

Nearly-Resonant Crystalline-Phononic Coupling in Quantum Spin Liquid Candidate CsYbSe₂

Yun-Yi Pai,^{1,2, a)} Claire E. Marvinney,^{1,2} Liangbo Liang,³ Jie Xing,¹ Allen Scheie,⁴ Alexander A. Puretzky,³ Gábor B. Halász,^{1,2} Xun Li,¹ Rinkle Juneja,¹ Athena S. Sefat,¹ David Parker,¹ Lucas Lindsay,¹ and Benjamin J. Lawrie^{1,2, b)}

¹⁾Materials Science and Technology Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37831

²⁾Quantum Science Center, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831

³⁾Center for Nanophase Materials Sciences, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37831

⁴⁾Neutron Scattering Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37831

(Dated: 23 November 2021)

CsYbSe₂, a recently identified quantum spin liquid (QSL) candidate, exhibits strong crystal electric field (CEF) excitations. Here, we identify phonon and CEF modes with Raman spectroscopy and observe strong CEF-phonon mixing resulting in a vibronic bound state. Complex, mesoscale interplay between phonon modes and CEF modes is observed in real space, and an unexpected nearly resonant condition is satisfied, yielding up to fifth-order combination modes, with a total of 17 modes identified in the spectra. This study paves the way to coherent control of possible QSL ground states with optically accessible CEF-phonon manifolds and mesoscale engineering of CEF-phonon interactions.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum spin liquids (QSLs) have been a topic of intense research interest in condensed matter physics in recent decades^{1–3}. The still elusive possibility of control over distributed many-body entanglement offers a key path toward fault-tolerant registers for quantum information processing. Quantum spin liquid candidates like α -RuCl₃^{4–12}, κ -(BEDT-TTF)₂Cu₂(CN)₃¹³, and YbMgGaO₄¹⁴ typically exhibit geometric frustration of some sort, but there have not yet been conclusive observations of QSLs, nor are there well accepted measurement protocols for QSL order parameters.

Yb delafossites¹⁵ like NaYbS₂^{16,17}, NaYbSe₂^{18–20}, NaYbO₂^{21–23}, CsYbSe₂^{24–27}, and KYbSe₂^{28,29} - with effective spin $S_{\text{eff}} = 1/2$ from Yb³⁺ ions and antiferromagnetic coupling decorating 2D triangular lattices - are popular candidates for the realization of quantum spin liquids. Easy-plane magnetic anisotropy results in a plateau at one-third of the saturation magnetization due to strong spin fluctuations^{19,21,23,24}. There have been no reports of long-range magnetic ordering at temperatures as low as $T = 0.4$ K as a result of the geometric frustra-

tion in these materials. This family is thought to be less defect prone than QSL candidate YbMgGaO₄^{24,26,27,30}.

Crystal electric field (CEF) modes emerge as a result of the lifting of the orbital degeneracy of transition metal ions in certain environments^{31,32}. CEFs can therefore be used as probes of internal fields. Lower energy CEFs are particularly important as they are part of the ground state wavefunction that defines properties such as magnetism, conductivity and superconductivity³³. For instance, the CEF splitting and spin-orbit coupling of Yb³⁺ 4f¹⁴ orbitals causes the intrinsic magnetic anisotropy in Yb delafossites. CEF modes are also responsible for a Schottky anomaly that has been observed in some members of this family. The rare earth Yb³⁺ doublets are time-reversal degenerate³⁴. The 4f electrons - well shielded compared to 3d electrons - exhibit smaller CEF splitting³⁵. CEF excitations can also interact with other excitations in the system^{36–38}. While CEFs have been extensively studied since the 60s, understanding of their interactions with other excitations beyond pristine single ion environments remains rather limited. CEF coupling to electron-hole pairs has been proposed as the mechanism that mediates superconductivity in UPd₂Al₃^{39–42} and PrOs₄Sb₁₂⁴³. It was reported for Pr(Os_{1-x}Ru_x)₄Sb₁₂ that, when CEF and phonon modes cross each other, the superconducting transition temperature has a minimum⁴⁴.

Near-resonant interactions between CEF and phonon modes can give rise to strong CEF-phonon coupling, which has been observed in CeAuAl₃^{37,45}, Ce₂O₃³⁶, CeAl₂^{46–48}, PrNi₅⁴⁹ NdBa₂Cu₃O_{7- δ} ⁵⁰, and Ho₂Ti₂O₇⁵¹, among other materials. Conduction electrons may further complicate the picture and alter the relative intensity of hybrid modes⁵². Understanding the complex manifold spanned by CEFs and phonons, their interactions, and their associated optical selection rules may lead to

^{a)}Electronic mail: yunyip@ornl.gov

^{b)}Electronic mail: lawriebj@ornl.gov; This manuscript has been authored by UT-Battelle, LLC, under contract DE-AC05-00OR22725 with the US Department of Energy (DOE). The US government retains and the publisher, by accepting the article for publication, acknowledges that the US government retains a nonexclusive, paid-up, irrevocable, worldwide license to publish or reproduce the published form of this manuscript, or allow others to do so, for US government purposes. DOE will provide public access to these results of federally sponsored research in accordance with the DOE Public Access Plan (<http://energy.gov/downloads/doe-public-access-plan>).




FIG. 1. (a) Side view and (b) top view of the crystal structure of CsYbSe₂. (c) Vibration patterns of Raman active phonon modes in CsYbSe₂. (d) Primary CEF excitations and phonon excitations.

emergent functionalities that take advantage of spin-lattice coupling. Also, this understanding may be useful for controlling and reading out possible QSL ground states for topological quantum information processing.

Inelastic scattering methods like neutron and Raman scattering are workhorse tools for probing fundamental excitations such as phonons, CEF modes⁵³, magnons, and possible Majorana states^{7,54}. Though Raman spectroscopy typically probes excitations near the Γ point in the Brillouin zone, it is capable of probing higher energy modes that are challenging to access with neutron scattering. Further, Raman microscopy can be used to probe sub-micron-scale spatial variation to reveal interactions between excitations. Here, we employ polarization-, spatially-, and temperature-resolved Raman spectroscopy to probe CEF-phonon interactions in CsYbSe₂. We identify all the primary phonons, and CEFs. We report combination modes, a vibronic bound state, and mode repulsion between CEF and phonon modes. Our work extends explorations of CEF-phonon coupling into the emerging class of candidate QSLs.

II. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Theoretical analysis of phonon and CEF modes

Figures 1 (a) and (b) show the crystal structure of CsYbSe₂. According to group theory and our first-principles phonon calculations, CsYbSe₂ belongs to the space group $P6_3/mmc$ (No. 194) with the point group D_{6h} . The bulk unit cell has a hexagonal lattice with 8 atoms in total, giving rise to 24 normal phonon modes at the Γ point: $\Gamma(D_{6h}) = A_{1g} + 3A_{2u} + 2B_{1u} + 2B_{2g} + E_{1g} + 2E_{2g} + 3E_{1u} + 2E_{2u}$, where Raman active phonon modes correspond to non-degenerate A_{1g} symmetry modes, doubly degenerate E_{2g} symmetry modes, and doubly degenerate E_{1g} symmetry modes. The intensity of a Raman mode is $I \propto |\mathbf{e}_s \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{R}} \cdot \mathbf{e}_i|^2$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}$ is the Raman tensor of a phonon mode, and $\mathbf{e}_s$ and $\mathbf{e}_i$ are the electric polarization vectors of the scattered and incident light, respectively^{55,56}. In the back-scattering geometry with linear laser polarization, $\mathbf{e}_s$ and $\mathbf{e}_i$ are in plane. Based on the Raman tensors shown in the Supplemental Information, it is clear that only A_{1g} and E_{2g} phonon modes can appear in the Raman spectra, whereas E_{1g} modes cannot be observed in our experimental configuration. This is common in hexagonal layered materials⁵⁶. Our DFT calculated frequencies for the two E_{2g} modes (E_{2g}^1 and E_{2g}^2) are 37 cm⁻¹ and 97 cm⁻¹, and A_{1g} at 122 cm⁻¹. These results are consistent with our experimental Raman observations that will be discussed below.

B. Temperature dependence

Temperature dependent Raman spectra acquired in an XX polarization configuration ($\mathbf{e}_s = (1, 0, 0)$, $\mathbf{e}_i = (1, 0, 0)$) from $T = 3.3$ K to $T = 285$ K (1 K step from 3.3 to 30 K, 5K step from 40 K to 285 K) are shown in Figure 2 (a) and (b). The white arrow in (a) and the black arrow in (b) highlight an artifact from the volume Bragg gratings that is unrelated to CsYbSe₂.

A total of 10 Raman modes on the Stokes side are resolved. We assign the three modes at 114 cm⁻¹, 183 cm⁻¹, and 269 cm⁻¹ to CEF1, CEF2, and CEF3 respectively. Since the CEF excitations in CsYbSe₂ are expected to be dominated by Yb³⁺ 4f¹⁴ orbitals with the electronic ground state $J = 7/2$ manifold that is split into 4 doubly degenerate Kramer pairs (Figure 1 (d)), these three modes and the ground state comprise the expected 4 pairs. The next excited state manifold $J = 5/2$ is expected to be about 10,000 cm⁻¹ higher⁵⁷. Additionally, CEFs typically exhibit strongly temperature-dependent intensity and linewidth³³. CEF1-CEF3 soften in energy at low temperatures and becomes significantly more prominent. In particular, CEF1 is more than 15.3 times stronger in intensity at $T = 3.3$ K than at $T = 285$ K. The energy levels for the three CEF1-CEF3 modes are consistent with previous spectroscopies of CEF modes in




FIG. 2. (a) Temperature dependent Raman spectra from $T = 3.3$ K to $T = 273$ K. The legends correspond to the assignment of the peaks. (b) The line traces of the temperature dependence data from (a). The white arrow in (a) and the black arrow in (b) indicate an artifact from volume Bragg gratings that leaked through the spectrometer.

NaYbSe_2 ¹⁸ and KYbSe_2 ²⁹. The CEF1 and CEF2 modes are also consistent with a recent report on CEF levels probed by resonant torsion magnetometry and low field susceptibility measurements that are particularly sensitive to CEF1 and the details of the CEF Hamiltonian²⁵.

Though it is common to fit experimentally observed CEF energy levels to obtain crystal field parameters, three clearly visible CEF peaks provide too little information to constrain a fit to the six nonzero crystal field parameters for the three-fold Yb^{3+} symmetry in CsYbSe_2 . Nevertheless, to get an approximate understanding of the CEF ground state, we modeled the CEF Hamiltonian using a point charge model calculated using PyCrystal-Field software⁵⁸ and the Se environment of CsYbSe_2 . To match energy scales, we fitted the Se effective charges to the three measured low-temperature CEF levels. This yielded an effective Se charge of $-1.54e$ for CsYbSe_2 . The observed and calculated CEF level energies are in Table I. The ground states of these models, assuming a quantization axis in the c direction, are

$$|\psi_{\pm}\rangle = \pm 0.968|\pm 7/2\rangle + 0.218|\pm 1/2\rangle \pm 0.128|\pm 5/2\rangle \quad (1)$$

This point charge fit is a crude approximation, and shows an easy-axis ground state. However, the coefficients for the ground state eigenkets can easily be adjusted to give an easy-plane ground state. Previous experience with these materials^{18,25} shows that their ground

states tend to be more isotropic or easy-planar, suggesting that the above point-charge fit is not very accurate.

Based on our DFT phonon calculations discussed above, we assign the E_{2g}^1 mode to the 46 cm^{-1} peak. Further, we assign the peak at 120 cm^{-1} at $T = 293$ K to E_{2g}^2 (see Supplemental Information for linecuts at $T = 293$ K). At first glance, it may seem that this high-temperature mode transitions continuously to the peak at 114 cm^{-1} at $T = 3.3$ K, which we assigned to CEF1 because of its strong softening and intensity increase at low temperatures. However, more careful analysis of the Raman spectra (discussed in greater detail below) shows that, at $T = 293$ K, CEF1 is a weak mode nearly resonant with E_{2g}^2 . As the temperature decreases, the amplitude of E_{2g}^2 drops compared to CEF1. The A_{1g} mode is assigned to a small peak at 169.0 cm^{-1} , since this peak shows up in the XX polarization configuration and disappears in the XY polarization configuration, a signature of A_{1g} symmetry according to the group theory analysis discussed below. While this mode is resolved at $T = 293$ K, due to its low intensity and its proximity to CEF2, we were not able to resolve it at low temperatures. We assign the mode 255.9 cm^{-1} to $2E_{2g}^2$, and 300 cm^{-1} to CEF1 + CEF2. The 368.0 cm^{-1} and 479.1 cm^{-1} peaks could be attributed to several higher-order modes including 368.0 cm^{-1} : 2CEF2 , $\text{CEF1} + 2E_{2g}^2$, $\text{CEF3} + 2E_{2g}^1$ and 479.1 cm^{-1} : $2E_{2g}^1 + 3E_{2g}^2$, $\text{CEF1} + 2\text{CEF2}$. We observed and identified 8 more modes in higher energy Raman spectra (Supplemental Information) that we will revisit in Section IID.

To further verify the mode assignment and symmetry, we performed polarization-resolved Raman spectroscopy measurements in both parallel (XX) and cross (XY) polarization configurations. According to group theory analysis (more details in Supplemental Information), the polarization profile of an E_{2g} Raman mode is circular under any linear polarization configuration. For an A_{1g} Raman mode, the polarization profile is circular in the XX configuration while its intensity is zero in the XY configuration ($\mathbf{e}_s = (1, 0, 0)$, $\mathbf{e}_i = (0, 1, 0)$). Similar polarization responses of Raman modes have been previously reported for NaYbSe_2 ¹⁸. Under the XX configuration, at room temperature, E_{2g}^1 , E_{2g}^2 , and A_{1g} all have 0-fold symmetry (i.e., circular polarization profiles), and at low temperatures, the E_{2g}^2 , CEF1, CEF2 and CEF3 modes likewise exhibit 0-fold symmetry (Supplemental Information), consistent with the group theory analysis for these modes. All of the modes above except A_{1g} exhibit nearly the same intensity across the XX and XY configurations while A_{1g} is suppressed in the XY configuration, in agreement with the analysis based on their Raman tensors (Supplemental Information). We note that the polarization profiles of CEF Raman modes are very similar to the polarization profiles of E_{2g} phonon modes, suggesting that CEF modes share similar forms of Raman tensors to E_{2g} phonon modes.

To track the temperature evolution of the observed




FIG. 3. Peak positions as a function of temperature for the most prominent 9 peaks (a) E_{2g}^1 , (b) CEF1 and E_{2g}^2 , (c) CEF2, (d) CEF3, (e) $2E_{2g}^2$, (f) CEF1 + CEF2, (g) 368.0 cm^{-1} and (h) $2E_{2g}^1 + 3E_{2g}^2$. The peak positions are extracted from Bayesian inference on the data in Figure 2. The shaded intervals are the 68% HDI and 95% HDI.

CEF and phonon modes, we employed Bayesian inference techniques with a Hamiltonian Monte Carlo technique PyMC3⁵⁹, a No U-Turns (NUTS) sampler, and 4 chains with 3,000 samples for spectral modeling. Figure 3 illustrates the inferred peak positions of the most prominent peaks: E_{2g}^1 , E_{2g}^2 , CEF1, CEF2, CEF3, $2E_{2g}^2$, CEF1 + CEF2, 368.0 cm^{-1} and 479.1 cm^{-1} . The traces are the median values from the Bayesian inference. The two shaded bands are 68 % (darker) and 95 % (lighter) highest density intervals (HDIs). The red trace is a fit of the resulting trace assuming a phonon anharmonicity relationship. The E_{2g}^1 mode harden as temperature decreases. The modes that have CEF character all soften. The CEF modes are more prominent for $T < 120 - 140 \text{ K}$ and far weaker at higher temperatures. This can be seen in the large uncertainty of the Bayesian inference result for these CEF modes at higher temperatures. The mode CEF1 + CEF2 at 300 cm^{-1} (Figure 3 (d)) disappears at $T < 80 \text{ K}$, suggesting that its initial state is a CEF excited state. Figure 3 (b) shows the interacting E_{2g}^2 and CEF1 modes. CEF1 has small amplitude at a lower energy than E_{2g}^2 at higher temperatures and become 15.3 times stronger at $T = 3.3 \text{ K}$ while E_{2g}^2 becomes small relative to CEF1.

C. Real space mode repulsion observed with hyperspectral Raman

Mesoscale interplay between CEF and phonon modes is also observed in real-space hyperspectral Raman microscopy of the same flake at $T = 3.3 \text{ K}$, as shown in Figure 4. The Raman map consists of 45×45 spectra across a $96 \times 88 \mu\text{m}$ area. Selected spectra with distinct representative features are shown in Figure 4 (a).

The spectrum at $(x, y) = (10 \mu\text{m}, 76 \mu\text{m})$ has prominent CEF1, CEF2, and CEF3 modes, consistent with the

majority of the 2,025 sampled pixels. While the average of all the spectra (illustrated by the shaded background) still exhibits most of the spectral content that is present at each pixel, material heterogeneity induces substantial linewidth broadening in the shaded spectrum. For example, at $(x, y) = (6 \mu\text{m}, 72 \mu\text{m})$, the intensity of the CEF1, CEF2 and CEF3 modes are only about 50 % of their peak intensity, and smaller peaks at 127.1 cm^{-1} and 145.1 cm^{-1} are observed. Additionally, the peaks at 233.9 cm^{-1} and 255.9 cm^{-1} are more prominent. There are also smaller peaks at 383.7 cm^{-1} and 510.7 cm^{-1} . We assign 127.1 cm^{-1} to E_{2g}^2 , which is only a small baseline next to CEF1 at most pixels and 145.1 cm^{-1} to a CEF-phonon coupling mode ω_2 . We further assign 255.9 cm^{-1} , 383.7 cm^{-1} and 510.7 cm^{-1} to $2E_{2g}^2$, $3E_{2g}^2$ and $4E_{2g}^2$, respectively.

To carefully track the spatial dependence of each mode we utilized baseline removal with asymmetric least squares (ALS) and non-negative matrix factorization (NMF). Below we discuss the ALS results. NMF results are described in the Supplementary Information.

Figures 4 (b) - (i) illustrate the Raman intensity maps (red: high; blue: low) for modes (b) CEF1, (c) E_{2g}^2 , (d) ω_2 , (e) CEF2 + E_{2g}^1 , (f) $2E_{2g}^2$, (g) CEF2, (h) CEF3 and (i) $2E_{2g}^1 + 3E_{2g}^2$. The selected pixels from panel (a) are marked. Spatial anticorrelations between the CEF modes and E_{2g}^2 phonons are observed: where CEFs are strong, the E_{2g}^2 and $2E_{2g}^2$ modes are weak. While there have been many spectroscopic reports of CEF-phonon coupling in other materials, interplay of CEF excitations and phonons in real space has not been previously reported. One possible origin of the inhomogeneity may come from Yb atoms occupying Cs sites (as reported for NaYbSe_2 ²⁰). A rigorous description of the origin of mesoscale phonon-CEF interactions is beyond the scope of this paper, but the ability to control phonon-CEF




FIG. 4. Hyperspectral Raman map of a $96.1 \mu\text{m}$ by $88.4 \mu\text{m}$ area of the crystal shows subtle mesoscale spatial dependence of the CEF modes and phonon modes. The data was taken with no polarization control. (a) Representative spectra at 5 positions on the sample. (b)-(i) integrated relative intensity of the prominent peaks as a function of position. (b) CEF1, (c) E^2_{2g} , (d) ω_2 , (e) $\text{CEF2} + E^1_{2g}$, (f) $2E^2_{2g}$, (g) CEF2, (h) CEF3, (i) $2E^1_{2g} + 3E^2_{2g}$.

interactions, through defect engineering, for example, could enable substantial advances in the development of quantum technologies based on Yb delafossite QSLs.

D. CEF-phonon bound state and combination modes

Bound state. When CEF and phonon modes are nearly resonant, vibronic bound states can form. This form of *magnetoelastic* coupling has been detected by Raman spectroscopy since the 80s in CeAl_2 ⁴⁸. There, closely spaced CEF and phonon modes form two new modes with energies described by the Thalmeier-Fulde description⁴⁸:

$$\omega_{1,2} = \frac{\omega_{\text{CEF}} + \omega_{\text{ph}}}{2} \pm \sqrt{\left(\frac{\omega_{\text{CEF}} - \omega_{\text{ph}}}{2}\right)^2 + V^2} \quad (2)$$

where ω_{CEF} and ω_{ph} are the energies of the closely spaced CEF and phonon modes, respectively, and V is the effective

coupling strength. With the 145.1 cm^{-1} peak assigned to the ω_2 mode of CEF1 and E^2_{2g} , we obtain an effective coupling strength of 23.6 cm^{-1} at $T = 3.3 \text{ K}$, which is smaller than Ce_2O_3 ³⁶ and larger than CeAl_2 ⁴⁸. This model suggests that a conjugate bound state ω_1 exists at 96.2 cm^{-1} , but ω_1 was not observed, potentially due to the 90 cm^{-1} cutoff of the longpass filter that was used for the hyperspectral Raman measurements. It is worth pointing out that ω_2 is observed only in a small subset of the sampled real space positions, such as $(x, y) = (6 \mu\text{m}, 72 \mu\text{m})$, the purple trace in Figure 4 (a) and purple square in the rest of the subplots of Figure 4. The eigenvibration of the E^2_{2g} mode is described by the out-of-phase vibration of the two Se atoms next to the Yb^{3+} ion, which is responsible for the CEF modes. One might ask how the CEF-phonon coupling of these two modes alters the ground state wavefunction and how the lower energy excitations accommodate this change. While the nascent literature argues that CsYbSe_2 is less

wavenumber (cm ⁻¹)	assignment
48.0	E _{2g} ¹
96.2	ω_1 from CEF1 and E _{2g} ² (V = 23.5839)
114.2	CEF1
127.1	E _{2g} ²
145.1	ω_2 from CEF1 and E _{2g} ² (V = 23.5839)
169.0	A _{1g} (293 K)
184.6	CEF2
233.9	CEF2 + E _{2g} ¹
255.9	2E _{2g} ²
271.4	CEF3
300.0	CEF1 + CEF2
368.0	2CEF2, CEF1 + 2E _{2g} ² , CEF3 + 2E _{2g} ¹
383.7	3E _{2g} ² , CEF1 + CEF3
479.1	2E _{2g} ¹ + 3E _{2g} ² , CEF1 + 2CEF2
510.7	4E _{2g} ²
615.4	CEF2 + E _{2g} ¹ + 3E _{2g} ² , 3CEF1 + CEF3
639.6	2CEF2 + CEF3, 5E _{2g} ²

TABLE I. Summary of assignments of the observed modes

defect prone than other QSL candidates^{24,26,27}, defects are still responsible for many of the observed properties. For example, the sister material NaYbSe₂ was reported to have 4.8% of Na sites occupied by Yb ions²⁰. A similar effect is likely present in CsYbSe₂ as Na and Cs both have the same valence as Yb. However, the presence of Yb atoms at Cs sites yielding a stronger phonon response and weaker CEF is counterintuitive as Yb is the cause of the CEF, so one would expect the CEF to be stronger at the defect sites. Furthermore, the E_{2g} modes are mainly due to the vibrations of Cs atoms. Heavier Yb (173.04 u) atoms at Cs (132.91 u) sites should yield a weaker Raman response.

Combination modes. Together, a total of 17 modes are observed in Figures 2, 4 and S1. Their energies and assignments are summarized in Table I. Up to fifth order combination modes such as CEF2 + E_{2g}¹ + 3E_{2g}² and 2CEF2 + CEF3, 5E_{2g}² are identified. Phonon dressed electronic excitations are extremely common in photoluminescence⁶⁰ and ARPES⁶¹, and combination modes and overtones are also quite common in resonant Raman spectroscopy, including CEF modes coupled to LO phonons⁶² and CEF subtraction modes⁶³. However, overtones and combination modes are far less common in non-resonant Raman spectroscopy. Resonant absorption with 532 nm (2.33 eV) excitation is not expected in this system, as there is no known absorption line for CsYbSe₂ near 2.33 eV.

III. CONCLUSION

We identified all the primary CEF and phonon modes for QSL candidate CsYbSe₂ and verified their symme-

tries. Interestingly, with sub-micron spot size, we observed mesoscale spatial mode repulsion between CEF and E_{2g}² (and 2E_{2g}²) phonon modes. Furthermore, we identified a CEF-phonon bound state ω_2 from CEF1 and E_{2g}² and extracted an effective coupling strength $V = 23.58 \text{ cm}^{-1}$. These results for the magnetoelastic coupling in CsYbSe₂ can be used to estimate the coupling between phonons and potential spinons which may enable the confirmation of the underlying QSL ground state^{64,65}. Understanding the mechanism behind the mesoscale CEF-phonon coupling with knowledge of the complex CEF and phonon manifolds may provide a pathway to optically addressable mesoscale quantum spin devices that take advantage of the QSL ground state.

IV. METHODS

A. Sample Details and Experimental Setup

High quality single crystal CsYbSe₂ (Figure 1) was grown using a previously described flux method²⁷. Polarization-resolved Raman spectra from $T = 3.3 \text{ K}$ - 300 K were taken in a Montana Instruments closed-cycle cryostat with out-of-plane excitation and a back scattering geometry (beam path $\parallel \mathbf{c}$). The spectra were measured with a Princeton Instruments Isoplane SCT-320 spectrograph with a Pixis 400BR Excelon camera and a 2400 line/mm grating. A 532.03 nm continuous wave laser excitation and a set of 3 Optigrate volume Bragg gratings were used to access low energy Stokes and anti-Stokes Raman modes. Achromatic half-wave plates were mounted on piezoelectric rotators for polarization control. The power at the sample was about 1.5 mW and the typical acquisition time was about 30 sec per spectrum. The hyperspectral Raman microscopy was performed with an AttoCube 3-axis positioner and Semrock filters in lieu of the Bragg gratings (for improved collection efficiency).

B. Calculation Details

To obtain frequencies and vibration patterns of Raman-active phonon modes in CsYbSe₂, first-principles plane-wave density functional theory (DFT) calculations were performed using VASP software with projector augmented wave (PAW) pseudopotentials for electron-ion interactions⁶⁶ and the Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof (PBE) functional for exchange-correlation interactions⁶⁷. The DFT+U method was used to consider the localized f electrons of Yb atoms, with the effective U parameter chosen as 6.0 eV⁶⁸. Other U values including 4.0, 5.0, and 7.0 eV were tested as well, which yielded the same phonon frequencies. Both atomic coordinates and lattice constants were optimized until the residual forces were below 0.001 eV/Å, with a cutoff energy of 400 eV and a

Γ -centered k-point sampling of $18 \times 18 \times 5$. The total energy was converged to 10^{-8} eV. Based on the optimized unit cell, we then performed phonon calculations using a finite-difference scheme implemented in Phonopy⁶⁹. The same cutoff energy and convergence criteria of energy were used. Hellmann-Feynman forces in the $3 \times 3 \times 1$ supercell with a Γ -centered k-point sampling of $6 \times 6 \times 5$ were computed by VASP for both positive and negative atomic displacements ($\delta = 0.03$ Å) and then used in Phonopy to construct the dynamical matrix. The diagonalization of the dynamical matrix provides phonon frequencies and eigenvectors (calculation results in Supplemental Information).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was sponsored by the U. S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Basic Energy Sciences, Materials Sciences and Engineering Division. The first-principles phonon calculations and Raman microscopy were performed at the Center for Nanophase Materials Sciences, which is a U.S. Department of Energy Office of Science User Facility. L.L. acknowledges computational resources of the Compute and Data Environment for Science (CADES) at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, which is supported by the Office of Science of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC05-00OR22725. Postdoctoral research support was provided by the Intelligence Community Postdoctoral Research Fellowship Program at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, administered by Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education through an interagency agreement between the U.S. Department of Energy and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

V. AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

All authors discussed the results thoroughly. Y.-Y. P., C. E. M., and B. J. L. performed most of the measurements. L. L. performed Raman tensor analysis. J. X. grew the samples. A. S. performed crystal field analysis. Y.-Y. P., L. L. did majority of the data analysis with inputs from A. A. P., X. L., R. J., L. L. performed DFT phonon calculations. A. S. S., D. P., L. L. and B. J. L. initiated and oversaw the project. Y.-Y. P., L.L., B. J. L. wrote most of the manuscript with contributions from all authors.

¹P. Anderson, “Resonating valence bonds: A new kind of insulator?” *Materials Research Bulletin* **8**, 153–160 (1973).

²J. Knolle and R. Moessner, “A field guide to spin liquids,” *Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics* **10**, 451–472 (2019).

³L. Savary and L. Balents, “Quantum spin liquids: a review,” *Reports on Progress in Physics* **80**, 016502 (2016).

⁴Y. Kasahara, T. Ohnishi, Y. Mizukami, O. Tanaka, S. Ma, K. Sugii, N. Kurita, H. Tanaka, J. Nasu, and Y. Motome, “Majorana quantization and half-integer thermal quantum hall effect in a Kitaev spin liquid,” *Nature* **559**, 227–231 (2018).

⁵L. J. Sandilands, Y. Tian, K. W. Plumb, Y.-J. Kim, and K. S. Burch, “Scattering continuum and possible fractionalized excitations in α -RuCl₃,” *Physical Review Letters* **114**, 147201 (2015).

⁶Y. Wang, G. B. Osterhoudt, Y. Tian, P. Lampen-Kelley, A. Banerjee, T. Goldstein, J. Yan, J. Knolle, H. Ji, R. J. Cava, J. Nasu, Y. Motome, S. E. Nagler, D. Mandrus, and K. S. Burch, “The range of non-Kitaev terms and fractional particles in α -RuCl₃,” *npj Quantum Materials* **5**, 14 (2020).

⁷D. Wulferding, Y. Choi, S.-H. Do, C. H. Lee, P. Lemmens, C. Faugeras, Y. Gallais, and K.-Y. Choi, “Magnon bound states versus anyonic Majorana excitations in the Kitaev honeycomb magnet α -RuCl₃,” *Nature Communications* **11**, 1603 (2020).

⁸A. Banerjee, C. A. Bridges, J. Q. Yan, A. A. Aczel, L. Li, M. B. Stone, G. E. Granroth, M. D. Lumsden, Y. Yiu, J. Knolle, S. Bhattacharjee, D. L. Kovrizhin, R. Moessner, D. A. Tennant, D. G. Mandrus, and S. E. Nagler, “Proximate Kitaev quantum spin liquid behaviour in a honeycomb magnet,” *Nature Materials* **15**, 733–740 (2016).

⁹A. Banerjee, J. Yan, J. Knolle, C. A. Bridges, M. B. Stone, M. D. Lumsden, D. G. Mandrus, D. A. Tennant, R. Moessner, and S. E. Nagler, “Neutron scattering in the proximate quantum spin liquid α -RuCl₃,” *Science* **356**, 1055–1059 (2017).

¹⁰S. H. Baek, S. H. Do, K. Y. Choi, Y. S. Kwon, A. U. B. Wolter, S. Nishimoto, J. van den Brink, and B. Buchner, “Evidence for a field induced quantum spin liquid in α -RuCl₃,” *Physical Review Letters* **119**, 037201 (2017).

¹¹N. Janša, A. Zorko, M. Gomilšek, M. Pregelj, K. W. Krämer, D. Biner, A. Biffin, C. Rüegg, and M. Klanjšek, “Observation of two types of fractional excitation in the Kitaev honeycomb magnet,” *Nature Physics* **14**, 786–790 (2018).

¹²Y.-Y. Pai, C. E. Marvinney, M. A. Feldman, B. Lerner, Y. S. Phang, K. Xiao, J. Yan, L. Liang, M. Brahlek, and B. J. Lawrie, “Magnetostriction of α -RuCl₃ flakes in the zigzag phase,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.01544* (2021).

¹³B. Miksch, A. Pustogow, M. J. Rahim, A. A. Bardin, K. Kanoda, J. A. Schlueter, R. Hübner, M. Scheffler, and M. Dressel, “Gapped magnetic ground state in quantum spin liquid candidate κ -(BEDT-TTF)₂Cu₂(CN)₃,” *Science* **372**, 276–279 (2021).

¹⁴Y. Shen, Y.-D. Li, H. Wo, Y. Li, S. Shen, B. Pan, Q. Wang, H. C. Walker, P. Steffens, M. Boehm, Y. Hao, D. L. Quintero-Castro, L. W. Harriger, M. D. Frontzek, L. Hao, S. Meng, Q. Zhang, G. Chen, and J. Zhao, “Evidence for a spinon fermi surface in a triangular-lattice quantum-spin-liquid candidate,” *Nature* **540**, 559–562 (2016).

¹⁵B. Schmidt, J. Sichelschmidt, K. M. Ranjith, T. Doert, and M. Baenitz, “Yb delafossites: Unique exchange frustration of $4f$ spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ moments on a perfect triangular lattice,” *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, 214445 (2021).

¹⁶M. Baenitz, P. Schlender, J. Sichelschmidt, Y. A. Onyikienko, Z. Zangeneh, K. M. Ranjith, R. Sarkar, L. Hozoi, H. C. Walker, J.-C. Orain, H. Yasuoka, J. van den Brink, H. H. Klauss, D. S. Inosov, and T. Doert, “*NaYbS₂*: A planar spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ triangular-lattice magnet and putative spin liquid,” *Phys. Rev. B* **98**, 220409 (2018).

¹⁷R. Sarkar, P. Schlender, V. Grinenko, E. Haeussler, P. J. Baker, T. Doert, and H.-H. Klauss, “Quantum spin liquid ground state in the disorder free triangular lattice *NaYbS₂*,” *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 241116 (2019).

¹⁸Z. Zhang, X. Ma, J. Li, G. Wang, D. T. Adroja, T. P. Perring, W. Liu, F. Jin, J. Ji, Y. Wang, Y. Kamiya, X. Wang, J. Ma, and Q. Zhang, “Crystalline electric field excitations in the quantum spin liquid candidate *NaYbSe₂*,” *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, 035144 (2021).

¹⁹K. M. Ranjith, S. Luther, T. Reimann, B. Schmidt, P. Schlender, J. Sichelschmidt, H. Yasuoka, A. M. Strydom, Y. Skourski, J. Wosnitza, H. Kühne, T. Doert, and M. Baenitz, “Anisotropic field-induced ordering in the triangular-lattice quantum spin liquid *NaYbSe₂*,” *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 224417 (2019).

- ²⁰P.-L. Dai, G. Zhang, Y. Xie, C. Duan, Y. Gao, Z. Zhu, E. Feng, Z. Tao, C.-L. Huang, H. Cao, A. Podlesnyak, G. E. Granroth, M. S. Everett, J. C. Neufeind, D. Voneshen, S. Wang, G. Tan, E. Morosan, X. Wang, H.-Q. Lin, L. Shu, G. Chen, Y. Guo, X. Lu, and P. Dai, “Spinon fermi surface spin liquid in a triangular lattice antiferromagnet NaYbSe_2 ,” *Phys. Rev. X* **11**, 021044 (2021).
- ²¹L. Ding, P. Manuel, S. Bachus, F. Grußler, P. Gegenwart, J. Singleton, R. D. Johnson, H. C. Walker, D. T. Adroja, A. D. Hillier, and A. A. Tsirlin, “Gapless spin-liquid state in the structurally disorder-free triangular antiferromagnet NaYbO_2 ,” *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 144432 (2019).
- ²²K. M. Ranjith, D. Dmytriieva, S. Khim, J. Sichelschmidt, S. Luther, D. Ehlers, H. Yasuoka, J. Wosnitza, A. A. Tsirlin, H. Kühne, and M. Baenitz, “Field-induced instability of the quantum spin liquid ground state in the $J_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{2}$ triangular-lattice compound NaYbO_2 ,” *Phys. Rev. B* **99**, 180401 (2019).
- ²³K. M. Ranjith, D. Dmytriieva, S. Khim, J. Sichelschmidt, S. Luther, D. Ehlers, H. Yasuoka, J. Wosnitza, A. A. Tsirlin, H. Kühne, and M. Baenitz, “Field-induced instability of the quantum spin liquid ground state in the $J_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{2}$ triangular-lattice compound NaYbO_2 ,” *Phys. Rev. B* **99**, 180401 (2019).
- ²⁴J. Xing, L. D. Sanjeeva, J. Kim, G. R. Stewart, A. Podlesnyak, and A. S. Sefat, “Field-induced magnetic transition and spin fluctuations in the quantum spin-liquid candidate CsYbSe_2 ,” *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 220407 (2019).
- ²⁵C. A. Pocs, P. E. Siegfried, J. Xing, A. S. Sefat, M. Hermele, B. Normand, and M. Lee, “Systematic fitting of crystal-field levels and accurate extraction of quantum magnetic models in triangular-lattice delafossites,” (2021), arXiv:2109.09758 [cond-mat.str-el].
- ²⁶T. Xie, J. Xing, S. E. Nikitin, S. Nishimoto, M. Brando, P. Khanenko, J. Sichelschmidt, L. D. Sanjeeva, A. S. Sefat, and A. Podlesnyak, “Field-induced spin excitations in the spin-1/2 triangular-lattice antiferromagnet CsYbSe_2 ,” (2021), arXiv:2106.12451 [cond-mat.str-el].
- ²⁷J. Xing, L. D. Sanjeeva, J. Kim, G. R. Stewart, M.-H. Du, F. A. Reboredo, R. Custelcean, and A. S. Sefat, “Crystal synthesis and frustrated magnetism in triangular lattice CsRESe_2 (re = la–lu): Quantum spin liquid candidates CsCeSe_2 and CsYbSe_2 ,” *ACS Materials Letters* **2**, 71–75 (2020).
- ²⁸J. Xing, L. D. Sanjeeva, A. F. May, and A. S. Sefat, “Synthesis and anisotropic magnetism in quantum spin liquid candidates AYbSe_2 ($A = \text{K}$ and Rb),” (2021), arXiv:2109.00384 [cond-mat.str-el].
- ²⁹A. O. Scheie, E. A. Ghioldi, J. Xing, J. A. M. Paddison, N. E. Sherman, M. Dupont, D. Abernathy, D. M. Pajerowski, S.-S. Zhang, L. O. Manuel, A. E. Trumper, C. D. Pemmaraju, A. S. Sefat, D. S. Parker, T. P. Devereaux, J. E. Moore, C. D. Batista, and D. A. Tennant, “Witnessing quantum criticality and entanglement in the triangular antiferromagnet kybse_2 ,” (2021), arXiv:2109.11527 [cond-mat.str-el].
- ³⁰W. Liu, Z. Zhang, J. Ji, Y. Liu, J. Li, X. Wang, H. Lei, G. Chen, and Q. Zhang, “Rare-earth chalcogenides: A large family of triangular lattice spin liquid candidates,” **35**, 117501 (2018).
- ³¹H. Bethe, “Termaufspaltung in kristallen,” *Annalen der Physik* **395**, 133–208 (1929), <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/andp.19293950202>.
- ³²J. H. Van Vleck, “Theory of the variations in paramagnetic anisotropy among different salts of the iron group,” *Phys. Rev.* **41**, 208–215 (1932).
- ³³G. Schaack, “Raman scattering by crystal-field excitations,” (Springer, 2000) pp. 24–173.
- ³⁴H. A. Kramers, “Théorie générale de la rotation paramagnétique dans les cristaux,” *Proc. Acad. Amst* **33** (1930).
- ³⁵D. Parker, E. A. Suturina, I. Kuprov, and N. F. Chilton, “How the ligand field in lanthanide coordination complexes determines magnetic susceptibility anisotropy, paramagnetic nmr shift, and relaxation behavior,” *Accounts of Chemical Research* **53**, 1520–1534 (2020), pMID: 32667187, <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.accounts.0c00275>.
- ³⁶A. Sethi, J. E. Slimak, T. Kolodiazhyi, and S. L. Cooper, “Emergent vibronic excitations in the magnetodielectric regime of Ce_2O_3 ,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 177601 (2019).
- ³⁷P. Čermák, A. Schneidewind, B. Liu, M. M. Koza, C. Franz, R. Schönmann, O. Sobolev, and C. Pfeiderer, “Magnetoelastic hybrid excitations in CeAuAl_3 ,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **116**, 6695–6700 (2019).
- ³⁸D. Adroja, A. del Moral, C. de la Fuente, A. Fraile, E. Goremychkin, J. Taylor, A. Hillier, and F. Fernandez-Alonso, “Vibron quasibound state in the noncentrosymmetric tetragonal heavy-fermion compound CeCuAl_3 ,” *Physical review letters* **108**, 216402 (2012).
- ³⁹E. Blackburn, A. Hiess, N. Bernhoeft, and G. H. Lander, “Inelastic neutron scattering from UPd_2Al_3 under high magnetic fields,” *Phys. Rev. B* **74**, 024406 (2006).
- ⁴⁰K. Iwasa, K. Saito, Y. Murakami, and H. Sugawara, “Electronic hybridization effect on $4f$ electron crystal field states of $\text{PrOs}_4\text{P}_{12}$,” *Phys. Rev. B* **79**, 235113 (2009).
- ⁴¹N. K. Sato, N. Aso, K. Miyake, R. Shiina, P. Thalmeier, G. Varelogiannis, C. Geibel, F. Steglich, P. Fulde, and T. Komatsubara, “Strong coupling between local moments and superconducting ‘heavy’ electrons in UPd_2Al_3 ,” *Nature* **410**, 340–343 (2001).
- ⁴²P. Thalmeier, “Dual model for magnetic excitations and superconductivity in UPd_2Al_3 ,” *The European Physical Journal B - Condensed Matter and Complex Systems* **27**, 29–48 (2002).
- ⁴³E. D. Bauer, N. A. Frederick, P.-C. Ho, V. S. Zapf, and M. B. Maple, “Superconductivity and heavy fermion behavior in $\text{PrOs}_4\text{Sb}_{12}$,” *Phys. Rev. B* **65**, 100506 (2002).
- ⁴⁴R. Miyazaki, Y. Aoki, D. Kikuchi, H. Sugawara, and H. Sato, “Crossing of the crystalline-electric-field and rattling-phonon excitation energies in the filled skutterudite superconductor $\text{Pr}(\text{Os}_{1-x}\text{Ru}_x)_4\text{Sb}_{12}$,” *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, **200**, 012125 (2010).
- ⁴⁵B.-Q. Liu, P. Čermák, C. Franz, C. Pfeiderer, and A. Schneidewind, “Lattice dynamics and coupled quadrupole-phonon excitations in CeAuAl_3 ,” *Phys. Rev. B* **98**, 174306 (2018).
- ⁴⁶M. Loewenhaupt, B. D. Rainford, and F. Steglich, “Dynamic jahn-teller effect in a rare-earth compound: CeAl_2 ,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **42**, 1709–1712 (1979).
- ⁴⁷G. Güntherodt, A. Jayaraman, G. Batlogg, M. Croft, and E. Melcher, “Raman scattering from coupled phonon and electronic crystal-field excitations in CeAl_2 ,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **51**, 2330–2332 (1983).
- ⁴⁸P. Thalmeier and P. Fulde, “Bound state between a crystal-field excitation and a phonon in CeAl_2 ,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49**, 1588–1591 (1982).
- ⁴⁹V. Aksenov, E. Goremychkin, E. Mühle, T. Frauenheim, and W. Bührer, “Coupled quadrupole-phonon excitations: Inelastic neutron scattering on van vleck paramagnet PrNi_5 ,” *Physica B+C* **120**, 310–313 (1983).
- ⁵⁰E. T. Heyen, R. Wegerer, and M. Cardona, “Coupling of phonons to crystal-field excitations in $\text{NdBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{7-\delta}$,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 144–147 (1991).
- ⁵¹J. Gaudet, A. M. Hallas, C. R. C. Buhariwalla, G. Sala, M. B. Stone, M. Tachibana, K. Baroudi, R. J. Cava, and B. D. Gaulin, “Magnetoelastically induced vibronic bound state in the spin-ice pyrochlore $\text{Ho}_2\text{Ti}_2\text{O}_7$,” *Phys. Rev. B* **98**, 014419 (2018).
- ⁵²G. Güntherodt, A. Jayaraman, E. Anastassakis, E. Bucher, and H. Bach, “Effect of configuration crossover on the electronic Raman scattering by $4f$ multiplets,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **46**, 855–858 (1981).
- ⁵³M. V. Klein, “Electronic raman scattering,” in *Light Scattering in Solids I: Introductory Concepts*, edited by M. Cardona (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1983) pp. 147–204.
- ⁵⁴A. Sahasrabudhe, D. A. S. Kaib, S. Reschke, R. German, T. C. Koethe, J. Buhot, D. Kamenskyi, C. Hickey, P. Becker, V. Tsurkan, A. Loidl, S. H. Do, K. Y. Choi, M. Grüninger, S. M. Winter, Z. Wang, R. Valentí, and P. H. M. van Loosdrecht, “High-field quantum disordered state in $\alpha - \text{RuCl}_3$: Spin flips,

- bound states, and multiparticle continuum,” *Phys. Rev. B* **101**, 140410 (2020).
- ⁵⁵Y. Zhao, X. Luo, H. Li, J. Zhang, P. T. Araujo, C. K. Gan, J. Wu, H. Zhang, S. Y. Quek, M. S. Dresselhaus, and Q. Xiong, “Interlayer breathing and shear modes in few-trilayer MoS_2 and WSe_2 ,” *Nano Letters* **13**, 1007–1015 (2013).
- ⁵⁶X. Kong, T. Berlijn, and L. Liang, “Thickness and spin dependence of raman modes in magnetic layered Fe_3GeTe_2 ,” *Advanced Electronic Materials* **7**, 2001159 (2021).
- ⁵⁷J. A. Koningstein, “Electronic raman spectra. i. raman transitions of trivalent ytterbium, europium, and neodymium in yttrium gallium garnet,” *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **46**, 2811–2816 (1967), <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1841119>.
- ⁵⁸A. Scheie, “*PyCrystalField*: software for calculation, analysis and fitting of crystal electric field Hamiltonians,” *Journal of Applied Crystallography* **54**, 356–362 (2021).
- ⁵⁹J. Salvatier, T. V. Wiecki, and C. Fonnesbeck, “Probabilistic programming in python using pymc3,” *PeerJ Computer Science* **2**, e55 (2016).
- ⁶⁰W. Jin, H. H. Kim, Z. Ye, G. Ye, L. Rojas, X. Luo, B. Yang, F. Yin, J. S. A. Horng, S. Tian, Y. Fu, G. Xu, H. Deng, H. Lei, A. W. Tsen, K. Sun, R. He, and L. Zhao, “Observation of the polaronic character of excitons in a two-dimensional semiconducting magnet CrI_3 ,” *Nature Communications* **11**, 4780 (2020).
- ⁶¹C. Chen, J. Avila, S. Wang, Y. Wang, M. Mucha-Kruczyński, C. Shen, R. Yang, B. Nosarzewski, T. P. Devereaux, G. Zhang, and M. C. Asensio, “Emergence of interfacial polarons from electron–phonon coupling in graphene/h-bn van der waals heterostructures,” *Nano Letters* **18**, 1082–1087 (2018), pMID: 29302973, <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.nanolett.7b04604>.
- ⁶²T. Livneh, “Coupling of multi-lo phonons to crystal-field excitations in UO_2 studied by raman spectroscopy,” *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **20**, 085202 (2008).
- ⁶³N. Ogita, R. Kojima, T. Hasegawa, M. Udagawa, H. Sugawara, and H. Sato, “Crystal field excitations of filled skutterudite $PrRu_4P_{12}$ by Raman scattering,” *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, **150**, 042147 (2009).
- ⁶⁴M. Ye, R. M. Fernandes, and N. B. Perkins, “Phonon dynamics in the kitaev spin liquid,” *Phys. Rev. Research* **2**, 033180 (2020).
- ⁶⁵K. Feng, M. Ye, and N. B. Perkins, “Temperature evolution of the phonon dynamics in the kitaev spin liquid,” *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, 214416 (2021).
- ⁶⁶G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, “Efficiency of ab-initio total energy calculations for metals and semiconductors using a plane-wave basis set,” *Computational Materials Science* **6**, 15–50 (1996).
- ⁶⁷J. P. Perdew, K. Burke, and M. Ernzerhof, “Generalized gradient approximation made simple,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 3865–3868 (1996).
- ⁶⁸S. L. Dudarev, G. A. Botton, S. Y. Savrasov, C. J. Humphreys, and A. P. Sutton, “Electron-energy-loss spectra and the structural stability of nickel oxide: An *lsda+u* study,” *Phys. Rev. B* **57**, 1505–1509 (1998).
- ⁶⁹A. Togo, F. Oba, and I. Tanaka, “First-principles calculations of the ferroelastic transition between rutile-type and $CaCl_2$ -type SiO_2 at high pressures,” *Phys. Rev. B* **78**, 134106 (2008).

Supplemental Information for Nearly-Resonant Crystalline-Phononic Coupling in Quantum Spin Liquid Candidate CsYbSe_2

1. TEMPERATURE DEPENDENCE FOR HIGHER ENERGY BAND

Figure S1 shows temperature-dependent unpolarized Raman spectra taken in a higher energy band from $T = 3.3$ K to $T = 270$ K. The spectra were taken with Semrock dichroic and longpass filters instead of a set of volume Bragg gratings.




Fig. S1. Raman spectra in a higher energy band as a function of temperature from $T = 3.3$ K to $T = 270$ K.

2. RAMAN GROUP THEORY ANALYSIS FOR CSYBSE₂

CsYbSe₂ belongs to the space group $P6_3/mmc$ (No. 194) with the point group D_{6h} , and its Raman active phonon modes consist of non-degenerate A_{1g} symmetry modes, doubly degenerate E_{2g} symmetry modes ($E_{2g} - x$ and $E_{2g} - y$), and doubly degenerate E_{1g} symmetry modes ($E_{1g} - x$ and $E_{1g} - y$). Their Raman tensors $\tilde{R}$ assume the following forms:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{R}(A_{1g}) &= \begin{pmatrix} a & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & a & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & b \end{pmatrix} \\ \tilde{R}(E_{2g} - x) &= \begin{pmatrix} c & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & -c & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{pmatrix}; \tilde{R}(E_{2g} - y) = \begin{pmatrix} \cdot & c & \cdot \\ c & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{pmatrix} \\ \tilde{R}(E_{1g} - x) &= \begin{pmatrix} \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & d \\ \cdot & d & \cdot \end{pmatrix}; \tilde{R}(E_{1g} - y) = \begin{pmatrix} \cdot & \cdot & d \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ d & \cdot & \cdot \end{pmatrix}\end{aligned}\quad (S1)$$

In the experimental back-scattering laser geometry (light Z in and Z out) with linear polarization, the electric polarization vectors of the scattered and incident light $\mathbf{e}_s$ and $\mathbf{e}_i$ are in-plane (i.e., the X-Y plane), and they are given by $\mathbf{e}_s = (\cos\gamma, \sin\gamma, 0)$ and $\mathbf{e}_i = (\cos\theta, \sin\theta, 0)$. With Raman intensity $I \propto |\mathbf{e}_s \cdot \tilde{R} \cdot \mathbf{e}_i|^2$, we have:

$$I \propto \left| \begin{pmatrix} \cos\gamma & \sin\gamma & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \tilde{R} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta \\ \sin\theta \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right|^2 \quad (S2)$$

It is obvious that E_{1g} phonon modes have zero Raman intensity in the back-scattering geometry, and thus cannot be observed experimentally. For A_{1g} and E_{2g} modes, by substituting the Raman tensors $\tilde{R}$ from Eq. S1 into Eq. S2, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}I(A_{1g}) &\propto \left| \begin{pmatrix} \cos\gamma & \sin\gamma & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} a & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & a & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & b \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta \\ \sin\theta \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right|^2 \\ &\propto |a\cos\gamma\cos\theta + a\sin\gamma\sin\theta|^2 \\ &\propto |a|^2\cos^2(\gamma - \theta)\end{aligned}\quad (S3)$$

$$\begin{aligned}I(E_{2g} - x) &\propto \left| \begin{pmatrix} \cos\gamma & \sin\gamma & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} c & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & -c & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta \\ \sin\theta \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right|^2 \\ &\propto \left| \begin{pmatrix} c\cos\gamma & -c\sin\gamma & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta \\ \sin\theta \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right|^2 \\ &\propto |c\cos\gamma\cos\theta - c\sin\gamma\sin\theta|^2 \\ &\propto |c|^2\cos^2(\gamma + \theta)\end{aligned}\quad (S4)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
I(E_{2g} - y) &\propto \left| \begin{pmatrix} \cos\gamma & \sin\gamma & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \cdot & c & \cdot \\ c & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta \\ \sin\theta \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right|^2 \\
&\propto \left| \begin{pmatrix} c\sin\gamma & c\cos\gamma & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta \\ \sin\theta \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right|^2 \\
&\propto |c\sin\gamma\cos\theta + c\cos\gamma\sin\theta|^2 \\
&\propto |c|^2 \sin^2(\gamma + \theta)
\end{aligned} \tag{S5}$$

Consequently, the Raman intensity of a doubly degenerate E_{2g} mode is

$$I(E_{2g}) = I(E_{2g} - x) + I(E_{2g} - y) = |c|^2 \cos^2(\gamma + \theta) + |c|^2 \sin^2(\gamma + \theta) = |c|^2 \tag{S6}$$

Eq. S6 indicates that the polarization profile of an E_{2g} phonon mode is a circle under any linear polarization configuration. For an A_{1g} phonon mode, under the experimental parallel polarization configuration (i.e., XX, $\gamma = \theta$), its intensity $I(A_{1g}) \propto |a|^2$ according to Eq. S3 and hence the polarization profile is also a circle; however, under the experimental cross polarization configuration (i.e., XY, $\gamma = \theta + 90^\circ$), its intensity $I(A_{1g}) = 0$. These results are in agreement with the experimental data. Interestingly, the polarization profiles of CEFs Raman modes are very similar to the polarization profiles of E_{2g} phonon modes, suggesting that CEFs modes share similar forms of Raman tensors to E_{2g} phonon modes.

3. POLARIZATION AND ANGULAR DEPENDENCE

Figure S2 shows the polarization dependence of the peaks E_{2g}^1 , CEF1, CEF2 and CEF3 $T = 3.3$ K, E_{2g}^1 , E_{2g}^2 and A_{1g} at $T = 293$ K.




Fig. S2. Polarization and angular dependence of the at $T = 3.3\text{ K}$ and $T = 293\text{ K}$.

4. CALCULATED PHONON DISPERSION




Fig. S3. Calculated phonon dispersion

5. POSITION DEPENDENCE

As described in the main text, we report subtle spatial anti-correlations between phonon and CEF modes, such as the CEF1, E_{2g}^2 , and ω_2 modes. Simple spatial plots of integrated counts over a specific peak may be affected by baseline corrections and/or large peaks nearby. The baseline can be removed by asymmetric least squares fitting but the accuracy is not necessarily satisfactory. Meanwhile, full-blown curve fitting over thousands of spatial points can be computational expensive. Non-negative matrix factorization (NMF) is a simple algorithm that captures the most linearly independent basis vectors out of a given hyper-dimensional data cube with very low computational cost, yet it is effective in exploratory data analysis. Here Figures S4, S5, and S6 illustrate spatially resolved Raman spectra at $T = 3$ K, $T = 120$ K, and $T = 130$ K, respectively. In these figures, (a) illustrates a subset of raw Raman spectra, with the inset illustrating the captured NMF components. (b-e) are integrated counts for selected peaks. (f-h) are the weights with respect to the basis vector components for the NMF decomposition. A similar anticorrelation between modes to that described in the main text is observed again in these representations. The (x, y) are the raw coordinate values. A value of $(x, y) = (2127 \mu\text{m}, 104 \mu\text{m})$ was subtracted in the main text.

A. $T = 3$ K




Fig. S4. Position Dependence at $T = 3.3$ K.

B. $T = 120\text{K}$




Fig. S5. Position Dependence at $T = 120\text{ K}$.

C. $T = 130\text{K}$




Fig. S6. Position Dependence at $T = 130\text{ K}$.