Aspects of the normal state resistivity of cuprate superconductors Bi2201 and Tl2201

Samantha Shears, Michael Arciniaga[†] and B Sriram Shastry[‡]

¹Physics Department, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA, 95064

February 4, 2025

Abstract

Planar normal state resistivity data from two families of hole doped single layer cuprate superconductors Bi2201 (Bi₂Sr₂CuO_{6+x}) and Tl2201 (Tl₂Ba₂CuO_{6+x}) are calculated using the extremely correlated Fermi liquid theory (ECFL)[1, 2, 3]. This theory was recently employed[4] for understanding the three families of single layer cuprate superconductors LSCO, BSLCO and NCCO. Adding these two systems accounts for essentially all single layer compounds where data is available for a range of densities and temperatures. The added case of Bi2201 is of particular interest since it was the original system where the almost linear in temperature resistivity was reported in 1990[9, 8], and has been followed up by a systematic doping analysis only recently in 2022 [10]. The Tl2201 system has two distinct set of band parameters that fit the same Fermi surface, providing new challenges and insights into the ECFL theory.

1 Introduction

Strongly correlated systems such as high T_c systems provide a formidable challenge to our current understanding of the physics of interacting Fermi systems.

^{*}sshears@.ucsc.edu

 $^{^{\}dagger}{\rm michael.arciniaga@gmail.com}$

 $^{^{\}ddagger}$ sriram@physics.ucsc.edu

The standard framework is largely built using the density functional theory of Kohn *et. al*, supplemented by methods incorporating weak or moderate strength interactions. New techniques to calculate the physics of strongly correlated systems, where interactions are much bigger than the band energy are few, and their reliability is not fully established. A major question that remains to be settled is whether such strongly correlated systems are Fermi liquids, or some variety of non-Fermi liquids. Monitoring and interpreting the behavior of the resistivity in the normal state can- in principle- identify the nature of the underlying normal state and distinguish between Fermi-liquids and non Fermi-liquids. Experimental data on many systems shows a complex set of T dependences in different regimes, varying with the density, and understanding them from the theoretical viewpoint is our main task.

The extremely correlated Fermi liquid theory (ECFL) [1, 2] was developed starting in 2011, to fill in this technical gap, and seems to hold promise for certain classes of systems that can be modeled by a single correlated banddescribable by the large U-Hubbard model or the t-J model. The ECFL theory is able to provide quantitative results for the resistivity, using the following ingredients:

- (i) A single copper oxide with dimensionless band parameters t'/t, t"/t... retrieved from the shape of the Fermi surface determined by angle resolved photo emission (ARPES). Here the interlayer hopping is assumed to be negligible.
- (ii) The particle density n (the number of electrons per copper), usually obtainable from the Luttinger-Ward area of the Fermi surface found from ARPES.
- (iii) The interlayer lattice constant c_0 obtainable from crystallography- it is usually half the c axis lattice constant c_L in the almost tetragonal unit cell.

These items determine all parameters in the t-J model Eq. (1), with the exception of J and t itself. Our earlier results suggest that J is not a sensitive parameter[3] and we take $J/t \sim 0.17$ in most of our work. The value of t is the single adjustable parameter that is fixed for each family of materials studied, by

choosing a reasonable overall fit to the resistivity over many densities. Having access to data sets containing several densities is advantageous, with an overall fit one can expect to reduce the implicit bias in the fits if only a single density is considered. It should be noted that the results of the ECFL (see Fig. (5, 11)) can be broadly characterized as leading to a resistivity that is quadratic in temperature below a surprisingly low scale (given the large $t \sim 1 \text{ eV}$), which crosses over to an almost linear behavior over a wide temperature scale, often with another crossover- and finally with sight curvature reappearing at fairly high T (~ 600 K). The quasiparticle weight turns out to be much reduced from unity, and the crossover T scales are sensitively dependent on the density and band parameters $t'/t, t''/t \dots$ The detailed equations of the ECFL theory given in [1, 2, 4], and summarized below, produce this complex variety of behaviour starting from the microscopic parameters defining the model Eq. (1).

In a recent paper [4] we applied the ECFL to four major families of cuprate superconductors- LSCO[5], BSLCO[5], NCCO[6] and LCCO[7]- where all the above ingredients are present. These systems are characterized by a single sheeted Fermi surface and with single layer (i.e. well separated) copper oxide planes, that allow or a quasi 2-dimensional theory to be applied. It is shown in that paper that theory shows quantitative agreements with experiments over several densities. For LSCO we studied samples at 11 densities, and for BSLCO we studied samples at 7 densities. For the electron doped materials NCCO we studied the 2 available metallic samples and for LCCO we studied samples at 4 densities. The temperature range of most of the systems was from T_c up to 300 and 400 K in the case of LSCO. In most cases [4] reports a close agreement between theory and experiment.

The single layer system Bi2201 was omitted from our study in [4] since results were available for only a single density at that time[8, 9], and is included in this work since further data has been published meanwhile[10]. This system was experimentally studied in a few influential papers [8, 9] in 1989-90. In these papers T-linearity of resistivity was reported over a remarkably large range of T, between 8 K and ~800 K. This result was expected to be a harbinger of universal T-linearity of resistivity in the cuprates, therefore possibly implying the general demise of any kind of Fermi liquid theory in these systems. However the reported results were confined to a single composition, and hence some of the ingredients mentioned above were missing. The situation remained unchanged for almost three decades until very recently. This system has been studied recently in [10], who have reported data on a few different densities overlapping with that in [8, 9], albeit over a smaller temperature range $T \lesssim 300$ K. New results on another interesting single layer system Tl2201 at a set of densities have also been reported recently in [11, 12, 13]. This system is of additional interest since it allows convenient access to the highly overdoped regime. The present work extends the earlier work [4] to include parameters relevant to the available samples of Bi2201 and Tl2201. We mention that Tl2201 leads to an interesting and unexpected theoretical situation, we found that the reported Fermi surface can be fit with a significantly different set of band parameters from the ones reported in [12, 13], and we are able to non-trivially test a theoretical hypothesis that it is the shape of the Fermi surface- rather than the values of the band parameters- that determine the computed resistivity. For context we note that in the t-J model, the hopping parameters multiply the (Gutzwiller) correlated Fermi operators which can be viewed as consisting of 4 Fermions, and hence this hypothesis seems to require testing.

1.1 The *t*-*J* model and the ECFL methodology

The t-J model [14] is very important for understanding strongly correlated systems. This model is related to the Hubbard model in the $U \to \infty$ limit, precluding double occupancy. The model is written in the usual form

$$H = P_G H_{tb} P_G + J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} (\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j - \frac{1}{4} n_i n_j)$$
(1)

where the first term is the Gutzwiller projected band energy, i.e. P_G is the Gutzwiller projector, and the exchange term is restricted to nearest neighbours. The tight binding term is written as a sum over a range of neighbours, where $\vec{r}_i \rightarrow i$ are the locations of the lattice sites assumed to be on a square lattice with lattice constant a_0 and with

$$H_{tb} = -\sum_{ij} t_{ij} C_{i\sigma}^{\dagger} C_{j\sigma} = \sum_{k\sigma} \varepsilon_k C_{k\sigma}^{\dagger} C_{k\sigma}$$
(2)

with

$$-t_{ij} = -t\delta_{|i-j|=a_0} - t'\delta_{|i-j|=\sqrt{2}a_0} - t''\delta_{|i-j|=2a_0}$$
(3)

1 INTRODUCTION

and the Fourier transform of $-t_{ij}$ is the band dispersion $\varepsilon_{\vec{k}}$ given by

$$\varepsilon(\vec{k}) = -2t(\cos(k_x a_0) + \cos(k_y a_0)) - 4t'\cos(k_x a_0)\cos(k_y a_0) - 2t''(\cos(2k_x a_0) + \cos(2k_y a_0))$$
(4)

Details of the ECFL formalism has been discussed extensively in prior papers [1, 2], and also the resistivity related paper [4]. Here we will provide the barest overview to familiarize the reader with notations.

In ECFL a one electron Green's function can be broken into the product of an auxiliary Green's function \mathbf{g} and the caparison function $\tilde{\mu}$:

$$G(\vec{k}, i\omega_n) = \mathbf{g}(\vec{k}, i\omega_n) \times \tilde{\mu}(\vec{k}, i\omega_n)$$
(5)

with $\omega_n = \frac{2\pi}{\beta}(n+\frac{1}{2})$ is the fermionic Matsubara frequency, and $\mathbf{g}(\vec{k}, i\omega_n)$ is a canonical fermion propagator. $\tilde{\mu}$ and \mathbf{g} are found from two self energies $\Psi(\vec{k}, i\omega_n)$ and $\chi(\vec{k}, i\omega_n)$

$$\widetilde{\mu}(\vec{k}, i\omega_n) = 1 - \lambda \frac{n}{2} + \lambda \Psi(\vec{k}, i\omega_n),
\mathbf{g}(\vec{k}, i\omega_n)^{-1} = i\omega_n + \mu' - \widetilde{\mu}(\vec{k}, i\omega_n)(\varepsilon(\vec{k}) - u_0/2) - \lambda \chi(\vec{k}, i\omega_n),$$
(6)

where λ is an interpolation parameter set equal to 1 at the end, $\mu' = \mu - \frac{1}{2}u_0 + \lambda nJ$, and u_0 is a Lagrange multiplier, which along with the thermodynamic chemical potential μ is fixed from two particle number sum-rules

$$n_G = 2\Sigma_k G(k) e^{i\omega_n 0^+} = n,$$

$$n_g = 2\Sigma_k \mathbf{g}(k) e^{i\omega_n 0^+} = n.$$
(7)

In the ECFL theory the two self energies satisfy coupled integral equations that are available as an expansion in powers of λ , this is truncated to second order for this problem as in [4]. We note that $\lambda = 0$ gives the non-interacting theory, whereas the exact Gutzwiller projected theory requires a summation of the λ expansion to all orders. By truncating the expansion to second order we are making an approximation to the exact theory, which captures some of the significant effects of strong correlations, as argued in [1, 2, 4]. Solving these equation gives the spectral function $A(\vec{k}, \omega)$ found by analytically continuing to real frequencies from the Matsubara frequencies $i\omega_n \to \omega + i0^+$ by using $A(\vec{k}, \omega) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im} G(\vec{k}, \omega).$

1 INTRODUCTION

1.2 Formulation for resistivity

Within the ECFL theory we express the resistivity as

$$o = R_{vK} \times c_0 \times \bar{\rho}\left(\frac{t'}{t}, \frac{t''}{t}, \frac{k_B T}{t}, \frac{J}{t}, n\right)$$
(8)

where $R_{vK} = \frac{h}{e^2} = 25813\Omega$ is the von Klitzing resistance, n is the particle density, c_0 is the interlayer separation for the cuprates- equalling half the caxis lattice constant c_L for the single layer compounds considered here. Here $\bar{\rho}$ is the dimensionless resistivity computed in terms of the microscopic model parameters and temperature measured in units of t. We express $\bar{\rho}$ in terms of the band velocities $\vec{v}_{\vec{k}} = \vec{\partial}_{\vec{k}} \varepsilon_k$, the Fermifunction $f(\omega) = \{e^{\beta\omega} + 1\}^{-1}$ and the electron spectral function $A(\vec{k}, \omega)$ obtained from the ECFL formalism [1] as

$$\frac{1}{\bar{\rho}} = \frac{(2\pi)^2}{a_0^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \left(-\frac{\partial f(\omega)}{\partial \omega}\right) \langle A^2(\vec{k},\omega)(\hbar v_k^x)^2 \rangle_{\vec{k}}.$$
(9)

The behaviour of $\bar{\rho}$ is quite intricate and it is discussed below as a function of various parameters.

For typical parameters encountered in our study, the resistivity ρ is found to be linear in T in a certain range of temperature, wherein one can express it in a Drude type form $\rho = \frac{m_*}{n_*e^2\tau}$, where the relaxation time $\tau = \frac{h}{k_BT}$ involves only Planck's constant. This is sometimes referred to as the "Planckian limit" [13], which is free from any material specific scale. Taking this observation as seriously suggesting a universal and otherwise scale free physics seems hard. It is impossible to extract τ from experiments- unencumbered by other essential parameter such as n_*, m_* . The parameters n_*, m_* in such a fit can be determined in each case and are far from being invariant - they vary with all other basic parameters of the theory. A similarly non-universal situation seems to occur in most experiments as well, where specific sets of data show a linear in T behaviour over a restricted range.

1.3 Computation

The ECFL equations were solved iteratively on four $N_k \times N_k$ lattices with $N_k = 81, 86, 91$ and 96, with a frequency grid of $N_\omega = 2^{14}$ points. In [4] smaller systems $N_k=62$ were studied, but otherwise we used the identical computational procedure. Our systems are still too small to display the systematics expected



Figure 1: The band parameters used here are given in Eq. (12). The resulting Fermi surfaces at densities n = 0.75, 0.8, 0.85 are shown in red in the two figures and compared to those from other suggested models, (Left) with parameters t'/t = -0.3143, t''/t = 0.04286 (in blue) quoted in [10] and, (Right) with parameters t'/t = -0.156, t''/t = 0.164 (dashed lines) quoted in [15].

from finite-sized scaling analysis. The different sizes studied show small but unsystematic variations. These are treated by averaging the resistivity results over the four samples. With a few exceptions at the lowest T values fluctuation $\delta \rho / \rho$ is generally less than 2%. Also as in [4] theoretical resistivities extending below T=77.8 K (asuming t= 1eV) are found by extrapolating from a fit $\rho \sim \alpha \frac{T^2}{T+T_0}$.

2 Bi2201 Results

2.1 Fermi surface and band parameters of Bi2201

We study Bi2201 using the tight binding parameters

Bi2201 tight binding parameters:
$$t' = -0.4t, t'' = 0.0, J = 0.17t,$$

 $t = 1.176eV$
 $c_L, c_0 = 24.6, 12.3 \text{\AA}$ (10)

where the magnitude of t is estimated from a best fit with the resistivity over all available samples, as discussed below in Fig. (2). Our choice in Eq. (12) is guided by requiring the simplest parameterization, with the smallest number of non-zero hopping elements, and differ somewhat from other schemes in literature. The band parameters suggested in [10], upon conversion to the convention used here are expressible in the form t' = -0.3143 t, t'' = 0.04286 t, and earlier estimates from band theory [15] are further away t' = -0.156 t, t'' = 0.164 t. Fig. (1) shows that both of these alternate schemes lead to very similar Fermisurfaces found from Eq. (12). While t'/t and t''/t are obtainable from the measured Fermi surface when available, the magnitude of t remains undetermined by these considerations. The magnitude of the single theoretical parameter t is determined to give a good overall fit to the resistivities over available densities, as noted in Fig. (2). We also made a few further checks with the the parameterization in [10], which yielded very similar resistivities after adjusting the scale of t.

We first summarize the available samples from [10, 9, 8] in Table 1, and discuss their resistivity in detail below. Their T_c 's and other parameters are listed in Table 1. In the last row of Table 1 we also include the early measurement of [9, 8]. Here we review those early findings in the context of recent and modern measurements in [10], as well as calculations from the ECFL theory.

In [10] the normal state resistivity of samples S:1-S:4 are reported for temperatures up to 300K. The question of determining the hole density x in this system is discussed in [10]. They estimate x (= p) by comparing the observed resistivity $\rho(T)$ and $d\rho(T)/dT$ with observations on LSCO at different densities [5]. They observe that for x deduced from different arguments, such as the ARPES Luttinger count, comparing resistivity and its T derivatives and the phenomenological relation (Eq. (13)) between T_c and x lead to rather different results in general. For the samples studied further in this work, we could not find the recommended estimates of x in the paper [10], and therefore used Eq. (13) to arrive at the x- column using the quoted T_c values, as detailed in [16]. Since the ECFL calculation- with suitable parameters- leads to a consistent quantitative description of the LSCO resistivity ρ and the derivative $d\rho/dT$ data from [5], we go ahead and compare the current calculation with all the reported resistivity data below- where we evaluate and comment on the quoted x values as well as

Sample $\#$	Ref.	T_c in K	x (Eq. (13))	T_{max} in K
S:1	[10]	7	0.258	300
S:2	[10]	17	0.239	300
S:3	[10]	27	0.213	300
S:4	[10]	31	0.197	300
S:5	[9]	6.5	0.259 (?)	800

Table 1: Samples S:1-S:4 of Bi2201 studied in 2022[10], and sample S:5 studied in 1989[9, 8] are compared with theory below. Resistivity measurements are reported up to T_{max} . In [10] the observed T_c for each of these overdoped samples is used to estimate the hole density x using the phenomenological relation Eq. (13). The quoted T_c of sample S:5 [9, 8] converts to a density x=0.259 by using Eq. (13). This value is essentially identical to that of sample S:1 in [10], but is observed to have a substantially different magnitude of resistivity from it, as seen in Fig. (3). Theoretically (see Fig. (4)) x=0.32 seems overall to be more consistent for sample S:5.

make suggestions to revise them.

2.2 Resistivity of Bi2201

In Fig. (2) we compare the ECFL theory resistivity with that from samples S:1-S:4 of [10]. We note that the $d\rho/dT$ of the two sets are close, however the sample S:4 has somewhat bigger ρ than the theoretical estimate-indicating that the estimated x might be slightly off. For this purpose, the top left panel in Fig. (2) shows the ECFL resistivities at n = 0.81 (x=0.19) as well as n = 0.8 (x=0.2) with identical remaining parameters, which seem to bracket the experimental result for the sample S:4.

Turning to the data from S:5 [9, 8], in Fig. (3) we compare the resistivity with S:1 from [10]. In Table 1, we see that by using the phenomenological relation [17, 16], these two are expected to be very close, but the resistivities do not appear to be very close. We next compare these with the ECFL resistivities at n = 0.71, 0.68 using the previously determined value t=1.176 eV. It seems thus that these two curves bracket the result for S:5. We explore this further by plotting the resistivity over a much bigger T scale- up to 800K in Fig. (4).



Figure 2: Clockwise from top left-the ECFL resistivities (in red and magenta) at n = 0.80 and 0.81, then (in red) at n = 0.787, 0.761, 0.742 plotted against the resistivity data of Berben *et. al.* [10] for samples S:4,S:3,S:2,S:1 respectively. The experimental data has been adjusted for impurity contribution by a simple shift in each case. The top left panel shows the theoretical ECFL resistivities at n = 0.81 (x=0.19) as well as n = 0.8 (x=0.2), which seems to bracket the data. The ECFL curves use the band parameters in Eq. (12) with t = 1.176 eV for all the curves. This value of t seems to be reasonable for the overall available data set, and the tight binding parameters Eq. (12) are used in calculation of all the Bi2201 figures below. For T \lesssim 70K the ECFL results are parabolic in T.



Figure 3: ECFL resistivity at n = 0.68 and n = 0.71 plotted against the data from Martin. et. al. [9, 8] and S:1 from Berben et. al. [10].

It is seen here that there is reasonable match between the two curves over most of the range.

In Fig. (5) we display the ECFL resistivities using the band parameters in Eq. (12) over a wide set of densities and a broad range of T. We note that the nonlinear (usually quadratic) corrections to the resistivity become more evident as the particle density n increases, being almost linear over the whole range at the lowest density- as also seen in Fig. (4).

3 Tl2201 Results

3.1 Fermi surface and band parameters of Tl2201

The ARPES determined Fermi surface for Tl2201 is available in [11, 12]. This work fits it to a band structure

$$\epsilon(k_x, k_y) = \frac{1}{2}\tau_1(\cos(k_x) + \cos(k_y)) + \tau_2\cos(k_x)\cos(k_y) + \frac{1}{2}\tau_3(\cos(2k_x) + \cos(2k_y)) + \frac{1}{2}\tau_4(\cos(2k_x)\cos(k_y) + \cos(k_y)\cos(2k_y)) + \tau_5\cos(2k_x)\cos(2k_y) \quad (11)$$



Figure 4: ECFL resistivity at n = 0.68 (blue) plotted against the data from Martin. et. al. [9, 8] over wide T range.



Figure 5: ECFL resistivities at typical densities over a wide temperature window.

where in units of eV $\tau_1 = -0.725$, $\tau_2 = 0.302$, $\tau_3 = 0.0159$, $\tau_4 = -0.0805$ and $\tau_5 = 0.0034$. Our preference is to use fewer parameters for performing the ECFL calculations involving a large number of further steps. Hence we checked for the possibility of fitting the Fermi surface resulting from Eq. (11) with at most two sets of neighbours i.e. with t, t', t'' only, and found that there are two distinct type of parameters which provide excellent fits of the above Fermi surface over the full range of densities studied- as seen in Fig. (6). We refer to these as Model-A and Model-B. The two hopping variable sets are given by

Tl2201 tight binding parameters: Model-A
$$t' = -0.430t, t'' = 0.005t$$

 $t = 1.82eV, J = 0.17t,$
Model-B $t' = -0.237t, t'' = 0.138t$
 $t = 1.053eV, J = 0.17t$
 $c_L, c_0 = 23.1, 11.56 \text{\AA}$ (12)

and we included the standard value of J used for easy reference.

Ref. [13] presents the normal state resistivity of four samples with densities n=0.817, 0.773, 0.744, 0.726. We display in Fig. (6) the Fermi surfaces from Eq. (12) compared with the Fermi surface from Eq. (11).

3.2 Resistivity of Tl2201

In Fig. (7) - Fig. (9) we compare model A and model B for n = 0.726, 0.744 and 0.773 to experimental results from Cooper et. al. [13]. In general the resistivities of Model-A and Model-B are very close over all densities and temperatures. Fig. (10) shows experimental results for n = 0.817. This curve does not agree well with either of our models and seems to be somewhat higher in magnitude. Two higher density results for model A are displayed for additional comparison, the curve at n = 0.86 seems closer in scale to the data. Further data at nearby densities would be helpful to clarify the resistivity-density systematics.

In Fig. (11) we display the full set of results at different densities for Model B over a wide range of T, Model-A gives very similar results and is therefore not displayed.



Figure 6: (Left) The Fermi surfaces at n=0.7. Blue curves are from Model-B (Eq. (12)) and the red curve is from Model-A (Eq. (12)). The inset shows the Model-B in blue and the Fermi surface from the experimentally derived energy dispersion in Eq. (11) in black. These are essentially indistinguishable. (Right) the same curves at density n=0.8. We thus see that the result from Model-A is fairly close to the experimentally derived Fermi surface, while the Model-B is exact at these densities.

4 Concluding Comments

We first comment about a minor difference in the treatment of the impurity contribution to resistivity this work from that in [4]. In the case of Tl2201, the data for each sample presented in [12, 13] is in the convenient form of a fit to a simple function $\rho = \rho_0 + \rho_1 T + \rho_2 T^2$, and hence we drop the term with ρ_0 to compare with theory. We note that for the case of Bi2201, we digitized the published data and fit it to the same functional form, and followed the same recipe.

Our results for the single layer compound Bi2201 are compared with theory in Fig. (2). Theory is in reasonable accord on an absolute scale with the data from [10] at n=0.787, 0.761 and 0.742. At n=0.80 the theoretical result for n=0.80 is somewhat off from the data, while the result for n=0.81 is close- albeit with a slightly greater slope. There seems to be no single scaling of t which could improve matters at all densities. A notable aspect of the comparison is that the



Figure 7: ECFL resistivity for Tl2201 using parameters in Eq. (12) at a density n=0.726 with Model-A (blue) and Model-B (black), compared with the experimental curve from [13]. The two values of t for the two models quoted in Eq. (12) are fixed by fitting the theoretical temperature with the observed one, and are taken to be fixed for other densities. We see that the theoretical curves as well as the experimental one show a significant quadratic correction in T here and at most other densities.



Figure 8: ECFL resistivity for Tl2201 using parameters in Eq. (12) at a density n=0.744 with Model-A (blue) and Model-B (black), compared with the experimental curve from [13]. Below 250 K, the theoretical and experimental curves are seen to be close at this density.



Figure 9: ECFL resistivity for Tl2201 using parameters in Eq. (12) at a density n=0.773 with Model-A (blue) and Model-B (black), compared with the experimental curve from [13]. The experimental curve is somewhat shifted upwards from the theoretical one.



Figure 10: ECFL resistivity for Tl2201 using parameters in Eq. (12) at a density n=0.83 (blue) and 0.86 (red) compared with the experimental curve at n=0.817. The two theoretical curves bracket the experimental curve, while the theoretical curve at n=0.817 is noticeably below the data.



Figure 11: ECFL resistivities at typical densities over a larger temperature window using Model-B.

data as well as theory show a T^2 correction to linear behaviour of different extent depending on the density.

The density of the sample in [9] was not fixed precisely, as far as we could see. With optimism that might be questionable, we estimated it crudely from the observed T_c , using the phenomenological relation Eq. (13) to be n=0.74. This estimate roughly coincides with the density of sample S:1 of [10]. In Fig. (3) the data at n=0.742 from [10] and the data from [9] are compared, together with the theoretical curves from ECFL at densities n=0.71 and n=0.68. The theoretical curves are drawn assuming the parameters already determined from the data sets from [10]. These densities are somewhat lower than the theoretical curve at n=0.742 shown in Fig. (2), but seem to bracket the data of [9], suggesting that for some unclear reason, the density of the sample in [9] is close to n=0.68. We take this phenomenological possibility further in Fig. (4) where the theoretical curve at n=0.68 and the data from [9] are compared. Barring the limiting values of T, the match between theory and the data seems intriguing, especially given the broad range of temperatures - up to 800 K.

Turning to Tl2201, our other material of focus, in Fig. (7, 8, 9, 10) we com-

pare the data at densities n=0.726, 0.744, 0.773 and 0.817 with theoretical results found using the two band models described in Eq. (12). The two theoretical models, start from two rather different sets of parameters characterized by distinct t'/t, t''/t values, and somewhat surprisingly describe the Fermi surface shape almost equally well, as seen in Fig. (6). It is therefore of interest to note that the resistivities of the two models agree very well, after a suitable choice is made of the nearest neighbour hopping t for each model, and seems to confirm the initial belief that the Fermi surface shape largely determines the resistivity results. We note that the data for n=0.726 and n=0.744 agrees on an absolute scale with theory, whereas at a higher densities n=0.773 the data is parallel but offset from the theoretical curves. At n=0.817 the discrepancy between theory and experiment is greater than at lower densities. To quantify this, we also display the calculated resistivity at n=0.83 and n=0.86 along with n=0.817. It is interesting that the theoretical curve for n=0.86 has the same scale as the experiment, and it might be interesting to obtain data from samples with other densities in this range.

In Fig. (5) for Bi2201 we display the theoretical resistivities over a broad range of temperatures for six densities. A comparison with a similar Fig. (11) for Tl2201 for a range of densities provides an overview of our results for these two set of parameters. We hope that these figures might provide motivation for further experiments - at higher T and at other densities in these systems.

Another interesting system is the mercury system $HgBa_2CuO_{4+\delta}$ studied in [18, 19, 20, 21]. One of the difficulties in analyzing this data, in common with the Bi2201 data of [10], is the lack of precise information about the electron density. The authors of [21] quote the superconducting T_c of the different samples, but it is not very clear to us how these can be used to infer the density [22].

5 Supplemental Material

For convenience we created smaller $N_k = 92$, $N_\omega = 2^{12}$ files from which we fit and stored the spectral data as polynomials. We include this data as supplemental material, along with a Jupyter notebook for processing. This can be used to retrieve a reasonable approximation of our resistivities, to interpolate to new resistivities at different *n* values and to perform any other desired calculations with the spectral functions. See the README file for more information. The files can be found in our GitHub repository here: Supplementary Data

6 Acknowledgments

This work used Expanse by Dell and SDSC through allocation DMR170044 from the Advanced Cyberinfrastructure Coordination Ecosystem: Services and Support (ACCESS) program, which is supported by National Science Foundation grants 2138259, 2138286, 2138307, 2137603, and 2138296. [23]

References

- Extremely Correlated Fermi Liquids, B. S. Shastry, Phys. Rev. Letts. 107, 056403 (2011). DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.107.056403
- [2] Extremely Correlated Fermi Liquids: The Formalism, B. S. Shastry, Phys. Rev. B 87, 125124 (2013).
- [3] Extremely correlated fermi liquid of t-J model in two dimensions, P. Mai and B. S. Shastry, Phys. Rev. B 98, 205106 (2018). See Fig. 24 where the variation with J is discussed.
- [4] Aspects of the Normal State Resistivity of Cuprate Superconductors, B.
 Sriram Shastry and Peizhi Mai, Phys. Rev. B101,115121(2020); DOI: https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.101.115121
- [5] Electronic Phase Diagram of High-Tc Cuprates from a Mapping of the In-Plane Resistivity Curvature, Y. Ando, Y. Kurita, S. Komiya, S. Ono, and K. Segawa, Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 267001 (2004).
- [6] Phase decomposition and chemical inhomogeneity in Nd_{2-x}Ce_xCuO_{4±δ} P.
 K. Mang, S. Larochelle, A. Mehta, O. P. Vajk, A. S. Erickson, L. Lu, W.
 J. L. Buyers, A. F. Marshall, K. Prokes, and M. Greven, Phys. Rev. B 70, 094507 (2004).
- [7] Anomalous normal-state resistivity in superconducting La_{2-x}Ce_xCuO₄: Fermi liquid or strange metal?, T. Sarkar, R. L. Green and S. Das Sarma, Phys. Rev. B 98, 224503 (2018).

- [8] Transport, Tunneling, X-Ray, and penetration depth studies of superconducting Bi_{2+x}Sr_{2-y}CuO_{6±δ} crystals, A. T Fiory, S. Martin, R. M. Fleming, L. F. Schneemeyer, J. V. Waszczak, A. F. Hebard and S. A. Sunshine, Physica C, 162-164, 1195 (1989).
- [9] Normal-state transport properties of Bi_{2+x}Sr_{2-y}CuO_{6±δ} crystals, S. Martin, A. T. Fiory, R. M. Fleming, L. F. Schneemeyer, and J. V. Waszczak, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 846 (1990).
- [10] Superconducting dome and pseudogap endpoint in Bi2201, M. Berben, S. Smit, C. Duffy, Y.-T. Hsu, L. Bawden, F. Heringa, F. Gerritsen, S. Cassanelli, X. Feng, S. Bron, E. van Heumen, Y. Huang, F. Bertran, T. K. Kim, C. Cacho, A. Carrington, M. S. Golden, and N. E. Hussey, Phys. Rev. Materials 6, 044804 (2022).
- [11] Fermi surface and quasiparticle excitations of overdoped Tl₂Ba₂CuO_{6+δ}.
 M. Platé, J. D. F. Mottershead, I. S. Elfimov, D. C. Peets, Ruixing Liang, D. A. Bonn, W. N. Hardy, S. Chiuzbaian, M. Falub, M. Shi, L. Patthey, and A. Damascelli, Phys. Rev. Letts. **95**, 077001 (2005).
- [12] Charge density waves and Fermi surface reconstruction in the clean overdoped cuprate superconductor Tl₂Ba₂CuO_{6+δ}, C.C. Tam, M. Zhu, J. Ayres, K. Kummer, F. Yakhou-Harris, J. R. Cooper, A. Carrington and S. Hayden, Nature Communications 13, 570 (2022).
- [13] Thermoelectric power of overdoped Tl2201 crystals: charge density waves and T¹ and T² resistivities, J. R. Cooper, J. C. Baglo, C. Putzke and A. Carrington, Supercond. Sci. Technol. **37**, 015017 (2024).
- The t-J model for the oxide high-Tc superconductors, M. Ogata and H. Fukuyama, Rep. Prog. Phys. 71, 036501 (2008).
- [15] Fermi-surface-free superconductivity in underdoped (Bi,Pb)(Sr,La)₂Cu
 O_{6+δ} (Bi2201), P. Mistark, H. Hafiz, R. S. Markiewicz and A. Bansil,
 Scientific Reports, 5.1, 9739 (2015).
- [16] For data from the Bi2201 family, the method adopted here for converting T_c to x following [10] is as follows. The samples are located on the T_c -x

parabolic plot assumed to be of the form Eq. (13) [17]. This phenomenological relation relates the hole doping x to the transition temperature T_c through

$$x = 0.16 \pm 0.11 \left\{ 1 - \frac{T_c}{T_c^{Max}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$
 (13)

Here the system dependent T_c^{Max} is taken to be ~ 35K, and yields a superconducting dome in the (hole) density range $0.05 \le x \le 0.27$, with an optimal value $x_{opt} = 0.16$.

- [17] General trends in oxygen stoichiometry effects on Tc in Bi and Tl superconductors, M. R. Presland, J. L. Tallon, R. G. Buckley, R. S. Liu, and N. E. Flower, Physica C 176, 95 (1991).
- [18] Universal sheet resistance and revised phase diagram of the cuprate hightemperature superconductors, N. Barisic, M. K. Chan, Yuan Li, Guichuan Yu, Xudong Zhao, M. Dressel, A. Smontara, and M. Greven, P. N. A. S. vol. **110**, 12235 (2013).
- [19] Angle-resolved photoemission spectroscopy study of HgBa₂CuO_{4+δ}, I. M. Vishik, N. Barisic, M. K. Chan, Y. Li, D. D. Xia, G. Yu, X. Zhao, W. S. Lee, W. Meevasana, T. P. Devereaux, M. Greven, and Z.-X. Shen, Phys. Rev. B89, 195141 (2014).
- [20] Q=0 collective modes originating from the low-lying Hg-O band in superconducting HgBa₂CuO_{4+ δ}, T. Das, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 054518 (2012).
- [21] Resistivity phase diagram of cuprates revisited, D. Pelc, M. J. Veit, C. J. Dorow, Y. Ge, N. Barisic and M. Greven, Phys. Rev. B 102, 075114 (2020).
- [22] The phenomenology used for Bi2201[16] to find the density from Tc, seems less clearly defined for this compound. On closer inspection, it seems the earlier data in [18] has some additional physics operative above T_c , presumably due to the more complicated Fermi surface involving the hopping involving the apical oxygen in the unit cell, so that the two copper oxide planes in the unit cell are not totally independent [19, 20]. This feature seems to lead to a kink in the resistivity curves. However if the kink is neglected, and indeed the kink seems to be missing in the more recent data

in Fig. 1 [21], the magnitudes of the resistivity and its T dependence are roughly consistent with the ECFL theory at a few densities checked by us.

 [23] ACCESS: Advancing Innovation: NSF's Advanced Cyberinfrastructure Coordination Ecosystem: Services & Support., T. J. Boerner, S. Deems, T. R. Furlani, S. L. Knuth, and J. Towns, PEARC '23, p. 173-176 (2023).