Phonon-phonon interactions in the polarization dependence of Raman scattering
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We have found that the polarization dependence of the Raman signal in organic crystals can only be described by a fourth-rank tensor formalism. The generalization from the traditional second-rank Raman tensor $R$ is physically motivated by consideration of the light scattering mechanism of anharmonic crystals at finite temperatures, and explained in terms of off-diagonal components of the crystal self-energy. We thus establish a novel manifestation of anharmonicity in inelastic light scattering, markedly separate from the better known phonon lifetime.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Raman spectrum of a crystal is usually interpreted through the prism of mode assignment, where each spectral peak is assigned an irreducible representation (irrep) of the relevant space group [1]. So entrenched was this perspective, that past studies would denote their measurement geometry in terms of the irreps observable by it [2–8]. This framework, also known as factor group analysis, provides a rigorous tool-set to connect observed spectra with crystal structure and vibrational symmetries. Besides predicting the number of Raman active modes and their degeneracy, factor group analysis also dictates the polarization dependence of a spectral feature associated with a specific irrep. The connection between the polarization of incident and scattered light for a spectral feature is thus governed by the assigned irrep. Most textbooks [9–14], as well as contemporary research [15–18], use the matrix representation, commonly known as the Raman tensor, to describe this irrep-specific polarization dependence. In this matrix formalism the scattering cross-section of a Raman peak, assigned an irrep $\Gamma_x$ and corresponding Raman tensor $R_{\Gamma_x}$, is determined by [9]

$$\sigma_{\Gamma_x} \propto |e_i \cdot R_{\Gamma_x} \cdot e_s|^2,$$

where $e_i$ and $e_s$ are the incident, and collected light polarization unit vectors, respectively. This expression completely governs the polarization dependence of the Raman signal, with the angle dependence entering through the geometrical relationships between the polarization unit vectors and crystal orientation (see Fig. 1(a)). The components of $R$ are susceptibility derivatives evaluated at equilibrium, so along with its persistent irrep identification, Eq. (1) predicts a temperature independent polarization pattern.

However, some of us recently showed the polarization-orientation (PO) Raman response, i.e., the polarization dependence of the Raman signal, evolves with temperature for some organic crystals [19]. This inadequacy of Eq. (1) stems from the naive treatment of temperature dependence in its derivation, which implicitly assumes a constant parabolic potential surface for atomic displacements, also known as the harmonic approximation [9, 20].

Here we employ a generalized many-body model to fit the evolving PO Raman response, and elucidate its physical origin. We show that these kind of PO patterns and their temperature dependence can not be captured by any superposition of irrep specific matrices (i.e., second-rank Raman tensor), and a generalization into a fourth-rank tensor formalism is necessary. This is the result of specific phonon-phonon interactions entering the Raman scattering process, an effect which is highly temperature and material dependent. We demonstrate how this mechanism can explain the PO spectra of a few organic crystals, focusing on [1]benzothieno[3,2-b]benzo[b]thiophene (BTBT) as an ideal showcase. As promising organic semiconducting molecular crystals, BTBT and its derivatives have been intensively investigated due to their high mobility and other application-oriented properties, such as air-stability and solution processability [21–26]. Besides its scientific importance, BTBT proved especially suitable for this study as its separate spectral features display the different possible PO trends with temperature, showing that the need for a fourth-rank tensor is not only material and temperature dependent, but may also be mode specific.
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II. POLARIZATION DEPENDENCE IN THE RAMAN SPECTRUM OF BTBT

Our experimental setup employed a back-scattering geometry, as shown in Fig. 1(a). In a PO measurement the polarization of the incident laser beam ($E_i$) is rotated in a plane parallel to the BTBT crystal [001] face. The inelastically back-scattered light can potentially assume any polarization ($E_s$). We separately probe the projection of the scattered light onto either a parallel ($\hat{e}_\parallel$) or cross ($\hat{e}_\perp$) polarizations with respect to the incident beam polarization. The full details for the measurement procedure and sample characterization are given in sections S1-2 in the supplementary material (SM) [27–32].

Fig. 1(b) and (c) present the Stokes Raman PO data for BTBT measured in our back-scattering geometry at 10 K and 290 K (RT), respectively. At 10 K we observe exactly six sharp distinguishable spectral peaks, in agreement with the prediction of factor group analysis (Sec. S8 in SM [27, 33]). This is an important validation for our subsequent analysis, as it makes the failure of the rigid-body approximation a less likely reason for inconsistencies. At 290 K we observe five distinguishable spectral peaks, due the low intensity of $\omega_2$ and the broadness of the spectrum. The correspondence between spectral peaks across temperatures is corroborated by continuously sampling the Raman spectrum throughout the temperature range (Sec. S6 in SM [27]).

The polarization angle (vertical axis) in figures 1(b) and (c) is off-set by a random angle controlled by the crystal orientation in the laboratory frame, but is consistent through all spectra.

Before examining the PO dependence of the spectra we must first associate a polarization dependent data series set, $\{I(\theta_i)\}$, with each spectral feature, in both parallel and cross configurations. We do so by fitting each spectrum to a multi-damped Lorentz line-shape, so the integrated intensity of each spectral feature may be directly evaluated (Sec. S3 in SM [27]). We perform this process for the PO Raman measurements at 10 K, 80 K, 150 K, 220 K, and 290 K (see Sec. S7 and Sec. S8 in SM for the raw PO Raman measurements and the extracted temperature dependent PO pattern of each spectral feature, respectively [27]). With the PO pattern at hand, we can apply our model of choice to try and interpret its polarization dependence.

Figure 2(a) presents the temperature evolution of the PO pattern for peak $\omega_4$ extracted from Fig. 1, i.e., the change with temperature of the polarization dependence of its integrated intensity. The PO pattern is highly temperature dependent in both parallel and cross configurations (see Sec. S4 in SM for the temperature independent PO response of silicon [27, 34]). The temperature evolution of polarization dependence in BTBT is fully reversible upon cooling, ruling out the appearance of static disorder.

Following the common harmonic treatment amounts to applying Eq. (1) and determining the appropriate irreps $\Gamma_x$ and its corresponding Raman tensor $R_{\Gamma_x}$. To account for birefringence effects, we use a corrected Raman tensor [17]. For our alternative, temperature dependent generalized treatment, we follow Cowley [35], and Born and Huang [36] before him, who described the Raman cross-section with a fourth-rank tensor

$$\sigma(\Omega) \propto \sum_{\mu\nu\xi\rho} n_\mu n_\xi I_{\mu\nu\xi\rho}(\Omega) E_\mu E_\rho,$$

where $E$ is the electric field vector of the incoming light and $n$ is the unit vector for the observed polarization, with Greek letters standing for Cartesian components.
FIG. 2. (a) The PO Raman response of $\omega_4$ from 10-290 K in parallel (top panel) and cross (bottom panel) configurations. (b) The fit results of the PO Raman response of $\omega_4$ at 10 K (top panels) and 290 K (bottom panels) using the second-rank Raman tensor formalism (left panels), and the fourth-rank Raman tensor formalism (right panels).

Fig. 2(b) shows the fitting attempts using both the predicted irrep [37] (left panels), and generalized fourth-rank tensor (right panels), for the same $\omega_4$ spectral feature at 10 K and 290 K (see Sec. S9.1 in the SM for the factor group analysis of BTBT and all fitting results [27]). Using the harmonic Raman tensor, we find a partial fit at 10 K, which gradually deteriorates as temperature increases up to RT. In strike contrast, the fourth-rank tensor formalism gives a near perfect fit for all data sets. A general fourth-rank tensor obviously offers a much larger parameter space, but as detailed in Sec. III D, symmetry considerations dramatically reduce the number of independent parameters in $I_{\mu\nu\xi\rho}$. We thus find the correct observable material property governing the Raman scattering around $\omega_4$ is a fourth-rank tensor. Similar behavior was previously observed in the Raman spectra of anthracene and pentacene crystals [19], where again, the appropriate fourth-rank tensor faithfully reproduces all PO patterns.

The matrix $R$ used in Fig. 2(b) is the specific irrep appropriate one. However, even a completely unconstrained second-rank tensor, with an additional phase parameter for birefringence effects [17], was not enough to successfully fit Eq. (1). This generalized form for $R$ includes the same number of parameters as the symmetry reduced form of $I_{\mu\nu\xi\rho}$. The explicit tensors and fitting results for both models are presented in sections S9.2-3 in the SM [27].

The tensor $I_{\mu\nu\xi\rho}$ depends on the probing frequency $\Omega$, and assuming only dipole scattering, is given by [35]:

$$I_{\mu\nu\xi\rho}(\Omega, T) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \langle \chi^*_{\mu\nu}(t) \chi_{\xi\rho}(0) \rangle_T e^{-i\Omega t} dt,$$

i.e., the Fourier transformed thermal average of the susceptibility auto-correlation function at temperature $T$. The fundamental physical entity - susceptibility, is indeed a second-rank tensor operator, but since experimentally we always measure intensity, the actual observable is determined by the tensor product of two susceptibilities operators. The symmetry considerations governing Eq. (3), as well as how temperature activated effects create the necessity for this fourth-rank tensor formalism, are discussed next.

III. FROM ANHARMONICITY TO FOURTH-RANK RAMAN TENSORS

A. Theory of inelastic light scattering in finite temperatures

We reiterate the tenets of the theory of inelastic light scattering from crystals at finite temperatures for clarity, and describe the novel aspect regarding polarization dependence demonstrated in this study. The presentation here and the full derivation in Sec. S11 of the SM [27] are in Hartree atomic units.

Working within the Born-Oppenheimer approximation, and assuming off-resonant scattering, the temperature and frequency dependence of Eq. (3) stem from the instantaneous crystal structure, $\chi_{\mu\nu} = \chi_{\mu\nu}(\{r_i\})$, where $\{r_i(t)\}$ is the set of nuclear locations. The connection between susceptibility and atomic configuration is generally unknown, so an expansion in powers of nuclear displacements is used. Expressing these displacements in terms of the standard phonon creation and annihilation operators, with momentum $q$ and polarization $s$,

$$A_{qs} = a_{qs} + a^*_{qs},$$

the susceptibility expansion becomes,

$$\chi_{\mu\nu} = \chi_0^{\mu\nu} + \chi_{\lambda}^{\mu\nu} A_\lambda + \chi_{\lambda\mu\nu} A_\lambda A_\nu + \chi_{\lambda\mu\nu\lambda'} A_\lambda A_\nu A_{\lambda'} + \cdots,$$

where we adopted a composite index $\lambda$ to denote $qs$, and $\chi_{\lambda}^{\mu\nu}$ are the Fourier transformed susceptibility derivatives.
FIG. 3. (a) The PO Raman response of ω₁ from 10-290 K in parallel (top panel) and cross (bottom panel) configurations. (b) The fit results of the PO Raman response of ω₁ at 10 K (top panels) and 290 K (bottom panels) using the second-rank Raman tensor formalism (left panels) and the fourth-rank Raman tensor formalism (right panels).

with respect to normal-mode displacement λ, evaluated at equilibrium (repeated indices are summed). Retaining only first order terms, Eq. (3) becomes

\[ I_{\mu\nu\xi\rho} = \sum_{\lambda,\lambda'} \chi_{\lambda}^{\mu,\nu} \chi_{\lambda'}^{\xi,\rho} \int \langle A_{\lambda}(t)A_{\lambda'}(0) \rangle_T e^{-i\Omega t} dt. \]  

(6)

The thermal average is now taken over crystal configurations. Except for the determination of the susceptibility derivatives, previously discussed [38], the problem has reduced to one of lattice dynamics.

The Hamiltonian governing the dynamics of an anharmonic crystal is given by a similar expansion in atomic displacements [36]. In our normal mode coordinates this becomes

\[ H_A = H_0 + \Phi_{\lambda\lambda'} A_{\lambda}A_{\lambda'} A_{\lambda} + \Phi_{\lambda\lambda'} A_{\lambda} A_{\lambda'} A_{\lambda'} A_{\lambda'} + \cdots, \]  

(7)

where \( H_0 \) stands for the Hamiltonian of a harmonic system and \( \Phi_{\lambda\lambda'} \) are the Fourier transformed expansion coefficients in normal coordinates. This kind of system is conveniently solved using the single-particle Green’s function, \( G_{\lambda\lambda'}(\Omega, T) \). Applying a many-body perturbative treatment up to third-order in Eq. (7), the Green’s function may be written as a sum of the harmonic Green’s function \( g_{\lambda\lambda'}^0(\Omega) \) and a complex self-energy \( \Sigma_{\lambda\lambda'}(\Omega) \) [39-41],

\[ G_{\lambda\lambda'}(\Omega)^{-1} = g_{\lambda\lambda'}^0(\Omega)^{-1} + \Sigma_{\lambda\lambda'}(\Omega). \]  

(8)

where

\[ \Sigma_{qq'}(\Omega) = -18 \sum_{q_1,q_2,s_1,s_2} \Phi_{q_1,q_2}^{s_1,s_2} \Phi_{q,q_2}^{s_1,s_2} S(s_1,s_2,\Omega) \]  

(9)

and

\[ S(s_a,s_b,\Omega) = (n_a + n_b + 1) \times \left[ \frac{1}{(\omega_a + \omega_b - \Omega)_p} - \frac{1}{(\omega_a + \omega_b + \Omega)_p} \right] + \frac{1}{(\omega_b - \omega_a + \Omega)_p} - \frac{1}{(\omega_b - \omega_a - \Omega)_p}, \]  

(10)

with \( \omega_a \) the harmonic frequency of phonon mode \( s_a \), and \( n_{qs} \) the Bose-Einstein distribution for energy \( h\omega_s(q) \). The \( \Phi_{q_1,q_2}^{s_1,s_2} \) terms in Eq. (9) are the same expansion coefficients of Eq. (5), only with λ indices disentangled to make explicit the summation over both phonon branches \( s \) and wave vectors \( q \).

We can now make Eq. (6) more analytically transparent by use of the Green’s function and its corresponding spectral function, \( J_{\lambda\lambda'}(\Omega, T) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im} \left\{ G_{\lambda\lambda'}(\Omega) \right\} \). The generalized anharmonic scattering tensor becomes

\[ I(\Omega, T)_{\mu\nu\xi\rho} = \sum_{\lambda,\lambda'} \chi_{\lambda}^{\mu,\nu} \chi_{\lambda'}^{\xi,\rho} [n(\Omega, T) + 1] J_{\lambda\lambda'}(\Omega). \]  

(11)

B. Scattering in harmonic and anharmonic systems

In harmonic systems all inter-atomic interactions are reduced to terms quadratic in their displacement from equilibrium in the potential expansion [20]. These produce ideal, non-interacting normal mode solutions, \( G_{\lambda\lambda'}(\Omega) = g_{\lambda\lambda'}^0(\Omega) \delta_{\lambda\lambda'} \) [40]. Using the harmonic spectral function [42], the Stokes component in Eq. (11) becomes

\[ I(\Omega, T) = \sum_{\lambda} \chi_{\lambda}^{\mu,\nu} \chi_{\lambda}^{\xi,\rho} \frac{[n(\Omega, T) + 1]}{2\omega_{\lambda}} \delta(\Omega - \omega_{\lambda}), \]  

(12)

which reproduces the temperature independent PO response of Eq. (1), alongside the conventional intensity temperature dependence of Raman scattering (see
Sec. S9.4 for explicit comparison of models). In reality, the temperature evolution of the structural dynamics of a crystal are much more complex than harmonic theory suggests, even in room temperature (RT). Many fundamental physical phenomena are not captured within the harmonic framework, such as thermal expansion [43], thermal conductivity [44–46], phonon lifetime [46, 47] and phase transitions [48, 49]. Furthermore, the phonon dispersion curve itself has been demonstrated to change with temperature throughout the Brillouin zone [45, 50–52].

The inadequacy of a purely harmonic treatment in light scattering is already partially recognized in most Raman studies, at least implicitly. As Eq. (12) shows, the frequency dependence of a truly harmonic system should be a delta-function. In practice, a Lorentzian-like line shape is commonly used, which is accounted for by the same spectral function \( J(\Omega) \), or more explicitly by \((\text{Im}(\Sigma))^{-1}\), commonly known as the phonon lifetime [47].

The necessity for a fourth-rank tensor, however, stems specifically from the off-diagonal components in the self-energy (\( \lambda \neq \lambda' \)), contributions previously discussed in the context of thermal conductivity [53], but hitherto ignored in Raman studies. No second-rank Raman tensor can reproduce the polarization dependence dictated by the general product \( \chi^\lambda_{\mu\nu} \chi^{\lambda'}_{\xi\rho} \), so a fourth-rank tensor must be invoked. As Eq. (9) demonstrates, the self-energy term emerges entirely from higher-order terms in the dynamic expansion, which makes this effect an explicit manifestation of anharmonicity.

The different PO patterns made possible by each formalism depend on the measuring geometry, but one concrete example is demonstrated in Fig. 2: In our backscattering geometry, any second-rank Raman tensor will make the cross signal PO pattern periodically vanish. Indeed, this prohibits a successful fit to many of the observed spectra. Conversely, the fourth-rank tensor has no such limitation, allowing a faithful reproduction of the measured PO patterns.

Note that examination of a single BTBT spectrum would not hint at any extraordinary anharmonic effects, as the spectral features themselves are not particularly broad, nor do they display exceptional softening upon heating. This shows that the significance of off-diagonal components is not necessarily correlated with the overall magnitude of the self-energy term. Indeed, it is perhaps the relative conventional spectrum shape that made the observation possible.

C. Different manifestations of anharmonicity in light scattering

The spectra and fits for another peak, \( \omega_1 \), are presented in Fig. 3. Unlike the PO patterns of \( \omega_1 \) (Fig. 2), fitting the irrep-specific Eq. (1) proved satisfactory for all temperatures (Fig. 3(b)), with the generalized fourth-rank tensor offering a modest improvement (Fig. 3(c)). Importantly, the PO pattern still exhibits a clear evolution with temperature (Fig. 3(a)), an evolution that can not be explained by harmonic theory. The anharmonic spectral function, however, is temperature dependent. Even if the fourth-rank tensor conforms to a squared second-rank tensor, \( (\chi^\lambda_{\lambda} \otimes \chi_{\lambda}) \), the weight of each mode \( \lambda \) may change with temperature, altering their relative contributions to the spectral feature.

The success or failure of Eq. (1) demonstrates an important distinction in our interpretation of the mode coupling described by the off-diagonal components of \( J_{\lambda\lambda'}(\Omega) \). If an irrep-specific tensor, \( R_{\Gamma_\lambda} \), is able to capture the PO pattern, then only same-irrep couplings have contributed to the peak. If, however, only a fourth-rank tensor can describe the PO pattern, a coupling between different irreps must be the culprit. In the case of BTBT, only \( A_g \) and \( B_g \) modes are Raman active, which teaches us spectral feature \( \omega_1 \) (Fig. 2) arises from appreciable \( (A_g, B_g) \) coupling in the spectral function. This statement can potentially be tested by numerical simulations [54], or a 2D-Raman measurement [55], where inter-mode correlations are directly evaluated.

D. Symmetry of a fourth-rank scattering tensor

Inspection of equations (9)–(11) shows that a bottom-up treatment of anharmonic scattering requires a large number of parameters. However, unlike the irrep-specific material property \( \chi_{\lambda} \), the fourth-rank tensor \( I_{\mu\nu\xi\rho} \) is an observable, which means it must conform to all symmetry constraints of the full crystal space group, no matter the underlying scattering mechanism. In the language of factor group analysis, \( I_{\mu\nu\xi\rho} \) must have \( \Gamma_1 \) symmetry. This places significant constraints on the tensor form, so even in the case of the low-symmetry monoclinic space group of BTBT, \( (P2_1/c) \), the number of fitting parameters reduces to five, (see Sec. S9.3 in SM for the full tensor [27]). This can facilitate analytical and numerical treatments [38], as well as make the fitting procedure tractable.

IV. DISCUSSION

Our results prompt a revisit of the assumptions leading to Eq. (1). Specifically, that factor group analysis and its ensuing mode assignment relies on the harmonic approximation [56]. It is only through this approximation that the equations of motion for atoms in a crystal are mapped to a linear eigenequation, and the apparatus of representation theory may be invoked for the classification of vibrational normal modes. Note that given a full quantum mechanical treatment, the linearity of the system is guaranteed, so as long as \( H_A \) conforms to the space group symmetry, each solution must belong to a single irrep. These eigenstates, however, are not vibrational normal modes, but some unknown function of
all nuclear coordinates, and as such offer little analytical utility. This means that although representation theory still offers valuable insight, one should be careful when assigning a single irrep to a spectral feature, while associating that feature with a plane wave-like (i.e., phonon) solution.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, we have demonstrated the unique role of anharmonic terms of the lattice dynamical expansion in the polarization dependence of inelastic light scattering at finite temperatures. By allowing for vibrational mode coupling, we showed the tensor structure governing Raman scattering must be generalized to fourth-rank, given by the tensor product of two susceptibility operators. By doing so we were able to account for the temperature dependence observed in the Raman PO patterns of BTBT, as well as other organic crystals. This observation was made possible by our unique measurement apparatus, which allows for a continuous PO measurement in a wide range of temperatures.
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S1 Measurement details

Crystals Growth and characterization: BTBT single-crystals were grown by leaving a saturated BTBT solution in chloroform in open air at room temperature until complete chloroform evaporation. We confirmed the crystal structure and high phase purity of the crystals by performing XRD measurements (see Sec. S2).

Temperature-Dependent PO Raman: A custom-built Raman system was used to conduct the Raman measurements. The system included a 785 nm Toptica diode laser with intensity of around 30 mW on the sample. To control the polarization of the incident and scattered light for the polarization-dependent measurements (5° steps), rotating half-wave plates and a polarizer-analyzer combination were used. The system included a 50x objective. Notch filters are included in the system to allow access to the low-frequency region (>10 cm⁻¹) and simultaneous acquisition of the Stokes and anti-Stokes signal. The system is based on a 1 m long Horiba FHR-1000 dispersive spectrometer with a 1800 mm⁻¹ grating. The spectral resolution was approximately 0.15 cm⁻¹. The temperature was set and controlled by a Janis cryostat ST-500 and a temperature controller by Lakeshore model 335.
Powder X-ray diffraction measurements of BTBT

Preferred orientation and phase purity of BTBT were analyzed using powder X-ray diffraction. The experiment was performed at room temperature. The Compound was finely ground using a mortar and pestle for phase confirmation measurement. Single crystals were mounted over the sample holder for preferential orientation analysis. For BTBT the measurements were conducted on a Panalytical Empyrean diffractometer using Cu–Kα radiation ($\lambda = 1.54178 \text{ Å}$). The diffractometer was set up with reflection-transmission spinner 3.0 configuration, and patterns were collected with $2\theta$ range between 5.0 and 30.0°, steps of 0.1°, time per step of 2.5 s, and rotation of 1 r/s. A calculated pattern was obtained from known crystal structure of BTBT [1–3] using Powder Pattern tool on Mercury software [4, 5]. The crystalline phase of BTBT was confirmed to have the same phase of the known crystal structures with CSD Refcode PODKEA02 [3] (BTBT) as it can be observed in Figure S1 (experimental diffraction pattern in red and calculated diffraction patterns in black). The results show single crystals of BTBT with highly (100) preferred orientation crystallized along [001] direction.

![Figure S1: X-Ray diffraction patterns calculated from the known crystal structures (in black), obtained experimentally from powders (in red) and obtained experimentally from single crystals (in blue) of BTBT.](image-url)
S3  Raman spectra fitting

We fit the measured Stokes-shift Raman spectra with the product of the Bose-Einstein distribution and a multi-damped Lorentz oscillator line shape,

\[ I_{\text{Raman}}(\Omega) = \left( \frac{1}{e^\frac{\hbar\Omega}{k_B T} - 1} + 1 \right) \sum_i c_i \frac{|\Omega|^3}{\Omega^2 \Gamma_i^2 + (\Omega^2 - \omega_i^2)^2} \] (1)

Where \( \omega_{0,i} \), \( c_i \) and \( \Gamma_i \) are the position, intensity, and width of each peak, respectively. \( \Omega \) is the measured frequency (Raman shift), \( T \) is the temperature, \( \hbar \) is the Planck constant and \( k_B \) is the Boltzmann constant. The Lorentz in Equation (1) is a variation of the Lorentz oscillator, where \( c \) is the maximum value of the peak.
Figure S2 presents the PO Raman measurements of a (100) silicon wafer at 10 K and 300 K with the analysis of the polarization dependence of the integrated intensity of the prominent Raman peak (the TO phonon at around 520 cm\(^{-1}\)). We performed the measurements and analysis similar to the organic crystals presented in the main text using the same optical setup. We present these results as an example for an inorganic material that shows a temperature independent PO response, in agreement with the harmonic picture. Furthermore, according to theory, the intensity of the prominent Raman peak should go down to zero at the minimum point \([6]\). In our measurement, the peak intensity drops to about 1\% of its maximum intensity, showing our system suffers very little leakage.

**Figure S2:** Temperature dependence of the PO Raman of silicon. (a) and (b) present the PO Raman measurement of silicon at 10 K and 300 K, respectively. The middle and bottom panels present the measurements in parallel and cross configurations, respectively. The top panel presents the unpolarized spectrum (sum over all angles). (c) presents the polarization dependence of the integrated intensity of the prominent Raman peak. The top and bottom panels present the results for parallel and cross configurations, respectively.
S5  Polarization-orientation Raman of chloroform

Figure S3 presents the PO Raman measurement of liquid chloroform at room temperature. The measurement was performed similarly to the organic crystals presented in the main text using the same optical setup. Since there is no long-range order in a liquid, we expect the measurement to be polarization independent. This is why measuring the PO response of a liquid is helpful as a test for the system response to the change in polarization angle. Our results show that the PO response of the vibrations of chloroform is completely polarization-independent - proving our systems response is minimal.

![Figure S3](image_url)

**Figure S3**: Polarization dependent measurement of liquid chloroform in parallel and cross configurations. The top panel shows a typical spectrum in the parallel configuration.
Figure S4 shows the temperature dependent low-frequency Raman spectroscopy spectra of BTBT, from 10 K to 290 K at 10 K increments. We see only a gradual redshift and broadening of the spectrum as temperature increases. No abrupt changes to the Raman spectrum indicate there is no phase transition in the measured temperature range.

**Figure S4:** Temperature dependent low-frequency Raman of BTBT. The spectra were normalized and shifted up for clarity. The temperature increment is 10 K.

Figure S5 shows the temperature dependence of the peaks position and full-width-half-maximum (FWHM) of the lattice vibrations, extracted from fitting the spectra according to Sec. S3. The trend with temperature of vibrational frequency and FWHM is primarily linear.
Figure S5: The temperature dependence of the vibrational frequencies and FWHM of the lattice vibrations of BTBT.
**S7  Raman polarization-orientation color maps of BTBT**

Figure S6 presents the raw data obtained from the PO Raman measurements for both parallel and cross configurations for a single crystal of BTBT at 10, 80, 150, 200, and 290 K.

![Figure S6: Raw PO Raman of BTBT in (a) parallel and (b) cross configurations at 10 K, 80 K, 150 K, 220 K and 290 K.](image)

**Figure S6:** Raw PO Raman of BTBT in (a) parallel and (b) cross configurations at 10 K, 80 K, 150 K, 220 K and 290 K.
Temperature evolution in the Raman polarization-orientation response of BTBT

Figure S7 presents the temperature evolution of the PO pattern of each separate peak in the Raman spectrum of BTBT. The results show the PO Raman response of all BTBT lattice vibrations evolves with temperature.

Figure S7: The temperature evolution of the PO dependence for the low-frequency peaks of BTBT in (a) parallel and (b) cross configurations. The intensities were normalized for each mode at each temperature.
S9 Fitting the PO response of BTBT

S9.1 Data preparation and factor group analysis for BTBT

Section S7 presents the contour plots of the PO Raman measurement of BTBT at 10, 80, 150, 220, and 290 K in parallel and cross configurations. The measurements were performed as described in Sec. S1. To extract the polarization dependence of the integrated intensity of each peak we fit the spectra at each polarization angle to a multi-damped Lorentz oscillator (see section S3). The dotted lines in Figures S8 and S9 show the integrated intensity of each damped Lorentz oscillator with respect to the excitation polarization angle. Next, for the second-rank Raman tensor formalism we extract the form of the Raman tensors, as well as the expected number of lattice modes and their vibrational symmetry, by using factor group analysis with the relevant space group (monoclinic, $P_{2_1}/c$) [7]. For BTBT, factor group analysis predicts 6 Raman-active lattice libration modes, and indeed our measured spectra showed exactly six distinguishable Raman peaks.

S9.2 Fitting the PO with a second-rank tensor

The symmetry allowed Raman tensors for $3A_g$ and $3B_g$ are [8]:

$$R_{A_g} = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & e \\ 0 & b & 0 \\ e & 0 & c \end{pmatrix}, \quad R_{B_g} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & d & 0 \\ d & 0 & f \\ 0 & f & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

We perform a global fit to the integrated intensity in both parallel and cross configurations using the second-rank Raman tensor formalism described in the main text (for more details regarding the fitting process, see Ref. [9]). Figure S8 shows the results for this fitting procedure at all measured temperatures. The 10 K fits show that $\omega_1$, $\omega_3$, and $\omega_5$ are $A_g$ modes, while $\omega_4$ and $\omega_6$ are $B_g$ modes. The intensity of $\omega_2$ was too weak to extract its polarization dependence reliably. The fit gets worse for $\omega_3$, $\omega_4$ and $\omega_6$ as temperature increases, while for $\omega_1$ and $\omega_5$ the fit is successful in all temperatures.

To further challenge the necessity of a fourth-rank tensor, we attempted fitting a symmetry-
relaxed second-rank tensor:

\[
\tilde{R} = \begin{pmatrix}
a & d_1 & e_1 \\
d_2 & be^{i\gamma} & f_1 \\
e_2 & f_2 & c \\
\end{pmatrix},
\]

(3)

where we introduce a relative phase \(\gamma\) to account for possible birefringence effects [10], and allow asymmetric components (effectively relaxing time-symmetry) [11]. Adapted to our back-scattering geometry, \(\tilde{R}\) has five independent parameters \((a, b, d_1, d_2, \gamma)\). As Fig. S8 demonstrates, this generalized second-rank tensor form was still unable to fit the observed PO pattern of \(\omega_4\).

### S9.3 Fitting the PO with a fourth-rank tensor

Applying the symmetry constraints of the relevant space group \((P2_1/c)\) along with the intrinsic left and right minor symmetries, and retaining only the components relevant for our back-scattering geometry, the effective fourth-rank tensor used for fitting the PO patterns was:

\[
I_{\mu\nu\xi\rho} = \begin{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & f & 0 \\ d & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\
\begin{pmatrix} 0 & d & 0 \\ e & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \begin{pmatrix} b & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\
\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

(4)

Figure S9 shows the fit results for the same PO Raman data set by using the fourth-rank Raman tensor formalism. Here we see that the fit is excellent at all temperatures. A discussion about these results appears in the main text.
S9.4 The fourth and second-rank equivalency for harmonic systems

To demonstrate how the generalized forth-rank expression (Equations (2) and (11) in main text) reduces back to the familiar second-rank expression (Eq. (1) in main text) we plug in the harmonic spectral function (Eq. (12) in main text) into the generalized formulae. The incident field, \( E_i \), observed scattering polarization, \( n \), and second-rank tensor, \( \chi_\lambda \) are defined as

\[
E_i = |E_i| \begin{pmatrix} e_x \\ e_y \\ e_z \end{pmatrix}; \quad n \equiv e_s = \begin{pmatrix} n_x \\ n_y \\ n_z \end{pmatrix}; \quad R \equiv \chi_\lambda = \begin{pmatrix} \chi_{xx} & \chi_{xy} & \chi_{xz} \\ \chi_{yx} & \chi_{yy} & \chi_{yz} \\ \chi_{zx} & \chi_{zy} & \chi_{zz} \end{pmatrix}.
\] (5)

The polarization dependence of the scattering cross-section for a single mode \( \lambda \) becomes:

\[
\sigma \propto \sum_{\mu\nu\xi\rho} n_\mu n_\xi I_{\mu\nu,\xi\rho} E_v E_\rho \\
= [n(\lambda, T) + 1] \frac{|E_i|^2}{2\omega_\lambda} \sum_{\mu\nu\xi\rho} n_\mu n_\xi (\chi^*_\lambda \otimes \chi_\lambda)_{\mu\nu,\xi\rho} e_v e_\rho \\
\propto \sum_{\mu\nu\xi\rho} n_\mu n_\xi \chi^*_\nu \chi_{\rho\xi} e_v e_\rho \\
= \left( \sum_{\nu\mu} \chi^*_\nu n_\mu e_v \right) \left( \sum_{\rho\xi} \chi_{\rho\xi} n_\xi e_\rho \right) = \left( \sum_{\nu\mu} \chi_{\nu\mu} n_\mu e_v \right)^* \left( \sum_{\rho\xi} \chi_{\rho\xi} n_\xi e_\rho \right) \\
= \left| \sum_{ij} \chi_{ij} n_j e_i \right|^2 = \left| \sum_i e_i \sum_{ij} \chi_{ij} n_j \right|^2 \\
= |e_i \cdot \chi_\lambda \cdot e_s|^2,
\]

which is exactly the original second-rank expression.
Figure S8: The fitting results for the PO Raman response of BTBT at different temperatures, using a general second-rank Raman tensor.

Figure S9: The fitting results for the PO Raman response of BTBT at different temperatures, showing the successful fit obtained by using the fourth-rank formalism.
S10  Raman polarization-orientation measurements of anthracene and pentacene
S11  Theory of inelastic light scattering from crystals in finite temperatures

S11.1  Vibrational excitations of an anharmonic crystal

In this section we outline the procedure to determine the Raman spectrum of an anharmonic crystal. We will begin by sketching the procedure to obtain the phonon-phonon correlation function in the presence of three-phonon anharmonicity via the equation of motion approach.

If we express the atomic displacements in terms of creation and annihilation operators we can identify the reciprocal space coefficients needed for the perturbative expansion, repeated here for clarity and consistency of notation. Start with the standard creation and annihilation operators for a phonon with momentum \( q \) and polarization \( s \) (when there is no loss of clarity we use the compound index \( \lambda \) to denote \( q_s \)):

\[
a_{qs} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2N\hbar}} \sum_{i\alpha} e^{i\alpha} \left( \sqrt{m_i\omega_{qs}}u_{i\alpha} - i\frac{p_{i\alpha}}{\sqrt{m_i\omega_{qs}}} \right) e^{-iq\cdot ri}
\]

(6)

\[
a_{qs}^+ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2N\hbar}} \sum_{i\alpha} e^{i\alpha} \left( \sqrt{m_i\omega_{qs}}u_{i\alpha} + i\frac{p_{i\alpha}}{\sqrt{m_i\omega_{qs}}} \right) e^{iq\cdot ri}
\]

(7)

\[
A_{qs} = a_{qs} + a_{qs}^+ = \frac{2}{\sqrt{2N\hbar}} \sum_{i\alpha} e^{i\alpha} \sqrt{m_i\omega_{qs}}u_{i\alpha} e^{-iq\cdot ri}
\]

(8)

\[
B_{qs} = a_{qs} - a_{qs}^+ = -\frac{2i}{\sqrt{2N\hbar}} \sum_{i\alpha} e^{i\alpha} \frac{p_{i\alpha}}{\sqrt{m_i\omega_{qs}}} e^{-iq\cdot ri}
\]

(9)

Here \( \epsilon \) are phonon eigenvectors \( (\epsilon_i \cdot \epsilon_j = \delta_{ij}) \), \( m \) atomic masses and \( \omega \) frequencies. The vector \( r \) is a lattice vector, and \( u \) and \( p \) are the position and momentum operators. We use the notation \( \bar{q} = -q \). We introduce scaled eigenvectors (to simplify notation) via

\[
\upsilon_{iqs} = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{2m_i\omega_{qs}}} e^{i\alpha}
\]

(10)

In this notation the matrix elements pertaining to anharmonicity become

\[
\Phi_{\lambda\lambda'\lambda''} = \frac{1}{3!} \sum_{ijk\alpha\beta\gamma} \upsilon_{iqs}^{i} \upsilon_{jq's'}^{j} \upsilon_{kp's''}^{k} \Phi_{ijk}^{\lambda\beta\gamma} e^{-i(q_r+q'_r+q''_r)}
\]

(11)

\[
\Phi_{\lambda\lambda'\lambda''\lambda'''} = \frac{1}{4!} \sum_{ijkl\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \upsilon_{iqs}^{i} \upsilon_{jq's'}^{j} \upsilon_{kp's''}^{k} \upsilon_{lp's'''}^{l} \Phi_{ijkl}^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} e^{-i(q_r+q'_r+q''_r+q'''_r)}
\]

(12)
so that the anharmonic part of the Hamiltonian becomes

\[ H_A = \Phi_{\lambda\lambda',\lambda''} A_{\lambda} A_{\lambda'} A_{\lambda''} + \Phi_{\lambda\lambda',\lambda''} A_{\lambda} A_{\lambda'} A_{\lambda''} A_{\lambda'''}, \]  

(13)

In an analogous way we define the coefficients of the expansion of the polarizability as

\[ \chi_{\lambda}^{\mu\nu} = \sum_{i\alpha} v_{qs}^{i\alpha} \chi_{\lambda i}^{\mu\nu,\alpha} e^{-iq \cdot \Delta q} = \sum_{i\alpha} v_{i\alpha} \chi_{\lambda}^{\mu\nu,\alpha} = \chi_{\lambda}^{\mu\nu}(s) \]  

(14)

\[ \chi_{\lambda\lambda',\lambda''}^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2!} \sum_{i\alpha\beta} v_{qs}^{i\alpha} v_{qs'}^{i\beta} \chi_{\lambda i}^{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} e^{-iq \cdot \Delta q} \]  

(15)

\[ = \frac{1}{2!} \sum_{i\alpha\beta} v_{qs}^{i\alpha} (v_{qs'}^{i\beta})^\dagger \chi_{\lambda i}^{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} e^{iq \cdot (\Delta q)} \]  

(16)

\[ \chi_{\lambda\lambda',\lambda''}^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{3!} \sum_{ij\alpha\beta\gamma} v_{qs}^{i\alpha} v_{qs'}^{j\beta} v_{qs''}^{k\gamma} \chi_{\lambda ij}^{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta\gamma} e^{-i(q \cdot \Delta q')} \]  

(17)

Such that

\[ \chi_{\lambda\lambda',\lambda''}^{\mu\nu} = \chi_0^{\mu\nu} + \chi_{\lambda\lambda',\lambda''}^{\mu\nu} A_{\lambda} A_{\lambda'} A_{\lambda''} + \chi_{\lambda\lambda',\lambda''}^{\mu\nu} A_{\lambda} A_{\lambda'} A_{\lambda''} A_{\lambda'''}. \]  

(19)

S11.2 Raman scattering in terms of the anharmonic Green’s function

If we start from the polarizability-polarizability correlation function and insert the expansion of the polarizability in terms of phonon coordinates, Eq. (19), we get

\[ \langle \chi(t) \chi(0) \rangle = \chi_0 \otimes \chi_0 + \chi_{\lambda} \otimes \chi_{\lambda} i\hat{G}(A_{\lambda}, A_{\lambda'}) + \chi_{\lambda\lambda'} \otimes \chi_{\lambda\lambda'} i\hat{G}(A_{\lambda}, A_{\lambda'}) + \chi_{\lambda\lambda',\lambda''} \otimes \chi_{\lambda\lambda',\lambda''} i\hat{G}(A_{\lambda}, A_{\lambda'} A_{\lambda''}) + \chi_{\lambda\lambda',\lambda''} \otimes \chi_{\lambda\lambda',\lambda''} i\hat{G}(A_{\lambda}, A_{\lambda'} A_{\lambda''}) + \chi_{\lambda\lambda',\lambda''} \otimes \chi_{\lambda\lambda',\lambda''} i\hat{G}(A_{\lambda}, A_{\lambda'} A_{\lambda''} A_{\lambda'''}) + \chi_{\lambda\lambda',\lambda''} \otimes \chi_{\lambda\lambda',\lambda''} i\hat{G}(A_{\lambda}, A_{\lambda'} A_{\lambda''} A_{\lambda'''}) + \chi_{\lambda\lambda',\lambda''} \otimes \chi_{\lambda\lambda',\lambda''} i\hat{G}(A_{\lambda}, A_{\lambda'} A_{\lambda''} A_{\lambda'''}) + \chi_{\lambda\lambda',\lambda''} \otimes \chi_{\lambda\lambda',\lambda''} i\hat{G}(A_{\lambda}, A_{\lambda'} A_{\lambda''} A_{\lambda'''}) \]  

(20)

where \( \hat{G}(A_{\lambda}, A_{\lambda'}, \tau) \equiv -i\langle A_{\lambda}(\tau), A_{\lambda'}(0) \rangle \), and we have omitted terms of \( A^4 \) or higher. The physical quantity of interest here is the spectral function, \( J_{\lambda\lambda'}(\Omega) \), which may also be written in
terms of the retarded Green’s function,
\[ G_{\lambda\lambda'}^R(\Omega) \equiv -i\theta(\tau) \langle [A_\lambda(\tau), A_{\lambda'}^+(0)] \rangle : \]

\[ J_{\lambda\lambda'}(\Omega) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im} \left\{ G_{\lambda\lambda'}^R(\Omega) \right\} = \frac{i}{(n(\Omega, T) + 1)} G_{\lambda\lambda'}^>(\Omega), \]  
(21)

with the retarded Green’s function conveniently given in terms of the sum of a diagonal harmonic part, \( S_{\lambda\lambda'}^0(\Omega) \), and the self-energy term \( \Sigma_{\lambda\lambda'}(\Omega) \):

\[ G_{\lambda\lambda'}^R(\Omega)^{-1} = S_{\lambda\lambda'}^0(\Omega)^{-1} \delta_{\lambda\lambda'} + \Sigma_{\lambda\lambda'}(\Omega). \]  
(22)

Following the work of others [12–15], we have previously discussed in detail the solution for the retarded Green’s function of an anharmonic system \( H_A \) [16]. In the case of third-order anharmonicity, the self-energy is given by

\[ \Sigma_{\lambda\lambda'}(\Omega) = -18 \sum_{q_1q_2s_1s_2} \Phi_{qq_1q_2}^{s_1s_2} \Phi_{qq_1q_2}^{s_1s_2} S(s_1, s_2, \Omega) \]  
(23)

and

\[ S(s_a, s_b, \Omega) = (n_a + n_b + 1) \left[ \frac{1}{(\omega_a + \omega_b - \Omega)_p} - \frac{1}{(\omega_a + \omega_b + \Omega)_p} \right] \]

\[ + (n_a - n_b) \left[ \frac{1}{(\omega_b - \omega_a + \Omega)_p} - \frac{1}{(\omega_b - \omega_a - \Omega)_p} \right]. \]  
(24)

The constant (zeroth) term in Eq. (20) does not contribute to the Raman spectrum. Using the spectral function (21), the first term becomes

\[ I^1 = \chi_\lambda \otimes \chi_{\lambda'} \int \tilde{G}(A_\lambda(t), A_{\lambda'}(0)) e^{-i\Omega t} dt = \chi_\lambda \otimes \chi_{\lambda'}(n(\Omega) + 1) J_{\lambda\lambda'}(\Omega). \]  
(25)

This is sufficient to understand the origin of the polarization dependence presented in this study. Higher terms in expansion (20) are usually smaller, but become significant in Raman inactive structures, where the derivatives in Eq. (25) identically vanish. This will happen for any crystal where all atomic sites constitute a center of inversion. See [16] for a detailed discussion for the case of rock-salt structure, as well as how higher-order terms might play a role in finite temperatures.
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