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We introduce copper molybdenum cyanides of general formula Cu$_2$[Mo(CN)$_8$]$_n$H$_2$O, which can serve as optofunctional magnetic devices. Their ground states generally stay paramagnetic down to temperatures of the K order but exhibit a spontaneous magnetization upon photoirradiation usually below a few tens of K. To interest us still further, such a ferromagnetic state induced by blue-laser irradiation is demagnetized step by step through further application of red or near-infrared laser pulses. We solve this intriguing photomagnetism. The ground-state properties are fully revealed by means of a group-theoretical technique. Taking account of experimental observations, we simulate applying pump laser pulses to a likely ground state and successfully reproduce both the magnetization and demagnetization dynamics. We monitor the photorelaxation process through angle-resolved photoemission spectroscopy. Electrons are fully itinerant in any of the photoinduced steady states, forming a striking contrast to the initial equilibrium state of atomic aspect. The fully demagnetized final steady state looks completely different from the initial paramagnetism but bears good analogy to one of the possible ground states available with the Coulomb repulsion on Cu sites suppressed.

1. Introduction

Photomanipulation of magnetism in metal-based molecular systems is one of the most challenging themes in the fields of synthetic chemistry, solid-state physics, and engineering. Many efforts to developments of new materials and measurement techniques have been devoted to an achievement of the purpose. Prussian-blue analogues which involve hexacyanometalates [M(CN)$_6$]$^{n-}$ (M: 3d transition metals) are widely known as phototunable magnets [1–4]. In the iron-cobalt analogues, photoirradiation triggers the transition from the low-spin configuration, Fe$^{II}$(S = 0)–CN–Co$^{III}$(S = 0), to the high-spin configuration, Fe$^{III}$(S = 1/2)–CN–Co$^{II}$(S = 3/2) [5–7]. Such a photoredox reaction, which is induced by the charge-transfer excitation between cyano-bridged metals, is one of the key ingredients of photomagnetism in metal-based molecular systems [8]. For the purpose of designing and constructing new photoswitchable magnets based on the octacyanometalates [M(CN)$_8$]$^{n-}$ (M = Mo, W), the chemical explorations of various cationic precursor complexes have made remarkable progress in the past decade [9, 10].

Octa-coordinated complexes are rich in configuration and such a geometric variety is characteristic of transition metals of the second and third rows [11]. The octacyano-bridged systems possess various charge-transfer and magnetic-exchange pathways and the resultant conducting and magnetic properties. Paramagnetic [12, 13], ferromagnetic [14–16], and antiferromagnetic [17–19] assemblies have been actually synthesized. Among others, octacyanomolybdates of [Mo$^{IV}$(CN)$_8$]$^{4-}$-based coordination networks are much interesting, where the anionic precursor as a building block takes the square antiprism (SAPR-8) configuration [20, 21].

Recently, remarkable phototunable magnetism of the copper-molybdenum bimetallic assemblies Cu$_2$[Mo(CN)$_8$] · nH$_2$O [22–25] has been reported. Ohkoshi et al. [26] observed details of the photoinduced magnetization and demagnetization of Cu$_2$[Mo(CN)$_8$] · 8H$_2$O. At the sufficiently
As is shown in Figure 1, the mixed-valent bimetallic coordination mechanism nor the ground-state magnetism has been interpreted yet beyond a phenomenological understanding. In spite of such intriguing observations, neither the photoexcitation mechanism nor the ground-state magnetism is repeatable. In low temperature 3 K, irradiation of a paramagnetic ground state with a laser light of 473 nm induces a macroscopic magnetization. Subsequent irradiation with another laser light of 658 nm conversely reduces the produced magnetization. When the sample is further irradiated with 840 nm laser lights successively, the magnetization gets smaller and smaller. The photoinduced magnetization is stable for hours up to 100 K or more and the photoconversion, both magnetization and demagnetization, is repeatable. In spite of such intriguing observations, neither the photoexcitation mechanism nor the ground-state magnetism has been interpreted yet beyond a phenomenological understanding.

As is shown in Figure 1, the mixed-valent bimetallic compound CuII/II-MoIV(CN)6 crystallizes in the 14/m tetragonal space group with C4h point, where each constituent ion [MoIV(CN)6]4− takes the SAPR-8 configuration with D4d point symmetry. Fully filled 4d\(z^2\) orbitals on MoIV sites and half-filled 3d\(yz/xz\) orbitals on CuII sites are physically active due to the crystalline-field splitting. The supramolecular coordination network based on octacyanomolybdates of the SAPR-8 configuration gives unique hopping paths and they must play a major role in realizing the photoreversible ferromagnetism.

We reveal possible magnetic and nonmagnetic states by making good use of a group-theoretical analysis on the 14/m cyano-bridged bimetallic assembly and simulate photoirradiation of the equilibrium states by numerically solving the time-dependent Schrödinger equation.

2. Model Hamiltonian and Its Symmetry Properties

We describe the supramolecular coordination network comprising divalent copper and tetravalent molybdenum ions in terms of a three-band extended Hubbard Hamiltonian [27, 28] of 2/3 electron filling:

\[
\mathcal{H} = \sum_{n,\sigma} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{4} \left( \epsilon_{\text{Cu}} n_{\text{Cu}(j)(\sigma)} + \frac{U_{\text{Cu}}}{2} n_{\text{Cu}(j)\sigma} n_{\text{Cu}(j)\bar{\sigma}} \right) \right.
\]

\[
+ \sum_{j=1}^{4} \left( \epsilon_{\text{Mo}} n_{\text{Mo}(j)(\sigma)} + \frac{U_{\text{Mo}}}{2} n_{\text{Mo}(j)\sigma} n_{\text{Mo}(j)\bar{\sigma}} \right) \]

\[
+ \sum_{\langle n,m,i \rangle} \sum_{\sigma,\tau} \left[ J_{\text{MoCu}(n)\sigma}(i) c_{\text{Mo}(j)\sigma} c_{\text{Mo}(j)\bar{\sigma}} + V_{\text{CuMo}} n_{\text{Cu}(i)\sigma} n_{\text{Mo}(j)\tau} \right]
\]

\[
+ \sum_{\langle n,m,i \rangle} \sum_{\sigma,\tau} \left[ J'_{\text{MoCu}(n)\sigma}(i) c_{\text{Mo}(j)\sigma} c_{\text{Cu}(j+4)\tau} + V_{\text{CuMo}} n_{\text{Cu}(i)\sigma} n_{\text{Cu}(j+4)\tau} \right]
\]

\[
+ \sum_{\langle n,m,i \rangle} \sum_{\sigma,\tau} \left[ J''_{\text{CuCu}(n)\sigma}(i) c_{\text{Cu}(j)\sigma} c_{\text{Cu}(j+4)\tau} + V_{\text{CuCu}} n_{\text{Cu}(i)\sigma} n_{\text{Cu}(j+4)\tau} \right],
\]

with \( n_{n,\sigma} = \sum_{\sigma} n_{n,\sigma} \) creating an electron of spin \( \sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow \) on the Cu \( 3d_{\text{xy/yz}} \) (\( A = \text{Cu} \) \( i = 1, 2, 3, 6 \)), Cu \( 3d_{\text{xy}} \) (\( A = \text{Cu} \) \( i = 3, 4, 7, 8 \)), or Mo \( 4d_{\text{xy}} \) (\( A = \text{Mo} \) \( i = 1, 2, 3, 4 \)) orbitals labelled \( i = \) unit cell \( \mathbf{n} \), as is shown in Figure 1. An on-site Coulomb repulsion and an orbital energy on the Cu(Mo) site are described as \( U_{\text{Cu(Mo)}} \) and \( \epsilon_{\text{Cu(Mo)}} \), respectively. \( \sum_{n,m,i,j} \) and \( \sum_{n,m,i,j} \) mean the sums all over nearest neighboring copper and molybdenum sites and nearest neighboring copper sites, respectively. The electron hoppings \( J_{\text{MoCu}} \) and \( J'_{\text{CuCu}} \) of the intermetallic Coulomb repulsions \( V_{\text{CuMo}} \) and \( V_{\text{CuCu}} \) of the exchange interactions \( J_{\text{MoCu}} \) and the pair-hopping interactions \( J'_{\text{MoCu}} \) and \( J''_{\text{CuCu}} \) are considered. All the two-body terms are treated within the Hartree-Fock (HF) scheme.

Unless the gauge symmetry is broken, the symmetry group of any electron system can be written as \([29, 30]\)

\[
G = \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{S} \times \mathbf{T},
\]
The space groups of the former two and the latter two turn out to be $L_1 \wedge C_{4h}$ and $L_2 \wedge C_{4h}$, respectively, where $L_1 = L$ and $L_2 = \{ (l_4 + l_1) a + (l_4 - l_1) b + l_4 c, l_4 a, l_4 b, l_4 c \in Z \}$. We explain them in Table 1 and Figure 2. Here, the two-dimensional representations $E_a$ and $E_d$, generally available in a $C_{4h}$ Hamiltonian, are discarded, because they have no axial isotropy subgroup [31, 32]. Every irreducible representation is guaranteed to yield a stable solution only when its isotropy subgroup possesses a one-dimensional fixed point subspace [33].

As is shown in Figure 2, all the nonmagnetic phases corresponding to the $\Gamma \hat{D}(\Gamma) \otimes \hat{S}^1 \otimes \hat{T}^0$ and $\hat{M}(\Gamma) \otimes \hat{S}^1 \otimes \hat{T}^0$ representations are classified into paramagnetic (PM) and charge-disproportionate (CDP) states of full symmetry, $\Gamma$-type (uniform) and $M$-type (cell-doubled) charge-density-wave (CDW) states, and a bond-order-wave (BOW = bond-centered CDW) state. There exists a variety of charge-ordering patterns: a CDW on the Cu sublattice ($\Gamma$-Cu-CDW), CDWs on the Mo sublattice [M-Mo-CDW, M-Mo-CDW(1), and M-Mo-CDW(2)], and CDWs on both the Mo and Cu sublattices [M-MoCu-CDW(1) and M-MoCu-CDW(2)]. They will be stabilized by predominant electron-phonon couplings or relevant intermetallic Coulomb interactions [34, 35]. We further find varied magnetic phases corresponding to the $\Gamma \hat{D}(\Gamma) \otimes \hat{S}^1 \otimes \hat{T}^1$ and $\hat{M}(\Gamma) \otimes \hat{S}^1 \otimes \hat{T}^1$ representations. A spin-bond-order-wave (SBOW) state is characterized by unequal canonical ensemble averages of the bond-centered up- and down-spin densities, \(\langle n_{A(b)} \rangle_{\text{HF}} \neq \langle n_{A'(b')} \rangle_{\text{HF}}\), where \(\langle \cdots \rangle_{\text{HF}}\) means taking the quantum average in a HF eigenstate. They
are mathematically interesting but of no occurrence under any realistic parameterization [36]. The rest are spin-density-wave states, including both ferromagnetism (FM) and antiferromagnetism (AFM). The antiferromagnetic ordering patterns are also classified into three groups in the same manner as the charge-ordering ones: AFM on the Cu sublattice (Γ-Cu-AFM), AFM on the Mo sublattice (Γ-Mo-AFM, M-Mo-AFM(1), and M-Mo-AFM(2)), and AFM on both the Mo and Cu sublattices [M-MoCu-AFM(1) and M-MoCu-AFM(2)]. These magnetic states are likely to be stabilized by the strong on-site Coulomb repulsions \( U_{\text{Mo}} \) and \( U_{\text{Cu}} \). Since all the possible magnetic states except the FM state have no macroscopic magnetization, major states before and after photoirradiation are to be the PM and FM states, respectively.

### 3. Competing Ground States

We have calculated the ground-state phase diagram at the sufficiently low temperature \( k_B T = 0.001 t_{\text{MoCu}} \). In Figure 3, the magnetic states FM and M-MoCu-AFM are stabilized with \( U_{\text{Mo}} \) and \( U_{\text{Cu}} \) increasing. With increasing \( V_{\text{CuCu}} \), the nonmagnetic phases PM and M-MoCu-CDW grow up but the magnetic regions shrink. The exchange interactions \( J_{\text{MoCu}} \) and \( J_{\text{CuCu}} \) are most effective for the magnetic states. We learn from the identity \( \sum_{\sigma,\tau} c^\dagger_{\text{m}A(\sigma)} c_{\text{m}A'\tau} c^\dagger_{\text{m}A'\tau} c_{\text{m}A\sigma} = -2s_{\text{n}A(\sigma)}^\dagger s_{\text{n}A'\tau} + n_{\text{n}A(\sigma)} n_{\text{n}A'\tau}/2 \), where \( s_{\text{n}A(\sigma)}^\dagger = \sum_{\sigma',\tau'} c^\dagger_{\text{m}A(\sigma')\sigma} c^\dagger_{\text{m}A'\tau'\tau} c_{\text{m}A\tau'\tau}/2 \). Considering that the analogue compound \( \text{Cu}^{II}_{15}[\text{Mo}^V(\text{CN})_8] \cdot 3\text{H}_2\text{O} \) takes a ferromagnetic interaction between spins on Mo and Cu sites [26], we set
positive $J_{\text{MoCu}}$. On the other hand, the direct Cu-Cu exchange interaction $J_{\text{CuCu}}$ is taken to be negative. The magnitude of the exchange interactions in the transfer-integral unit is comparable to that in typical cyano-bridged transition-metal complexes [37–39]. The pair-hopping correlation $J'_{\text{CuCu}}$ set positive indirectly supports FM, destabilizing any other phase [27]. On the other hand, $J'_{\text{CuCu}}$ set negative favors PM and M-MoCu-CDW because the pair hoppings between Cu sites are possible in them. PM and FM are sitting adjacently on the phase diagrams, and, therefore, a photoinduced phase transition between them is promising. With the experimental observations [26] in mind, we choose $U_{\text{Cu}} = U_{\text{Mo}} = 3.2t_{\text{MoCu}}$ and $V_{\text{CuCu}} = 2.4t_{\text{MoCu}}$ as standard parameters for CuII-MoIV(CN)$_8$, which is indicated by $\times$ in Figure 3. On this parameter point, we can well reproduce the valences of MoIV and CuII in the paramagnetic ground state. Another nonmagnetic and uniform state, referred to as CDP, can be stabilized in a $U_{\text{Mo}} \gg U_{\text{Cu}}$ region. In contrast with PM, CDP shows localization of electrons on Cu $d$ orbitals. The PM and CDP states belong to the same irreducible representation but their electronic structures are quite different from each other. The details of CDP are discussed later.

In Figure 4(a), we present a band structure of the PM state. Hereafter, the transfer integral $t_{\text{MoCu}}$ is set equal to 0.7 eV, which is comparable to the intermetallic transfer integrals in typical Prussian-blue analogues [7, 40]. In the PM state, bands for the up- and down-spin electrons are degenerate and the Fermi level lies in the band gap of 0.35 eV. Thus it exhibits insulating behavior. In the PM state, the Cu $d$ orbitals contribute to both the occupied and unoccupied bands, whereas the Mo $d$ orbitals contribute only to the occupied bands. One can easily understand these differences by considering the valences of Cu and Mo ions in the PM state.

We further calculate the polarized optical conductivity defined as

$$\sigma_\lambda^\text{opt} (\omega) = \sigma_\lambda^\text{re} (\omega) + \sigma_\lambda^\text{reg} (\omega),$$

where

$$\sigma_\lambda^\text{re} (\omega) = \frac{\pi}{N\omega} \sum_{n \neq 0} |\langle E_i | J_\lambda | E_0 \rangle|^2 \delta (E_i - E_0 - \hbar \omega)$$

with the relevant current operator

$$J_\lambda = i \sum_{\langle n,m,i \rangle} \sum_{\sigma} \frac{e r_{n}^\lambda \text{Cu}(i) \sigma \cdot \text{Mo}(j)}{\hbar}$$

$$\times \left\{ (-1)^{i+j+1} t_{\text{MoCu}} - V_{\text{MoCu}} \text{P}_{n \text{Cu}(i):m \text{Mo}(j)}^{\sigma} \right.$$}$$\text{C}(i) \text{M}(j)$$

$$+ J_{\text{MoCu}} \text{P}_{n \text{Cu}(i):m \text{Mo}(j)}^{\sigma}$$

$$+ J'_{\text{MoCu}} \text{P}_{n \text{Cu}(i):m \text{Mo}(j)}^{\sigma}$$

$$\times \epsilon_{n \text{Cu}(i):m \text{Mo}(j)}^{\sigma}$$

$$+ i \sum_{\langle n,m,i \rangle} \sum_{\sigma} \frac{e r_{n}^\lambda \text{Cu}(i) \sigma \cdot \text{Cu}(i+4)}{\hbar}$$

$$\times \left\{ t_{\text{CuCu}} - V_{\text{CuCu}} \text{P}_{n \text{Cu}(i):m \text{Cu}(i+4)}^{\sigma}$$

$$+ J_{\text{CuCu}} \text{P}_{n \text{Cu}(i):m \text{Cu}(i+4)}^{\sigma}$$

$$+ J'_{\text{CuCu}} \text{P}_{n \text{Cu}(i):m \text{Cu}(i+4)}^{\sigma}$$

$$\times \epsilon_{n \text{Cu}(i):m \text{Cu}(i+4)}^{\sigma}$$

$$+ \text{H.c.} \right\} \right.$$ (6)

Here, $|E_i\rangle$ is an arbitrary wave function of energy $E_i$ ($E_0 \leq E_1 \leq E_2 \leq \cdots$), $r_{A(i):A'(i)}^\lambda$ indicates the $\lambda=a,b,c$-direction component of the vector $r_{A(i):A'(i)}$ which is the relative vector between nearest neighboring $A(i)$ and $A'(i)$ sites, and $P_{n:A(i):n':A'(i)}^{\sigma} = \langle c_{n:A(i):\sigma}^{+} c_{n':A'(i):\sigma} \rangle_{\text{HF}}$. Hereafter, we set $|c|$
equal to $\sigma_f$. The Drude spectral weight \cite{41,42} in (4) is given by
\[
\sigma_0 = -\frac{\pi}{N} \left( \left| E_0 \right| \mathcal{T}_\Lambda \left| E_0 \right| + 2 \sum_{\mu \neq 0} \left| \frac{\left< E_i \right| \mathcal{J}_\Lambda \left| E_0 \right>}{E_i - E_0} \right|^2 \right)
\]
with the kinetic-energy operator
\[
\mathcal{T}_\Lambda = \sum_{(n,m,i,j)} \sum_\sigma \frac{\epsilon_{\Gamma;\Lambda}^{n,\sigma} \epsilon_{\Lambda}^{m,\sigma}}{\hbar} \left[ (-1)^{i+j} t_{\text{MoCu}}^{\sigma,n,\sigma,m} - V_{\text{MoCu}}^{\sigma,n,\sigma,m} + J_{\text{MoCu}}^{\sigma,n,\sigma,m} \right]
\]
\[
\times \left\{ \left[ \epsilon_{\Gamma;\Lambda}^{n,\sigma} \epsilon_{\Lambda}^{m,\sigma} \right] \right\}.
\]

We define the ground state $|E_0\rangle$ as
\[
|E_0\rangle = \prod_{\epsilon_k^{\sigma} \leq \epsilon_F} \epsilon_k^{\sigma} \left| 0 \right>,
\]
where $|0\rangle$ is the true electron vacuum, $\epsilon_F$ is the Fermi energy, and $\epsilon_k^{\sigma}$ creates an electron of spin $\sigma$ in the HF eigenstate with an eigenvalue $\epsilon_{k,\sigma}^{\chi} (\chi = 1, 2, \ldots, 12)$. Excited states can be calculated within the HF scheme, being generally defined as
\[
|E_i\rangle = \epsilon_k^{\sigma} \epsilon_{k,\sigma}^{\chi} \epsilon_k^{\sigma} \left| E_0 \right>.
\]

Here we investigate effects of photoirradiation of the PM ground state. The photoinduced magnetization is hardly detectable at zero magnetic field, while it rapidly increases just
The presence of the DM interaction \( D = 0.07, 0.7, 7, 70 \text{ meV} \) allows magnetization to be broken by the vertical arrow in Figure 4. Another key ingredient in applying a moderate field to the system is the Peierls phase factor \( \exp \left[ -i \frac{\pi}{4} \right] \). In order to visualize these features, we introduce Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya (DM) vectors that should be compatible with the crystalline structure 

\[
\mathcal{H}_{\text{DM}} = \sum_n \sum_{\kappa=0}^4 \sum_{\sigma=0}^1 (-1)^{\sigma+\kappa} \mathbf{D}_{\kappa}^{(\sigma)} \cdot \mathbf{s}_{n+\delta(l,\rho,\sigma);\text{Mo}(1+3\sigma')(-1)^{\rho}+\sigma,\rho'} \times \mathbf{s}_{n\text{Mo}(2l-\sigma)},
\]

where \( \delta(l,\rho,\sigma,\sigma') = \sigma' \text{Re}[f(l)](a/a) + \sigma' \text{Im}[f(l)](b/a) + \sigma\rho(c/c) \) with \( f(l) = e^{i\pi/4} \left[ 1 + e^{i(\pi-1)/2} \right] / \sqrt{2} \). The DM vectors should be compatible with the crystalline structure as \( \mathbf{D}_{\kappa}^{(\sigma)} = g_{\kappa}(e) \mathbf{C}_{i}\mathbf{C}_{i}\mathbf{C}_{i}\mathbf{C}_{i} \), where \( g_{\kappa}(e) \mathbf{C}_{i}\mathbf{C}_{i}\mathbf{C}_{i} \) is the hopping term \( \sum_{j=1}^4 \mathcal{E}_{i}\mathbf{C}_{i}\mathbf{C}_{i}\mathbf{C}_{i} \). We lay them down in the \( ab \) plane with \( \mathbf{D}_{\kappa}^{(\sigma)} = (D, 0, 0) \). In order to visualize photoinduced electronic excitations and the following magnetic relaxation, we solve the time-dependent Schrödinger equation:

\[
\dot{\Psi}(t) = \mathcal{H}_{\text{HF}}(t) \Psi(t),
\]

where the instantaneous Hamiltonian \( \mathcal{H}_{\text{HF}}(t) \) consists of \( \mathcal{H}_{\text{ex}}, \mathcal{H}_{\text{ex}}, \) and \( \mathcal{H}_{\text{DM}} \) in the Hartree-Fock approximation \([44, 45]\) with the Peierls phase factor switched on, while the path-integrated wave-function array \( \Psi(t) \) is a square matrix of degree \( 24N \) and we define \( \Psi(0) \) as the complete set of wave functions for the “static” Hamiltonian, \( [\Psi_{k}\nu](0); 0 \leq k \leq 3, 0 \leq \nu \leq 4 \), which are specified with momentum \( k \) and band label \( \nu \). Discretizing the time variable as \( t_m = m\Delta t \) for \( m = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \) and \( \Delta t = 0.005h/T_{\text{Mo(Mo)}} \), we integrate (13) step by step:

\[
\Psi(t_{m+1}) = \exp \left[ -i \frac{\mathcal{H}_{\text{HF}}(t_m)}{\hbar} \Delta t \right] \Psi(t_m).
\]

Once we start the time integration \( m > 0 \), \( \Psi(t_m) \) deviates from the eigenvectors of \( \mathcal{H}_{\text{HF}}(t_m) \) in general. Pump laser pulses are described by the vector potential,

\[
\mathbf{A}(t) = A_0 \sum_{i=0}^3 e^{-\gamma(t-i)^2} \cos \omega_\ell t,
\]

where centers and photon energies of the first–fourth \( i = 0 \sim 3 \) pulses are given by \( t_i = 0.38 + 0.75(i) \) ps and \( h\omega_\ell = (1 - 0.25i)\hbar\omega_0 \), respectively, and a width and amplitude of each pulse are \( 2\gamma^{-1} = 0.25 \) ps and \( |A_0| = A_0 = 2.0(h\nu/ea) \), respectively. We irradiate the PM state with \( a \)-axis-polarized \( \mathbf{A}_0 = (A_0, 0, 0) \) and \( c \)-axis-polarized \( \mathbf{A}_0 = (0, 0, A_0) \) photons.

In Figure 5, we study DM interaction effects on the photomagnetism, before entering into detailed discussions of

\[\text{FIGURE 5: Manipulation of the magnetization by applying successive pump laser pulses in the form of (15) with (a) \( A_0 \parallel a \) and (b) \( A_0 \parallel c \) in the presence of the DM interaction \( D = 0.07, 0.7, 7, 70 \text{ meV} \), where } M_{\text{max}} \text{ is the saturated magnetization.}\]
the dynamics. The \(\lambda(=a, b, c)\)-direction component of the magnetization vector \(M\) is defined by

\[
M^\lambda = \frac{1}{N} \sum _n \sum _{ij} \langle \Phi (t) | \left( \sum _{ji} ^8 \lambda _n ^a \Phi _{ij} ^a (t) + \sum _{ji} ^8 \lambda _n ^c \Phi _{ij} ^c (t) \right) | \Phi (t) \rangle
\]  

(16)

with |\(\Phi (t)\rangle = \prod _{k=1} ^{16N} \lambda | \Psi _{k}(t)\rangle\), as a function of time. Both the \(a\)- and \(c\)-axis-polarized photons induce magnetization and demagnetization of the system. The macroscopic magnetizations are induced by the first pulses and they are erased successively by the second, third, and fourth pulses. The induced magnetizations by the \(c\)-axis-polarized photons are slightly larger than those by the \(a\)-axis-polarized ones. Even though \(D\) varies over three orders of magnitude (0.07–70 meV), the induced magnetizations take almost the same value and the following demagnetization processes hardly vary. Depending on the value of \(D\), the global magnetization occurs at different points in time, but these differences are at most 9 fs and 14 fs in the cases of \(A_0\) \(\parallel\) \(a\) and \(A_0\) \(\parallel\) \(c\), respectively. Of course, in the absence of the DM interaction, photodiffraction never induces a net magnetization. Thus, the DM interaction plays an important role to bring the magnetic relaxation but does not so strongly affect the performances of the photomagnets. Hereafter, we set the magnitude of the DM vector equal to 0.7 meV, which is comparable to that in typical transition-metal oxides [46, 47].

In Figure 6, we present details of the photoinduced dynamics, where the increase of the electronic energy,

\[
\Delta E = \langle \Phi (t) | \mathcal{H}_{\text{HF}} (t) | \Phi (t) \rangle - \langle \Phi (0) | \mathcal{H}_{\text{HF}} | \Phi (0) \rangle
\]  

(17)

the averaged electron densities on Mo and Cu sites,

\[
d_{\text{Mo}} = \frac{1}{4N} \sum _{j=1} ^4 \sum _n \langle \Phi (t) | n_{\text{Mo}j} | \Phi (t) \rangle,
\]

\[
d_{\text{Cu}} = \frac{1}{8N} \sum _{j=1} ^8 \sum _n \langle \Phi (t) | n_{\text{Cu}j} | \Phi (t) \rangle, 
\]

(18)

and the magnetization, \(M\), are monitored. We first focus on the dynamics induced by the \(a\)-axis-polarized photons. The irradiation with \(\hbar \omega_0\) photons first induces electron transfers from Mo to Cu sites. The electronic energy nonmonotonically increases with a time passage through instantaneous stagnation in the photoabsorption, which is seen at around the center of the pulse. \(\Delta E\) upon the first photodiffraction reads as a double-stepped function of time. The occurrence of the significant magnetization looks simultaneous with the second step of \(\Delta E(t)\). The thus-induced magnetization is decreased by the second irradiation with 0.75\(\hbar \omega_0\) photons. Even in this demagnetization process, electrons further transfer from Mo to Cu sites. This means that the demagnetization process cannot be interpreted as a simple reverse process of the magnetization. The magnetization gets smaller and smaller by the second, third, and fourth pulses; that is, the photoinduced ferromagnetic state comes back to a nonmagnetic state finally.

Next, we discuss the case of \(A_0\) \(\parallel\) \(c\). We obtain qualitatively the same results with \(A_0\) \(\parallel\) \(a\), upon the first photodiffraction. However, the absorbed energy is slightly smaller than that in the case of \(A_0\) \(\parallel\) \(a\). Given the larger magnetization than that induced by the \(a\)-axis-polarized photons, the \(c\)-axis-polarized ones are more effective for photomagnetization than the \(a\)-axis-polarized ones. Electron transfers upon the subsequent photodiffraction are insignificant in comparison with those in the case of \(A_0\) \(\parallel\) \(a\), where the electrons transiently come back to Mo sites only by the third photodiffraction. However, step-by-step demagnetization, observed in the case of \(A_0\) \(\parallel\) \(a\) as well, is clearly seen. Thus, the dynamics induced by the \(a\)- and \(c\)-axis-polarized photons are similar to each other. Even if we consider superposition of the two excited states which are induced by photons polarized in the \(a\) and \(c\) directions (see the right panels of Figure 6), the above magnetic features are retained. The tunable photomagnetism we revealed here agrees with the polycrystalline-sample measurements [26].

We further present \(M^a\), \(M^b\), and \(M^c\) corresponding to the \(a\)-, \(b\)-, and \(c\)-direction components of \(M\), respectively, in Figure 6(c). In both the cases of \(A_0\) \(\parallel\) \(a\) and \(A_0\) \(\parallel\) \(c\), photodiffraction does not induce \(M^c\). While rotating in the \(a\)-\(b\) plane, the induced magnetizations disappear. Here, we emphasize that the thus-demagnetized states by the photodiffraction differ from the initial stationary PM state in the valence arrangement. The electron densities on both Cu and Mo sites come close to the average value 16/12 = 1.33.

Photon-energy dependences of the magnetization and demagnetization dynamics are shown in Figure 7. In the case of \(A_0\) \(\parallel\) \(a\), the induced magnetization value decreases with decreasing irradiated photon energy. However, the magnetization values in the final steady states at 3.0 ps seem to be unaffected by the photon energy \(\hbar \omega_0\). The same tendency is seen in the dynamics induced by the \(c\)-axis-polarized photons. Here, we recall the ground-state optical conductivity of PM shown in Figure 4(b). In the \(\sigma_1\) spectrum, an absorption at 2.0 eV is smaller than that at 2.6 eV, whereas, in the \(\sigma_\perp\) spectrum, the former is larger than the latter. Despite such differences between \(\sigma_1\) and \(\sigma_\perp\), the magnetic responses to the \(a\)- and \(c\)-axis-polarized photons resemble each other in the photon-energy dependence. The photoinduced ferromagnetism is strongly affected by the photon energy itself rather than the intensity of the corresponding photon absorption. We will thus be able to control a sensitivity of the photomagnetism by tuning a wavelength of the irradiation light.

In order to see changes in the electronic structures in more detail, we calculate one-particle spectral functions [48]:

\[
D(t; \mathbf{k}, \omega) = E(t; \mathbf{k}, \omega) + H(t; \mathbf{k}, \omega)
\]  

(19)

with the electron part

\[
E(t; \mathbf{k}, \omega) = \sum _{\mathbf{k}', \sigma} \delta (\hbar \omega - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}' \sigma}) \langle \Phi (t) | c_{\mathbf{k}' \sigma} ^\dagger \overline{c}_{\mathbf{k} \sigma} | \Phi (t) \rangle,
\]

(20)
Figure 6: Manipulation of the magnetization by applying successive pump laser pulses in the form of (15) with $A_0 \parallel a$ (the left panels) and $A_0 \parallel c$ (the middle panels). (a) An absorbed photon energy and an envelope of the applied vector potential. (b) Averaged electron densities on Mo and Cu sites. (c) A magnetization. The two-to-one mixtures of the results in the cases of $A_0 \parallel a$ and $A_0 \parallel c$ (the right panels) are also presented in an attempt to reproduce powder-sample observations [26].

Figure 7: Manipulation of the magnetization by applying successive pump laser pulses in the form of (15) with $A_0 \parallel a$ and $A_0 \parallel c$, where the photon energy $\hbar \omega_0$ is set equal to 2.0 eV or to 2.6 eV.
The band splitting is induced by the second pulse irradiation with $\alpha$-axis-polarized photons, which corresponds to the remarkable demagnetization shown in Figure 6(c). The induced magnetizations decrease with decreasing band splitting, by the third and fourth photoirradiation. The thus-demagnetized final steady states at $t = 3.00$ ps show an entirely different band structure from that of the initial stationary PM state.

5. Summary and Discussion

We have revealed phototunable magnetism in the cyano-bridged copper-molybdenum bimetallic assembly $\text{Cu}_2[\text{Mo(CN)}_8]$, where the coordination geometry of every molybdenum complex ion is square antiprism. Indeed the magnetization is both induced and erased optically, but the present reversible magnetism does not necessarily mean a roundtrip of electrons. Divalent copper ions are reduced into monovalent ones during magnetization, while reoxidation of these photoexcited copper ions is of rare occurrence during demagnetization. Electrons of Cu character and those of Mo character are both fully itinerant in any of the photoinduced steady states and look different from rather atomic ones in the initial equilibrium paramagnetic state. In this context we may be reminded of the thus-called hidden states [49].

Figure 9(a) visualizes the density of states $D(t; \mathbf{k}, \omega)$, the electron-distribution function $E(t; \mathbf{k}, \omega)$, and the hole-distribution function $H(t; \mathbf{k}, \omega)$ of the demagnetized final
steady state at $t = 3.00$ ps. This band structure looks very similar to that of the equilibrium CDP state shown in Figure 9(b). The CDP state exhibits insulating behavior due to the energy gap of 0.88 eV, where the Cu and Mo d orbitals contribute to the occupied and unoccupied bands, respectively, because all the electrons are localized on Cu sites. On the other hand, the final steady state has no well-defined electron and hole bands anymore due to the photoirradiation, which are clearly seen in $E(t; \mathbf{k}, \omega)$ and $H(t; \mathbf{k}, \omega)$, and therefore this state is metallic. Electron transfers from Cu to Mo sites in the equilibrium CDP state can lead to situation just like Figure 9(a). Thus the final steady state may read as a CDP state which has the different electron distribution from that in the equilibrium situation. The photoconverted FM state from the PM state is further optically converted to such a “nonequilibrium” CDP state. In the ground-state phase diagram, the CDP phase as well as the PM phase is indeed located adjacent to the FM phase (cf. Figure 3(b)). Such a relationship among three phases may be a key ingredient of the tunable photomagnetism. In order to improve a performance of the photomagnets, it is also necessary to clarify thermal and chemical-doping effects on the phase competition.

Modern experiments enable us to directly observe femtosecond electron transfer dynamics [50–54]. For example, time-resolved optical measurements can detect the metallic conductivity of the photoexcited states and time- and angle-resolved photoemission measurements can directly observe the changes in the band structures shown in Figure 8. We hope the present calculations will stimulate such ultrafast pump-probe experiments on the cyano-bridged copper-molybdenum bimetallic assemblies.
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