

Relaxation Dynamics of the Holstein Polaron

Denis Golež,¹ Janez Bonča,^{1,2} Lev Vidmar,^{1,3} and Stuart A. Trugman⁴

¹*J. Stefan Institute, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia*

²*Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, University of Ljubljana, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia*

³*Department of Physics and Arnold Sommerfeld Center for Theoretical Physics, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, D-80333 München, Germany*

⁴*Theoretical Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545, USA*

(Received 12 September 2012; published 5 December 2012; corrected 3 September 2013)

Keeping the full quantum nature of the problem, we compute the relaxation time of the Holstein polaron in one dimension after it was driven far from the equilibrium by a strong oscillatory pulse. Just after the pulse, the polaron's kinetic energy increases and subsequently exhibits a relaxation-type decrease with simultaneous emission of phonons. In the weak coupling regime, partial tunneling of the electron from the polaron self-potential is observed. The inverse relaxation time is for small values of electron-phonon coupling λ linear with λ , while it deviates downwards from the linear regime at $\lambda \gtrsim 0.1/\omega_0$. The imaginary part of the equilibrium self-energy shows good agreement with the inverse relaxation time obtained from nonequilibrium simulations.

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.236402](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.236402)

PACS numbers: 71.38.-k, 63.20.kd, 72.20.Ht

Photoexcitation is due to recent technological advances in ultrafast spectroscopy, becoming one of the main experimental approaches to disentangle different elementary excitations in a real-time domain on a femtosecond scale. This rapidly developing field enables a novel insight into quantum many-body systems; however, it also requires the development of new theoretical concepts. In this context, numerical simulations of nonequilibrium quantum mechanical systems may provide a key insight into processes on a femtosecond time scale.

Several pump-probe experiments reported the observation of self-trapping of excitations emerging after the pump pulse [1–3]. These experiments then triggered theoretical studies of different scenarios of the polaron formation, revealing a complex interplay between a single electron and quantum phonons under nonequilibrium conditions [4,5].

The role of electron-phonon (*e-ph*) interaction in several different classes of strongly correlated materials is, despite intensive research, still ambiguous since a subtle interplay between electron-electron and electron-phonon interaction may lead to various unconventional properties. Pump-probe techniques have shown a potential to identify fingerprints of these interactions during the relaxation process [6–9]. Recently, the phenomenological two-temperature model developed a long time ago [10,11] was extended to more involved approaches like the three-temperature model [12] and Boltzmann equation approaches [13–15]. Moreover, the assumption of fast relaxation within the electron subsystem was recently challenged in the case of strong electronic correlations [16]. In contrast to many previous findings, it was shown that, in the 1D strongly correlated system coupled to phonons, the relaxation on short time scales is mostly due to *e-ph* interaction [17].

Theoretical studies of the polaron motion in strong but constant electric field started with the seminal work by Thornber and Feynman [18]. Later works mostly relied on the rate or Boltzmann equations [19–21]. While quantum coherent effects are absent in the Boltzmann description [22], some recent approaches [23,24] show that taking quantum effects fully into account is decisive to obtain proper electric field dependence of the drift velocity at large electric fields. Since most past works focused on the influence of a constant electric field on the Holstein polaron, the impact of a short oscillatory pulse on polaron relaxation dynamics remains an open problem, despite significant advances in ultrafast spectroscopy.

In this Letter, we present the results of a fully quantum mechanical time evolution of the Holstein model in one dimension driven far from the equilibrium by a laser pulse. We determine characteristic relaxation times for the system that is initially in equilibrium at zero temperature. The investigated Holstein polaron is subjected to a spatially homogeneous and time-dependent scalar potential that mimics a short laser pulse,

$$\phi(t) = Ae^{-[(t-t_c)/t_d]^2} \sin[\omega_p(t-t_c)], \quad (1)$$

which is incorporated into the Hamiltonian via a Peierls substitution in the hopping amplitude,

$$H = -t_0 \sum_{l,\sigma} [e^{i\phi(t)} c_{l,\sigma}^\dagger c_{l+1,\sigma} + \text{H.c.}] + g \sum_j n_j (a_j^\dagger + a_j) + \omega_0 \sum_j a_j^\dagger a_j, \quad (2)$$

where $c_{l,\sigma}^\dagger$ and a_l^\dagger represent electron and phonon creation operators at site l and $n_l = c_l^\dagger c_l$ is the electron density.

ω_0 denotes the dispersionless phonon frequency, and t_0 is the nearest neighbor hopping amplitude.

The system is described by two dimensionless parameters α and λ , where $\alpha = \frac{\omega_0}{t_0}$ and $\lambda = g^2/(2\omega_0 t_0)$ that determine the crossover from the adiabatic ($\alpha \ll 1$) to the nonadiabatic ($\alpha \gg 1$) limits and the weakly dressed electron ($\lambda \ll 1$) to a heavy polaron ($\lambda \gg 1$). We measure the electric field $F = -\partial_t \phi(t)$ in units of $t_0/e_0 a$, where e_0 is the unit charge and a is the lattice distance. The unit of energy is given by hopping amplitude t_0 , and the unit of time is \hbar/t_0 . From here on, we set $a = e_0 = \hbar = t_0 = 1$. Unless explicitly stated, the phonon frequency is set to $\omega_0 = 1$. The pulse in Eq. (1) is centered at $t_c = 5$, while the width is given by $t_d = 2$.

We solve the time-dependent Schrödinger equation for a single Holstein polaron on an infinite one-dimensional chain. We use the numerical method based on the exact diagonalization of the variational Hilbert space that led to numerically exact solutions of the polaron ground state [25] and low-lying excited-state properties [26–29], as well as for description of the time-dependent case [24]. The total energy gain from the external pulse is given by

$$\Delta \langle H(t) \rangle = \int \langle j(t) \rangle F(t) dt, \quad (3)$$

where $j(t) = -\partial_\phi H$ is the current operator.

Before examining the more physically relevant case, we analyze the action of a pulse in the form of a delta function $F(t) = -\Phi_0 \delta(t)$ that leads to a simple form of the scalar potential $\phi(t) = \Phi_0 \theta(t)$, where $\theta(t)$ is the Heaviside function. Action with $\phi(t)$ on a free electron state ($\lambda = 0$) at $k = 0$ shifts its kinetic energy from $E_{\text{kin}} = -2$ at $t < 0$ to $E_{\text{kin}} = -2 \cos(\Phi_0)$ when $t > 0$, leaving the electron in an excited state, but an eigenstate at $t > 0$. In Fig. 1(a), we show results for $\lambda = 0.1$ and $\Phi_0 = \pi$. Just after the pulse, the increase of the total $\Delta E(t) = \langle H(t) \rangle - \langle H(t=0) \rangle$, as well as the kinetic energy $\Delta E_{\text{kin}}(t)$, reach the value $\Delta E \sim \Delta E_{\text{kin}} \sim -2 \cos(\Phi_0) + 2 = 4$, while the change of the phonon energy ΔE_{ph} remains close to its value in the polaron ground state, i.e., $\Delta E_{\text{ph}} \sim 0$. After initial time $t \geq t_i \sim 10$, $\Delta E_{\text{kin}}(t)$ exhibits a relaxation-type exponential decay towards a constant value $\Delta E_{\text{kin}}(t \rightarrow \infty)$; meanwhile, $\Delta E_{\text{ph}}(t)$ increases and the electron-phonon interaction term $\Delta E_{e\text{-ph}}(t)$ remains nearly a constant. This dynamics is interpreted as a transfer of the excited electron kinetic energy into phonon excitations. In Fig. 1(b), only $\Delta E_{\text{kin}}(t)$ is shown for different choices of pulse amplitude Φ_0 . In all cases except for $\Phi_0 = \pi/4$, $\Delta E_{\text{kin}}(t)$ decrease exponentially with roughly the same relaxation time. In the case of $\Phi_0 = \pi/4$, the increase of $\Delta E_{\text{kin}}(t)$ is lower than ω_0 , indicating that the energy transfer from the pulse was insufficient to allow electron relaxation via phonon emission; thus, no relaxation is observed.

We next consider a more realistic form of a pulse described by the scalar potential of Eq. (1). At small




FIG. 1 (color online). (a) Expectation values of different parts of the Hamiltonian vs time at $\lambda = 0.1$ and $\omega_0 = 1.0$ after the action of $\phi(t) = \Phi_0 \theta(t)$ for $\Phi_0 = \pi$. (b) $\Delta E_{\text{kin}}(t)$ vs t for different $\Phi_0 = \pi, 3\pi/4, \pi/2, \pi/4$, while other parameters are the same as in (a). (c) Expectation values of different parts of the Hamiltonian vs time at $\lambda = 0.1$ and $\omega_0 = 1$ after the action of the pulse, as given in Eq. (1), with $A = 3$, where $\omega_p = 1.5$ is set close to the maximum of the optical conductivity, while parameters $t_c = 5$ and $t_p = 2$ remain unchanged throughout this Letter. (d) $\Delta E_{\text{kin}}(t)$ vs t for different values of $A = 1, 3, 5$; the rest is the same as in (c). The inset represents the difference between kinetic energy and $E_{\text{kin}}(t \rightarrow \infty)$ for the same pulse amplitudes as the main figure. (e) Energy of the different parts of the Hamiltonian vs t for $\lambda = 1.0$ and $\omega_p = 2.5$. (f) $\Delta E_{\text{kin}}(t)$ vs t for different values of $A = 1, 3, 5$, while the rest is the same as in (e).

$\lambda = 0.1$, we observe a gain of the total energy $\Delta E(t)$ —see Fig. 1(c)—signaling that, despite rather weak λ , the system has absorbed a substantial amount of energy. Note that, after the pulse is switched off for $t \geq 9 = t_{\text{off}}$, the total energy remains constant, while there is a clear redistribution between expectation values of the parts of the Hamiltonian. Redistribution between the kinetic $\Delta E_{\text{kin}}(t)$ and the phonon $\Delta E_{\text{ph}}(t)$ parts of the total energy clearly indicates a relaxation of the system. After the pulse, $\Delta E_{\text{ph}}(t)$ increases with time and $\Delta E_{\text{kin}}(t)$ exponentially decreases, while $\Delta E_{e\text{-ph}}(t)$ oscillates roughly around zero. This behavior is similar to the case when $\phi(t) = \Phi_0 \theta(t)$; see Fig. 1(a). For $t \gg t_{\text{off}}$, most of the gained energy is absorbed by the lattice. We should remark that the relaxed expectation values of the kinetic energy are not the same as before the pulse. As a general rule, we find in all other cases $\Delta E_{\text{kin}}(t \rightarrow \infty) \lesssim \omega_0$, which indicates that a finite value of $\Delta E_{\text{kin}}(t \rightarrow \infty)$ is a consequence of the gap for optical phonons [22]. Nevertheless, we detect a clear tendency of the exponential decay of the kinetic energy towards only a slightly elevated value $\Delta E_{\text{kin}}(t \rightarrow \infty)$ in comparison to the initial energy $E_{\text{kin}}(t=0)$. We have also computed the relaxation of the kinetic energy for

different amplitudes of the pulse, presented in Fig. 1(d). We found that the decay time is within our numerical accuracy, independent of the amplitude of the pulse A , as long as A exceeds a threshold value $A \geq 1$ —see also the inset of Fig. 1(d)—which is in agreement with the Boltzmann theory.

In the intermediate coupling regime, namely, $\lambda = 1.0$, a different response of the system is expected due to a bigger gap between the polaron band and the continuum of excited states. After the pulse, almost the entire excess energy is absorbed into the lattice vibrations, i.e., $\Delta E(t > t_{\text{off}}) \sim \Delta E_{\text{ph}}(t > t_{\text{off}})$; see Fig. 1(e). In addition to a large increase, the latter displays oscillations with the period corresponding roughly to the phonon frequency, as well. In Fig. 1(f), we present results of $\Delta E_{\text{kin}}(t)$ for different amplitudes of the pulse. Apart from pronounced oscillations, we again observe approximately exponential decay in the kinetic energy, roughly independent of the strength of A when $A \geq 1$. We also observe distinct long-time limits of kinetic energies; however, in all cases, $\Delta E_{\text{kin}}(t \gg t_{\text{off}}) < \omega_0$.

To get further insight into the relaxation dynamics, we calculated the average number of phonon quanta located at a given distance x from the electron

$$\gamma(x) = \left\langle \sum_i n_i a_{i+x}^\dagger a_{i+x} \right\rangle, \quad (4)$$

satisfying the sum rule $\langle n_{\text{ph}} \rangle = \sum_x \gamma(x)$. At time $t = 0$, $\gamma(x)$ displays a pronounced peak at the position of the electron ($x = 0$), consistent with the shape of the polaron in equilibrium. In the weak coupling regime, at $\lambda = 0.1$ and $t > t_{\text{off}}$, $\gamma(x)$ also shows, besides the original polaron correlation peak, pronounced peaks separating from the central peak in both directions as time increases; see Fig. 2(a). This result is consistent with a hypothesis that a strong pulse splits the polaron into an excited polaron and a nearly free electron. The wave function is a superposition of an excited polaron, responsible for the large value of




FIG. 2 (color online). Electron-phonon correlation function $\gamma(x)$ for pulse amplitude $A = 3$: (a) $\lambda = 0.1$ and the pulse frequency $\omega_p = 1.5$ and (b) $\lambda = 1.0$ and $\omega_p = 2.5$, at different times. Note that there are different scales on both figures.

$\gamma(x)$ at $x = 0$ and a nearly free electron, traveling predominantly in the $x > 0$ direction. The more pronounced signal for $\gamma(x < 0)$ can be interpreted as a partial tunneling of the electron part of the wave function from the polaron self-potential that remains located at $x = 0$. The asymmetry on the parity transformation $x \rightarrow -x$ is dynamically induced and can be tuned by choosing a different shape of the incoming pulse.

The peak at $x < 0$ starts to diminish with time because (i) the escaped nearly free electron is gradually captured by the lattice and (ii) the excited electron redistributes its excess energy into a constantly spreading area of excited lattice vibrations, giving rise to nearly uniform but elevated values of $\gamma(x)$, clearly seen in Fig. 2(a). Here, we should stress that redistribution in the correlation function must be due to the electron's motion since phonons are dispersionless. This hypothesis is well supported by the estimation of the velocity of the side peaks $v_p = \Delta x / \Delta t \sim 2$, representing the maximal group velocity of the weakly coupled electron [see the dashed line in Fig. 2(a)]. Similar partial tunneling was noticed within the adiabatic limit of the driven Su-Schrieffer-Heeger problem [30]. The above considerations give complementary real space interpretation of related experimental results, where excitations are identified in the frequency domain [1,2]. In the strong coupling regime, namely, $\lambda = 1.0$, as presented in Fig. 2(b), the polaron peak at $\gamma(x \sim 0)$ is preserved, but it broadens with time and we observe no peak due to partial electron tunneling.

We computed the relaxation time by fitting the expectation value of the kinetic energy after the pulse with the simple expression $\Delta E_{\text{kin}}(t) = \Delta E_{\text{kin}}(t \rightarrow \infty) + B e^{-t/\tau}$, where $\Delta E_{\text{kin}}(t \rightarrow \infty)$ is the kinetic energy after relaxation and τ is the relaxation time; see Fig. 3. The inverse




FIG. 3 (color online). Inverse relaxation time $1/\tau$ (squares) vs λ for $\omega_0 = 1.0$ using a Gaussian pulse, Eq. (1). The dashed line represents $1/\tau = 2\omega_0\lambda$; see the discussion in the text. The diamonds represent the imaginary part of the averaged equilibrium self-energy $\text{Im}[\tilde{\Sigma}]$. The circles represent $1/\tau$ after the instantaneous pulse $\phi(t) = \Phi_0\theta(t)$, where pulse strength $\Phi_0 = \pi$ was used. The horizontal dotted line indicates the inverse pulse width. The inset presents $1/\tau$ vs $\lambda\omega_0$, using the Gaussian pulse, Eq. (1), for $\omega_0 = 1$ (solid squares) and $\omega_0 = 0.7$ (open squares).

relaxation time $1/\tau$ in the extreme weak coupling $\lambda \leq 0.1$ regime shows a linear increase with electron-phonon coupling, consistent with $1/\tau \approx 2\omega_0\lambda$. Considering an emission of a phonon by the excited electron with the kinetic energy above the one-phonon threshold using Fermi's golden rule yields linear dependence on λ , i.e., $1/\tau = 2\omega_0\lambda/\sin(k_f)$, where k_f is the final electron's momentum and the inverse relaxation time is determined by the longest decay time, namely, at $k_f = \pi/2$. With increasing λ , the inverse relaxation time $1/\tau$ first deviates downwards from the linear λ dependence and then saturates as it becomes comparable to the pulse width. The larger error bars are a consequence of strong oscillations and a smaller spatial extension of the variational phase space in the strong coupling regime. Calculating $1/\tau$ at smaller $\omega_0 = 0.7$ shows that the scaling of $1/\tau \sim f(\lambda\omega_0)$, where $f(x)$ is some unknown function [note that, within Fermi's golden rule, $f(x) = 2x$], persists beyond the linear in the λ regime; see the inset of Fig. 3. The saturation of $1/\tau$ is absent in the case when $\phi(t) = \Phi_0\theta(t)$, also presented in Fig. 3. The relaxation time after an instantaneous pulse corresponds to the process averaged over all frequencies, and this explains the deviation of the inverse relaxation time from a finite width pulse.

An alternative method for the computation of $1/\tau$ from equilibrium properties is via the imaginary part of the self-energy $\text{Im}[\Sigma(\omega)]$ [31] that represents the inverse of the relaxation time of the quasiparticle excitation $1/\tau_\Sigma = \text{Im}[\tilde{\Sigma}(\omega_p)]$. Since $\text{Im}[\Sigma(\omega)]$ depends on the value of the frequency of the pulse ω_p , we define $1/\tau_\Sigma$ via the average value $\tilde{\Sigma}(\omega_p) = (1/\sqrt{2\pi\sigma}) \int e^{-(\omega-\omega_p)^2/(2\sigma)^2} \Sigma(\omega) d\omega$, where $\sigma = 1/t_d$, and integrate over a distribution of frequencies corresponding to the Fourier transform of the pulse.

To conclude, in this Letter, we studied the relaxation dynamics of the Holstein polaron after the strong photoexcitation. In all cases, a threshold value of the absorbed energy $\Delta E \sim \omega_0$ exists, above which the relaxation dynamics via phonon emission is observed. We computed the relaxation time that is mostly independent of the shape of the pulse. We focused on the values of the e -ph coupling λ below the crossover to the strong-coupling regime, i.e., $\lambda_c \sim 1$. In this range of λ , relaxation dynamics exhibits two distinct regimes with qualitatively different behavior: the regime of very weak e -ph coupling, $\lambda < 0.1/\omega_0$, and the regime when $\lambda \gtrsim 0.1/\omega_0$.

In the weak-coupling regime $\lambda < 0.1/\omega_0$, $1/\tau$ roughly follows the linear scaling $1/\tau \sim 2\omega_0\lambda$ obtained from the Fermi golden rule. In the regime of $\lambda \gtrsim 0.1/\omega_0$, $1/\tau$ deviates from the linear in λ dependence well below the crossover to the small polaron regime and is reproduced by the imaginary part of the averaged electron self-energy. The real-time calculation reveals oscillations in $\Delta E_{\text{kin}}(t)$ and other expectation values, with the period of the phonon frequency, $T \sim 2\pi/\omega_0$. This result is in agreement with a

recent study of a half-filled 2D Hubbard-Holstein model [32], where oscillations with the period T were observed for $\lambda < \lambda_c$.

In comparison with the experiments, our relaxation times are short, which is a consequence of the rather high adiabatic coefficient $\alpha = 1$. While, in the regime $\lambda \leq 0.1/\omega_0$, the effect on τ by lowering α can be obtained from the Fermi golden rule $\tau \propto 1/\lambda\omega_0 = 1/\lambda\alpha t_0$, our numerical results show that, even in the regime when $\lambda \gtrsim 0.1/\omega_0$, there exists approximate scaling $\tau \sim 1/f(\lambda\omega_0)$ that can be used to extend our results towards potentially more physically relevant values of α and consequently longer relaxation times τ . Another interesting topic for further research is the effect of the dimensionality. In the equilibrium, the crossover to the large effective mass regime of the higher-dimensional polaron is much sharper than in the 1D systems [33]. Our nonequilibrium simulations are qualitatively consistent with experiments on quasi-one-dimensional systems [34], where exponential relaxation takes place [1,2], while slower relaxation dependence was observed in 2D systems [35–38].

Let us briefly discuss the possible relevance of our results to correlated electron systems with a finite electron density, such as, e.g., the Hubbard model. A recent non-equilibrium DMFT study showed that the relaxation time of the pump-excited Hubbard model in the case of large Coulomb repulsion is unexpectedly long [16] due to the exponentially slow decay rate of pump-generated doublons, in agreement with experiments on optical lattices [39]. These results open a relevant question about the dominant mechanism of fast relaxation observed in photoexcited strongly correlated materials. Lately, the emission of phonons in the 1D Hubbard-Holstein model was indeed shown to be a very efficient relaxation mechanism [17], where a non-negligible amount of phonons is already emitted during the application of the pulse. This observation is in agreement with our results, presented in Fig. 1, and suggests that the time evolution far from the equilibrium may provide a comprehensive understanding of the photoexcited polaronic systems.

Stimulating discussions with T. Tohyama, V. V. Kabanov, and C. Gadermaier are acknowledged. J. B. and L. V. acknowledge support by Grant No. P1-0044 of ARRS, Slovenia. J. B. expresses gratitude for the support of the CINT user program of the Los Alamos National Laboratory. The work at Los Alamos was supported by the U.S. DOE Office of Basic Energy Sciences: Materials Science and Engineering.

-
- [1] S. L. Dexheimer, A. D. Van Pelt, J. A. Brozik, and B. I. Swanson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 4425 (2000).
 - [2] A. Sugita, T. Saito, H. Kano, M. Yamashita, and T. Kobayashi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 2158 (2001).

- [3] F. X. Morrissey and S. L. Dexheimer, *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 094302 (2010).
- [4] L.-C. Ku and S. A. Trugman, *Phys. Rev. B* **75**, 014307 (2007).
- [5] H. Fehske, G. Wellein, and A. R. Bishop, *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 075104 (2011).
- [6] S. D. Conte, C. Giannetti, G. Coslovich, F. Cilento, D. Bossini, T. Abebaw, F. Banfi, G. Ferrini, H. Eisaki, M. Greven, A. Damascelli, D. van der Marel, and F. Parmigiani, *Science* **335**, 1600 (2012).
- [7] K. W. Kim, A. Pashkin, H. Schäfer, M. Beyer, M. Porer, T. Wolf, C. Bernhard, J. Demsar, R. Huber, and A. Leitenstorfer, *Nat. Mater.* **11**, 497 (2012).
- [8] I. Avigo, R. Cortes, L. Rettig, S. Thirupathaiiah, H. S. Jeevan, P. Gegenwart, T. Wolf, M. Ligges, M. Wolf, J. Fink, and U. Bovensiepen, [arXiv:1204.4069v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/1204.4069v1).
- [9] Y. Kawakami, T. Fukatsu, Y. Sakurai, H. Unno, H. Itoh, S. Iwai, T. Sasaki, K. Yamamoto, K. Yakushi, and K. Yonemitsu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 246402 (2010).
- [10] M. Kaganov, I. Lifshitz, and L. Tanatarov, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **4**, 173 (1957).
- [11] P. B. Allen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59**, 1460 (1987).
- [12] L. Perfetti, P. A. Loukakos, M. Lisowski, U. Bovensiepen, H. Eisaki, and M. Wolf, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 197001 (2007).
- [13] J. Demsar, R. D. Averitt, K. H. Ahn, M. J. Graf, S. A. Trugman, V. V. Kabanov, J. L. Sarrao, and A. J. Taylor, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 027401 (2003).
- [14] V. V. Kabanov and A. S. Alexandrov, *Phys. Rev. B* **78**, 174514 (2008).
- [15] C. Gadermaier, A. S. Alexandrov, V. V. Kabanov, P. Kusar, T. Mertelj, X. Yao, C. Manzoni, D. Brida, G. Cerullo, and D. Mihailovic, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 257001 (2010).
- [16] M. Eckstein and P. Werner, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 035122 (2011).
- [17] H. Matsueda, S. Sota, T. Tohyama, and S. Maekawa, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **81**, 013701 (2012).
- [18] K. K. Thornber and R. P. Feynman, *Phys. Rev. B* **1**, 4099 (1970).
- [19] D. Emin and C. F. Hart, *Phys. Rev. B* **36**, 2530 (1987).
- [20] S. Rott, N. Linder, and G. H. Döhler, *Phys. Rev. B* **65**, 195301 (2002).
- [21] F. S. Khan, J. H. Davies, and J. W. Wilkins, *Phys. Rev. B* **36**, 2578 (1987).
- [22] A. Wacker, A.-P. Jauho, S. Rott, A. Markus, P. Binder, and G. H. Döhler, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 836 (1999).
- [23] J. Bonča and S. A. Trugman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 4874 (1997).
- [24] L. Vidmar, J. Bonča, M. Mierzejewski, P. Prelovšek, and S. A. Trugman, *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 134301 (2011).
- [25] J. Bonča, S. A. Trugman, and I. Batistić, *Phys. Rev. B* **60**, 1633 (1999).
- [26] L. Vidmar, J. Bonča, and S. A. Trugman, *Phys. Rev. B* **82**, 104304 (2010).
- [27] O. S. Barišić, *Phys. Rev. B* **73**, 214304 (2006).
- [28] D. Golež, J. Bonča, and L. Vidmar, *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 144304 (2012).
- [29] The construction of the variational space starts from an electron with no phonon excitation in a translationally invariant state. We generate new parent states by applying the generator of states, as described in Eq. (4) of Ref. [26]. By choosing different values of N_h , where N_h defines the spatial extent of the polaron, and M , which controls the maximal number of phonon quanta, the method allows for accurate calculation of ground state properties, dynamic response, and even time evolution—see Refs. [24,28]—in the weak as well as strong coupling regimes.
- [30] A. A. Johansson and S. Stafström, *Phys. Rev. B* **69**, 235205 (2004).
- [31] R. Sensarma, D. Pekker, E. Altman, E. Demler, N. Strohmaier, D. Greif, R. Jördens, L. Tarruell, H. Moritz, and T. Esslinger, *Phys. Rev. B* **82**, 224302 (2010).
- [32] G. De Filippis, V. Cataudella, E. A. Nowadnick, T. P. Devereaux, A. S. Mishchenko, and N. Nagaosa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 176402 (2012).
- [33] L.-C. Ku, S. A. Trugman, and J. Bonča, *Phys. Rev. B* **65**, 174306 (2002).
- [34] The coupling of excitons to phonons and of electrons to phonons can sometimes be described by the same Hamiltonian. See E. Rashba and M. Sturge, *Excitons*, Modern Problems in Condensed Matter Science Vol. 2 (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1982).
- [35] N. Ge, C. Wong, R. Lingle, J. McNeill, K. Gaffney, and C. Harris, *Science* **279**, 202 (1998).
- [36] N. Ge, C. Wong, and C. Harris, *Acc. Chem. Res.* **33**, 111 (2000).
- [37] A. Miller, I. Bezel, K. Gaffney, S. Garrett-Roe, S. Liu, P. Szymanski, and C. Harris, *Science* **297**, 1163 (2002).
- [38] In Refs. [35–37], the relaxation dynamics of the molecular dipole rearrangement in the vicinity of the electron was studied, which can be described by a formally equivalent electronic polaron model; see G. Mahan, *Many-Particle Physics* (Springer, New York, 2000).
- [39] N. Strohmaier, D. Greif, R. Jördens, L. Tarruell, H. Moritz, T. Esslinger, R. Sensarma, D. Pekker, E. Altman, and E. Demler, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 080401 (2010).