Effective model for studying optical properties of lead-halide perovskites
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We use general symmetry-based arguments to construct an effective model suitable for studying optical properties of lead-halide perovskites. To build the model, we identify an atomic-level interaction between electromagnetic fields and the spin degree of freedom that should be added to a minimally-coupled \( \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p} \) Hamiltonian. As an application, we study two basic optical characteristics of the material: the Verdet constant and the refractive index.

Lead-halide perovskites (LHP) is a family of lead-based compounds with the structure \( \text{APbX}_3 \) where \( A = \text{Cs, CH}_{3}\text{NH}_3; X = \text{Cl, Br, I} \). They attract attention as promising candidates for solar cells with high performance and stability [1, 2]. In order to construct improved photovoltaic devices as well as to explore further potential applications of perovskite compounds, it is necessary to gain a better understanding of the material properties of this system. The study of basic optoelectronic phenomena in LHP in the near-infrared range is particularly important in this regard as it may provide an insight into microscopic properties of the charged excitations in these materials such as dispersion and excitonic states [3, 4].

The response of a given system to applied electromagnetic fields crucially depends on how these fields couple to the (relevant) degrees of freedom of the system. In this paper, which accompanies [5], we argue that introducing electromagnetic field by naive minimal electromagnetic coupling to the \( \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p} \) Hamiltonian does not adequately capture the frequency dependence of basic optical properties of lead-halide perovskites. Moreover, we amend the \( \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p} \) Hamiltonian by introducing new terms which have a transparent physical meaning. We test our effective description of LHP against available experimental data and produce numeric values for the strengths of the new terms in the effective Hamiltonian.

The paper is structured as follows: in Sec. I we use general symmetry-based arguments to construct an effective low-energy description of LHP. This result is then used in Secs. II and III to calculate the linear optical polarizability and the Verdet constant. Section IV contains a brief summary of our work. Technical details to support the discussion are presented in two appendices.

I. EFFECTIVE DESCRIPTION OF LHP

A. Basis States and Symmetries

The low-energy optoelectronic properties of LHP is determined by the hybridization of \( s \)– and \( p \)–orbitals of Pb and halide atoms [6]. Near the gap edge the Pb contribution dominates and the states have a pronounced \( s \)– (valence band) and \( p \)–type (conduction band) character. As a result of spin-orbit coupling the \( p \)–type states further split into \( J = 1/2 \) and \( J = 3/2 \) manifolds. The former shapes the properties of the bottom of the conduction band. Therefore, to analyze the low-energy physics of LHP, it is sufficient to consider only the following four basis states [7]:

\[
|\downarrow\uparrow\rangle = \left( |s_{\frac{1}{2}}\rangle, |p_{\frac{1}{2}}\rangle \right) = |s\rangle |\uparrow\rangle \tag{1}
\]
\[
|\downarrow\downarrow\rangle = \left( |s_{\frac{1}{2}}\rangle, |p_{\frac{1}{2}}\rangle \right) = |s\rangle |\downarrow\rangle \tag{2}
\]
\[
|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle = \left( |p_{\frac{1}{2}}\rangle, |p_{\frac{1}{2}}\rangle \right) = |p\rangle |\uparrow\rangle + \frac{i|p\rangle |\downarrow\rangle}{\sqrt{3}} \tag{3}
\]
\[
|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle = \left( |p_{\frac{1}{2}}\rangle, |p_{\frac{1}{2}}\rangle \right) = |p\rangle |\downarrow\rangle - \frac{i|p\rangle |\uparrow\rangle}{\sqrt{3}} \tag{4}
\]

where the left-hand-side introduces the ‘quasi-spin’ notation convenient for our work. The right-hand-side follows the standard notation [8, 9] for the spin structure of a state \([\downarrow\downarrow] \) and \([\uparrow\uparrow] \) and for the components of the Bloch functions \([|s\rangle, |p_x\rangle, |p_y\rangle, |p_z\rangle] \). For clarity, we also describe the states in terms of the total angular momentum and its projection in the parentheses. Note that in the companion paper [5], for simplicity, we used a somewhat different notation, e.g., there \( \uparrow\downarrow \) was used instead of \( \uparrow\downarrow \). We do not employ this simplification here.

In a periodic lattice, the atomic states form bands. In the basis given by Eqs. (1)-(4), the \( s \) and \( p \) states form the valence and conduction band, respectively. To understand the corresponding physics, the standard approach is to construct an effective \( \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p} \) Hamiltonian acting on these basis states. In the cubic phase, the resulting Hamiltonian in the matrix form acting on \( \psi^T = (\uparrow\uparrow, \uparrow\downarrow, \downarrow\uparrow, \downarrow\downarrow) \) can be written down in the vicinity of the high-symmetry \( R \)-point of the Brillouin zone as follows (\( \hbar = 1 \)):
here $k_i$ is the momentum of the electron (without loss of generality, we assume that $k = 0$ corresponds to the $R$-point); $k_i = k_x \pm ik_y$; $a$ is the (cubic) lattice unit; $\Delta(k)$ has the meaning of an energy gap with a minimum at the $R$-point; $(it)$ is the intra-orbital ($s$-$p$) overlap integral between the neighbouring sites [2].

The $k \cdot p$ method is a powerful tool with a general applicability [8, 9]. However it turns out that for the specific case of a cubic lead-halide perovskite it could be of advantage to take an alternative route, and construct an effective description of the low-energy physics from the allowed symmetries. To this end, we note that any system is isotropic, then the allowed symmetries. To this end, we note that any operator $O$ that acts in the Hilbert space based upon the states in Eqs. (1)-(4), can be written as follows:

$$
\hat{O} = \sum_{i,j,l} C_i^j D_j^l \tau_i^\alpha \otimes \tau_j^\beta,
$$

where $\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3$ is a set of the Pauli matrices and $\tau_0$ is the identity matrix. The subscript $\uparrow$ ($\downarrow$) defines in a natural way the subset of the space where the matrices act. To simplify the notation, we shall define

$$
\tau_i \equiv \tau_i^\uparrow, \quad \sigma_i \equiv \tau_i^\downarrow.
$$

The expansion coefficients $C_i^j$ and $D_j^l$ can depend on the momentum of the particle as well as on the external electric, $E$, and magnetic, $B$, fields. If one assumes that the system is isotropic, then $\{C_1^j, C_2^j, C_3^j\}$ and $\{D_1^l, D_2^l, D_3^l\}$ should transform like vectors under the change of the system of coordinates. In our work, we shall assume cubic symmetry $O_h$ to model LHP. Therefore, in our work, the system becomes approximately isotropic only in the limit of low momenta.

Naturally, the effective Hamiltonian that describes the system should be of the form of Eq. (6). Its most general form can be obtained by fixing time-reversal, and parity symmetries of the system. It is straightforward to show that the operators that implement these symmetries for the states in Eqs. (1)-(4) are

$$
\hat{T} = i \tau_3 \otimes \sigma_2 \hat{K},
$$

$$
\hat{P} = -\tau_3 \otimes \sigma_0,
$$

where $\hat{K}$ is the complex conjugation operator. The operators $\hat{T}$ and $\hat{P}$ commute with each other as they should.

Note that the time-reversal operator $\hat{T}$ acts in the standard way in the $\downarrow$ manifold

$$
\hat{T} | \downarrow \uparrow \rangle = | \downarrow \downarrow \rangle \quad \hat{T} | \downarrow \down \rangle = - | \downarrow \uparrow \rangle.
$$

However, there is an unconventional sign when $\hat{T}$ operates in the $\uparrow$ manifold

$$
\hat{T} | \uparrow \uparrow \rangle = - | \uparrow \downarrow \rangle \quad \hat{T} | \uparrow \down \rangle = | \uparrow \uparrow \rangle.
$$

(11)

Analogously, one can check that the parity operation also depends on the manifold.

B. Effective Hamiltonian

To construct an effective Hamiltonian, let us first consider the simplest case of vanishing momentum ($k = 0$) and no external electromagnetic fields ($E = 0, B = 0$). In this case, there are only three commuting operators: $\hat{T}$, $\hat{P}$ and the identity operator, $I$. The operator $\hat{T}$ is anti-unitary and cannot enter the Hamiltonian. Therefore, the Hamiltonian must be of the form

$$
H(\mathbf{k} = E = B = 0) = \alpha(1) \tau_0 \otimes \sigma_0 + \alpha(2) \tau_3 \otimes \sigma_0 + \sum_l \alpha_l(1) \tau_l \otimes \sigma_l + \sum_l \alpha_l(2) \tau_l \otimes \sigma_l + \sum_l \alpha_l(3) \tau_l \otimes \sigma_l + \sum_l \alpha_l(4) \tau_l \otimes \sigma_l + \sum_l \alpha_l(5) \tau_l \otimes \sigma_l + \sum_l \alpha_l(6) \tau_l \otimes \sigma_l,
$$

(12)

where the parameter $\alpha(1)$ determines the offset of the energy $[10]$. It will be not important for our discussion and can be set to zero. The physics of the parameter $\alpha(2)$ is also clear; it fixes the gap between the $\uparrow$ and $\downarrow$ manifolds. One can conveniently write it as $\Delta/2$. For the APbBr$_3$ perovskites the value of the gap is known to be approximately 2 eV; see also below as well as Ref. [11] and references therein.

For a non-vanishing momentum and electromagnetic fields, one can add terms to Eq. (12). Indeed, in this case the coefficients $C_i^j$ and $D_j^l$ can depend on $\mathbf{k}$, $E$ and $B$, and the Hamiltonian can be written as

$$
H = \alpha(1) \tau_0 \otimes \sigma_0 + \alpha(2) \tau_3 \otimes \sigma_0 + \sum_l \alpha_l(1) \tau_l \otimes \sigma_l + \sum_l \alpha_l(2) \tau_l \otimes \sigma_l + \sum_l \alpha_l(3) \tau_l \otimes \sigma_l + \sum_l \alpha_l(4) \tau_l \otimes \sigma_l + \sum_l \alpha_l(5) \tau_l \otimes \sigma_l + \sum_l \alpha_l(6) \tau_l \otimes \sigma_l,
$$

(13)

where $\alpha(1)$ and $\alpha(2)$ are symmetric under the action of both $\hat{T}$ and $\hat{P}$; $\alpha_l(3)$ is antisymmetric under $\hat{T}$ and $\hat{P}$; $\alpha_l(4)$ is symmetric under $\hat{T}$, but antisymmetric under $\hat{P}$; $\alpha_l(5)$ and $\alpha_l(6)$ are antisymmetric under $\hat{T}$, but symmetric under $\hat{P}$. As above, we shall assume that $\alpha(1) = 0$. Note that by definition $\hat{T} \mathbf{k} = \hat{P} \mathbf{k} = -\mathbf{k}$, $\hat{T} \mathbf{E} = -\mathbf{P} \mathbf{E} = \mathbf{E}$, and $\hat{T} \mathbf{B} = -\mathbf{P} \mathbf{B} = -\mathbf{B}$.

Assuming that the electromagnetic fields are weak, we can write (see also [2])

$$
H = H_k + H_E + H_B,
$$

(14)

where $H_k$ determines the dispersion relation of the system. $H_E$ and $H_B$ determine coupling of LHP to electromagnetic fields beyond the minimal coupling to $H_k$. Without loss of generality, we write the operator $H_k$ as

$$
H_k = \frac{1}{2} \Delta(\mathbf{k}) \tau_3 \otimes \sigma_0 + 2t \tau_2 \otimes \sum_{i=1}^3 \sigma_i S(k_i),
$$

(15)
where $\tilde{k}_l = k_l a - \frac{q a}{\mu} A_l$ ($q$ is the charge of a particle, $A_l$ is the vector potential) and $t$ is the hopping parameter. The even function $\Delta(x)$ and the odd function $S(x)$ define the momentum dependence of the electronic band. In what follows, we shall also write $\Delta(x)$ as

$$\Delta(\tilde{k}) = \left( \Delta + t_3 \sum_{l=1}^3 C(\tilde{k}_l) \right),$$

where $C(x)$ is some even function. In the limit $x \to 0$, we assume that $C(x) \simeq x^2/2$ and $S(x) \simeq x$. This implies that in the limit $k \to 0$ the Hamiltonian $H_k$ corresponds to the model of Ref. [7], see Eq. (5).

The operators $H_E$ and $H_B$ have the form

$$H_E = \mu \tau_3 \otimes \sum_{l=1}^3 \sigma_i E_l,$$

$$H_B = (\mu_B^{(1)} \tau_0 + \mu_B^{(2)} \tau_3) \otimes \sum_{l=1}^3 \sigma_i B_l,$$

where $\mu$ controls the response of the medium to the external electric field (similar to the dipole moment). The parameters $\mu_B^{(1)}$ and $\mu_B^{(2)}$ determine the magnetic susceptibility. Note that in Ref. [5], we assumed that $\mu_B^{(1)} = -\mu_B^{(2)}$. This assumption does not modify the result for the Faraday effect whose strength is given by $\mu_B^{(1)}$, see Sec. [11].

As it turns out, the Hamiltonian in Eq. (13) is the only possible low-energy description of the system assuming the Hilbert space from Eqs. (1)-(4). As expected, in the absence of external fields and for $k \to 0$, it coincides with the $k \cdot p$ Hamiltonian in Eq. (3). Strictly speaking, the effective Hamiltonian $H$ is limited to the vicinity of the band gap. However, most of the low-energy optical properties are determined by the transitions in this region, making the proposed effective model useful. Another merit of the presented phenomenological approach is that using similar symmetry arguments one can further amend the effective Hamiltonian with new degrees of freedom of a known symmetry.

II. LINEAR OPTICAL POLARIZABILITY

A. General Derivations

As a first application of the effective Hamiltonian, we calculate the linear optical susceptibility in the vicinity of the energy gap. To this end, we follow the standard procedure [12]. First, we assume that the magnetic field is zero, and the electric field is weak ($E_l, A_l \to 0$). This allows us to write the Hamiltonian as

$$H \simeq H_0 + H_P(t),$$

where the time-independent part reads as

$$H_0 = \frac{1}{2} \Delta(k a) \tau_3 \otimes \sigma_0 + 2t \tau_2 \otimes \sum_{l=1}^3 \sigma_i S(k_l a),$$

and the time-dependent perturbation has the form

$$H_P = \mu \tau_3 \otimes \sum_{l=1}^3 \sigma_i E_l - \frac{q a}{\epsilon} \sum_{l=1}^3 A_l \left( \frac{t_3}{2} C(k_l a) \tau_3 \otimes \sigma_0 + 2t_2 \otimes \sigma_i S(k_l a) \right).$$

Note that we have neglected the terms at the order of $A_l^2$ and beyond to be consistent with the derivation of the effective Hamiltonian.

To calculate the polarizability, we first use perturbation theory to calculate the change in the energy of the material in the approximation of slow fields. Then, we differentiate it with respect to the fields, see Appendix A. Close to the band gap, the resonant transition dominates the optics (see Fig. 1), and we derive in the leading order in $t/\Delta$ the polarizability of a unit volume

$$\alpha_{zz}(\omega) = \frac{\mu - 2t S(k_l a) \frac{q a}{\mu}}{\Delta(k a) - \omega - i \Gamma/2}.$$

FIG. 1. (left) Cartoon of the cubic lattice with $s$- and $p$-type orbitals. (right) The resonant band gap transition that contributes to the polarizability in Eq. (22). The vertical lines show the eigenstates of the Hamiltonian in Eq. (20). They are separated by $\Delta(k a)$ for $t = 0$. The horizontal arrows show a transition to a virtual level driven by a photon with frequency $\omega$.

where $\omega$ is the frequency of light, and $\Gamma$ is a phenomenological parameter to model non-unitary processes, such as decay of energy levels. Note that Eq. (22) should be used only in the vicinity of the energy gap ($\omega \simeq \Delta$), in particular, it does not lead to a finite value of $\alpha_{zz}$ as $\omega \to 0$. The polarizability at low frequencies requires additional calculations as we discuss in Appendix A.

This theoretical prediction can be tested using the imaginary part of the refractive index, which can be calculated using the Clausius–Mossotti relation (aka the
Lorentz–Lorenz law, see, e.g., [12, 13]
\[ n^2 = 1 + \frac{3\alpha_{zz}}{3\varepsilon_0 - \alpha_{zz}}, \]
where \( \varepsilon_0 \) is the permittivity of free space. The integer 3 is used here in approximation of an isotropic material; in general, it can also be used as a fitting parameter. Assuming that the imaginary parts of \( \alpha_{zz} \) are small, we derive
\[ (\text{Re}(n))^2 \simeq 1 + \frac{3\text{Re}(\alpha_{zz})}{3\varepsilon_0 - \text{Re}(\alpha_{zz})}, \]
\[ \text{Im}(n) \simeq \frac{9\varepsilon_0 \text{Im}(\alpha_{zz})}{2\text{Re}(n)[3\varepsilon_0 - \text{Re}(\alpha_{zz})]^2}, \]
which leads to
\[ \frac{\text{Im}(\alpha_{zz})}{\varepsilon_0} \simeq \frac{18\text{Re}(n)\text{Im}(n)}{[(\text{Re}(n))^2 + 2]^2}. \]

In our experimental set-up [3], we can measure \( \text{Re}(n) \) and \( \text{Im}(n) \), which allows us to benchmark our theoretical calculations against experimental measurements. Note that \( \text{Re}(n) \simeq 2 \) for the considered parameters, which leads to \( \text{Im}(\alpha_{zz}) \simeq \text{Im}(n) \).

### B. Comparison to the experiment

Here, we use experimental values of \( \text{Re}(n) \) and \( \text{Im}(n) \) discussed in Ref. [5] to calculate the right-hand-side of Eq. (26). To estimate the left-hand-side, we work with our theoretical prediction presented in Eq. (22). To fix the parameters that enter Eq. (22), we rely on available experimental data [14] and the numerical data for CsPbBr\(_3\) [7].

As we show in Fig. (2), Eqs. (27) and (28) lead to similar results for \( \text{Im}(\alpha_{zz}) \). The single fit parameter \( \mu \) is almost independent of \( \Gamma \), assuming reasonable values of \( \Gamma \). Note that in the companion paper [5] we included also the fit to the exciton peak. We do not do it here, as an analysis of the exciton peak requires calculations beyond our single-body theoretical model; moreover, the value of \( \mu \) is (almost) not sensitive to the inclusion of the exciton peak in the fitting procedure.

### III. FARADAY EFFECT

As the next application of our effective model, we consider the Faraday effect [18], in which polarization of an electromagnetic wave is rotated in the presence of a magnetic field co-linear with propagation of light. First, we focus on a simple scenario without hopping terms \( t = t_3 = 0 \). Then, we consider a general case.

#### A. Faraday effect from \( H \) with \( t = t_3 = 0 \)

To illustrate the origin of the Faraday effect in LHP, we calculate linear susceptibilities using the standard procedure (see Appendix B)

\[ \chi_{xy}(\omega) = -\chi_{yx}(\omega) \simeq \frac{-i\mu^2}{\varepsilon_0} \frac{8\mu_B^{(1)} \Delta \omega}{(\Delta^2 - \omega^2)^2} B, \]

and

\[ \chi_{xx}(\omega) = \chi_{yy}(\omega) \simeq \frac{2\mu^2}{\varepsilon_0} \frac{\Delta}{\Delta^2 - \omega^2}. \]

Note that only \( \mu_B^{(1)} \) enters Eq. (29) implying that only the first term in Eq. (18) contributes to \( \chi_{xy} \). The term \( \mu_B^{(2)} t_3 \sum_{l=1}^3 \sigma_l B_l \) does not modify the energy differences between levels for the relevant transitions, see Fig. 3 and hence does not modify the susceptibility.

To show that Eqs. (29) and (30) lead to the Faraday effect, we consider the susceptibility matrix \( \hat{\chi} \) written in the following form

\[ \hat{\chi}(\omega) = \chi_{xx}(\omega) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & i\text{Im}(\chi_{xy})/\chi_{xx} \\ -i\text{Im}(\chi_{xy})/\chi_{xx} & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \]

This form of \( \hat{\chi}(\omega) \) conserves circular polarization of light

\[ \hat{\chi} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \pm i \end{pmatrix} = (\chi_{xx} \mp i\text{Im}(\chi_{xy})) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \pm i \end{pmatrix}. \]
where the assumption of the companion paper [5]:

$t_\text{tors}$ [19] constant enjoys the standard form for semiconductors, which lead to the Faraday effect. The resulting Verdet refraction of polarized light. Correspondingly, there are two indices of refraction

\[ n_\pm = \sqrt{1 + \chi_{xx} \mp \Im(\chi_{xy})}, \]

allowing us to write the polarization vector as

\[ P_\pm = c_0(\chi_{xx} \mp \Im(\chi_{xy}))E_\pm, \]

where \( \pm \) corresponds to the amplitudes of right- and left-polarized light. Correspondingly, there are two indices of refraction

\[ n_\pm = \sqrt{1 + \chi_{xx} \mp \Im(\chi_{xy})}, \]

which lead to the Faraday effect. The resulting Verdet constant enjoys the standard form for semiconductors [19]

\[ V \equiv \frac{\omega n_+ - n_-}{2c} \times \frac{\Im(\chi_{xy})}{B} \simeq -\frac{\Im(\chi_{xy})}{2cB\sqrt{1 + \chi_{xx}}}, \]

where \( \chi_{xy} \) should be taken from Eq. (29); instead of using the theoretical expression for \( \chi_{xx} \) presented in Eq. (30), it is logical to use experimental data for the refractive index: \( \sqrt{1 + \chi_{xx}} \simeq \Re(n) \).

\[ V \equiv \frac{\omega n_+ - n_-}{2c} \times \frac{\Im(\chi_{xy})}{B} \simeq -\frac{\Im(\chi_{xy})}{2cB\sqrt{1 + \chi_{xx}}}, \]

B. General case

In general, the Verdet coefficient assumes the form (see Appendix B2)

\[ V = \frac{\mu^{(1)}_B}{c_0\Re(n)} \int \frac{\text{d}k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{c_0 + c_2 \omega^2}{[\Delta(ka)^2 - \omega^2]^2}, \]

where

\[ c_0 = 16\Delta(ka)^2 S'(k_x a)S'(k_y a)(qa)^2 \]
\[ + 4t\mu\Delta(ka)^2(S'(k_x a) + S'(k_y a))qa, \]

and

\[ c_2 = 4\Delta(ka)^2 + 4tqa\mu(S'(k_x a) + S'(k_y a)). \]

Note that \( V \) is finite at \( \omega = 0 \), which is possible on general grounds if hopping is allowed [20].

The existence of the spin-electric term (i.e., \( \mu \neq 0 \)) is crucial for explaining strong Faraday effect observed in the experiment [5] [21]. Indeed, if \( \mu = 0 \), then \( c_2 = 0 \) and the reduced Verdet coefficient \( V(1 - \omega^2/\Delta^2)^2 \) has only weak frequency dependence, which contradicts experimental observations.

We have observed that the Verdet coefficient at low frequencies is sensitive to the form of the functions \( S(x) \) and \( C(x) \). Therefore, one can provide only an order-of-magnitude estimate of \( \mu^{(1)}_B \). To this end, we notice that if \( t_3 \to 0 \), then

\[ V = \frac{4\Delta\mu^2\omega^2\mu^{(1)}_B}{c_0\Re(n)} 1 + \frac{t}{2} F(\omega) \]
\[ (\Delta^2 - \omega^2)^2, \]

where \( F(\omega) \) is some even function of \( \omega \). Using this expression, we estimate \( \mu^{(1)}_B = 0.2\mu_B \), where \( \mu_B \) is the Bohr magneton, see also Ref. [5].

IV. SUMMARY AND OUTLOOK

In this paper, which accompanies [5], we introduced a natural extension of the \( \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p} \) Hamiltonian (see Eq. (6)) that allows one to study optoelectronic phenomena in LHP in the near-infrared range beyond minimal coupling substitution. In our study, we first used general symmetry constraints such as time-reversal and parity symmetry to identify possible terms in the effective model of LHP, see Eq. (13). This construction allowed us to propose an effective model of LHP in weak electromagnetic fields.

To test this model, we theoretically calculated the linear optical polarizability and the Verdet constant. Comparison of our theoretical calculations to experimental data allowed us to confirm the necessity of the spin-electric and Zeeman terms, which go beyond those in the minimally coupled \( \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p} \) Hamiltonian. Furthermore, the experimental data allowed us to fix the introduced phenomenological parameters.

The proposed effective Hamiltonian suggests a number of phenomena, such as Rashba-type splitting of energy levels and axion-type physics. These effects, which are briefly discussed in Ref. [5], require further theoretical and experimental investigations. Furthermore, the presented phenomenological approach paves the way for symmetry-based inclusion of further terms into effective models of LHP. It suggests a framework for inclusion coupling to other relevant degrees of freedom, for example, given by lattice. A study of the effect of the spin-electric term on excitons is another research direction that will naturally follow from our work.
Appendix A: Derivation of the polarizability of the medium

Here, we work with the Hamiltonian from Eq. (19), $H = H_0 + H_P(t)$, and derive the polarizability of the medium presented in Eq. (22). Let us now write time-independent eigenstates of $H_0$ as $|m\rangle$. A time-evolved eigenstate can be derived using first order perturbation theory

$$\langle \psi_n(t) | H | \psi_n(t) \rangle = |n\rangle e^{-i\varepsilon_n t} - \sum_{m, \omega} \langle m | H_P(\omega) | n \rangle \frac{e^{-i\varepsilon_n t + i\omega t}}{\varepsilon_m - \varepsilon_n + \omega - i\Gamma/2} |m\rangle,$$

where we have introduced decay via $\Gamma$, and used

$$H_P(t) \equiv \sum_\omega H_P(\omega)e^{i\omega t} = \sum_{\omega, l} \tilde{H}_P(\omega) E_l(\omega)e^{i\omega t}.$$

Assuming that the perturbation is given by Eq. (21), the quantity $\tilde{H}_P(\omega)$ takes the form:

$$\tilde{H}_P(\omega) = \mu \tau_1 \otimes \sigma_l - 2I(a_0 t + \sigma_l) - i\frac{qa}{\omega} t_3 \otimes \sigma_0 C(k_0 a)',$n

where we have used that $E = -\frac{1}{\epsilon} \frac{\partial A}{\partial \phi}$. To calculate linear susceptibility, we calculate the terms in the expectation value of the Hamiltonian that contain $E_f^2$ terms and have a finite value of time average:

$$\langle \psi_n(t) | H | \psi_n(t) \rangle \rightarrow - \sum_{m,\omega,\omega'} \langle m | H_P(\omega') | m \rangle \langle m | H_P(\omega) | n \rangle \frac{e^{i\omega t + i\omega't}}{\varepsilon_m - \varepsilon_n + \omega - i\Gamma/2} - \sum_{k,\omega,\omega'} \langle m | H_P(\omega') | (m | H_P(\omega) | n)\rangle^* \frac{e^{-i\omega t + i\omega't}}{\varepsilon_m - \varepsilon_n + \omega + i\Gamma/2}.$$

We average these terms over time and derive an expression suitable for our calculations

$$\frac{\langle \psi_n(t) | H | \psi_n(t) \rangle}{\langle \psi_n(t) | \psi_n(t) \rangle} \rightarrow \mathcal{E} = - \sum_{m,\omega} \langle m | H_P(\omega) | m \rangle \langle m | H_P(\omega) | n \rangle \frac{e^{i\omega t}}{\varepsilon_m - \varepsilon_n - \omega - i\Gamma/2} - \sum_{m,\omega} \langle m | H_P(\omega) | (m | H_P(\omega) | n)\rangle^* \frac{e^{-i\omega t}}{\varepsilon_m - \varepsilon_n + \omega + i\Gamma/2}.$$

If we differentiate this energy with respect to $E_i(\omega)^*$ and $E_j(\omega)$, we derive the polarizability of the medium for a given value of the momentum $k$

$$\alpha_{ij}^{(k)}(\omega) = \sum_m \left( \frac{\langle m | \tilde{H}_P(\omega) | m \rangle \langle m | \tilde{H}_P(\omega) | n \rangle}{\varepsilon_m - \varepsilon_n - \omega - i\Gamma/2} \right) + \left( \frac{\langle m | \tilde{H}_P(\omega) | n \rangle \langle m | \tilde{H}_P(\omega) | n \rangle^*}{\varepsilon_m - \varepsilon_n + \omega + i\Gamma/2} \right).$$

which is a logical extension of textbook results (see, e.g., [12]) to our problem. It is straightforward to calculate this expression exactly. However, the resulting expression is cumbersome and does not provide physical insight. Therefore, we use $t = 0$ in $H_0$, which is a natural assumption, since $t$ is much smaller than $\Delta$. Note that the last term in Eq. (A3) does not induce any transitions within this approximation scheme. Hence, it can be neglected for calculations of $\alpha$ in the vicinity of the band gap transition, and we derive

$$\alpha_{ii}^{(k)}(\omega) = \frac{(\mu + 2\frac{qa}{\omega} t S(k_0 a))}{\Delta(k_0 a) - \omega - i\Gamma/2} + \frac{\Delta(k_0 a) + \omega + i\Gamma/2}{\Delta(k_0 a) + \omega + i\Gamma/2}.$$

We average this terms over time and derive an expression suitable for our calculations

$$\frac{\langle \psi_n(t) | H | \psi_n(t) \rangle}{\langle \psi_n(t) | \psi_n(t) \rangle} \rightarrow \mathcal{E} = - \sum_{m,\omega} \langle m | H_P(\omega) | m \rangle \langle m | H_P(\omega) | n \rangle \frac{e^{i\omega t}}{\varepsilon_m - \varepsilon_n - \omega - i\Gamma/2} - \sum_{m,\omega} \langle m | H_P(\omega) | (m | H_P(\omega) | n)\rangle^* \frac{e^{-i\omega t}}{\varepsilon_m - \varepsilon_n + \omega + i\Gamma/2}.$$

If we differentiate this energy with respect to $E_i(\omega)^*$ and $E_j(\omega)$, we derive the polarizability of the medium for a given value of the momentum $k$

$$\alpha_{ij}^{(k)}(\omega) = \sum_m \left( \frac{\langle m | \tilde{H}_P(\omega) | m \rangle \langle m | \tilde{H}_P(\omega) | n \rangle}{\varepsilon_m - \varepsilon_n - \omega - i\Gamma/2} \right) + \left( \frac{\langle m | \tilde{H}_P(\omega) | n \rangle \langle m | \tilde{H}_P(\omega) | n \rangle^*}{\varepsilon_m - \varepsilon_n + \omega + i\Gamma/2} \right).$$

which is a logical extension of textbook results (see, e.g., [12]) to our problem. It is straightforward to calculate this expression exactly. However, the resulting expression is cumbersome and does not provide physical insight. Therefore, we use $t = 0$ in $H_0$, which is a natural assumption, since $t$ is much smaller than $\Delta$. Note that the last term in Eq. (A3) does not induce any transitions within this approximation scheme. Hence, it can be neglected for calculations of $\alpha$ in the vicinity of the band gap transition, and we derive

$$\alpha_{ii}^{(k)}(\omega) = \frac{(\mu + 2\frac{qa}{\omega} t S(k_0 a))}{\Delta(k_0 a) - \omega - i\Gamma/2} + \frac{\Delta(k_0 a) + \omega + i\Gamma/2}{\Delta(k_0 a) + \omega + i\Gamma/2}.$$

Here, the first part is resonant in the vicinity of the band gap transition. It was used to derive Eq. (22).

Finally, note that the expression in Eq. (A7) is valid only in the vicinity of the band gap transition, and should be modified otherwise. For example, to have a meaningful expression in the limit $\omega \rightarrow 0$, one should include higher orders of $A_l$ in the expansion of $S(k)$, which leads to

$$\alpha_{ii}^{(k)}(\omega \rightarrow 0) = \frac{(\mu - \frac{qa}{\omega} t S(k_0 a))}{\Delta(k_0 a) - \omega} + \frac{(\mu + 2\frac{qa}{\omega} t S(k_0 a))}{\Delta(k_0 a) + \omega} + \frac{8t^2 S(k_0 a) S''(k_0 a)}{\Delta} \left( \frac{qa}{\omega} \right)^2.$$
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Therefore, for \( \omega = 0 \), we have

\[
\alpha_{ii}(\omega = 0) = \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^2} \left[ \frac{2\mu^2}{\Delta(ka)} - \frac{8qat\mu S(k_i \alpha)'}{\Delta(ka)^2} \right].
\]  

(A9)

**Appendix B: Faraday Effect**

1. **Derivation of Eqs. (29) and (30)**

For \( t = t_3 = 0 \), the Hamiltonian of the system reads as

\[
H = \frac{1}{2} \Delta(\vec{k}) \tau_3 \otimes \sigma_0 + (\mu_B^{(1)} \tau_0 + \mu_B^{(2)} \tau_3) \otimes \sum_{i=1}^{3} \sigma_i B_i + \mu \tau_1 \otimes \sum_{i=1}^{3} \sigma_i E_i.
\]  

(B1)

In the derivation of the susceptibility, the last term should be considered as perturbation of the form \((-\sum \mu_i E_i)\). The expression of \( \chi_{ij} \) far from resonances in this case is [12]

\[
\chi_{ij}(\omega) = \frac{N}{\epsilon_0} \sum_{m} \left( \frac{\mu_m^j \mu_m^i}{\varepsilon_m - \varepsilon_n + \omega} + \frac{\mu_m^j \mu_m^i}{\varepsilon_m - \varepsilon_n - \omega} \right),
\]  

(B2)

where \( n \) refers to the ground state, and \( N \) implies either integration over the momentum or the density of atoms, without loss of generality we shall omit this symbol. The sum in Eq. (B2) is over all possible states, \( m \).

Assuming that the \( B \)-field is along the \( z \)-axis that is determined by the direction of light propagation, we derive

\[
\chi_{ij}(\omega) = \frac{\mu^2}{2\epsilon_0} \left[ \frac{\langle \phi \phi | \sigma_i \sigma_j \phi \phi \rangle}{\Delta + 2\mu_B^{(1)} B + \omega} + \frac{\langle \phi \phi | \sigma_j \sigma_i \phi \phi \rangle}{\Delta + 2\mu_B^{(1)} B - \omega} \right] + \frac{\mu^2}{2\epsilon_0} \left[ \frac{\langle \phi \phi | \sigma_i \sigma_j \phi \phi \rangle}{\Delta - 2\mu_B^{(1)} B + \omega} + \frac{\langle \phi \phi | \sigma_j \sigma_i \phi \phi \rangle}{\Delta - 2\mu_B^{(1)} B - \omega} \right].
\]

Equations (29) and (30) now follow, for example,

\[
\chi_{xy}(\omega) = \frac{i\omega \mu^2}{\epsilon_0} \left[ \frac{1}{(\Delta + 2\mu_B^{(1)} B)^2 - \omega^2} - \frac{1}{(\Delta - 2\mu_B^{(1)} B)^2 - \omega^2} \right] \approx \frac{i\omega \mu^2}{\epsilon_0} \frac{8\mu_B^{(1)} B \Delta}{(\Delta^2 - \omega^2)^2}.
\]

2. **Derivation of Eq. (36)**

To derive the linear susceptibility, we follow the routine discussed in Appendix A, i.e., we consider the Hamiltonian as the sum, \( H = H_0 + H_P \), where

\[
H_0 = \frac{1}{2} \Delta(k \alpha) \tau_3 \otimes \sigma_0 + 2t \tau_2 \otimes \sum_{i=1}^{3} \sigma_i S(k_i \alpha) + (\mu_B^{(1)} \tau_0 + \mu_B^{(2)} \tau_3) \otimes \sum_{i=1}^{3} \sigma_i B_i,
\]  

(B3)

and the time-dependent perturbation has the form

\[
H_P = \mu \tau_1 \otimes \sum_{i=1}^{3} \sigma_i E_i - \frac{qa}{c} \sum_{i=1}^{3} A_i \left( \frac{t_3}{2} C(k_i \alpha)' \tau_3 \otimes \sigma_0 + 2t \tau_2 \otimes \sigma_i S(k_i \alpha)' \right).
\]  

(B4)

The linear susceptibility far from resonances reads as

\[
\chi_{ij}(\omega) = \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_{m} \left( \frac{\langle n | \hat{H}_P(\omega) | m \rangle \langle m | \hat{H}_P(-\omega) | n \rangle}{\epsilon_m - \epsilon_n - \omega} + \frac{\langle n | \hat{H}_P(\omega) | m \rangle^* \langle m | \hat{H}_P(\omega) | n \rangle}{\epsilon_m - \epsilon_n + \omega} \right),
\]  

(B5)

where \( \hat{H}_P \) is defined in Eq. (A3). The states \( m \) and \( n \) are eigenstates of \( H_0 \) in Eq. (B3). This form of \( \chi_{ij} \) will lead to two contributions to the Verdet coefficients: the first contribution is due to the change in the energy levels due to \( B \).
(also sometimes called the diamagnetic part), and the second one is due to the change of the eigenvectors [20]. We focus on the dominant first part, which can be written as

$$\chi_{xy}(\omega) = \frac{1}{2\varepsilon_0} \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_m \left( \langle \downarrow \uparrow | \hat{H}_p^0(\omega) | m \rangle \langle m | \hat{H}_p^0(-\omega) | \downarrow \uparrow \rangle + \langle \downarrow \uparrow | \hat{H}_p^0(-\omega) | m \rangle \langle m | \hat{H}_p^0(\omega) | \downarrow \uparrow \rangle \right)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2\varepsilon_0} \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_m \left( \langle \downarrow \uparrow | \hat{H}_p^0(\omega) | m \rangle \langle m | \hat{H}_p^0(-\omega) | \downarrow \uparrow \rangle + \langle \downarrow \uparrow | \hat{H}_p^0(-\omega) | m \rangle \langle m | \hat{H}_p^0(\omega) | \downarrow \uparrow \rangle \right).$$

(B6)

Note that the $t_3$-term in Eq. (B4) does not induce any transitions between states, and therefore does not contribute to the Verdet coefficient. The corresponding expression for $\chi_{xy}$ reads as

$$\chi_{xy} = \frac{i}{2\varepsilon_0} \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^3} \left( \frac{4t^2S'(k_xa)S'(k_ya) \frac{\omega a}{\varepsilon_0}^2 + \mu^2 + 2\mu t(S'(k_xa) + S'(k_ya)) \frac{\omega a}{\varepsilon_0}}{\Delta(k) + 2\mu_{B}^{(1)} B - \omega} \right)$$

$$+ \frac{i}{2\varepsilon_0} \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^3} \left( -\frac{4t^2S(k_xa)S(k_ya) \frac{\omega a}{\varepsilon_0}^2 - \mu^2 + 2\mu t(S'(k_xa) + S'(k_ya)) \frac{\omega a}{\varepsilon_0}}{\Delta(k) + 2\mu_{B}^{(1)} B + \omega} \right)$$

$$+ \frac{i}{2\varepsilon_0} \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^3} \left( -\frac{4t^2S'(k_xa)S'(k_ya) \frac{\omega a}{\varepsilon_0}^2 - \mu^2 - 2\mu t(S'(k_xa) + S'(k_ya)) \frac{\omega a}{\varepsilon_0}}{\Delta(k) - 2\mu_{B}^{(1)} B - \omega} \right)$$

$$+ \frac{i}{2\varepsilon_0} \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^3} \left( 4t^2S(k_xa)S(k_ya) \frac{\omega a}{\varepsilon_0}^2 + \mu^2 \right) + 4t \mu (\Delta(k)^2 + \omega^2) (S'(k_xa) + S'(k_ya)) \frac{\omega a}{\varepsilon_0}$$

$$\left( \Delta(k)^2 - \omega^2 \right)^2.$$  

(B7)

This expression can be re-written as

$$\chi_{xy} = -\frac{2\mu_{B}^{(1)} B}{\varepsilon_0} \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^3} 4\omega \Delta(k) \left( 4t^2S'(k_xa)S'(k_ya) \frac{\omega a}{\varepsilon_0}^2 + \mu^2 \right) + 4t \mu (\Delta(k)^2 + \omega^2) (S'(k_xa) + S'(k_ya)) \frac{\omega a}{\varepsilon_0}$$

$$\left( \Delta(k)^2 - \omega^2 \right)^2.$$  

(B8)

[10] In principle, this parameter can take into account the electric potential, and differences in the masses of electrons and holes.
[14] I. P. Pashuk, N. S. Pydhirailo, and M. G. Matsko, Exciton


