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We introduce a microscopic model to describe the ultrafast response of magnetic materials with two sublattices to heating by a femtosecond laser pulse. Even though the model is based on a set of simple Hamiltonians, it readily reproduces experimental observations such as ultrafast reversal of ferrimagnets and delayed demagnetization of one sublattice in ferromagnetic alloys. The calculations give insight into the microscopic mechanisms and thermodynamics governing the complex dynamics of these multisublattice magnets.
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Controlling the magnetic state of ferromagnetic materials by femtosecond laser pulses has drawn significant attention from the scientific community since the first pioneering experiments by Beaurepaire et al. In these experiments it was shown that the magnetization of ferromagnetic nickel can be quenched on subpicosecond time scales. This discovery lead to intense theoretical and experimental investigations on the origin of these ultrafast magnetization dynamics, however, the dominant microscopic mechanism is still under debate.

Parallel to the research on the dynamics of homogeneous ferromagnets, more exotic materials were being investigated. A breakthrough in the field was made by Stanciu et al., who have shown that the direction of the magnetization of the sublattices in the ferrimagnetic alloy GdFeCo can be changed by the use of a femtosecond laser pulse and a small applied field. Recently, the origin of this magnetization reversal has been unraveled by separately measuring the dynamics of the Gd and FeCo sublattices. It was concluded that a delay in the demagnetization of one of the sublattices can be observed indeed, again corresponding to the experimental observations. The nature of the assumptions reveals important information on the microscopic processes governing ultrafast magnetization dynamics in these strongly coupled ferromagnetic alloys.

The equations of motion we derive are aimed to be the simplest microscopic description of a multisublattice magnet, but accurate enough to keep contact with experimental observations. To this end, while we treat separate spin subsystems, for simplicity we let them interact with only one common electron system, which is assumed to be a noninteracting Fermi sea of spinless fermions with a constant density of states \( N_D \), \( \rho_{\text{Fermi}} \)

\[
H = H_e + H_p + H_{s,\ell} + H_{c,\ell}
\]

where \( c_k^\dagger \) (\( c_k \)) describes the creation (annihilation) of an electron in the state \( k \), \( a_q^\dagger \) (\( a_q \)) are similar operators for phonons in the state \( q \), \( D_{\ell,i} \) is the average atomic spin density, and \( S_{\ell,i,j} \)

is the \( \ell \) spin operator.

For the spin system a Weiss mean-field approach is used, where the exchange splitting of the discrete energy levels is
is transferred between the two magnetic sublattices. This yields
assumed that scattering Hamiltonians have to be introduced. First of all, it is
approximation. Like in the M3TM, phonon-assisted Elliott-Yafet spin flips couple the spin system to the electronic heat
bath, transferring the angular momentum between the spin and phonon subsystems. Finally, exchange scattering is added,23
where in an interband e-e scattering event angular momentum is transferred between the two magnetic sublattices. This yields the following scattering Hamiltonians:

$$J_{ex,1} = (\gamma_{1,1}m_1 + \gamma_{1,2}m_2)/S_1,$$

$$J_{ex,2} = (\gamma_{2,2}m_2 + \gamma_{1,2}m_1)/S_2,$$

where \(m_1\) and \(m_2\) are the normalized magnetizations of the two sublattices, and \(\gamma_{1,1}\), \(\gamma_{2,2}\), and \(\gamma_{1,2}\) are the Weiss molecular field constants, which are related to the intra- and intersublattice exchange energies, respectively. When \(\gamma_{1,2}\) is positive (negative) the sublattices are ferromagnetically (antiferromagnetically) coupled.

To describe the interactions between the subsystems the scattering Hamiltonians have to be introduced. First of all, it is
assumed that e-e and p-p scattering are instantaneous, hence the e and p systems are in internal equilibrium at all times. Second, e-p scattering is taken into account within the random-
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FIG. 1. (Color online) Schematic overview of the model. (a) Energy flow between the subsystems. (b) Flow of the angular momentum between the subsystems. Due to exchange scattering, the angular momentum can be transported between the two magnetic sublattices. Both sublattices can exchange angular momentum with the lattice by e-p scattering. (c) Spin-flip event due to e-e scattering, transferring angular momentum from one sublattice to the other. (d) Change of occupation of the discrete energy levels due to the exchange scattering event depicted in (c).

M3TM model6 are that (i) an exchange scattering mechanism is taken into account, which is schematically depicted in Figs. 1(c) and 1(d), and (ii) there are two spin sublattices which are neither in internal equilibrium nor in equilibrium with respect to each other. The main difference between the here derived model and the atomistic Landau-Lifschitz-Gilbert18,19 and Landau-Lifschitz-Bloch (LLB) approach9 is that the coupling of the spin system to the electron and phonon baths is derived from microscopic scattering Hamiltonians instead of a phenomenological coupling constant. We do note that replacing this phenomenological coupling constant by a parameter derived from the same microscopic scattering Hamiltonians could yield similar results, which has been shown to be the case for the LLB and M3TM.9

All ingredients to calculate the magnetization dynamics of the sublattices due to femtosecond laser pulse heating have now been introduced. Next we proceed to check whether the model can reproduce the ultrafast reversal of a ferrimagnet due to a fs heat pulse. The aim of the calculations is not to reproduce the experimental observations as closely as possible, but to show that the model qualitatively yields similar dynamics. To this extent we introduce the most simple fictitious ferrimagnet, namely, one with a 1:1 atomic ratio and respective atomic exchange and 3d
hybridization,24 is for simplicity replaced by a single interatomic exchange. The molecular field constants are \(\gamma_{1,1} = 4\gamma_{2,2} = -4\gamma_{1,2} = 138\) meV. The other
TABLE I. Microscopic parameters used in the calculations. The magnetic parameters are mentioned in the main text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( D_p )</th>
<th>( D_f )</th>
<th>( D_s )</th>
<th>( T_D )</th>
<th>( \lambda_{ep} )</th>
<th>( \lambda_{\text{ex,0}} )</th>
<th>( a_{df} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ferrimagnet</td>
<td>3 eV</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>400 K</td>
<td>20 meV</td>
<td>25 meV</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferromagnet</td>
<td>3 eV</td>
<td>0.8/0.2</td>
<td>0.8/0.2</td>
<td>400 K</td>
<td>20 meV</td>
<td>70 meV</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

microscopic parameters are given in Table I. We would like to stress that these parameters are very realistic for ferromagnetic materials and similar to the ones reported earlier. Finally, the laser pulse is assumed to have a Gaussian profile with a standard deviation of 50 fs.

Figure 2(a) displays the resulting equilibrium magnetization as a function of temperature. The symbols are the equilibrium values obtained by solving the derived differential equations for \( T_e = T_p = T_{\text{ambient}} \), whereas the lines are calculated using the Weiss model. The molecular field constants are chosen such that the compensation temperature \( T_{\text{comp}} \) of the ferrimagnet is slightly larger than room temperature, as in the first experiments. In Figs. 2(b) and 2(c) the typical time evolution of the electron (phonon) temperature \( T_e (T_p) \) and the magnetic moments on the sublattices are displayed, respectively, however, in the calculations exchange scattering is neglected by setting \( \lambda_{\text{ex}} \) to zero. Just as in the experiments, the sublattice with the strongest exchange coupling and smallest magnetic moment, \( M_1 \), demagnetizes more rapidly. This is in line with predictions of the original M3TM, where the demagnetization rate is proportional to the intrasublattice exchange and inversely proportional to the atomic magnetic moment.6

Next, in contrast to the calculation in Fig. 2(c), exchange scattering is turned on, allowing for an angular momentum transfer between the subsystems. The corresponding calculations, while keeping other microscopic parameters fixed, are displayed in Fig. 2(d). The main difference from Fig. 2(c) is that the demagnetization rates of both sublattices are enhanced significantly due to the extra transport channel for the angular momentum. While the electron temperature is larger than \( T_C \), one would expect that the magnetization of the sublattices would be fully quenched. However, an unexpected ferromagnetic alignment of the sublattices is observed. Since \( M_1 \) (originally in the negative direction) demagnetizes more rapidly than \( M_2 \), it reaches zero while \( M_2 \) still has a relatively large (positive) magnetic moment. \( M_2 \) will now be further quenched by exchange scattering, however, this inevitably leads to a slightly positive value of \( M_1 \) and thus a temporary ferromagnetic state. When the electron system cools below \( T_C \) due to equilibration with the phonons after \( \approx 1 \) ps, the magnetization of the sublattice coupled most strongly to the electrons, i.e., \( M_1 \), starts growing to larger positive values. Then, finally, the antiferromagnetic coupling with \( M_2 \) acts as the driving force to switch the orientation of \( M_2 \) from positive to negative.

In the model one parameter is introduced that cannot be easily obtained from experiments, which is \( \lambda_{\text{ex}} \). To show that switching does not depend strongly on this parameter but is in fact very robust, we plot the switching time as a function of laser fluence and \( \lambda_{\text{ex}} \) in Fig. 2(e). The switching time is defined as the delay time where \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) cross. Switching is observed if \( \lambda_{\text{ex}}^2 > 0.2 \) there is a fluence where the sublattices change their mutual orientation. For fluences larger than 1 (arb. units) the final temperature after laser pulse excitation is larger than \( T_C \), hence no switching occurs.

After verifying that ultrafast switching of antiferromagnetically coupled sublattices can be described by the presented model, we will investigate the magnetization dynamics of two ferromagnetically coupled sublattices as recently studied experimentally by Mathias et al.20 Here it was shown that the compensation temperature of the (average) magnetic moment on the Ni atoms in permalloy is delayed with respect to the moments on the Fe atoms. To calculate the magnetization dynamics of permalloy with the introduced model, the exchange coupling between the sublattices is assumed to be ferromagnetic. Furthermore, because the electronic states around the Fermi level of Ni and Fe are strongly hybridized, it is assumed that the inter- and intrasublattice exchange interactions are identical, giving the same temperature dependent equilibrium properties of the sublattices.

For the calculations a fictitious ferromagnetic alloy resembling permalloy is used, which is an 80-20 mixture of Ni (\( M_1 \)) and Fe (\( M_2 \)) with a Curie temperature of 800 K. The spin-flip rate of \( M_1 \) is chosen to be four times smaller than that of \( M_2 \), hence without any exchange coupling between the sublattices \( M_1 \) demagnetizes four times slower due to \( e-p \) scattering. The other microscopic parameters used, which are chosen to be very similar to the ferrimagnetic case, are given in Table I.
inset the normalized demagnetization is plotted on a semilogarithmic scale in the inset of Fig. 3. The data is fitted by the following simple model:

\[
\frac{dm_1}{dt} = -\frac{m_1}{\tau_1} - \frac{D_{m_1}}{\tau_1} m_{min}^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (9)
\]

\[
\frac{dm_2}{dt} = -\frac{m_2}{\tau_2} - \frac{D_{m_2}}{\tau_2} m_{min}^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (10)
\]

where \(\tau_1\) and \(\tau_2\) are the time constants for demagnetization of the two individual sublattices, while \(\tau_{ex}\) is the time scale of the exchange interaction. Note that this fit function is almost identical to the one used by Mathias et al.,\(^{20}\) except the fraction of the atomic spin densities is added to the exchange interaction term, as the total angular momentum should be conserved in the exchange scattering process. It can be observed from the inset of Fig. 3 that the simple model fits the data reasonably well, and \(\tau_{ex} = 44 \pm 2\) fs is obtained from the fits. Furthermore, \(\tau_1/\tau_2\) is found to be \(\approx 4\). We can thus conclude that the derived microscopic model shows similar dynamics to the experimental ones when assuming that the magnetic moments of the Ni atoms are less strongly coupled to the electronic system compared to Fe. The origin of such a difference, which is rather unexpected due to the large hybridization of the electronic system, remains to be elucidated.

To conclude, we have introduced a simple microscopic model to describe the ultrafast dynamics of magnetic materials with ferro- or antiferromagnetically coupled sublattices. Both ultrafast switching of a ferrimagnet and the magnetization dynamics of a strongly hybridized ferromagnetic alloy are readily reproduced by using realistic values for the microscopic material parameters. Although within the present Rapid Communication we only discussed two cases where the two spin sublattices are associated with different atomic positions, our approach is much more general, and can be extended easily to cases with more sublattices, or sublattices representing different orbitals on the same atom. Treating the coupled dynamics of \(d\) and \(f\) magnetic moments in rare-earth ferromagnets would provide an intriguing example thereof.
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