

Optical control of competing exchange interactions and coherent spin-charge coupling in two-orbital Mott insulators

M. M. S. Barbeau^{1*}, M. Eckstein², M. I. Katsnelson¹, J. H. Mentink¹

¹ Institute for Molecules and Materials, Radboud University Nijmegen, Heyendaalseweg 135, NL-6525 AJ Nijmegen, The Netherlands University.

² Friedrich-Alexander Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, Institut für Theoretische Physik, Standtstraße 7, 91058 Erlangen, Germany.

* m.barbeau@science.ru.nl

September 21, 2021

Abstract

In order to have a better understanding of ultrafast electrical control of exchange interactions in multi-orbital systems, we study a two-orbital Hubbard model at half filling under the action of a time-periodic electric field. Using suitable projection operators and a generalized time-dependent canonical transformation, we derive an effective Hamiltonian which describes two different regimes. First, for a wide range of non-resonant frequencies, we find a change of the bilinear Heisenberg exchange J_{ex} that is analogous to the single-orbital case. Moreover we demonstrate that also the additional biquadratic exchange interaction B_{ex} can be enhanced, reduced and even change sign depending on the electric field. Second, for special driving frequencies, we demonstrate a novel spin-charge coupling phenomenon enabling coherent transfer between spin and charge degrees of freedom of doubly ionized states. These results are confirmed by an exact time-evolution of the full two-orbital Mott-Hubbard Hamiltonian.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Method	3
2.1	Electronic model	3
2.2	Projection operators	4
2.3	Generalized time-dependent canonical transformation	5
3	Results	7
3.1	Spin-one model	8
3.2	Beyond the spin-one model	12
4	Time-dependent numerical simulations	15
5	Conclusion	17

A	Projection operators	18
B	Effective Hamiltonian	19
C	Spin-one and pseudo spin-one operators	22
D	Derivation of the effective spin-one Hamiltonian	22
E	Effective Hamiltonian with Spin-Charge coupling	27
	References	28

1 Introduction

The exchange interaction J_{ex} between microscopic spins is the strongest interaction in magnetic systems. Therefore, the control of exchange is a very promising way for ultrafast control of magnetic order, with potentially high energy efficiency. Recently, the control of J_{ex} has received significant interest both in experiments with cold atoms as well as in condensed matter systems [1–11]. An appealing way to achieve a control of J_{ex} is to use periodic driving with off-resonant pulses as was extensively investigated theoretically [12–17]. In particular, it was predicted theoretically [12, 13] and recently confirmed experimentally [11] that by tuning the strength and frequency of the driving, J_{ex} can be reduced, enhanced and even reverse sign. However, so far, most theoretical studies rely on single-orbital models, while multi-orbital physics is important in many materials. Moreover, existing studies [18–21] on multi-orbital systems did not reveal the role of orbital dynamics on the control of exchange interactions.

In order to have a better understanding of the influence of orbital dynamics on the control of exchange, we report the study of a two-orbital system at half filling under the effect of a periodic electric field. There are two main differences between single and multi-orbital systems which are already captured in the two-orbital case. First, there is the Hund interaction J_{H} that directly arises from inter-orbital exchange on the same site. At half filling and for $J_{\text{H}} > 0$, each orbital is singly occupied and the low-energy degrees of freedom are spin-one states which interact both via a normal Heisenberg exchange $J_{\text{ex}} \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j$ and with a biquadratic exchange interaction $B_{\text{ex}} (\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j)^2$. Second, as illustrated in Figure 1, the two-orbital model has excited states which are doubly ionized and strongly gapped with respect to states with only one electron in each orbital (we will refer to configurations with one electron in each orbital as singly occupied states). The doubly ionized states are charge states, which are coupled to singly occupied states by two subsequent hopping processes.

Below we demonstrate that there exist two distinct regimes for the non-resonantly driven two-orbital model. First, a regime for which the control of intersite exchange interactions dominates. We recover a Heisenberg exchange interaction $J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ that is similar as in single-orbital systems, where \mathcal{E} is the driving strength and ω the driving frequency. In addition, we find that analogous to $J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$, also the biquadratic exchange interaction $B_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ can be reduced, enhanced and reverse sign by tuning the strength and frequency of the driving field. Second, we elucidate a regime for which a new type of spin-charge coupling phenomenon

dominates over the exchange interaction. In this regime, a reversible transfer between spin and charge degrees of freedom is feasible.




Figure 1: (Color online) Sketch of virtual hopping processes t_0 (in blue) between site i and j with different number of doublons d in the case of a single orbital (left) and a two-orbital (a and b) model (right). Small red arrows indicate the spins of electrons. U denotes the Coulomb repulsion and J_H is the on-site Hund exchange interaction.

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we introduce the two-orbital Hubbard model, define projection operators, and introduce a generalization of the time-dependent canonical transformation [16, 18, 22, 23]. In Section 3 we derive the effective Hamiltonian, study its low energy part, and show how to map it onto a spin-one model. From this spin-one model, the Heisenberg exchange interaction as well as the additional biquadratic exchange interaction are extracted. Beyond the spin model, we study the spin-charge coupling phenomenon. Moreover, we confirm the analytical results on the spin-charge coupling by computing the time evolution of the full two-orbital Mott-Hubbard model for a two-site cluster. Finally, in Section 5, we draw conclusions.

2 Method

2.1 Electronic model

To study the role of orbital dynamics on the electrical control of exchange, we investigate a two-orbital model at half-filling. The Hamiltonian is given by $\hat{H}(t) = \hat{H}_U + \hat{H}_{\text{kin}}(t)$, where $\hat{H}_U = \hat{H}_{\text{nn}} + \hat{H}_{\text{sf}}$. \hat{H}_{nn} , \hat{H}_{sf} and \hat{H}_{kin} contain the density-density interaction, the spin-flip and pair hopping, and the intersite hopping, respectively:

$$\hat{H}_{\text{nn}} = \sum_i \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta, \sigma} \left\{ U \hat{n}_{i\alpha\uparrow} \hat{n}_{i\alpha\downarrow} + \frac{(U-2J_H)}{2} \hat{n}_{i\alpha\sigma} \hat{n}_{i\beta\bar{\sigma}} + \frac{(U-3J_H)}{2} \hat{n}_{i\alpha\sigma} \hat{n}_{i\beta\sigma} \right\} \quad (1)$$

$$\hat{H}_{\text{sf}} = -J_H \sum_{i, \alpha \neq \beta} \left(\hat{c}_{i\alpha\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{i\alpha\downarrow} \hat{c}_{i\beta\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{i\beta\uparrow} + \hat{c}_{i\alpha\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{i\beta\downarrow} \hat{c}_{i\alpha\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{i\beta\uparrow} \right) \quad (2)$$

$$\hat{H}_{\text{kin}}(t) = - \sum_{\langle i, j \rangle} t_{ij}(t) \sum_{\alpha, \sigma} \hat{c}_{i\alpha\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j\alpha\sigma}. \quad (3)$$

Here $\hat{c}_{i\alpha\sigma}^\dagger(\hat{c}_{i\alpha\sigma})$ are fermionic creation (annihilation) operators for site i , orbital $\alpha=a, b$, spin $\sigma=\uparrow, \downarrow$, and $\hat{n}_{i\alpha\sigma}=\hat{c}_{i\alpha\sigma}^\dagger\hat{c}_{i\alpha\sigma}$. U is the on-site Coulomb interaction and J_H is the Hund exchange interaction.

The time-dependence of the hopping term originates from the external electric field which is described using the Peierls substitution $t_{ij}(t)=t_0e^{ieA_{ij}(t)}$ [12,24,25], where e is the electronic charge, $A_{ij}(t)=-\frac{1}{\omega}E_0\cos(\omega t)(R_i-R_j)$ is the projection of the vector potential along the direction from site i to j , where E_0 is the amplitude of the field.

2.2 Projection operators

The conventional way to derive the exchange interaction is to use a canonical transformation also known as Schrieffer-Wolff transformation [16,18,22,23]. For the two-orbital case, this is more involved due to the Hund interaction J_H . To deal with this additional complexity, we restrict the Hilbert space to blocks involving only two sites (ij). For all states $|\phi_k\rangle$ on the bond (ij), we then define projection operators $\hat{P}_d^\nu(N, M)$ onto the following quantum numbers:

- Particle number:

$$(N - \hat{N}) \hat{P}_d^\nu(N, M) |\phi_k\rangle = 0, \quad (4)$$

where $\hat{N}=\sum_{i\alpha\sigma}\hat{n}_{i\alpha\sigma}$ and $N=0, \dots, 8$ the number of electrons which occupy the system.

- Total spin \hat{S}^z component:

$$(M - \hat{S}_{\text{tot}}^z) \hat{P}_d^\nu(N, M) |\phi_k\rangle = 0, \quad (5)$$

where $\hat{S}_{\text{tot}}^z = \sum_i(\hat{S}_{ia}^z + \hat{S}_{ib}^z)$ and $M=-2, \dots, 2$.

Below we focus on a half filled system, $N=4$. In addition, we consider an antiferromagnetic state such that $M=0$, and write $\hat{P}_d^\nu(N=4, M=0) \equiv \hat{P}_d^\nu$.

- Number of doublons:

$$(d - \hat{d}) \hat{P}_d^\nu |\phi_k\rangle = 0, \quad (6)$$

where $d=0, 1, 2$ is the double occupancy and $\hat{d}=\sum_{i\alpha}\hat{n}_{i\alpha\uparrow}\hat{n}_{i\alpha\downarrow}$. Hence, \hat{P}_d^ν projects onto states with d doublons.

- Hund rule violation:

$$(\nu - \hat{\nu}) \hat{P}_d^\nu |\phi_k\rangle = 0, \quad (7)$$

with $\hat{\nu}=\sum_{i\alpha\neq\beta}\frac{1}{2}(\hat{n}_{i\alpha\uparrow}\hat{h}_{i\alpha\downarrow}\hat{h}_{i\beta\uparrow}\hat{n}_{i\beta\downarrow}+\hat{n}_{i\alpha\uparrow}\hat{n}_{i\alpha\downarrow}\hat{h}_{i\beta\uparrow}\hat{h}_{i\beta\downarrow})$, where $\hat{h}_{i\alpha\sigma}=(1-\hat{n}_{i\alpha\sigma})$. The value $\nu=0, 1$ corresponds to configurations that satisfy or violate local spin alignment dictated by Hund exchange, respectively. For example, in the \hat{P}_0^ν sector, the states with $\nu=0$ are $|\uparrow, \uparrow\rangle_i|\downarrow, \downarrow\rangle_j$, $|\downarrow, \downarrow\rangle_i|\uparrow, \uparrow\rangle_j$, and the $\nu=1$ states are $|\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle_i|\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle_j$, $|\downarrow, \uparrow\rangle_i|\downarrow, \uparrow\rangle_j$, $|\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle_i|\downarrow, \uparrow\rangle_j$, $|\downarrow, \uparrow\rangle_i|\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle_j$, where $|\sigma_a, \sigma'_b\rangle_i = \hat{c}_{ib\sigma'}^\dagger\hat{c}_{ia\sigma}^\dagger|0\rangle$.

Although $[\hat{H}_{\text{sf}}, \hat{P}_d^\nu]=0$, the states $\hat{P}_d^\nu|\phi_k\rangle$, with $\nu=1$ do not diagonalize \hat{H}_{sf} . In principle, it is possible to further decompose \hat{P}_d^ν by introducing additional quantum numbers that

project on states that simultaneously diagonalize \hat{P}_d^ν and \hat{H}_{sf} . Here we restrict ourselves to the projectors \hat{P}_d^ν , since this is already sufficient to describe the control of the biquadratic exchange interaction as well as the spin-charge coupling, as we discuss in more detail below.

It is shown in Appendix A that explicit expressions for $\hat{P}_d^\nu(N, M)$ in terms of single-electron operators can be derived using

$$\hat{p}(i) = \prod_{\alpha, \sigma} (\hat{n}_{i\alpha\sigma} + \hat{h}_{i\alpha\sigma}), \quad (8)$$

where $\hat{h}_{i\alpha\sigma} = (1 - \hat{n}_{i\alpha\sigma})$. With these definitions, the identity reads

$$1 = \hat{p}(i)\hat{p}(j) = \sum_{d, \nu, N, M} \hat{P}_d^\nu(N, M). \quad (9)$$

The hopping term Eq. (3) connects \hat{P}_d^ν with different d and can be re-written in terms of operators $\hat{T}^{+1}(t)$, $\hat{T}^{-1}(t)$ and $\hat{T}^0(t)$ that change d by $+1$, -1 and 0 respectively

$$\hat{H}_{\text{kin}}(t) = \hat{T}^{+1}(t) + \hat{T}^{-1}(t) + \hat{T}^0(t), \quad (10)$$

where

$$\hat{T}^{+1}(t) = \sum_{\nu=0,1} (\hat{P}_2^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{kin}}(t) \hat{P}_1^0 + \hat{P}_1^0 \hat{H}_{\text{kin}}(t) \hat{P}_0^\nu), \quad (11)$$

$$\hat{T}^{-1}(t) = \sum_{\nu=0,1} (\hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{kin}}(t) \hat{P}_1^0 + \hat{P}_1^0 \hat{H}_{\text{kin}}(t) \hat{P}_2^\nu), \quad (12)$$

and

$$\hat{T}^0(t) = \hat{P}_1^0 \hat{H}_{\text{kin}}(t) \hat{P}_1^1 + \hat{P}_1^1 \hat{H}_{\text{kin}}(t) \hat{P}_1^0. \quad (13)$$

Expressions for $\hat{T}^{+1}(t)$, $\hat{T}^{-1}(t)$ and $\hat{T}^0(t)$ in terms of single electron operators are given in Appendix A. The projection operators \hat{P}_d^ν and hopping operators $\hat{T}^{+1}(t)$, $\hat{T}^{-1}(t)$, $\hat{T}^0(t)$ play an important role in the canonical transformation described below.

2.3 Generalized time-dependent canonical transformation

The canonical transformation is a technique which enables the derivation of an effective Hamiltonian for the subspace of states \hat{P}_d^ν [16, 18, 22, 23, 26]. Formally, this is achieved by unitary transformation $\hat{V}(t) = e^{-i\hat{S}(t)}$ that transforms the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}(t)$ to a rotated frame. The effective Hamiltonian in the rotated frame reads

$$\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}(t) = \hat{V}^\dagger(t) (\hat{H}(t) - i\partial_t) \hat{V}(t). \quad (14)$$

The aim is to identify a suitable subspace (defined by values of d and ν) and determine \hat{V} such that \hat{H}_{eff} leaves this subspace invariant. To do this, we perform the unitary transformation

perturbatively, treating the hopping parameter $t_0 \ll U$ as a perturbation. We expand $i\hat{S}(t)$ and $\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}(t)$ in terms of a Taylor series

$$i\hat{S}(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} i\hat{S}^{(n)}(t), \quad (15)$$

$$\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(n)}(t), \quad (16)$$

where $\hat{S}^{(n)}, \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(n)} \propto t_0^n$. For deriving a pure spin model, one could construct the unitary transformation such that $\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(n)}$ does not contain terms that change d [16, 26–28], and obtain an effective Hamiltonian in the subspace $d = 0$. Here we use a more general requirement which will allow us to derive an effective Hamiltonian in a subspace different from that without doublons. This turns out to be crucial for a description of multi-orbital systems. We enlarge our effective model and keep terms that change d by ± 2 , while we design $\hat{P}_d^\nu i\hat{S}^{(n)} \hat{P}_{d'}^{\nu'}$ such that

$$\hat{P}_d^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(n)}(t) \hat{P}_{d\pm 1}^{\nu'} = 0. \quad (17)$$

Since we work at half filling and inter-orbital hopping is not allowed i.e. $t_{\alpha\neq\beta} = 0$, only odd orders of $i\hat{S}^{(n)}(t) \propto t_0^n$ remain,

$$i\hat{S}^{(n)}(t) = i\hat{S}^{(1)}(t) + i\hat{S}^{(3)}(t) + \mathcal{O}(t_0^5). \quad (18)$$

Eqs. (17) and (18) not only allow us to obtain an effective description of the low energy states \hat{P}_0^ν , but also enable us to keep track of the coupling between the low energy space (spin: \hat{P}_0^ν) and the space with the highest excited states (charge: \hat{P}_2^ν). Eqs. (17) and (18) yields the zeroth order contribution to the effective Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(0)} = \hat{H}_{\text{nn}} + \hat{H}_{\text{sf}}. \quad (19)$$

Using the projection operators, we obtain the following equation for $i\hat{S}^{(1)}(t)$

$$\hat{P}_d^\nu [\hat{T}^{\pm 1}(t) + [i\hat{S}^{(1)}(t), \hat{H}_U] - \partial_t i\hat{S}^{(1)}(t)] \hat{P}_{d\pm 1}^{\nu'} = 0. \quad (20)$$

In contrast to the zeroth order contribution $\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(0)}$, Eq. (20) is a time-dependent equation. In principle, it is possible to solve this equation for arbitrary time-dependency, as worked out in [18]. However, here we use a simpler algebraic solution that is feasible for time periodic driving and which is closely related to Floquet theory [12, 16, 27] and the high frequency expansion [13, 22, 28]. Given a time periodic electric field $E(t) = E(t+T)$ with a period $T = \frac{2\pi}{\omega}$, we can expand $\hat{T}^{\pm 1}(t)$ and $i\hat{S}^{(n)}(t)$ in a Fourier series as follows

$$\hat{T}^{\pm 1}(t) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{+\infty} \hat{T}_m^{\pm 1} e^{im\omega t}, \quad i\hat{S}^{(n)}(t) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{+\infty} i\hat{S}_m^{(n)} e^{im\omega t}, \quad (21)$$

where m is the Fourier index, which can be seen as the number of virtual photons absorbed by the system [27]. Using Eqs. (20) and (21), we obtain:

$$\hat{P}_d^\nu i\hat{S}_m^{(1)} \hat{P}_{d\pm 1}^{\nu'} = C_{dd\pm 1}^{\nu\nu', m} \hat{P}_d^\nu \hat{T}_m^{\pm 1} \hat{P}_{d\pm 1}^{\nu'}, \quad (22)$$

with $C_{dd'}^{\nu\nu',m}=(E_d^\nu - E_{d'}^{\nu'} + m\omega)^{-1}$ and

$$\hat{P}_d^\nu \hat{H}_U \hat{P}_{d'}^{\nu'} = \delta_{dd'} \delta_{\nu\nu'} E_d^\nu \hat{P}_d^\nu. \quad (23)$$

For $\nu = 1$, E_d^ν is a matrix and we would have to further decompose P_d^ν for the procedure to be exact (see also Section 2.2). Here instead we use an approximation $E_d^\nu = \min(E_d^{\nu,\mu})$, where $E_d^{\nu,\mu}$ are the eigenvalues obtained from diagonalizing $\langle \phi_k | \hat{P}_d^\nu \hat{H}_U \hat{P}_d^\nu | \phi_k \rangle$. This is a generalization of the energy approximation employed in [29], where E_d is approximated by the mean energy of all states for given d . The present approximation is accurate for

$$|E_d^{\nu,\mu} - E_d^{\nu,\mu'}| \ll |E_d^\nu - E_{d'}^{\nu'}|, \quad (24)$$

where $d \neq d'$. We find that this condition is satisfied for the calculations presented in Section 3.

The first order effective Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(1)}(t)$ vanishes because $\hat{T}^0(t)=0$ for orbital-diagonal hopping $t_{\alpha\neq\beta}=0$. Eq. (22) allows us to compute higher order contributions to $\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}(t)$ in a straightforward way. The second order contribution reads

$$\hat{P}_d^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(2)}(t) \hat{P}_{d'}^{\nu'} = \sum_m \sum_{k+l=m} \hat{P}_d^\nu \frac{1}{2} [i\hat{S}_k^{(1)}, \hat{T}_l^{\pm 1}] \hat{P}_{d'}^{\nu'} e^{im\omega t}, \quad (25)$$

where, $d, d'=0, 2$ and $\nu, \nu'=0, 1$.

The third order contribution to $\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}(t)$ gives us an expression for $\hat{P}_d^\nu i\hat{S}_m^{(3)} \hat{P}_{d\pm 1}^{\nu'}$:

$$\hat{P}_d^\nu i\hat{S}_m^{(3)} \hat{P}_{d\pm 1}^{\nu'} = C_{dd\pm 1}^{\nu\nu',m} \frac{1}{3} \sum_{p+q+r=m} \hat{P}_d^\nu [i\hat{S}_p^{(1)}, [i\hat{S}_q^{(1)}, \hat{T}_r^{\pm 1}]] \hat{P}_{d\pm 1}^{\nu'}. \quad (26)$$

This yields the following fourth order contribution to the effective Hamiltonian:

$$\hat{P}_d^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(4)}(t) \hat{P}_{d'}^{\nu'} = \frac{1}{8} \sum_m \sum_{p+q+r+s=m} \hat{P}_d^\nu [i\hat{S}_p^{(1)}, [i\hat{S}_q^{(1)}, [i\hat{S}_r^{(1)}, \hat{T}_s^{\pm 1}]]] \hat{P}_{d'}^{\nu'} e^{im\omega t}, \quad (27)$$

With Eqs. (25) and (27) we have derived the central result of this section, namely an effective Hamiltonian up to fourth order in the hopping.

3 Results

In this section we present the results obtained with the projection operators and the effective Hamiltonian derived above. First we show that the $d = 0$ part can be mapped onto an effective spin-one ($S=1$) model. This requires two additional unitary transformations to account for the presence of non $S=1$ states within the \hat{P}_0^ν sector as well as to exclude coupling to the \hat{P}_2^ν sector. Finally, we extract the Heisenberg $J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ and biquadratic $B_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ exchange interactions. Second, we focus on the coupling terms between sectors $d=0$ and $d=2$ by taking both of them into account in the low energy description. This goes beyond the spin model and captures the spin-charge coupling dynamics.

3.1 Spin-one model

According to condition Eq. (17), the full effective Hamiltonian yields

$$\sum_{n=2,4} \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(n)}(t) = \sum_{\substack{n=2,4 \\ \nu\nu'}} \left\{ \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(n)}(t) \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} + \hat{P}_2^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(n)}(t) \hat{P}_2^{\nu'} + \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(n)}(t) \hat{P}_2^{\nu'} + \hat{P}_2^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(n)}(t) \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} \right\}, \quad (28)$$

In this subsection we study the low energy effective Hamiltonian up to fourth order in the hopping. In the derivation of the spin-one model, we have to consider the sector \hat{P}_2^ν as a high energy sector and perform a second canonical transformation in order project out states for which $d=2$

$$\tilde{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(4)}(t) = \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(4)}(t) + \sum_{\substack{\nu,\nu',\nu'' \\ m}} C_{20}^{\nu'0,m} \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff},m}^{(2)}(t) \hat{P}_2^{\nu'} \hat{H}_{\text{eff},-m}^{(2)}(t) \hat{P}_0^{\nu''}, \quad (29)$$

where we used that $C_{d0}^{\nu'0,m} = C_{d0}^{\nu'1,m}$. From this projection, we obtain the effective Hamiltonian in the form

$$\sum_{\nu\nu'} \hat{P}_0^\nu (\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(2)}(t) + \tilde{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(4)}(t)) \hat{P}_0^{\nu'}, \quad (30)$$

where $\hat{P}_0^\nu \tilde{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(4)}(t) \hat{P}_0^{\nu'}$ takes into account all fourth order contributions for the nearest-neighbor bond (ij). Details of the second canonical transformation are given in Appendix B.

We would like point out that in the full lattice, additional 4th order interactions occur, such as ring-exchange terms, spin chirality terms [16] as well as additional 4th order contribution to the Heisenberg and biquadratic exchange interactions. Since we restrict ourselves to a two site model, such processes are not taken into account in our calculations.

Hamiltonian Eq. (30), can be reduced to a set of spin-one ($S=1$) operators as described before in [30] for the static case. In general, $S=1$ operators can be defined using many-electron operators [31]. Here, we define their projection onto local spin states $|S, m_S\rangle$

$$|S, m_S\rangle_i = \left\{ |1, 1\rangle_i, |1, 0\rangle_i, |1, -1\rangle_i \right\}. \quad (31)$$

Then, we can write the spin-one states in terms of single electron states using suitable Clebsh-Gordan coefficients

$$|1, 1\rangle_i = |\uparrow, \uparrow\rangle_i, \quad |1, 0\rangle_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle_i + |\downarrow, \uparrow\rangle_i), \quad |1, -1\rangle_i = |\downarrow, \downarrow\rangle_i, \quad (32)$$

where $|\sigma_a, \sigma'_b\rangle_i = \hat{c}_{ib\sigma'}^\dagger \hat{c}_{ia\sigma}^\dagger |0\rangle$. Using the relation [31]

$$\hat{S}_i^q |S, m_S\rangle_i = \sqrt{S(S+1)} C_{Sm_S, 1q}^{Sm_S+q} |S, m_S + q\rangle_i, \quad (33)$$

one can write \hat{S}_i^q in terms of single electron operators (index i is omitted for brevity), which yields

$$\hat{S}^{+1} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} \hat{c}_{\alpha\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\alpha\downarrow} (\hat{n}_{\beta\uparrow} \hat{h}_{\beta\downarrow} + \hat{h}_{\beta\uparrow} \hat{n}_{\beta\downarrow}), \quad (34)$$

$$\hat{S}^{-1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} \hat{c}_{\alpha\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\alpha\uparrow} (\hat{n}_{\beta\uparrow} \hat{h}_{\beta\downarrow} + \hat{h}_{\beta\uparrow} \hat{n}_{\beta\downarrow}), \quad (35)$$

$$\hat{S}^0 = \hat{n}_{a\uparrow} \hat{h}_{a\downarrow} \hat{n}_{b\uparrow} \hat{h}_{b\downarrow} - \hat{h}_{a\uparrow} \hat{n}_{a\downarrow} \hat{h}_{b\uparrow} \hat{n}_{b\downarrow}. \quad (36)$$

Using the definition $\hat{S}^{\pm 1} = \mp \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\hat{S}^x \pm i \hat{S}^y)$ for the spin-one spin flip terms [31], one can compute the product $\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j$ as well as $(\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j)^2$ in terms of single electron operators and identify them with the terms of Eq. (30), see Appendix D. After time averaging $\langle \hat{O}(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \hat{O}(\bar{t}) d\bar{t}$, this procedure leads to an effective Hamiltonian written in terms of $S = 1$ operators:

$$\sum_{\substack{n=2,4 \\ \nu\nu'}} \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(n)} \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \left\{ K_1(\mathcal{E}, \omega) (\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j + \hat{R}_{ij}^1) + K_2(\mathcal{E}, \omega) (\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j + \hat{R}_{ij}^1)^2 \right. \\ \left. + K_3(\mathcal{E}, \omega) ((\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j)^2 + \hat{R}_{ij}^2) \right\}, \quad (37)$$

$K_1(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ corresponds to the exchange $J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ up to second order in the hopping. $K_2(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ gives a fourth order contribution to $J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ as well as the biquadratic exchange $B_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$. $K_3(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ gives a contribution directly to $B_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$.

Remaining terms \hat{R}_{ij}^1 and \hat{R}_{ij}^2 describe orbital resolved spin dynamics that strictly go beyond a spin-one model. Their expression in terms of fermionic operators can be found in Appendix D. To arrive at an effective spin-one model only, we perform a second transformation. The coupling between orbital resolved spin dynamics and the spin-one states scales with $J_{\text{ex}}/J_{\text{H}} \ll 1$. This coupling is taken into account by an additional downfolding, which is described in Appendix D. As a result of the two additional transformations described above, we have the Heisenberg exchange interaction

$$J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{+\infty} \left\{ \frac{t_0^2 J_m^2(\mathcal{E})}{U + J_{\text{H}} + m\omega} - \frac{t_0^4 J_m^4(\mathcal{E})}{2(U + J_{\text{H}} + m\omega)^3} \right\}, \quad (38)$$

where J_m is a Bessel function of order m , and $\mathcal{E} = eaE_0/\omega$ is the parameter that represents the driving strength. The first term of Eq. (38) corresponds to $K_1(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ and the second term is a contribution from $K_2(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$.

We now would like to compare the behavior of the second order $J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ in single and two-orbital systems. $J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ for single-orbital systems reads

$$J_{\text{ex}}^{\text{single}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{2t_0^2 J_m^2(\mathcal{E})}{U + m\omega}. \quad (39)$$

We can see that in the two-orbital model, $J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$, Eq. (38), has an additional factor 1/2 as compared to $J_{\text{ex}}^{\text{single}}$. This is related to the fact that inter-orbital hopping $t_{\alpha\beta}$ is not taken into account in our model. If inter-orbital hopping would be the same as intra-orbital hopping i.e. $t_{\alpha\beta} = t_{\alpha\alpha} = t_0$, the second order Heisenberg exchange for the two-orbital case would have the same prefactor as for the single-orbital $J_{\text{ex}}^{\text{single}}$. The relative modification of the exchange $\Delta J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)/J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ is nonetheless the same in the single and two-orbital system. Thus, the orbital dynamics does not change the control of $J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ in the leading order.

The biquadratic exchange interaction is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
B_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega) = & t_0^4 \sum_{k+l+m+n=0} J_k(\mathcal{E}) J_l(\mathcal{E}) J_m(\mathcal{E}) J_n(\mathcal{E}) \left\{ A_2^0 \left((-1)^{k+m} + (-1)^{l+n} \right) \right. \\
& + \frac{1}{2} A_2^1 \left((-1)^{k+l} + (-1)^{m+n} + 2 \right) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{C_{10}^{00,k} C_{10}^{00,m}}{(4J_H + (k+l)\omega)} \left((-1)^k + (-1)^l \right) \left((-1)^m + (-1)^n \right) \left. \right\} \\
& + \sum_{m=-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{t_0^4 J_{|m|}^4(\mathcal{E})}{2(U + J_H + m\omega)^3},
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

with coefficients

$$\begin{aligned}
A_2^\nu = & C_{10}^{00,k} \left(C_{21}^{\nu 0,l} (C_{21}^{\nu 0,m} - C_{10}^{00,m}) - C_{10}^{00,l} (C_{21}^{\nu 0,m} + C_{21}^{\nu 0,k}) \right) \\
& + C_{20}^{\nu 0,k+l} (C_{10}^{00,m} - C_{21}^{\nu 0,m}) (C_{21}^{\nu 0,k} - C_{10}^{00,k}).
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

In the derivation we used $C_{d0}^{\nu 0,m} = C_{d0}^{\nu 1,m}$ due to Eq. (24). The complex form of $B_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ is due to commutator of Eq. (27), the second canonical transformation which projects out the $d = 2$ states, the additional downfolding in the \hat{P}_0^ν space, and the contribution of the $K_2(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ term. We can identify two main terms in Eq. (40). The first term contains the following contributions: (i) the biquadratic exchange path to the \hat{P}_2^0 sector, (ii) the biquadratic exchange path to the \hat{P}_2^1 sector and (iii) the contribution obtained after additional downfolding with the \hat{P}_0^ν sector. The second term is the contribution from $K_2(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$.

Figure 2 sketches examples of hopping processes that illustrate different biquadratic exchange paths. The biquadratic exchange path via the \hat{P}_2^0 sector involves the hopping processes sketched in Figure 2a and b. The factor $((-1)^{k+m} + (-1)^{l+n})$ gives the sign of the biquadratic exchange path via the \hat{P}_2^0 sector, where $(-1)^m$ comes from Bessel functions J_{-m} which are symmetric for even m but anti-symmetric for odd m . Since this factor is never equal to zero ($k+l+m+n$ has to be equal to 0), both symmetric and anti-symmetric path (illustrated in Figure 2a and b) are allowed. However, the second biquadratic exchange path via the \hat{P}_2^1 states allows only one type of hopping process, as sketched in Figure 2b. This is the hopping process for which the factor $((-1)^{k+l} + (-1)^{m+n} + 2)$ is non-zero. Note that hopping processes to sector \hat{P}_2^1 give rise to a constant 2 which is not present in the case of the \hat{P}_2^0 sector. The diagrams in Figure 2a and b are restricted to processes which are second order in the field \mathcal{E}^2 . Hopping processes to other sectors $\Delta m > 1$ are possible at higher order in the field. Figure 2c illustrates biquadratic process that arises from the additional downfolding to the \hat{P}_0^ν space, where only the process at zeroth order in the field \mathcal{E} is represented. One observes that hopping is restricted to both the \hat{P}_0^ν and to \hat{P}_1^0 sector, the latter originates from the original canonical transformation performed before the additional downfolding. The last term of Eq. (40) is not illustrated in Figure 2. The process involved in this exchange is equivalent to two times the Heisenberg exchange path to the first excited states of \hat{P}_1^0 .

In order to show the behavior of the biquadratic exchange as compared to the Heisenberg exchange interaction in the two-orbital model, we show two figures: Figure 3b and Figure 4. In both cases, we discuss only driving frequencies above the gap $\omega \gg U + J_H$. In particular we




Figure 2: (Color online) Examples of hopping processes for the two biquadratic exchange paths: hopping processes via \hat{P}_2^0 states are represented in (a) and (b) and the hopping process via \hat{P}_2^1 is represented in (b). Blue arrows represent hopping processes between different Fourier sectors, which are represented by dashed squares. Only processes at leading order in the field \mathcal{E}^2 are shown, such that only two Fourier sectors are involved. The Hermitian conjugate of the processes involved in $B_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ are not represented in this sketch. Panel (c) sketches the hopping processes responsible for the biquadratic exchange derived from the additional downfolding within \hat{P}_0^ν .

choose $\omega > 8J_H$, which corresponds to the highest eigenenergy obtained after diagonalization of $\langle \phi_k | \hat{P}_d^1 \hat{H}_U \hat{P}_d^1 | \phi_{k'} \rangle$. For frequencies below the gap, the approximation Eq. (24) is in general not valid. Accounting for the control of exchange interactions in this regime requires to further generalize the canonical transformation. The latter will be important, for example, to derive optical control of orbital resolved spin dynamics beyond the spin-one model, which deals with an alternative mapping of the low-energy space, see [30]. We leave the study of such orbital resolved spin dynamics for future work. Here, we restrict ourselves to the energy approximation (Eq. (24)) which gives reliable results for frequencies above the gap $U + J_H$.

Figure 3a,b shows the typical behavior of $J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E})$ and $B_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E})$ as a function of \mathcal{E} , respectively. The exchange interactions have been computed for frequencies $\omega = 19, 25$ and 35 . One observes in Figure 3a that $J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ can be controlled with the strength \mathcal{E} and frequency ω of the electric field similarly as found in [12] for the single-orbital system. The biquadratic exchange is negative in equilibrium which favors a collinear alignment of spins in the classical limit. Figure 3b shows that $B_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ can also be controlled by the electric field.

Because of the denominators of $B_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ in Eq. (40), are proportional to $1/U^3$, the biquadratic exchange remains weak as compared to the Heisenberg exchange interaction and reaches values close to zero for increasing \mathcal{E} . One can see that the biquadratic exchange can reach small positive values for $\mathcal{E} \sim 2$ for frequencies $\omega = 19$ and 25 . However, a similar feature is not observed for $\omega = 35$. This is due to the denominator $C_{20}^{00, k+l}$ in Eq. (40), which results from the second canonical transformation done with terms $\hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(2)} \hat{P}_2^\nu + h.c.$. This denominator gives a negative value for ω close to $E_2^0 - E_0 = 32$ which is large compared to other $C_{dd'}^{\nu\nu', m}$. For large driving strength \mathcal{E} , $C_{20}^{00, k+l}$ will reduce $B_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E})$. In addition, for $\omega = 19$, an additional dip of $B_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E})$ is observed for driving strength $\mathcal{E} \sim 0.5$. This originates from the biquadratic




Figure 3: (Color online) (a) $J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ and (b) $B_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E})$ as a function of \mathcal{E} for $\omega=19$ (solid line), $\omega=25$ (dashed line) and $\omega=35$ (dots). Parameters for the Figure: $U=10$, $J_H=2$, $t_0=1$.

path via the \hat{P}_2^0 states that gives a large negative contribution due to $C_{21}^{00,m}$ denominators for a frequency close to $E_2^0 - E_1 = 20$. These contributions are large enough to overcome other biquadratic contributions and therefore, reduce $B_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E})$.

Next, we investigate possible enhancement of the biquadratic exchange interaction as compared to the Heisenberg exchange. To this end, we study the value of the ratio $B_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)/J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$. For frequencies from $\omega=18$ to 40 and driving strength $\mathcal{E} < 3$ ($\omega=40$ is larger than the highest energy of the undriven system, $40 > E_2^0 - E_0^0$). The result is shown in Figure 4 as a color map as a function of \mathcal{E}, ω . Positive values of the ratio are shown in yellow and negative values are shown in blue. Figure 4 clearly demonstrates that the exchange ratio can be enhanced as well as reduced depending on ω and \mathcal{E} . The parameters for which $B_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)/J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ is strongly enhanced correspond to two types of situations:

- Frequencies for which $\omega = E_d^\nu - E_{d'}^{\nu'}$. At these frequencies, $B_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ diverges, such that the canonical transformation breaks down. This is indicated with white areas around $\omega=20$ and 32 in Figure 4. Note that $\omega=32$ is the frequency that separates spin states from the doubly ionized state, such that a coupling appears close to this frequency. This coupling leads to charge dynamics and therefore, the spin-one model is not accurate in this region. This coupling to charge states is studied in detail in the next section.

- ω and \mathcal{E} for which $J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega) = 0$ but $B_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega) \neq 0$ are indicated in white dashed lines. Although this realizes a regime where $B_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega) \gg J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$, $B_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ itself remains small.

Summarizing, orbital degrees of freedom do not change the behavior of $J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$. Both sign and strength of $J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ and $B_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ can be controlled by driving, while $B_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega) \gg J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ is reached only for $J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega) \simeq 0$.

3.2 Beyond the spin-one model

Besides the additional term B_{ex} , the inclusion of orbital degrees of freedom also gives rise to qualitatively new effects that go beyond a description in terms of a spin model alone. In




Figure 4: (Color online) Value of the exchange ratio $B_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)/J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ for frequencies from $\omega=18$ to 40 and driving amplitude \mathcal{E} up to 3. White straight lines represent the frequencies for which $B_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ diverges. These frequencies are multiples $m=-4$ to 4 of the energy denominators $C_{dd'}^{\nu\nu',m}$ in the expression for $B_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$. White dashed lines correspond to points for which $J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)=0$. Parameters: $U/t_0=10$, $J_H/t_0=2$. We restrict ourselves to values of the ratio $B_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)/J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ from -0.23 to 0.23 in order to show local variations more precisely.

particular, under driving there can be coupling to the doubly ionized charge sector ($d=2$), which is irrelevant in equilibrium due to the large energy difference between the sectors. Under non-equilibrium conditions, the spin charge coupling reads

$$\sum_n \sum_{\nu=0,1} \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(n)}(t) \hat{P}_2^{\nu'} + h.c.. \quad (42)$$

We now study the regime for which \hat{P}_0^ν and \hat{P}_2^ν from different m sectors overlap. This overlap appears for frequencies ω close to $E_0^\nu = E_2^\nu + m\omega$. Although this seems a resonant condition, a direct optical transition is not possible since two hoppings are required to go from the \hat{P}_0^ν sector to the \hat{P}_2^ν sector. Equation (42) can be divided into two different contributions $\sum_m \hat{H}_{\text{eff},m=0}^{(n)}$ and $\sum_m \hat{H}_{\text{eff},m \neq 0}^{(n)}$. The first contribution represents the coupling within one Fourier sector m . This contribution remains weak since \hat{P}_0^ν and \hat{P}_2^ν states are strongly gapped when they belong to the same Fourier sector. We therefore focus on the second term that allows coupling between the spin sector \hat{P}_0^ν and the charge sector \hat{P}_2^ν with different Fourier index m . For small \mathcal{E} , the leading contribution to Eq. (42) arises from $n=2$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_\nu \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff},m=1}^{(2)}(t) \hat{P}_2^\nu &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \left(\frac{1}{3U - 5J_H - k\omega} - \frac{1}{U + J_H - k\omega} \right) \\ &\times \left[\sum_\nu \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{T}_k^{-1} \hat{P}_1^0 \hat{T}_{1-k}^{-1} \hat{P}_2^0 e^{i\omega t} \right] \sim \mathcal{E} + \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

and its Hermitian conjugate $\sum_\nu \hat{P}_2^0 \hat{H}_{\text{eff},m=-1}^{(2)}(t) \hat{P}_0^\nu$. To illustrate the spin-charge coupling, we restrict ourselves to the space $\nu'=0$. The two states represented by \hat{P}_2^0 have all electrons

on one of the two sites i, j . Without driving, these states have the highest energy and are isolated from the rest of the spectrum. An expression of $\sum_m \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff},m \neq 0}^{(2)}(t) \hat{P}_2^0 + h.c.$ in terms of fermionic operators is written in Appendix E.

To show the effect of this coupling, we compute the low energy spectrum for driving frequencies $\omega = \omega_0 + \delta\omega$, where $\omega_0 = |E_0^\nu - E_2^0|$. The spectrum is shown in Figure 5 for $\delta\omega = 0.5$ in the two-site system. In this case, the lowest energy state is a singlet state that couples to the two charge states of \hat{P}_2^0 . The latter are degenerate up to t_0^4 since four hoppings are needed in order to transfer the four electrons from one atom to the other one. Black lines, from top to bottom, show the quintet state ($S=2$) and the triplet state ($S=1$) that are not involved in the spin-charge coupling. The black dashed line shows the behavior of the spin state which is a singlet state from sector $m=0$. The dotted lines show the behavior of the charge states from $m=-1$. The thick red and blue lines show the spin and charge states, respectively and are obtained by diagonalizing the full $\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(2)}$ that contains the spin-charge coupling terms, see Appendix E. The eigen-energies show an avoided crossing, which reveals a hybridization between the spin and charge states. For driving frequencies far away from ω_0 , the spin-charge coupling terms $\hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(2)}(t) \hat{P}_2^\nu + h.c.$ remain very small. Moreover, for these frequencies, the spin and charge states are gapped. Therefore, the hybridization is negligible and we recover the regime for which the exchange interaction formulae are valid. However, in the regime we study here ($\omega \sim \omega_0$), the hybridization between the spin and charge states is possible and the exchange interaction formulae obtained in the previous section are no longer accurate.

To sketch the hybridization process, let us take the equilibrium ground state of the system which is the singlet state (spin state). After switching on the electric field and by slowly changing the field amplitude ($\partial_t E_0 / E_0 \ll \omega$), one anticipates that the system starts in a pure spin state and, approaching the avoided-crossing regime, charge states are mixed to the state. For strong \mathcal{E} , the spin state becomes a pure charge state. The energy gap of the avoided-crossing is relatively small, $\omega_{\text{sc}} \simeq 0.2$. Therefore, to observe the hybridization, the electric field envelope must be changed slowly (adiabatic change).

In the literature, a time-dependent traverse of an avoided crossing is widely studied. The basic example is the Landau-Zener (LZ) effect [32, 33]. Also condensed matter systems can exhibit LZ physics. For instance, the Zener breakdown has been studied [34, 35] in semiconductors and more recently in Mott insulators [36]. Nonetheless, distinct from these LZ effects which involve changes of the electrical conductivity, here we report coherent transfer of spin to charge degrees of freedom that keep the system in an insulating regime.

In conclusion, orbital dynamics gives access to charge states that are not accessible in equilibrium. The spin-charge coupling offers the possibility to induce coherent charge dynamics in the system. This phenomenon appears in the non-equilibrium low-energy spectrum as an avoided crossing. We stress that it is quite distinct from spin-orbit coupling since here we have an interplay with Coulomb and Hund interaction with the driving field. The spin-charge coupling is not present in single band systems, and we expect it to be universal for multi-orbital systems. Indeed, since multi-orbital systems offer the possibility of having multiple excited states (multiple doublons), multi-doublon excitation should be possible for multi-orbital systems in general. Note that here we did not study \hat{P}_2^1 states, they are nonetheless very interesting since they have a lower energy (at and below gap energy $U + J_H$) and therefore are reachable with lower frequencies ω .




Figure 5: (Color online) Low energy spectrum as a function of the driving amplitude \mathcal{E} . The spectrum is restricted to the spin states of the $m=0$ sector and the highest excited state of the sector $m=-1$. Upper and lower thin black lines represent the quintet state and the triplet state. The thin black dots and the dashed line represent the charge multiplet and the singlet without spin-charge coupling, respectively. Blue to red thick line represents the charge ($\mathcal{E}<0.5$) to spin ($\mathcal{E}>1$) state and the red to blue thick line represents the spin ($\mathcal{E}<0.5$) to charge ($\mathcal{E}>1$) state. Parameters: $U/t_0=10$, $J_H/t_0=2$ and $\omega=\omega_0+0.5$.

4 Time-dependent numerical simulations

In the previous section, we showed that the generalized canonical transformation can capture a qualitatively new phenomenon that couples the spin and doubly ionized charge sector. This phenomenon appears only in multi-orbital systems and gives rise to an hybridization of charge and spin states for non-resonant frequencies ω . To further support this finding, we perform an exact time propagation of a cluster of two sites described by the Mott-Hubbard Hamiltonian. We focus our attention on the coherent transfer of spin to charge degrees of freedom. In order to describe the charge dynamics, we define pseudo-spin one operators \hat{T}^z that are composed of Anderson pseudo-spin 1/2 operators $\hat{\tau}_{i\alpha}^+ = \hat{c}_{i\alpha\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{i\alpha\downarrow}^\dagger$ ($\hat{\tau}_{i\alpha}^- = \hat{c}_{i\alpha\downarrow} \hat{c}_{i\alpha\uparrow}$) [37, 38]. The construction of \hat{T}^z is inspired by the expression of the spin-one operator \hat{S}^z . By using a similar procedure with \hat{T}^z and pseudo-spin 1/2 operators, we obtain $\hat{T}^z = \hat{\tau}_a^+ \hat{\tau}_a^- \hat{\tau}_b^+ \hat{\tau}_b^- - \hat{\tau}_a^- \hat{\tau}_a^+ \hat{\tau}_b^- \hat{\tau}_b^+$. This leads to the expression

$$\hat{T}^z = \hat{n}_{a\uparrow} \hat{n}_{a\downarrow} \hat{n}_{b\uparrow} \hat{n}_{b\downarrow} + \hat{h}_{a\uparrow} \hat{h}_{a\downarrow} \hat{h}_{b\uparrow} \hat{h}_{b\downarrow}, \quad (44)$$

that characterizes fully occupied and completely empty sites from the \hat{P}_2^0 sector. Note that \hat{T}^x and \hat{T}^y can be defined analogously, see Appendix C.

To solve the time-dependent Schrödinger equation, we use a second order commutator-free approximation of the time-propagator [39]. Using this time-propagator, we compute the time-dependent wavefunction $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ and evaluate observables as $\langle \hat{O} \rangle(t) = \langle \Psi(t) | \hat{O} | \Psi(t) \rangle$. We focus on three different observables: First, we compute the spin correlation $\langle \hat{S}_i \cdot \hat{S}_j \rangle(t)$ to show the spin dynamics during the laser pulse. Then, we characterize the charge states \hat{P}_2^0 with $\langle \hat{T}_i^z \hat{T}_j^z \rangle(t)$. Finally, to probe the states that possess one doublon $d=1$, we evaluate $\langle \hat{N}_{d=1} \rangle(t)$, where $\hat{N}_{d=1} = \hat{P}_1^0 \hat{d} \hat{P}_1^0$.

To demonstrate the coherent spin-charge transfer discussed in Section 3.2 and illustrated in Figure 5, we use an electric field $E(t)=E_0\cos(\omega t)e^{-\frac{(t-t_*)^2}{\tau^2}}$, where E_0 is the amplitude of the field, t_* is the time at which $E(t)$ peaks and τ is the pulse width, chosen such that $\tau\times\omega_{sc}\gg 1$, where $\omega_{sc}\simeq 0.2$ is approximately the energy splitting of the avoided crossing (see Figure 5). We choose a Gaussian envelope with $\tau=400\pi/\omega$ and $\omega=\omega_0+\delta\omega$, with $\delta\omega=0.5$. It has been shown that the effective Hamiltonian picture can break down for long-time dynamics in the thermodynamic limit, because the system heats up to infinite temperature [40]. However, here we restrict ourselves to a two-site system to mimic the dynamics of a large system at relatively short timescales, for which heating does not occur.




Figure 6: (Color online) (a) and (c) Spin $\langle \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j \rangle(t)$ and charge $\langle \vec{T}_i^z \cdot \vec{T}_j^z \rangle(t)$ dynamics as a function of time, in units of $\omega_{sc}=0.2$. The dynamics is computed for driving amplitudes \mathcal{E} from 0.1 to 1.5 with steps $d\mathcal{E}=0.2$ represented by different color shades. (b) Single doublon number $\langle \hat{N}_{d=1} \rangle(t)$ in blue, for $\mathcal{E}=0.7$. The amplitude of the electric field envelop is shown in Figure (a),(b) and (c) by a light blue Gaussian, each laser pulse contains 400 cycles. Parameters $U/t_0=10$ and $J_H/t_0=2$, for an electric field frequency $\omega=\omega_0+0.5$. The inset shows a comparison between the time evolution (dots) and the analytical calculation in the adiabatic limit for the field envelope (solid line). Red dashed lines in (a) and (c) represent the spin and charge dynamics for frequency $\omega=\omega_0+3$ and $\mathcal{E}=0.7$, away from the hybridization.

Figure 6a, c show the plot of the charge and spin observables respectively, for different driving strength \mathcal{E} from 0.1 to 1.5. The laser pulse is represented in light blue and the results are computed for $U/t_0=10$ and $J_H/t_0=2$.

Figure 6c shows $\langle \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j \rangle(t)$ for different \mathcal{E} . In equilibrium and for small \mathcal{E} , $\langle \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j \rangle \simeq -1.9$, which slightly deviates from the pure spin case ($\langle \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j \rangle = -2$) due to hybridization with \hat{P}_0^ν , \hat{P}_1^0 and \hat{P}_2^0 sectors. Figure 6c shows that, with increasing \mathcal{E} the state has less spin characteristics. Figure 6a shows $\langle \vec{T}_i^z \cdot \vec{T}_j^z \rangle(t)$ for different \mathcal{E} , represented by different shades of green. Indeed, it is observed that with increasing \mathcal{E} , the state has more charge characteristics. Moreover,

after the laser pulse, both charge excitation and the spin correlations return to their initial value, demonstrating that the coupling is reversible. In addition to the spin-charge coupling dynamics, we observe oscillations of spin and charge states for $\mathcal{E} > 0.6$ at the peak of the laser field. This is due to internal dynamics that occurs in both \hat{P}_0^ν and \hat{P}_2^ν sectors.

Further, we confirm that for frequencies away from ω_0 the spin-charge coupling dynamics is not present. This can be observed in Figure 6a,c where the charge and spin dynamics are represented in red dashed lines for $\delta\omega=3$. In this case, no enhancement is observed. Similarly, in Figure 6c, the spin correlations are not diminished.

Moreover, we show the single doublon states dynamics $\langle \hat{N}_{d=1} \rangle(t)$ in Figure 6b, for a field strength $\mathcal{E}=0.7$. We observe that the laser pulse does not trigger any positive excitation of \hat{P}_1^0 states. This means that enhancement of charge dynamics is not due to resonant excitation of the intermediate excited states \hat{P}_1^0 . Interestingly, we actually observe depopulation of the \hat{P}_1^0 states during the laser pulse. This means that more \hat{P}_1^0 states are virtually excited towards charge sector than spin states excited towards \hat{P}_1^0 sector. Finally, the inset of Figure 6a shows values of the peak of the spin correlations $\langle \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j \rangle(t_{\text{peak}})$ for each \mathcal{E} in dots and values of the spin correlations $\langle \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j \rangle$ as a function of \mathcal{E} is obtained from the analytical calculation of Section 3.2. Good agreement between analytical and numerical results is found, which confirms the predictions of the analytical theory. The discrepancies between $\langle \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j \rangle_{\mathcal{E}}$ and $\langle \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j \rangle(t_{\text{peak}})$ can be reduced by taking into account higher order terms in the effective Hamiltonian as well as the spin-charge coupling dynamics to the full P_2^ν sector. In addition, we note that with careful tuning of $\delta\omega$, the reduction of $|\langle \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j \rangle|$ as a function of \mathcal{E} at small \mathcal{E} can be made even stronger *e.g.* by increasing $\delta\omega$, one can move the avoided-crossing closer to $\mathcal{E} = 0$ which enhances hybridization with the charge states at small \mathcal{E} . Summarizing, the numerical results confirm the analytical results derived in Section 3.2.

5 Conclusion

In summary, we obtain an analytical expression for the Heisenberg $J_{ex}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ and biquadratic $B_{ex}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ exchange interaction in a periodically driven two-orbital system. We show that $J_{ex}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ can be controlled analogous to the single-orbital case. We also find that $B_{ex}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ is negative for low driving strength \mathcal{E} but can reach small positive values for stronger \mathcal{E} . We demonstrate that the ratio $B_{ex}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)/J_{ex}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ cannot be enhanced by the field unless in trivial points for which $J_{ex}(\mathcal{E}, \omega) \simeq 0$. Moreover, a new coupling between spin and charge states is demonstrated. We show that this coupling does exist in equilibrium but can strongly be enhanced with the laser field. This coupling leads to a hybridization between spin and charge states for frequencies close to the spin-charge gap. In contrast to a common charge excitation by resonant photo-absorption, the spin-charge coupling allows non-resonant and reversible coupling to charge degrees of freedom. We have furthermore confirmed these results by simulating the electron dynamics on a two-site cluster.

Natural extension of this work are numerical studies for extended systems. This could be possible for example using multiband extensions of nonequilibrium Dynamical Mean Field Theory (DMFT) [41–44]. We emphasize that, besides the possibility to induce coherent charge dynamics, the presence of the spin-charge coupling should also be visible for short pulses, enabling the excitation of doubly ionized states which could remain coherent due to the gapping with the normal Mott-Hubbard gap. This suggests interesting perspectives

for enhancing electronic coherence in correlated electron systems. In this context, it will be interesting to explore the applicability of the two-orbital model to experimental spin-one systems such as KNiF_3 [8], which in the literature are considered as prototypical $S = 1$ systems. In addition, we would like to point out that modification of the charge occupation is known to systematically influence phonon excitation. Since we did not take into account electron-phonon interactions in our model, an interesting outlook would be to study phonon excitation induced by the spin-charge coupling. Finally, we hope that our work can find applications in cold atoms systems, where multi-orbital systems can nowadays be engineered [45, 46]. With an adiabatic ramping of the electric field strength, the fully reversible spin-to-charge conversion might be directly observed in double-well systems.

Acknowledgements

This work was partially supported by the NWO via the Spinoza Prize, by a Rubicon and a VENI grant, by the European Research Council (ERC) Advanced Grant No. 338957 (FEMTO/NANO) and Advanced Grant No. 339813 (EXCHANGE), and the Shell-NWO/FOM-initiative "Computational sciences for energy research" of Shell and Chemical Sciences, Earth and Life Sciences, Physical Sciences, FOM and STW.

A Projection operators

In this section, we express the projection operators \hat{P}_d^ν as well as the hopping operators $\hat{T}^{\pm 1}$, \hat{T}^0 in terms of the electron operators $\hat{c}_{i\alpha\sigma}^\dagger$ ($\hat{c}_{i\alpha\sigma}$).

$$\hat{P}_0^0 = \sum_{\sigma} \hat{n}_{i\alpha\sigma} \hat{h}_{i\alpha\bar{\sigma}} \hat{n}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{i\beta\bar{\sigma}} \hat{h}_{j\alpha\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\alpha\bar{\sigma}} \hat{h}_{j\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\beta\bar{\sigma}}, \quad (45)$$

$$\hat{P}_0^1 = \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} \hat{n}_{i\alpha\uparrow} \hat{h}_{i\alpha\downarrow} \hat{h}_{i\beta\uparrow} \hat{n}_{i\beta\downarrow} (\hat{n}_{j\alpha\uparrow} \hat{h}_{j\alpha\downarrow} \hat{h}_{j\beta\uparrow} \hat{n}_{j\beta\downarrow} + \hat{h}_{j\alpha\uparrow} \hat{n}_{j\alpha\downarrow} \hat{n}_{j\beta\uparrow} \hat{h}_{j\beta\downarrow}), \quad (46)$$

$$\hat{P}_1^0 = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta, \sigma} \hat{n}_{i\alpha\sigma} \hat{n}_{i\alpha\bar{\sigma}} \hat{n}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{i\beta\bar{\sigma}} (\hat{h}_{j\alpha\sigma} \hat{h}_{j\alpha\bar{\sigma}} \hat{h}_{j\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\beta\bar{\sigma}} + \hat{h}_{j\alpha\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\alpha\bar{\sigma}} \hat{h}_{j\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{j\beta\bar{\sigma}}), \quad (47)$$

$$\hat{P}_1^1 = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta, \sigma} \hat{n}_{i\alpha\sigma} \hat{n}_{i\alpha\bar{\sigma}} \hat{h}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{i\beta\bar{\sigma}} \hat{n}_{j\alpha\sigma} \hat{h}_{j\alpha\bar{\sigma}} \hat{h}_{j\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\beta\bar{\sigma}}, \quad (48)$$

$$\hat{P}_2^0 = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \hat{h}_{i\alpha\uparrow} \hat{h}_{i\alpha\downarrow} \hat{h}_{i\beta\uparrow} \hat{h}_{i\beta\downarrow} \hat{n}_{j\alpha\uparrow} \hat{n}_{j\alpha\downarrow} \hat{n}_{j\beta\uparrow} \hat{n}_{j\beta\downarrow}, \quad (49)$$

$$\hat{P}_2^1 = \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} \hat{n}_{i\alpha\uparrow} \hat{n}_{i\alpha\downarrow} \hat{h}_{i\beta\uparrow} \hat{h}_{i\beta\downarrow} (\hat{n}_{j\alpha\uparrow} \hat{n}_{j\alpha\downarrow} \hat{h}_{j\beta\uparrow} \hat{h}_{j\beta\downarrow} + \hat{h}_{j\alpha\uparrow} \hat{h}_{j\alpha\downarrow} \hat{n}_{j\beta\uparrow} \hat{n}_{j\beta\downarrow}). \quad (50)$$

From Eqs. (11-13) of the main text, we can compute the following expressions for $T^{\pm 1}$ and

T^0 in terms of single electron operators

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{T}_m^{+1}(t) = -t_0 J_m(\mathcal{E}) \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta, \sigma} \{ & \hat{n}_{i\alpha\bar{\sigma}} \hat{c}_{i\alpha\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j\alpha\sigma} \hat{h}_{j\alpha\bar{\sigma}} (\hat{n}_{i\beta\bar{\sigma}} \hat{h}_{j\beta\bar{\sigma}} + \hat{h}_{i\beta\bar{\sigma}} \hat{n}_{j\beta\bar{\sigma}}) \\ & + (-1)^m \hat{n}_{j\alpha\bar{\sigma}} \hat{c}_{j\alpha\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{i\alpha\sigma} \hat{h}_{i\alpha\bar{\sigma}} (\hat{n}_{j\beta\bar{\sigma}} \hat{h}_{i\beta\bar{\sigma}} + \hat{h}_{j\beta\bar{\sigma}} \hat{n}_{i\beta\bar{\sigma}}) \} e^{im\omega t} \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{T}_m^{-1}(t) = -t_0 J_m(\mathcal{E}) \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta, \sigma} \{ & \hat{h}_{i\alpha\bar{\sigma}} \hat{c}_{i\alpha\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j\alpha\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\alpha\bar{\sigma}} (\hat{n}_{i\beta\bar{\sigma}} \hat{h}_{j\beta\bar{\sigma}} + \hat{h}_{i\beta\bar{\sigma}} \hat{n}_{j\beta\bar{\sigma}}) \\ & + (-1)^m \hat{h}_{j\alpha\bar{\sigma}} \hat{c}_{j\alpha\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{i\alpha\sigma} \hat{n}_{i\alpha\bar{\sigma}} (\hat{n}_{j\beta\bar{\sigma}} \hat{h}_{i\beta\bar{\sigma}} + \hat{h}_{j\beta\bar{\sigma}} \hat{n}_{i\beta\bar{\sigma}}) \} e^{im\omega t} \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{T}_m^0(t) = -t_0 J_m(\mathcal{E}) \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta, \sigma} \{ & \hat{c}_{i\alpha\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j\alpha\sigma} (\hat{h}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{i\beta\bar{\sigma}} \hat{n}_{j\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\beta\bar{\sigma}} + \hat{n}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{i\beta\bar{\sigma}} \hat{h}_{j\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\beta\bar{\sigma}}) \\ & + (-1)^m \hat{c}_{j\alpha\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{i\alpha\sigma} (\hat{h}_{j\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\beta\bar{\sigma}} \hat{n}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{i\beta\bar{\sigma}} + \hat{n}_{j\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\beta\bar{\sigma}} \hat{h}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{i\beta\bar{\sigma}}) \} e^{im\omega t} \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

B Effective Hamiltonian

In this section we provide explicit expressions for the effective Hamiltonian up to fourth order in the hopping in terms of electron operators. In addition, more details are given for the second canonical transformation that is used to obtain the mapping of the $d = 0$ sector. The second order contribution to the low energy effective Hamiltonian reads

$$\sum_{\nu, \nu'} \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(2)}(t) \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} = - \sum_{\substack{m \\ \nu, \nu'}} \frac{\hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{T}_m^{-1} \hat{P}_1^0 \hat{T}_m^{+1} \hat{P}_0^\nu}{U + J_H + m\omega} e^{i(m-m)\omega t}. \quad (54)$$

Note that for the \hat{P}_1^ν sector, only $\nu = 0$ contributes since the \hat{P}_1^1 sector is not connected to $\hat{P}_{d \neq 1}^\nu$ for inter-orbital hopping $t_{\alpha \neq \beta} = 0$.

The fourth order contribution low energy effective Hamiltonian $\hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(4)}(t) \hat{P}_0^{\nu'}$ reads

$$\sum_{\nu \nu'} \hat{P}_0^\nu \tilde{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(4)}(t) \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} = \sum_{\nu \nu'} \left\{ \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(4)}(t) \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} + \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{W}^{(4)}(t) \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} \right\}, \quad (55)$$

where the first term, $\hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(4)}(t) \hat{P}_0^{\nu'}$, is computed using the direct generalized canonical transformation, Eq. (27). After developing the commutator in Eq. (27) of the main text and

inserting identities $\sum_{d,\nu} \hat{P}_d^\nu = 1$, $\hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(4)}(t) \hat{P}_0^{\nu'}$ reads

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\nu,\nu'} \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(4)}(t) \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} &= \sum_{\substack{\nu,\nu',\nu'' \\ d=0,2}} \frac{1}{8} \sum_{k+l+m+n=0} \hat{P}_0^\nu \left\{ i\hat{S}_k^{(1)} \hat{P}_1^0 i\hat{S}_l^{(1)} \hat{P}_d^{\nu''} i\hat{S}_m^{(1)} \hat{P}_1^0 \hat{T}_n^{\pm 1} - i\hat{S}_l^{(1)} \hat{P}_1^0 i\hat{S}_m^{(1)} \hat{P}_d^{\nu''} \hat{T}_n^{\pm 1} \hat{P}_1^0 i\hat{S}_k^{(1)} \right. \\
&- i\hat{S}_k^{(1)} \hat{P}_1^0 i\hat{S}_m^{(1)} \hat{P}_d^{\nu''} \hat{T}_n^{\pm 1} \hat{P}_1^0 i\hat{S}_l^{(1)} - i\hat{S}_k^{(1)} \hat{P}_1^0 i\hat{S}_l^{(1)} \hat{P}_d^{\nu''} \hat{T}_n^{\pm 1} \hat{P}_1^0 i\hat{S}_m^{(1)} + i\hat{S}_m^{(1)} \hat{P}_1^0 \hat{T}_n^{\pm 1} \hat{P}_d^{\nu''} i\hat{S}_l^{(1)} \hat{P}_1^0 i\hat{S}_k^{(1)} \\
&+ i\hat{S}_l^{(1)} \hat{P}_1^0 \hat{T}_n^{\pm 1} \hat{P}_d^{\nu''} i\hat{S}_m^{(1)} \hat{P}_1^0 i\hat{S}_k^{(1)} + i\hat{S}_k^{(1)} \hat{P}_1^0 \hat{T}_n^{\pm 1} \hat{P}_d^{\nu''} i\hat{S}_m^{(1)} \hat{P}_1^0 i\hat{S}_l^{(1)} - \hat{T}_n^{-1} \hat{P}_1^0 i\hat{S}_m^{(1)} \hat{P}_d^{\nu''} i\hat{S}_l^{(1)} \hat{P}_1^0 i\hat{S}_k^{(1)} \left. \right\} \\
&\times \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} e^{i(k+l+m+n)\omega t}.
\end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

We introduce the shorthand relations:

$$\hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{kl}^{--} \hat{P}_2^{\nu'} = \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{T}_k^{-1} \hat{P}_1^0 \hat{T}_l^{-1} \hat{P}_2^{\nu'}, \tag{57}$$

$$\hat{P}_2^\nu \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{kl}^{++} \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} = \hat{P}_2^\nu \hat{T}_k^{-1} \hat{P}_1^0 \hat{T}_l^{-1} \hat{P}_0^{\nu'}, \tag{58}$$

$$\hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{kl}^{-+} \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} = \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{T}_k^{-1} \hat{P}_1^0 \hat{T}_l^{+1} \hat{P}_0^{\nu'}. \tag{59}$$

Using Eq. (22) in the main text, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\nu,\nu'} \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(4)}(t) \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} &= \frac{1}{8} \sum_{k+l+m+n=0} C_{10}^{00,k} \hat{P}_0^\nu \left\{ C_{21}^{\nu''0,m} \left[C_{21}^{\nu''0,l} (\hat{\mathbb{T}}_{kl}^{--} \hat{P}_2^{\nu''} \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{mn}^{++} + \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{nm}^{--} \hat{P}_2^{\nu''} \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{lk}^{++}) \right. \right. \\
&- C_{10}^{00,l} (\hat{\mathbb{T}}_{lm}^{--} \hat{P}_2^{\nu''} \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{nk}^{++} + \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{km}^{--} \hat{P}_2^{\nu''} \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{nl}^{++} + \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{ln}^{--} \hat{P}_2^{\nu''} \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{mk}^{++} + \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{kn}^{--} \hat{P}_2^{\nu''} \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{ml}^{++}) \left. \right] \\
&- C_{10}^{00,m} C_{21}^{\nu''0,l} (\hat{\mathbb{T}}_{mn}^{--} \hat{P}_2^{\nu''} \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{lk}^{++} + \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{kl}^{--} \hat{P}_2^{\nu''} \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{nm}^{++}) + 8C_{10}^{00,m} C_{10}^{00,l} \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{kl}^{-+} \hat{P}_0^{\nu''} \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{mn}^{-+} \left. \right\} \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} \\
&\times e^{i(k+l+m+n)\omega t},
\end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

where we used $C_{d0}^{\nu 0,m} = C_{d0}^{\nu 1,m}$. Note that the last term of Eq. (60) describes the hopping process via \hat{P}_0^ν states and therefore, is simpler than the rest of the equation which describes hopping processes via \hat{P}_2^0 and \hat{P}_2^1 . Using the fact that we sum over all k, l, m , and n indices and that $k+l+m+n=0$, we find suitable combinations of $C_{dd'}^{\nu\nu',m}$ and $\hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{kl}^{--} \hat{P}_2^{\nu''} \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{mn}^{++} \hat{P}_0^{\nu'}$ such that $\hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(4)}(t) \hat{P}_0^{\nu'}$ can be reduced and reads

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\nu,\nu'} \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(4)}(t) \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} &= \sum_{\substack{k+l+m+n=0 \\ \nu,\nu',\nu''}} C_{10}^{00,k} \left\{ \frac{1}{4} \left[C_{21}^{\nu''0,l} (C_{21}^{\nu''0,m} - C_{10}^{00,m}) - C_{10}^{00,l} (C_{21}^{\nu''0,m} + C_{21}^{\nu''0,k}) \right] \right. \\
&\times \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{kl}^{--} \hat{P}_2^{\nu''} \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{mn}^{++} \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} + C_{10}^{00,m} C_{10}^{00,l} \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{kl}^{-+} \hat{P}_0^{\nu''} \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{mn}^{-+} \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} \left. \right\} e^{i(k+l+m+n)\omega t}.
\end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

In addition to $\hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(4)} \hat{P}_0^{\nu'}$, we do a second canonical transformation with terms $\hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(2)}(t) \hat{P}_2^{\nu'} + h.c.$ in order to obtain the fourth order contribution to the effective Hamiltonian in the $d=0$ sector. Performing this second canonical transformation we obtain:

$$\sum_{\nu, \nu'} \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{W}^{(4)}(t) \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\nu, \nu'} \sum_m \hat{P}_0^\nu [i\tilde{S}_m^{(1)}(t), \tilde{T}_m^{\pm 1}(t)] \hat{P}_0^{\nu'}, \quad (62)$$

where $\hat{P}_d^\nu i\tilde{S}_m^{(1)}(t) \hat{P}_d^{\nu'} = C_{dd'}^{\nu\nu', m} \hat{P}_d^\nu \tilde{T}_m^{\pm 1}(t) \hat{P}_d^{\nu'}$, $C_{dd'}^{\nu\nu', m} = (E_d^\nu - E_{d'}^{\nu'} + m\omega)^{-1}$.

Note that $E_d^\nu = E_d^{\nu(0)} + E_d^{\nu(2)}$, where $E_d^{\nu(n)}$ is the energy contribution to E_d^ν of order t_0^n . We use $E_d^\nu \simeq E_d^{\nu(0)}$ and do not take into account second order contribution $E_d^{\nu(2)}$ since it leads to 6th order corrections to $\hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{W}^{(4)}(t) \hat{P}_0^{\nu'}$ which are not considered here.

$\tilde{T}_m^{\pm 1}(t)$ read

$$\tilde{T}_m^{+1}(t) = \sum_{\nu\nu'} \hat{P}_2^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}, m}^{(2)}(t) \hat{P}_0^{\nu'}, \quad \tilde{T}_m^{-1}(t) = \sum_{\nu\nu'} \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}, m}^{(2)}(t) \hat{P}_2^{\nu'}. \quad (63)$$

Yields

$$\tilde{T}_m^{+1}(t) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\nu\nu'} \sum_{k+l=m} \hat{P}_2^\nu (C_{21}^{0\nu, k} \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{kl}^{+++} - C_{10}^{0\nu', k} \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{lk}^{+++}) \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} e^{i(k+l)\omega t}, \quad (64)$$

and

$$\tilde{T}_m^{-1}(t) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\nu\nu'} \sum_{k+l=m} \hat{P}_0^\nu (C_{10}^{0\nu, k} \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{kl}^{---} - C_{21}^{0\nu', k} \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{lk}^{---}) \hat{P}_2^{\nu'} e^{i(k+l)\omega t}. \quad (65)$$

Note that the k index can be different from the l index therefore, $\hat{P}_d^\nu \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{kl}^{qq} \hat{P}_d^{\nu'} \neq \hat{P}_d^\nu \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{lk}^{qq} \hat{P}_d^{\nu'}$, where $q=\pm 1$ and $d=0, 2$. $\hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{W}^{(4)}(t) \hat{P}_0^{\nu'}$ reads

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\nu, \nu'} \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{W}^{(4)}(t) \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} &= \frac{1}{8} \sum_{\substack{k+l+m+n=0 \\ \nu, \nu', \nu''}} e^{i(k+l+m+n)\omega t} C_{20}^{\nu''0, k+l} \\ &\quad \times \hat{P}_0^\nu \left\{ C_{10}^{00, k} C_{21}^{\nu''0, m} (\hat{\mathbb{T}}_{kl}^{--} \hat{P}_2^{\nu''} \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{mn}^{++} + \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{nm}^{--} \hat{P}_2^{\nu''} \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{lk}^{++}) \right. \\ &\quad + C_{21}^{\nu''0, k} C_{10}^{00, m} (\hat{\mathbb{T}}_{lk}^{--} \hat{P}_2^{\nu''} \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{nm}^{++} + \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{mn}^{--} \hat{P}_2^{\nu''} \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{kl}^{++}) \\ &\quad - C_{10}^{00, k} C_{10}^{00, m} (\hat{\mathbb{T}}_{kl}^{--} \hat{P}_2^{\nu''} \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{nm}^{++} + \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{mn}^{--} \hat{P}_2^{\nu''} \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{lk}^{++}) \\ &\quad \left. - C_{21}^{\nu''0, k} C_{21}^{\nu''0, m} (\hat{\mathbb{T}}_{lk}^{--} \hat{P}_2^{\nu''} \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{mn}^{++} + \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{nm}^{--} \hat{P}_2^{\nu''} \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{kl}^{++}) \right\} \hat{P}_0^{\nu'}, \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

where we used $C_{d0}^{\nu0, m} = C_{d0}^{\nu1, m}$. Similarly as Eq. (61), Eq. (66) can be reduced and reads

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\nu, \nu'} \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{W}^{(4)}(t) \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\substack{k+l+m+n=0 \\ \nu, \nu', \nu''}} C_{20}^{\nu''0, k+l} (C_{10}^{00, m} - C_{21}^{\nu''0, m}) (C_{21}^{\nu''0, k} - C_{10}^{00, k}) \\ &\quad \times \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{kl}^{--} \hat{P}_2^{\nu''} \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{mn}^{++} \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} e^{i(k+l+m+n)\omega t}. \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

C Spin-one and pseudo spin-one operators

Using the expression for spin-one operators in terms of spin 1/2 operators, we derive pseudo-spin operators \hat{T}^q . The spin-one operators in term of spin 1/2 operators acting on orbital $\alpha, \beta=a, b$ read

$$\hat{S}^{+1} = - \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} (\hat{s}_\alpha^+ \hat{s}_\alpha^- + \hat{s}_\alpha^- \hat{s}_\alpha^+) \hat{s}_\beta^+, \quad \hat{S}^{-1} = - \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} (\hat{s}_\alpha^+ \hat{s}_\alpha^- + \hat{s}_\alpha^- \hat{s}_\alpha^+) \hat{s}_\beta^- \quad (68)$$

$$\hat{S}^z = \hat{s}_a^+ \hat{s}_a^- \hat{s}_b^+ \hat{s}_b^- - \hat{s}_a^- \hat{s}_a^+ \hat{s}_b^- \hat{s}_b^+, \quad (69)$$

where $\hat{s}_\alpha^+ = \hat{c}_{\alpha\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\alpha\downarrow}$ and $\hat{s}_\alpha^- = \hat{c}_{\alpha\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\alpha\uparrow}$. This notation is convenient to derive the pseudo-spin one operators \hat{T}^q in term of Anderson pseudo-spin 1/2 operators $\hat{\tau}^\pm$ [37], using $\hat{\tau}_\alpha^+ = \hat{c}_{\alpha\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\alpha\downarrow}$ and $\hat{\tau}_\alpha^- = \hat{c}_{\alpha\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\alpha\uparrow}$, we have

$$\hat{T}^{+1} = - \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} (\hat{\tau}_\alpha^+ \hat{\tau}_\alpha^- + \hat{\tau}_\alpha^- \hat{\tau}_\alpha^+) \hat{\tau}_\beta^+, \quad \hat{T}^{-1} = - \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} (\hat{\tau}_\alpha^+ \hat{\tau}_\alpha^- + \hat{\tau}_\alpha^- \hat{\tau}_\alpha^+) \hat{\tau}_\beta^-, \quad (70)$$

$$\hat{T}^z = \hat{\tau}_a^+ \hat{\tau}_a^- \hat{\tau}_b^+ \hat{\tau}_b^- - \hat{\tau}_a^- \hat{\tau}_a^+ \hat{\tau}_b^- \hat{\tau}_b^+. \quad (71)$$

Hence, in terms of electron operators the pseudo-spin one operators read

$$\hat{T}^{+1} = - \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} (\hat{n}_{\alpha\uparrow} \hat{n}_{\alpha\downarrow} + \hat{h}_{\alpha\uparrow} \hat{h}_{\alpha\downarrow}) \hat{c}_{\beta\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\beta\downarrow}^\dagger, \quad \hat{T}^{-1} = - \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} (\hat{n}_{\alpha\uparrow} \hat{n}_{\alpha\downarrow} + \hat{h}_{\alpha\uparrow} \hat{h}_{\alpha\downarrow}) \hat{c}_{\beta\downarrow} \hat{c}_{\beta\uparrow} \quad (72)$$

$$\hat{T}^z = \hat{n}_{a\uparrow} \hat{n}_{a\downarrow} \hat{n}_{b\uparrow} \hat{n}_{b\downarrow} + \hat{h}_{a\uparrow} \hat{h}_{a\downarrow} \hat{h}_{b\uparrow} \hat{h}_{b\downarrow}. \quad (73)$$

D Derivation of the effective spin-one Hamiltonian

Here we derive the effective Hamiltonian up to fourth order in the hopping in terms of spin-one operators. Since the low-energy subspace contains not only spin-one terms, we perform an additional downfolding.

The bilinear spin-one term reads

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j = & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta, \sigma} \left\{ \hat{c}_{i\alpha\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{i\alpha\bar{\sigma}} \hat{c}_{j\alpha\bar{\sigma}}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j\alpha\sigma} (\hat{h}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{i\beta\bar{\sigma}} \hat{n}_{j\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{j\beta\bar{\sigma}} + \hat{n}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{i\beta\bar{\sigma}} \hat{h}_{j\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\beta\bar{\sigma}}) + \hat{c}_{i\alpha\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{i\alpha\bar{\sigma}} \hat{c}_{j\beta\bar{\sigma}}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j\beta\sigma} \right. \\ & \left. \times (\hat{n}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{i\beta\bar{\sigma}} \hat{h}_{j\alpha\bar{\sigma}} \hat{n}_{j\alpha\bar{\sigma}} + \hat{h}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{i\beta\bar{\sigma}} \hat{n}_{j\alpha\bar{\sigma}} \hat{h}_{j\alpha\bar{\sigma}}) - \hat{n}_{i\alpha\sigma} \hat{h}_{i\alpha\bar{\sigma}} \hat{n}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{i\beta\bar{\sigma}} \hat{h}_{j\alpha\bar{\sigma}} \hat{n}_{j\alpha\bar{\sigma}} \hat{h}_{j\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\beta\bar{\sigma}} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

The first two terms of $\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j$ allows an exchange interaction process that transforms a state that does not violate Hund rule ($\nu=0$) to a state which violates Hund rule ($\nu=1$) and vice versa. The last term is a density term which stands for $\hat{S}_i^z \hat{S}_j^z$.

One can derive the following relation

$$\sum_{\substack{m \\ \nu, \nu'}} \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{T}_m^- \hat{P}_1^0 \hat{T}_{-m}^+ \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} = t_0^2 \sum_m J_{|m|}^2(\mathcal{E}) (\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j + \hat{R}_{ij}^1), \quad (75)$$

and use it to write $\hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(2)}(t) \hat{P}_0^{\nu'}$ in terms of $\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j$. After time averaging $\hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(2)} \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} = \langle \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(2)}(t) \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} \rangle$, we obtain:

$$\sum_{\nu, \nu'} \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(2)} \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} = \sum_{\langle i, j \rangle} J_{ex} \{ \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j + \hat{R}_{ij}^1 \}. \quad (76)$$

The term \hat{R}_{ij}^1 contains a description for the non spin-one states from \hat{P}_0^ν , the coupling between a spin-one and a non spin-one state and an energy constant which arises because \hat{H}_U gives rise to spin states with energies different from zero, whereas the lowest spin state energy taken for the transformation onto spin-one basis has been set to zero. \hat{R}_{ij}^1 reads

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{R}_{ij}^1 = & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta, \sigma} \left\{ 3 \hat{c}_{i\alpha\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{i\alpha\sigma} \hat{c}_{j\alpha\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j\alpha\sigma} (\hat{h}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{j\beta\sigma} + \hat{n}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{j\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\beta\sigma}) \right. \\ & - \hat{c}_{i\alpha\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{i\alpha\sigma} \hat{c}_{j\beta\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j\beta\sigma} (\hat{n}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{j\alpha\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\alpha\sigma} + \hat{h}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\alpha\sigma} \hat{h}_{j\alpha\sigma}) \left. \right\} \\ & - \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta, \sigma} \left\{ \hat{n}_{i\alpha\sigma} \hat{h}_{i\alpha\sigma} \hat{n}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{j\alpha\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\alpha\sigma} \hat{h}_{j\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\beta\sigma} + 2 \hat{n}_{i\alpha\sigma} \hat{h}_{i\alpha\sigma} \hat{h}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{j\alpha\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\alpha\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{j\beta\sigma} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

Similarly, we map $\hat{P}_0 \tilde{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(4)} \hat{P}_0$ onto the spin-one model. The biquadratic spin-one term reads

$$\begin{aligned} (\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j)^2 = & \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta, \sigma} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} [\hat{c}_{i\alpha\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{i\alpha\sigma} \hat{c}_{j\alpha\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j\alpha\sigma} (\hat{h}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{j\beta\sigma} + \hat{n}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{j\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\beta\sigma}) \right. \\ & + \hat{c}_{i\alpha\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{i\alpha\sigma} \hat{c}_{j\beta\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j\beta\sigma} (\hat{n}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{j\alpha\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\alpha\sigma} + \hat{h}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\alpha\sigma} \hat{h}_{j\alpha\sigma}) \left. \right\} \\ & + \hat{n}_{i\alpha\sigma} \hat{h}_{i\alpha\sigma} \hat{h}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{i\beta\sigma} (\hat{h}_{j\alpha\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\alpha\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{j\beta\sigma} + \hat{n}_{j\alpha\sigma} \hat{h}_{j\alpha\sigma} \hat{h}_{j\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\beta\sigma}) \\ & + \hat{n}_{i\alpha\sigma} \hat{h}_{i\alpha\sigma} \hat{n}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{j\alpha\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\alpha\sigma} \hat{h}_{j\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\beta\sigma} \left. \right\} + \sum_{\sigma} \hat{c}_{i\alpha\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{i\alpha\sigma} \hat{c}_{j\alpha\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j\alpha\sigma} \hat{c}_{i\beta\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{c}_{j\beta\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j\beta\sigma}. \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

The biquadratic spin-one term $(\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j)^2$ contains all the terms present in $\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j$ plus density terms which describe states for which $\nu=1$. The last term of $(\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j)^2$ represents a process which interchange the two states which do not violate Hund rule *i.e.* the $\nu=0$ states.

We derive the following equalities

$$\sum_{\substack{k, l, m, n \\ \nu, \nu', \nu''}} \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{T}_{kl}^- \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} \hat{T}_{mn}^+ \hat{P}_0^{\nu''} = t_0^4 \sum_{k, l, m, n} J_k(\mathcal{E}) J_l(\mathcal{E}) J_m(\mathcal{E}) J_n(\mathcal{E}) \sum_{\langle i, j \rangle} (\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j + \hat{R}_{ij}^1)^2, \quad (79)$$

for the hopping process via $\hat{P}_0^{\nu''}$ sector,

$$\sum_{\substack{k,l,m,n \\ \nu,\nu'}} \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{kl}^{--} \hat{P}_2^0 \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{mn}^{++} \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} = 4t_0^4 \sum_{k,l,m,n} J_k(\mathcal{E}) J_l(\mathcal{E}) J_m(\mathcal{E}) J_n(\mathcal{E}) ((-1)^{n+l} + (-1)^{m+k}) \times \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} ((\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j)^2 + \hat{R}_{ij}^2), \quad (80)$$

for the hopping process via \hat{P}_2^0 sector,

$$\sum_{\substack{k,l,m,n \\ \nu,\nu'}} \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{kl}^{--} \hat{P}_2^1 \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{mn}^{++} \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} = 2t_0^4 \sum_{k,l,m,n} J_k(\mathcal{E}) J_l(\mathcal{E}) J_m(\mathcal{E}) J_n(\mathcal{E}) ((-1)^{k+l} + (-1)^{m+n} + 2) \times \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} ((\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j)^2 + \hat{R}_{ij}^2), \quad (81)$$

for the hopping process via \hat{P}_2^1 sector. We use these equalities to write the time averaged effective Hamiltonian in terms of spin-one operators

$$\sum_{\substack{n=2,4 \\ \nu\nu'}} \hat{P}_0^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(n)} \hat{P}_0^{\nu'} = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \left\{ K_1(\mathcal{E}, \omega) (\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j + \hat{R}_{ij}^1) + K_2(\mathcal{E}, \omega) (\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j + \hat{R}_{ij}^2)^2 + K_3(\mathcal{E}, \omega) ((\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j)^2 + \hat{R}_{ij}^2) \right\}, \quad (82)$$

where $K_1(\mathcal{E}, \omega) = J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ is the second order Heisenberg exchange interaction and reads

$$K_1(\mathcal{E}, \omega) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{+\infty} \left\{ \frac{t_0^2 J_{|m|}^2(\mathcal{E})}{U + J_H + m\omega} - \frac{t_0^4 J_{|m|}^4(\mathcal{E})}{2(U + J_H + m\omega)^3} \right\}. \quad (83)$$

$K_2(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ is responsible for an energy contribution to both the fourth order Heisenberg exchange as well as the biquadratic exchange interaction, see Eqs. (38) and (40) of the main text.

$$K_2(\mathcal{E}, \omega) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{t_0^4 J_{|m|}^4(\mathcal{E})}{(U + J_H + m\omega)^3}. \quad (84)$$

$K_3(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ only enters in the biquadratic exchange interaction formula, see Eq. (40), and reads

$$K_3(\mathcal{E}, \omega) = t_0^4 \sum_{k+l+m+n=0} J_k(\mathcal{E}) J_l(\mathcal{E}) J_m(\mathcal{E}) J_n(\mathcal{E}) \left\{ A_2^0 \left((-1)^{k+m} + (-1)^{l+n} \right) + \frac{1}{2} A_2^1 \left((-1)^{k+l} + (-1)^{m+n} + 2 \right) \right\}, \quad (85)$$

where the A_2^{ν} coefficients read

$$A_2^\nu = C_{10}^{00,k} \left(C_{21}^{\nu 0,l} (C_{21}^{\nu 0,m} - C_{10}^{00,m}) - C_{10}^{00,l} (C_{21}^{\nu 0,m} + C_{21}^{\nu 0,k}) \right) + C_{20}^{\nu 0,k+l} (C_{10}^{00,m} - C_{21}^{\nu 0,m}) (C_{21}^{\nu 0,k} - C_{10}^{00,k}), \quad (86)$$

where we used $C_{d0}^{\nu 0,m} = C_{d0}^{\nu 1,m}$. We have the following expressions for \hat{R}_{ij}^2

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{R}_{ij}^2 = & \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta, \sigma} \hat{c}_{i\alpha\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{i\alpha\bar{\sigma}} \hat{c}_{j\beta\bar{\sigma}}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j\beta\sigma} (\hat{n}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{i\beta\bar{\sigma}} \hat{h}_{j\alpha\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\alpha\bar{\sigma}} + \hat{h}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{i\beta\bar{\sigma}} \hat{n}_{j\alpha\sigma} \hat{h}_{j\alpha\bar{\sigma}}) \right. \\ & - \sum_{\sigma} [3\hat{n}_{i\alpha\sigma} \hat{h}_{i\alpha\bar{\sigma}} \hat{n}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{i\beta\bar{\sigma}} \hat{h}_{j\alpha\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\alpha\bar{\sigma}} \hat{h}_{j\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\beta\bar{\sigma}} + \hat{c}_{i\alpha\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{i\alpha\bar{\sigma}} \hat{c}_{j\alpha\bar{\sigma}}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j\alpha\sigma} \hat{c}_{i\beta\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{i\beta\bar{\sigma}} \hat{c}_{j\beta\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j\beta\bar{\sigma}} \\ & \left. + \hat{n}_{i\alpha\sigma} \hat{h}_{i\alpha\bar{\sigma}} \hat{h}_{i\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{i\beta\bar{\sigma}} (3\hat{h}_{j\alpha\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\alpha\bar{\sigma}} \hat{n}_{j\beta\sigma} \hat{h}_{j\beta\bar{\sigma}} - 4\hat{n}_{j\alpha\sigma} \hat{h}_{j\alpha\bar{\sigma}} \hat{h}_{j\beta\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\beta\bar{\sigma}})] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

\hat{R}_{ij}^2 contains a fourth order contribution to the energy of the non spin-one states, a contribution to the coupling between the spin-one and the non spin-one state and a constant similar to \hat{R}_{ij}^1 .

We now interest ourselves to the second order coupling between the spin-one and the non spin-one state of \hat{P}_0^ν that is described by \hat{R}_{ij}^1 . The basis transformation which allows one to go from a electron occupation number basis to the angular momentum basis is the following

$$|S, m_S, S_i, S_j\rangle = \sum_{m_i, m_j} C_{S_i m_i, S_j m_j}^{S m_S} |S_i, m_i, S_j, m_j\rangle, \quad (88)$$

where $C_{S_i m_i, S_j m_j}^{S m_S}$ are Clebsch-Gordan coefficients. From this basis transformation, we obtain three spin-one states, namely a singlet ($S=0$), a triplet ($S=1$) and a quintet state ($S=2$)

$$\begin{aligned} |0, 0, 1, 1\rangle = & \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} \left\{ -2|\uparrow, \uparrow\rangle_i |\downarrow, \downarrow\rangle_j - 2|\downarrow, \downarrow\rangle_i |\uparrow, \uparrow\rangle_j + |\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle_i |\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle_j + |\downarrow, \uparrow\rangle_i |\downarrow, \uparrow\rangle_j \right. \\ & \left. + |\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle_i |\downarrow, \uparrow\rangle_j + |\downarrow, \uparrow\rangle_i |\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle_j \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$

$$|1, 0, 1, 1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left\{ -|\uparrow, \uparrow\rangle_i |\downarrow, \downarrow\rangle_j + |\downarrow, \downarrow\rangle_i |\uparrow, \uparrow\rangle_j \right\}, \quad (90)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |2, 0, 1, 1\rangle = & \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \left\{ |\uparrow, \uparrow\rangle_i |\downarrow, \downarrow\rangle_j + |\downarrow, \downarrow\rangle_i |\uparrow, \uparrow\rangle_j + |\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle_i |\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle_j + |\downarrow, \uparrow\rangle_i |\downarrow, \uparrow\rangle_j \right. \\ & \left. + |\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle_i |\downarrow, \uparrow\rangle_j + |\downarrow, \uparrow\rangle_i |\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle_j \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (91)$$

and three states which are non spin-one states. We define spin-one $\hat{P}_{S=1}$ and non spin-one $\hat{P}_{S \neq 1}$ projection operator such that $\sum_{\nu} \hat{P}_0^\nu = \hat{P}_{S=1} + \hat{P}_{S \neq 1}$ [30].

In the angular momentum basis, the second order effective Hamiltonian reads

$$\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(2)} = \hat{P}_{S=1} \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(2)} \hat{P}_{S=1} + \hat{P}_{S \neq 1} \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(2)} \hat{P}_{S \neq 1} + \hat{P}_{S=1} \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(2)} \hat{P}_{S \neq 1} + \hat{P}_{S \neq 1} \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(2)} \hat{P}_{S=1}, \quad (92)$$

where the coupling between the spin-one and the non spin-one state is described by terms $\hat{P}_{S=1} \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(2)} \hat{P}_{S \neq 1} + \hat{P}_{S \neq 1} \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(2)} \hat{P}_{S=1}$. We do an additional downfolding of the \hat{P}_0^ν sector in order

to diagonalize the angular momentum basis, this downfolding is done using the following canonical transformation

$$\tilde{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(4)} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_m \hat{P}_{S=1} [i\tilde{S}_m^{(1)}, \tilde{T}_{-m}^{\pm 1}] \hat{P}_{S=1}, \quad (93)$$

where $\hat{P}_S i\tilde{S}_m^{(1)} \hat{P}_{S'} = C_{SS'}^m \hat{P}_S \hat{H}_{\text{eff},m}^{(2)} \hat{P}_{S'}$, with $S, S'=(S=1), (S \neq 1)$. The spin-one-non spin-one coupling only involves the singlet state and the non spin-one state $|0, 0, 0, 0\rangle$

$$|0, 0, 0, 0\rangle = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ -|\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle_i |\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle_j - |\downarrow, \uparrow\rangle_i |\downarrow, \uparrow\rangle_j + |\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle_i |\downarrow, \uparrow\rangle_j + |\downarrow, \uparrow\rangle_i |\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle_j \right\}, \quad (94)$$

therefore, $\tilde{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(2)}$ reads

$$\tilde{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(4)} = - \sum_m \frac{\hat{P}_s \hat{H}_{\text{eff},m}^{(2)} \hat{P}_{s'} \hat{H}_{\text{eff},-m}^{(2)} \hat{P}_s}{E_{s'} - E_s + m\omega}, \quad (95)$$

where \hat{P}_s describes the singlet state and $\hat{P}_{s'}$ describes the state $|0, 0, 0, 0\rangle$. Note that, the energy approximation of Eq. (24) is not valid for this additional canonical transformation since $d=d'$. Therefore, we take the exact value for the energies, namely $E_s=0$ and $E_{s'}=4J_H$. We treat $\hat{P}_s \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(2)} \hat{P}_{s'}$ and $\hat{P}_{s'} \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(2)} \hat{P}_s$ as a perturbation because $\hat{P}_s \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(2)} \hat{P}_{s'}, \hat{P}_{s'} \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(2)} \hat{P}_s \propto J_{\text{ex}}$ and $J_{\text{ex}} \ll 4J_H$ which yields

$$\tilde{E}_{S=0}^{(4)} = -3t_0^4 \sum_{k+l+m+n=0} J_k(\mathcal{E}) J_l(\mathcal{E}) J_m(\mathcal{E}) J_n(\mathcal{E}) \frac{C_{10}^{00,k} C_{10}^{00,m}}{(4J_H + (k+l)\omega)} ((-1)^k + (-1)^l) ((-1)^m + (-1)^n), \quad (96)$$

This is the additional fourth order energy contribution to the singlet state due to the additional downfolding of \hat{P}_0^ν . Using the spin-one Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_{\text{spin}} = E_0 + \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \{ J_{\text{ex}} \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j + B_{\text{ex}} (\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j)^2 \}, \quad (97)$$

one can obtain a relation between J_{ex} and B_{ex} and the spin-one state energies

$$J_{\text{ex}} = (E_{S=2} - E_{S=1})/4, \quad (98)$$

$$B_{\text{ex}} = (E_{S=2} - E_{S=1})/4 - (E_{S=2} - E_{S=0})/6. \quad (99)$$

Since the additional downfolding of \hat{P}_0^ν gives rise to an energy contribution for the singlet state only, we have the additional energy contribution to the biquadratic exchange interaction $B'_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega) = \tilde{E}_{S=0}^{(4)}/6$, which leads to Eq. (40) in the main text. Note that $B'_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega) \propto J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)/J_H$, which means that the canonical transformation gives an accurate description of $B'_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$ as long as $J_{\text{ex}}(\mathcal{E}, \omega) \ll J_H$. This inequality is always fulfilled for the regime of frequencies studied here. However, for $\omega < U+V$, the spin-one description breakdown and orbital resolved spin dynamics is needed [30], see discussion in Section 3.1.

E Effective Hamiltonian with Spin-Charge coupling

In this section we discuss in more details the effective Hamiltonian which describes the spin-charge coupling phenomenon. We study the effective Hamiltonian responsible for the non-equilibrium spin-charge coupling between \hat{P}_0^ν states from Fourier sector $m=0$ and \hat{P}_2^0 states from the $m=-1$ sector as showed in Figure 5. This effective Hamiltonian forms a 8×8 matrix

$$\sum_{\substack{n,d,d'=0,2 \\ \nu\nu'}} \langle \phi_k | \hat{P}_d^\nu \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(n)}(t) \hat{P}_{d'}^{\nu'} | \phi_k \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} -4t_0^2 F & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2t_0^2 F & 2t_0^2 F & \vdots & 2t_0^2 I & -2t_0^2 I \\ 0 & -4t_0^2 F & 0 & 0 & 2t_0^2 F & 2t_0^2 F & \vdots & 2t_0^2 I & -2t_0^2 I \\ 0 & 0 & 2J_H & 0 & -J_H & -J_H & \vdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2J_H & -J_H & -J_H & \vdots & 0 & 0 \\ 2t_0^2 F & 2t_0^2 F & -J_H & -J_H & 2J_H - 4t_0^2 F & 0 & \vdots & -2t_0^2 I & 2t_0^2 I \\ 2t_0^2 F & 2t_0^2 F & -J_H & -J_H & 0 & 2J_H - 4t_0^2 F & \vdots & -2t_0^2 I & 2t_0^2 I \\ \dots & \dots \\ 2t_0^2 I^* & 2t_0^2 I^* & 0 & 0 & -2t_0^2 I^* & -2t_0^2 I^* & \vdots & E_I - \omega + 2t_0^2 G & 0 \\ -2t_0^2 I^* & -2t_0^2 I^* & 0 & 0 & 2t_0^2 I^* & 2t_0^2 I^* & \vdots & 0 & E_I - \omega + 2t_0^2 G \end{pmatrix}, \quad (100)$$

where

$$F = \sum_m \frac{J_{|m|}^2(\mathcal{E})}{U + J_H + m\omega} e^{i(m-m)\omega t}, \quad G = \sum_m \frac{J_{|m|}^2(\mathcal{E})}{3U - 5J_H + m\omega} e^{i(m-m)\omega t} \quad (101)$$

$$I = \sum_k J_k(\mathcal{E}) J_{k+1}(\mathcal{E}) \left\{ \frac{1}{3U - 5J_H + k\omega} + \frac{1}{U + J_H + k\omega} \right\} e^{i\omega t}. \quad (102)$$

I^* is the complex conjugate of I and $E_I = 4(U - J_H)$ is the energy of the doubly ionized states. The upper left block of the matrix Eq. (100) corresponds to the effective Hamiltonian in \hat{P}_0^ν sector with $m=0$ where the basis states are

$$h_{d=0} = \left\{ | \uparrow, \uparrow \rangle_i | \downarrow, \downarrow \rangle_j, | \downarrow, \downarrow \rangle_i | \uparrow, \uparrow \rangle_j, | \uparrow, \downarrow \rangle_i | \uparrow, \downarrow \rangle_j, \right. \quad (103)$$

$$\left. | \downarrow, \uparrow \rangle_i | \downarrow, \uparrow \rangle_j, | \uparrow, \downarrow \rangle_i | \downarrow, \uparrow \rangle_j, | \downarrow, \uparrow \rangle_i | \uparrow, \downarrow \rangle_j \right\}, \quad (104)$$

where $|\sigma_a, \sigma'_b\rangle_i = \hat{c}_{ib\sigma'}^\dagger \hat{c}_{ia\sigma}^\dagger |0\rangle$. The lower right block of the matrix corresponds to the effective Hamiltonian in \hat{P}_2^0 sector with $m=1$ where the basis is the following

$$h_{d=2} = \left\{ | \uparrow\downarrow, \uparrow\downarrow \rangle_i |0, 0\rangle_j, |0, 0\rangle_i | \uparrow\downarrow, \uparrow\downarrow \rangle_j \right\}. \quad (105)$$

We diagonalize the effective Hamiltonian, Eq. (100) and, after time averaging, we obtain the spectrum shown in Figure 5.

References

- [1] J. Zhao, A. Bragas, D. Lockwood and R. Merlin, *Magnon squeezing in an antiferromagnet: reducing the spin noise below the standard quantum limit*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93** (2004), doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.93.107203.
- [2] S. Wall, D. Prabhakaran, A. Boothroyd and A. Cavalleri, *Ultrafast coupling between light, coherent lattice vibrations, and the magnetic structure of semicovalent LaMnO₃*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**(097402) (2009), doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.097402.
- [3] M. Forst *et al.*, *Driving magnetic order in a manganite by ultrafast lattice excitation*, Phys. Rev. B **84**(241104) (2011), doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.84.241104.
- [4] T. Li *et al.*, *Femtosecond switching of magnetism via strongly correlated spin-charge quantum excitations*, Nature **496**, 69–73 (2013), doi:10.1038/nature11934.
- [5] R. R. Subkhangulov *et al.*, *All-optical manipulation and probing of the d-f exchange interaction in EuTe*, Sci. Rep. **4**(4368) (2014), doi:10.1038/srep04368.
- [6] M. Matsubara *et al.*, *Ultrafast optical tuning of ferromagnetism via the carrier density*, Nat. Commun. **6**(6724) (2015), doi:10.1038/ncomms7724.
- [7] R. V. Mikhaylovskiy *et al.*, *Ultrafast optical modification of exchange interactions in iron oxides*, Nat. Commun. **6**(8190) (2015), doi:10.1038/ncomms9190.
- [8] D. Bossini *et al.*, *Macrospin dynamics in antiferromagnets triggered by sub-20 femtosecond injection of nanomagnons*, Nat. Commun. **7** (2016), doi:10.1038/ncomms10645.
- [9] S. Trotzky *et al.*, *Time-resolved observation and control of superexchange interactions with ultracold atoms in optical lattices*, Science **319**(295–9) (2008), doi:10.1126/science.1150841.
- [10] Y.-A. Chen *et al.*, *Controlling correlated tunneling and superexchange interactions with ac-driven optical lattices*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**(210405) (2011), doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.107.210405.
- [11] F. Görg *et al.*, *Enhancement and sign change of magnetic correlations in a driven quantum many-body system*, Nature **553** (2018), doi:10.1038/nature25135.
- [12] J. H. Mentink, K. Balzer and M. Eckstein, *Ultrafast and reversible control of the exchange interaction in Mott insulators*, Nat. Commun. **6**(6708) (2015), doi:10.1038/ncomms7708.
- [13] A. P. Itin and M. I. Katsnelson, *Effective Hamiltonians for rapidly driven many-body lattice systems: Induced exchange interactions and density-dependent hoppings*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**(075301) (2015), doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.075301.
- [14] U. Meyer, G. Haack, C. Groth and X. Waintal, *Control of the oscillatory interlayer exchange interaction with terahertz radiation*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**(097701) (2017), doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.118.097701.

- [15] E. A. Stepanov, C. Dutreix and M. I. Katsnelson, *Dynamical and reversible control of topological spin textures*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**(157201) (2017), doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.118.157201.
- [16] S. Kitamura, T. Oka and H. Aoki, *Probing and controlling spin chirality in Mott insulators by circularly polarized laser*, Phys. Rev. B **96**(014406) (2017), doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.96.014406.
- [17] J. H. Mentink, *Manipulating magnetism by ultrafast control of the exchange interaction*, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **29**(453001) (2017), doi:10.1088/1361-648X/aa8abf.
- [18] M. Eckstein, J. H. Mentink and P. Werner, *Designing spin and orbital exchange Hamiltonians with ultrashort electric field transients*, arXiv:1703.03269v1 (2017).
- [19] V. A. Gavrichkov, S. I. Polukeev and S. G. Ovchinnikov, *Contribution from optically excited many-electron states to the superexchange interaction in Mott-Hubbard insulators*, Phys. Rev. B **95**(144424) (2017), doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.95.144424.
- [20] J. Liu, K. Hejazi and L. Balents, *Floquet engineering of multi-orbital Mott insulators: applications to orthorhombic titanates*, arXiv:1801.00401 (2018).
- [21] S.-S. Lee, J. von Delft and A. Weichselbaum, *Generalized Schrieffer-Wolff transformation of multi-flavor Hubbard models*, arXiv:1710.01171v1 (2017).
- [22] M. Bukov, M. Kolodrubetz and A. Polkovnikov, *Schrieffer-Wolff transformation for periodically driven systems: Strongly correlated systems with artificial gauge fields*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**(125301) (2016), doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.125301.
- [23] M. G. Bukov, *Floquet engineering in periodically driven closed quantum systems from dynamical localization to ultracold topological matter*, Ph.D. thesis, Boston University (2017).
- [24] R. E. Peierls, *Zur theorie des diamagnetismus von leitungselektronen*, Phys. **80**(763) (1933), doi:10.1007/BF01342591.
- [25] J. M. Luttinger, *The effect of a magnetic field on electrons in a periodic potential*, Phys. Rev. **84**(814) (1951), doi:10.1103/PhysRev.84.814.
- [26] A. H. MacDonald, S. M. Girvin and D. Yoshioka, *t/U expansion for the Hubbard model*, Phys. Rev. B. **37**(16) (1988), doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.41.2562.
- [27] A. Eckardt and E. Anisimovas, *High-frequency approximation for periodically driven quantum systems from a Floquet-space perspective*, New J. Phys. **17**(093039) (2015), doi:10.1088/1367-2630/17/9/093039.
- [28] M. Bukov, L. D'Alessio and A. Polkovnikov, *Universal high-frequency behavior of periodically driven systems: from dynamical stabilization to floquet engineering*, Advances in Physics **64**(2), 139 (2015), doi:10.1080/00018732.2015.1055918.
- [29] K. A. Chao, J. Spalek and A. Oleś, *Canonical perturbation expansion of the Hubbard model*, Phys. Rev. B **18**(7) (1978), doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.18.3453.

- [30] I. de P. R. Moreira *et al.*, *Derivation of spin Hamiltonians from the exact Hamiltonian: Application to systems with two unpaired electrons per magnetic site*, Phys. Rev. B **66**(134430) (2002), doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.66.134430.
- [31] V. Y. Irkhin and Y. P. Irkhin, *Many-electron operator approach in the solid state theory*, physica status solidi (b) (183), 9 (1994).
- [32] L. Landau, *To the theory of energy transmission in collisions. ii*, Phys. Z. Sowjet Union **2**(46) (1932).
- [33] C. Zener, *Non-adiabatic crossing of energy levels*, Proc. R. Soc. Lon. A **137**(696) (1932), doi:10.1098/rspa.1932.0165.
- [34] A. Sibille, J. F. Palmier and F. Laruelle, *Zener interminiband resonant breakdown in superlattices*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**(4506) (1998), doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.80.4506.
- [35] B. Rosam *et al.*, *Field-induced delocalization and Zener breakdown in semiconductor superlattices*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**(1307) (2001), doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.86.1307.
- [36] T. Oka and other, *Breakdown of a Mott insulator: A nonadiabatic tunneling mechanism*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**(6) (2003), doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.91.066406.
- [37] P. W. Anderson and P. Morel, *Generalized Bardeen-Cooper-Schrieffer states and the proposed low-temperature phase of liquid He³*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **123**(6) (1961), doi:10.1103/PhysRev.123.1911.
- [38] P. W. Anderson, *The resonating valence bond state in La₃CuO₄ and superconductivity*, Science **235**(4793) (1987), doi:10.1126/science.235.4793.1196.
- [39] A. Alvermann and H. Fehske, *High-order commutator-free exponential time-propagation of driven quantum systems*, J. Comput. Phys. **230**(15), 5930 (2011), doi:10.1016/j.jcp.2011.04.006.
- [40] L. D'Alessio and M. Rigol, *Long-time behavior of isolated periodically driven interacting lattice systems*, Phys. Rev. X **4**(041048) (2014), doi:10.1103/PhysRevX.4.041048.
- [41] M. Eckstein and P. Werner, *Nonequilibrium dynamical mean-field calculations based on the noncrossing approximation and its generalizations*, Phys. Rev. B **82**(115115) (2010), doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.82.115115.
- [42] H. Aoki *et al.*, *Nonequilibrium dynamical mean-field theory and its applications*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **86**(779) (2014), doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.86.779.
- [43] H. U. R. Strand, D. Golež, M. Eckstein and P. Werner, *Hund's coupling driven photocarrier relaxation in the two-band Mott insulator*, Phys. Rev. B **96**(165104) (2017), doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.96.165104.
- [44] P. Werner, H. Strand, S. Hoshino, Y. Murakami and M. Eckstein, *Enhanced pairing susceptibility in a photo-doped two-orbital Hubbard model*, arXiv:1801.07053 (2018).
- [45] G. Wirth, M. Ölschläger and A. Hemmerich, *Quantum phase transition to unconventional multi-orbital superfluidity in optical lattices*, Nat. Phys. **7**, 147–153 (2011), doi:10.1038/nphys2128.

- [46] Z. Zhang *et al.*, *Modulated pair condensate of p-orbital ultracold fermions*, Phys. Rev. A **82**(033610) (2010), doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.82.033610.