this approach allowed for a detailed solution that permitted a transparent understanding of many physical aspects of the electronic first order transition in this problem. It exposes a dimer-Mott-transition mechanism, where the effective intra-dimer exchange is controlled by correlations, it is weakened in the metal and strongly enhanced in the Mott insulator. In the metal, this leads to a pair of split quasiparticle bands, which then in the insulator further separate, to join and coexist with the usual incoherent Hubbard bands. Despite the simplicity of our model, we made semi-quantitative connections to several experimental data in VO$_2$, including a crucial
optical conductivity study within the 1st order transition, that remained unaccounted for. Our work, sheds light on the long-standing question of the driving force behind the metal-insulator transition of VO₂ highlighting the relevance of the Mott mechanism. The present approach may be considered the counterpart for VO₂ of the DMFT studies of the Mott transition in paramagnetic Cr-doped V₂O₅.
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Supplementary Material

I. DIMER HUBBARD MODEL (DHM) REPRESENTATION

In figure S5 we show on the left panel the schematic representation of our model Hamiltonian. The blue lines correspond to the inter-dimer hopping matrix $t$ and the purple line the intra-dimer hopping $t_\perp$. For simplicity, the model is depicted in 3D, but it is mathematically formulated in the limit of a large coordination lattice. The right hand side panel shows the corresponding DMFT quantum impurity problem, where the dimer is embedded in a self-consistent medium.

Figure S5. Left panel: schematic representation of the lattice Hamiltonian. Right panel: Associated self-consistent quantum impurity problem, where the dimer is embedded in a self-consistent medium.

II. VALIDATION OF IPT AGAINST THE EXACTLY SOLVABLE ISOLATED DIMER LIMIT (IE ATOMIC LIMIT OF THE LATTICE MODEL)

We numerically demonstrate that the IPT method exactly captures the atomic limit of the lattice model. The fact that a perturbative calculation captures the atomic limit (i.e., $U/t \to \infty$) is not to be expected, but, interestingly enough, is analogous to the well known property of the IPT solution of the one band Hubbard model. This is shown in figure S6 where we compare the exact Self-Energy of the atomic limit (isolated dimer) with the respective IPT solution.
The very good agreement between QMC and IPT is also found in the whole phase diagram. This is shown in figure S6. The data is shown along with fits obtained from the IPT solution. The Green’s functions and Self-Energies are very non-trivial. Figure S7 shows the numerically exact CT-QMC Green’s functions at suitably close values of the parameters. The very good agreement between QMC and IPT is also found in the whole phase diagram. This is shown in figure S7.

III. COMPARISON OF IPT WITH NUMERICAL SOLUTIONS (CT-QMC AND EXACT DIAGONALIZATION)

A. Solutions in the Matsubara axis
Figure S8. Comparison of the (numerically) exact CT-QMC solution and IPT away from the coexistence region for metal (top) and insulator (bottom). Left panels: the local \( \text{Im}[G_{11}] \) (green) and \( \text{Re}[G_{12}] \) (blue). Right panels: the local \( \text{Im}[\Sigma_{11}] \) (green) and \( \text{Re}[\Sigma_{12}] \) (blue). Circular and square symbols are CT-QMC data at \( U=1.8 \) (metal) and 3.3 (insulator), and black solid lines are IPT at \( U=2 \) (metal) and 3.35 (insulator). The intra-dimer hopping is always fixed at \( t_\perp=0.3 \). Notice that, as in the one band Hubbard model case, the best quantitative agreement between QMC and IPT is found for values of \( U \) that are slightly different.

Figure S9. Comparison of the electronic structures in the Metal and Insulator phases at \( t_\perp=0.3 \). Left CT-QMC in the coexistence \( U=2.15 \), center IPT taken from main text \( U=2.5 \), right results from ED metal at \( U=1.8 \), insulator at \( U=3 \)

S8 where IPT and CT-QMC are compared at two parameter values away from the coexistence region.

B. Electronic Structure

Within DMFT, the bandstructure is obtained as a function of the single particle energy \( \epsilon \), which in the semicircular DOS lattice adopted here has a simple linear dispersion.\(^{[8]}\) Hence at \( U=0 \) the non-interacting bandstructure are two parallel linear bands split by \( 2t_\perp \) (i.e. the bonding and anti-bonding bands).

In figure S9 we show the electronic dispersion (i.e. \( \epsilon \) and \( \omega \) resolved density of states \( A(\epsilon, \omega) \)) of the metallic and insulating states obtained by the IPT, CT-QMC and ED methods, respectively. As seen in the figure, all the three methods provide the key qualitative features that are discussed in the text. Namely, the split quasiparticle bands in the metal and in the insulating states.
IV. CHOICE OF PARAMETERS IN THE DIMER LATTICE

The dimer Hubbard Model has very few parameters inter-dimer (or lattice) hopping \( t \), intra-dimer hopping \( t_\perp \), local Coulomb repulsion \( U \), and the temperature. The lattice hopping provides the bandwidth of our model Hamiltonian \( W = 4t \). In the case of VO\(_2\) reference LDA calculations agree that both, \( e_g \) and \( a_{1g} \) bands have an approximate bandwidth of \( 2eV \), hence we have set \( t = 0.5eV \).

The intra-dimer hopping quoted in ref \( \text{[S3]} \) is \( \sim 0.68eV \), which is about a factor of 2 larger than our adopted value 0.3eV. However, that value concerns solely the \( a_{1g} \) (\( d_{xy} \)) orbital. There are in fact also two additional intra-dimer hopping amplitudes (associated to \( e_g \) states), which is 0.22eV and a smaller value. The values for the hopping amplitudes found in later work \( \text{[S1,S2]} \) are consistent with this findings. Since we are considering a unit cell with two sites and one orbital each, we have a single intra-dimer hopping parameter. Therefore, and in the spirit of a mean field theory, we chose a value that is the approximate average of the 3 hopping amplitudes.

In regard to the value of \( U \), we adopted the value of \( U = 2.5eV \) for the semi-quantitative comparison with experiments. This is quite consistent with the values considered in \( \text{[S3]} \) who systematically explored the range of \( U = 2.2 \) to 3.5eV, and found the MIT between 2.7 and 3eV at the lowest temperatures considered. The values adopted in ref \( \text{[S1,S2]} \) are \( U = 4eV \) and \( J = 0.68 \). These values are in fact higher than ours, however, Biermann et al dedicate the last paragraph of their Letter to discuss their choice of the value of \( U \) and \( J \). They mention that smaller values, such as \( U = 2eV \) are also compatible with their findings. This is also consistent with our choice of \( U = 2.5eV \).

V. MOTT INSULATOR IN THE DIMER LATTICE

The Mott insulating state is signaled by the divergence of the Self-Energy in the Mott gap. This divergence is clearly visible on the real axis in figure \( \text{S10} \) (middle and bottom rows). In the left column we show the well known case of a single-band Hubbard model \( (t_\perp = 0) \) with particle-hole symmetry. In this case the Self-Energy diverges at zero frequency, and this is therefore visible in the Matsubara axis too. eg. in figure \( \text{S6} \) above (the \( t_\perp = 0 \) blue squares on the top most right panel). In the case of the dimer lattice \( (t_\perp = 0.3) \), with two atoms per unit cell, the dimerization splits the divergence of the Self-Energy into two poles, symmetric around zero frequency, as displayed on the right right column on figure \( \text{S10} \). In this case the divergence is no more visible on the Matsubara axis, and in particular \( \text{Im} \Sigma_{11} \) goes smoothly to zero as \( \omega \to 0 \).

A. The electronic structure of the dimer model

The dimer Hubbard Model is not a single band model despite being a single orbital per site system. Since it has two sites (the dimer) in the unit cell, there are two bands. The two sites are related by symmetry thus the two bands are degenerate in the atomic-site representation but are distinct in the bonding/antibonding basis. The physics of the system is independent of the choice of the representation. To further clarify this point we show in figure \( \text{S11} \) the DOS from our model calculation from Fig. 3 of the manuscript in the atomic-site basis, along with the bonding and antibonding DOS. The average of the latter two gives the former one (which has degeneracy 2).

VI. ELECTRONIC STRUCTURE OF THE ATOMIC (ISOLATED DIMER) LIMIT OF THE LATTICE MODEL

In order to identify the electronic structure of the insulator state of the model, we obtained the corresponding quantity in the atomic limit, which can be analytically solved in the real frequency axis (the impurity model is an isolated dimer). In this limit the lattice Green’s function is obtained as,

\[
G^{-1}_{\text{lat}} \approx \begin{bmatrix} \omega - \epsilon & -t_\perp \\ -t_\perp & \omega - \epsilon \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_{11} & \Sigma_{12} \\ \Sigma_{12} & \Sigma_{11} \end{bmatrix}_{\text{dimer}}
\] (S3)

The electronic structure in this limit is shown in figure \( \text{S12} \) at 2 different temperatures. The left panel is at inverse temperature \( \beta = 100 \), where we see two highly dispersive bands along with two flatter ones. At high temperature \( \beta = 5 \) more excitations are apparent as the first excited state of the dimer becomes thermally populated. This dramatically enriches the electronic structure. Interestingly, these multiple excitations can be readily identified in the actual model results shown in the Main Text.
VII. OPTICAL CONDUCTIVITY

To calculate the optical conductivity one requires a geometrical definition of the lattice. As a common practice, one turns to the hypercube in infinite dimensions to keep on with the exact limit of the DMFT approximation\textsuperscript{[S7]}. Using the Peierls ansatz to find the current operator and aligning our dimer along the, say, $x$ direction in the hypercube one finds the current operator along the $x$ direction to be:

$$
\hat{j}_x = \sum_{\sigma} e \left[ 2a - \frac{t}{\sqrt{2d}} \sin (k_x a) \left( \hat{b}^{\dagger}_{k_x,\sigma} \hat{b}_{k_x,\sigma} + \hat{a}^{\dagger}_{k_x,\sigma} \hat{a}_{k_x,\sigma} \right) + i\eta t \left( \hat{b}^{\dagger}_{k_x,\sigma} \hat{a}_{k_x,\sigma} - \hat{a}^{\dagger}_{k_x,\sigma} \hat{b}_{k_x,\sigma} \right) \right]
$$

(S4)

where $e$ is the electron charge, $i$ is the imaginary unit, $a$ is the lattice unit cell length, and $\eta \in (0,a)$ is the separation between atoms of the dimer. When one diagonalizes the lattice Hamiltonian one can see it in terms of quasiparticles that form a bonding ($\hat{b}$) and an anti-bonding ($\hat{a}$) band, one uses then the operators $\hat{b}^{\dagger}_{k_x,\sigma}$, $\hat{b}_{k_x,\sigma}$ to create (annihilate) quasiparticles in the bonding band with momentum $k_x$ and spin $\sigma$ and analogously the operators $\hat{a}^{\dagger}_{k_x,\sigma}$, $\hat{a}_{k_x,\sigma}$ for the anti-bonding band. In infinite dimensions to keep the kinetic energy constant one has to scale the hopping amplitude $t \rightarrow \frac{t}{\sqrt{2d}}$\textsuperscript{[S1]}. Then following the procedure established in\textsuperscript{[S7]} we arrive to the expression
Figure S11. Top panel shows the DOS in the atomic-site basis (from Fig.3 of manuscript) This DOS is doubly degenerate (the same at each of the two atoms of the unit cell). Bottom panel show the DOS in the bonding (blue) and antibonding (green) combinations, respectively. The average of the bottom two DOS gives the top one. Red arrow in bottom left panel indicates the origin of th MIR peak which appears at $\omega \sim 0.22eV$ (cf. fig. S13).

\[
\bar{\sigma}_{xx}(\omega) = \frac{2\pi e^2 a^2 t^2}{d} \int d\omega' \frac{f(\omega') - f(\omega' + \omega)}{\omega} \times \\
\int dE \rho(E) [A_a(E,\omega)A_a(E,\omega + \omega') + A_b(E,\omega)A_b(E,\omega + \omega')] \\
+ 2\pi e^2 \eta^2 t_\perp^2 \int d\omega' \frac{f(\omega') - f(\omega' + \omega)}{\omega} \times \\
\int dE \rho(E) [A_b(E,\omega)A_a(E,\omega + \omega') + A_a(E,\omega)A_b(E,\omega + \omega')] \\
\]

(S5)

Where $\rho(E) = \exp(-E^2/(2t^2))$ is the density of states of the hypercube, and $A_b, A_a$ are the spectral functions of the bonding and anti-bonding bands. From the previous equation we find that, in general, both intra-band and inter-band transitions are present. Notice that the latter are usually disregarded (e.g. Ref S8). The two contributions are weighted with different factors that depend on the specific geometry. For the sake of simplicity, we set those geometric prefactors equal to unity, as they are expected to be of the same order ($a \sim \eta, t \sim t_\perp$ and $d = 3$). In figure S13, we plot for the metal and the insulator case the individual contribution of the interband transitions from the bonding to antibonding bands(refer to figure S11) and of the intraband excitations.
Figure S12. Lattice dispersion approximated with the isolated dimer Self-energy. Setup is $(U = 2.15, t_\perp = 0.3)$. Left panel at $\beta = 100$ only ground state excitations, right panel $\beta = 5$ presents excitations out of ground state and first excited states.
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