

Enhancing the ODMR Signal of Organic Molecular Qubits

Yong Rui Poh^{1,*} and Joel Yuen-Zhou^{1,†}

¹*Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093, USA*

(Dated: September 28, 2024)

In the fields of quantum information science and sensing, electron spins are often purified into a specific polarisation through an optical-spin interface, a process known as optically-detected magnetic resonance (ODMR). Diamond-NV centres and transition metals are both excellent platforms for these so-called colour centres, while metal-free molecular analogues are also gaining popularity for their extended polarisation lifetimes, milder environmental impacts, and reduced costs. In our earlier attempt at designing such organic high-spin π -diradicals, we proposed to spin-polarise by shelving triplet $M_S = \pm 1$ populations as singlets. This was recently verified by experiments albeit with low ODMR contrasts of $< 1\%$ at temperatures above 5 K. In this work, we propose to improve the ODMR signal by moving singlet populations back into the triplet $M_S = 0$ sub-level, designing a true carbon-based molecular analogue to the NV centre. To achieve both spin channels in π -diradicals, we leverage on weaker spin-orbit couplings beyond the nearest-neighbour approximation, made possible by careful control of orbital nodal structures and group-theoretical considerations. These analyses are further confirmed by ab initio calculations of a realistic trityl-based radical dimer. Microkinetic analyses point towards high ODMR contrasts of around 30% under experimentally-feasible conditions, a stark improvement from previous works. Finally, in our quest towards ground-state optically-addressable molecular spin qubits, we exemplify how our symmetry-based design avoids Zeeman-induced singlet-triplet mixings during electron paramagnetic resonance (EPR) experiments, setting the scene for realising electron spin qubit gates.

INTRODUCTION

Polarised electron spins are promising quantum bit (qubit) candidates [1] with applications in quantum sensing [2] and quantum information science [3]. Purifying these spin magnetic dipoles into a particular polarisation requires irreversible decays and these have been achieved in solid-state spin defects [4–13] by coupling the microwave-addressable electron spins with their orbital degrees of freedom [Fig. 1a]. Because the latter lies high in the optical regime, this technique has become known as optically-detected magnetic resonance (ODMR) – “detected” because the same optical-spin interface also enables readout of the spin polarisation. Platforms hosting optically addressable spins are then referred to as colour centres.

While early endeavours in this direction have focused on solid-state defects such as nitrogen-vacancy (NV) centres in diamond [14], their poor scalability and tunability have motivated the community to shift towards molecular platforms [15–24]. Transition metal complexes with high-spin ground states (GSs) offer the most natural starting point and this has been successful in Cr(IV), V(III), Ni(II), and, most recently, Ir(IV) complexes [25–37]. However, in none of these systems were the spin lifetimes as long as NV centres, essential for applications like qubit operations, and this has been attributed to the larger spin-orbit couplings (SOCs) introduced by metals. Other challenges include higher costs and poorer sustainability. This has prompted a search for a molecular NV-centre mimic that is metal-free, just like diamond itself, notwithstanding the benefits of metal-based qubit systems such as higher biocompatibility [38, 39] and simpler protocols for multiqubit addressability [16, 40–42].

As a first step along this path, organic molecules were designed to demonstrate ODMR in high-spin excited states while acknowledging the limited lifetimes of these electronic excitations [43–50]. Subsequently, our group theoretically proposed a class of organic π -diradicals with optically-addressable high-spin ground states [51] that were also experimentally validated by Chowdhury et al. [52] and Kopp

et al. [53]. In all of these systems, spin polarisation was likely attained by shelving the triplet $M_S = \pm 1$ population in the singlet manifold via spin-selective intersystem crossings (ISCs) while utilising the presence of additional singlet charge-recombined states absent from the triplet manifold [Fig. 1b]. (Interestingly, such imbalances have recently been proposed as evidence of low-energy electronic spin isomers [54].) Missing from the ODMR cycles are the ISCs between singlets and triplets selective for the $M_S = 0$ triplet sub-level, which the NV centre exhibits. As mentioned in our previous work [51], this limits the maximum possible triplet $M_S = 0$ population to 25%, constraining the ODMR resolution. Moreover, this increases the risk of metastable singlet molecules returning as $M_S = \pm 1$ triplets, which would negate the accumulated spin polarisation. Indeed, in the aforementioned experimental works, poor ODMR contrasts of $< 1\%$ were observed at temperatures above 5 K. We note in passing that, apart from π -diradicals, alkaline earth metal complexes [55, 56] and nitrenes [57] also display diradical properties and their functions as molecular colour centres have not been fully explored.

Here, we design another class of organic π -diradicals, this time capable of ISCs involving both triplet $M_S = \pm 1$ and $M_S = 0$ sublevels of *different* electronic states [Fig. 1c]. This way, we create a true analogue of the NV centre, which we predict to demonstrate enhanced ODMR signals. We are motivated by the presence of beyond-nearest-neighbour (through-space) SOC that were not explored in our previous nearest-neighbour-only (through-bond-only) semi-empirical model [51]. As explained in the Supplementary Information of that work, such SOC can facilitate ISCs among the lowest triplet local excitations (LEs) and the lowest singlet charge transfers (CTs) [Fig. 1b], whereby the LEs comprise linear combinations of each monoradical’s lowest electronic transitions (hence “local”) while the CTs represent charge-recombination states of the two radicals (also known as zwitterionic states). This effect was subsequently observed by Kopp et al. [53] (albeit in the absence of a $\Delta M_S = 0$ -selective ISC that limited the ODMR contrast), simplifying the electronic structure analysis to only the first four singlet and first two triplet excitations [Fig. 1b]. Preliminary analysis conducted by the present work found only modest spin selectivities of 68.1% from next-nearest-neighbour SOC, in contrast to the 100% selectivity from nearest-neighbour SOC endowed by symme-

* ypoh@ucsd.edu

† joelyuen@ucsd.edu

try. Subsequent optimisation leveraging on interferences from higher-nearest-neighbour SOC’s enhances the former value to 100% with opposite spin selectivities from their nearest-neighbour counterparts. Our design principle stems from a careful group-theoretical analysis of the transitioning orbitals, which coincidentally also solves the problem of singlet-triplet mixing during electron paramagnetic resonance (EPR) measurements of weakly-coupled diradicals (as most π -diradicals are [53, 58]). As a realistic prototypical example of our design, the electronic structure of $\text{PT}_2\text{TM-}p\text{-PT}_2\text{TM}$ [Fig. 1c] was shown at both density functional theory (DFT) and multi-configurational (MC) levels of theory to demonstrate an ODMR mechanism similar to the NV centre. The potential for signal enhancement through this ODMR pathway is supported by microkinetic analyses, where we found high ODMR contrasts of around 30% to be experimentally possible (as compared to $< 1\%$ in earlier studies [52, 53]). While not explored by the present work, we expect further mesitylation [Fig. 1c] to improve the luminescence quantum yield via geometrical relaxation [59, 60], as exemplified by Chowdhury et al. [52] to produce near-unity photoluminescence yields. This paves the way towards better designs of optically-addressable organic spins. Note that the alternancy symmetry of $\text{PT}_2\text{TM-}p\text{-PT}_2\text{TM}$ is not important to our design, which should be separated from our earlier work [51].

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Investigating the role of beyond-nearest-neighbour SOC’s

As we have previously shown [51], when two benzylic radicals are covalently connected with a significant torsion (as is the way most π -diradicals are experimentally constructed [58, 61–77]), its SOC matrix elements are dominated by nearest-neighbour interactions between the two $2p$ atomic orbitals (AOs) of opposite π -rings (reason: El-Sayed rules) that are closest to the dimer linkage (reason: SOC is a local effect). Henceforth, we refer solely to π AOs. Furthermore, if the spin quantisation axis lies parallel (perpendicular) to the line connecting the two $2p$ AO centres, then the ISC spin selectivity arising from the SOC matrix elements is strictly $\Delta M_S = 0$ (± 1) due to symmetry [51]. Note that the last condition is satisfied for interactions at the dimer bond because the spin axes (without applying any magnetic fields) coincide with the dimer’s high symmetry axes. However, ISC’s in π -diradicals occur not between pairs of $2p$ AOs but between pairs of *delocalised* molecular orbitals (MOs) that are each a linear combination of a few $2p$ AOs. When one of the transitioning MOs contains a node at the dimer linkage, the relevant SOC matrix elements necessarily involve next-nearest-neighbour couplings not considered by the above analysis. Such effects are generally small following the local nature of SOC’s, yet they can be appreciable if most of the transitioning MO’s amplitude is piled up at these next-nearest-neighbour sites (as opposed to nearest-neighbour couplings weighted by small MO amplitudes). Importantly, next-nearest-neighbour interactions involve two $2p$ AO centres that are not colinear with the spin quantisation axis, causing the ISC selectivity to break down [Fig. 2a]. Indeed, for two benzylic radicals covalently tethered at the *para* positions with 90° torsion (hereafter called benzyl-*p*-benzyl), the next-nearest-neighbour SOC evaluated over singly-occupied $2p$ AOs biases the $\Delta M_S = \pm 1$ transitions with 68.1% selectivity (noting that the spin quantisation (z -)axis lies parallel to the dimer linkage due to the molecular D_{2d} point group symmetry) and this SOC has a significant amplitude of 0.13 cm^{-1} [Fig. 2b]. For comparison, the nearest-neighbour analogue

has a *perfect* spin selectivity of $\Delta M_S = 0$ with a larger amplitude of 1.37 cm^{-1} . Note that these SOC matrix elements represent upper bounds to the true molecular values because we have assumed one full electron in each AO.

Perfecting the spin selectivity using the molecular point group symmetry

That ISC in π -diradicals can actually occur with both spin selectivities is contrary to most theoretical analyses [78–80] (including ours [51]) and opens up the possibility of transferring the full electronic structure of NV centres into molecules. Our next step is to perfect the next-nearest-neighbour spin selectivity via symmetry considerations. We note that by connecting two benzylic radicals at their *para* positions, the resulting diradical has at least a D_2 point group symmetry with irreducible representations (irreps) organised by their characters under $C_2(y)$ and $C_2(z)$ rotations. The irrep of any electronic state is in turn the direct product of its orbital and spin irreps. Focusing on the orbital part, if we continue to align the z -axis along the dimer linkage [Fig. 2b,e], then a $C_2(y)$ rotation becomes equivalent to swapping the two monomers. Therefore, for two weakly-interacting π -systems of significant torsion, the low-lying excitations are expected to appear in near-degenerate pairs of $\{A, B_1\}$ and $\{B_2, B_3\}$, each comprising a state of opposite parity under $C_2(y)$, i.e. equal probability of exciting either monomer. These two pairs can be distinguished by their transformations under $C_2(z)$ and, for that, it is easier to think in the basis of *monomeric* π MOs. We first note that $2p$ AOs have π symmetry, that is, their phases change under C_2 rotation about the AO centre. Further, for the two $2p$ AOs at the dimer linkage, that π -symmetry-defining C_2 rotation coincides with the diradical’s $C_2(z)$ symmetry element. Hence, a monomeric MO with a non-zero amplitude at the dimer linkage *must* be antisymmetric under $C_2(z)$ rotation. By contrast, for a monomeric MO to be symmetric under $C_2(z)$ rotation, it *must* possess a node at the dimer linkage. For instance, the Hückel method predicts the highest occupied, singly occupied and lowest unoccupied MOs (abbreviated as HOMO, SOMO, and LUMO respectively) of the benzylic radical to have $+1$, -1 , and $+1$ characters under $C_2(z)$ rotation [Fig. 2c]. Finally, we recall that the symmetry of the orbital wavefunction is the direct product of the symmetries of all singly occupied orbitals. Therefore, the ground states of benzyl-*p*-benzyl, having two unpaired electrons in the SOMOs, transform as either A or B_1 . Similarly, the lowest CT singlets with all doubly-occupied orbitals also transform as either A or B_1 . As for the lowest LEs, they are a linear combination of HOMO-to-SOMO and SOMO-to-LUMO excitations (an outcome of alternancy symmetry; see Ref. [51]) and hence transform as either B_2 or B_3 . Including the characters under $C_2(y)$ rotation yields the approximate energy level diagram illustrated in Fig. 2d (for a review of the electronic structure of benzylic diradicals, see our earlier work [51]).

Returning to our goal of attaining perfect ISC spin selectivities, we note that the singlet, triplet $M_S = 0$, and triplet $M_S = \pm 1$ spin sublevels transform as A , B_1 , and $\{B_2, B_3\}$ respectively [81, 82]. For an ISC to be symmetry-allowed, the SOC matrix elements must contain the totally symmetric irrep. Hence, because the SOC Hamiltonian is totally symmetric, ISC processes in benzyl-*p*-benzyl are spin-selective for $\Delta M_S = \pm 1$ when moving between triplet LEs and singlet CTs, and $\Delta M_S = 0$ when moving between singlet CTs and triplet GSs. Actually, we already knew this from the previous section: The first ISC occurs between SOMOs and LUMOs (or HOMOs) of opposite monomers and only the latter has a node at the dimer linkage [Fig. 2c]. Thus, this process occurs predominantly via next-




FIG. 1: (a) Simplified ODMR mechanism typical of diamond-NV defects. (b) Simplified ODMR mechanism of alternant π -diradicals as explored by our previous work [51]. Note that the CT-to-GS ISC rates are small if the two benzylic radicals are tethered at their *meta* positions, which is avoided by our new design (see main text). (c) ODMR mechanism of our new design, which more closely resembles the spin polarisation pathway of NV centres. Also drawn are the PT₂TM-*p*-PT₂TM diradical and its mesitylated counterpart, both of which satisfy our design requirements. (Abbreviations of electronic transitions: Abs = absorption; PL = photoluminescence; IC = internal conversion; ISC = intersystem crossing. Labels for electronic states: GS = ground state; LE = local excitation; CT = charge transfer. These labels are inherited from our previous analysis of the π -diradical electronic structure [51] with subscripts signifying the state irreps.)




FIG. 2: (a) Breakdown of the spin selection rule for ISCs involving next-nearest-neighbour SOC. (b) Amplitudes of the SOC matrix elements evaluated between two carbon $2p$ AOs centred on opposite π -systems of the benzyl-*p*-benzyl diradical. Each $2p$ AO is assumed to be occupied by one full electron with either the same or opposite spin as its counterpart on the other benzylic fragment. Taking the difference between the matrix elements-squared of the two spin alignments and weighing the result by their sums give the spin selectivity. (c) Sketches of the frontier Hückel MOs for the benzylic monoradical. Also illustrated are their parities under $C_2(z)$ rotation. (d) Approximate electronic structure of benzyl-*p*-benzyl obtained from the Hückel theory analysis in (c). The excitation labels are inherited from Ref. [51] and the subscripts indicate the state irreps. In this work, all molecular geometries are presented in the coordinate frame depicted in (e).

nearest-neighbour SOCs, which we found before to exhibit $\Delta M_S = \pm 1$ selectivity. Similarly, the second ISC connects between two SOMOs of opposite monomers and is mediated mostly by nearest-neighbour SOCs with $\Delta M_S = 0$ selectivity. Yet, the key improvement achieved by this section is the perfection of ISC spin selectivities to 100% by making the opposite spin channel symmetry-forbidden. From a microscopic perspective, we have destructively interfered any deleterious ISC channels using other higher-nearest-neighbour SOCs, treated more generally by the group-theoretical approach. Importantly, this electronic structure produces the ODMR mechanism shown in Fig. 1c, where populations in the triplet $M_S = \pm 1$ LEs are moved into the triplet $M_S = 0$ GS via two sequential ISCs of opposite spin selectivities. In other words, such molecules exhibit the ODMR mechanism of NV centres. As an aside, while it is tempting to consider only symmetry arguments and ignore the discussions in the previous section, note that symmetry-allowed transitions need not occur with high amplitudes. Therefore, one still needs to check if the allowed ISCs are facilitated by either nearest- or next-nearest-neighbour SOCs, which have the largest amplitudes. For example, the *meta*-connected diradicals explored in our previous work [51] have negligible SOCs between singlet CTs and triplet GSs [Fig. 1b] because they are dominated by third-nearest-neighbour effects with a maximum SOC amplitude of 0.02 cm^{-1} [Fig. 2b]. In other words, our plan is made viable by our specially-chosen *para*-connectivity – a consequence of our group-theoretical analysis (*meta*-connectivity does not yield D_2 point group symmetry).

Our proposal

We now introduce a molecular design that realises the ODMR mechanism described in Fig 1c:

1. **The π -diradical should be a dimer centralised around a benzyl-*p*-benzyl-like framework.** This ensures that the diradical’s electronic structure resembles Fig. 2d.
2. **Sufficient steric hindrances should be installed around the dimer linkage to maintain a 90° torsion.** Otherwise, *para* connectivity facilitates π -bonding and encourages a singlet ground state [65, 83–86]. For instance, chloro substituents can be introduced at the *meta* positions, which is common practice when synthesising luminescent benzyl-type radicals [65].
3. **Any additional π -conjugation to the benzylic radical should continue to localise the lowest-lying excitations around the benzylic group.** For instance, phenyl substituents added to the benzylic radical (typically used to improve radical stability and luminescence) should have less-extensive internal π -conjugation so that their lowest transitions are energetically separated from the benzylic fragment’s.
4. **These extra substituents should also maintain the monoradical’s $C_2(z)$ symmetry, where the z -axis lies along the *ipso-para* direction.** The reason is that the $C_2(z)$ axis is the *only* symmetry element discriminating between the monomeric π MOs [Fig. 2c], thus their parities under $C_2(z)$ dictate the spin selectivity of their intermonomer ISCs. (For the same reason, diradicals of D_2 point group symmetry are not the only molecules satisfying our design criteria. Non-dimeric diradicals can also be constructed with C_2 symmetry and the above near-degenerate pairs of $\{A, B_1\}$ and $\{B_2, B_3\}$ excitations

will become split in energy, thereby offering a ladder of states through which the singlet molecules can decay. Here, we will focus solely on dimeric diradicals of D_2 symmetry for simplicity.) As an example, when substituting the two hydrogens on the benzylic centre, both hydrogens should be replaced simultaneously and with identical moieties.

These features are summarised in Fig. 3a using our prototype $\text{PT}_2\text{TM-}p\text{-PT}_2\text{TM}$ diradical as an example. Note that its alternacy symmetry is not crucial to our design, which should be distinguished from our earlier work [51].

Ab initio calculations of the prototype $\text{PT}_2\text{TM-}p\text{-PT}_2\text{TM}$ diradical

To support the above theory, calculations were performed on the $\text{PT}_2\text{TM-}p\text{-PT}_2\text{TM}$ diradical as a representative example of experimentally-feasible diradicals. Starting with its ground state properties, the equilibrium geometry was found using unrestricted DFT to display a significant torsion of 86.4° around the dimer linkage. At this geometry, the ground singlet state is only 1.08 meV lower in energy (equivalent to thermal energy at 12.5 K) than the ground triplet state, computed using broken-symmetry (BS) DFT. Thus, the *m*-chloro substituents sufficiently minimise π -bonding between the two radicals, that is, we have obtained a true diradical.

Excited state properties were then estimated using unrestricted time-dependent DFT (TDDFT) within the Tamm–Dancoff approximation (TDA). The electronic structure fits our requirements for the ODMR mechanism [Fig. 1c] with the exception of another low-lying LE pair of irreps A and B_1 at around 0.1 eV away from the lowest LEs [Fig. 3b]. As eluded in Fig 1c, these excitations are spectroscopically distinguishable from the lowest LEs by wavelength and may be avoided by optically pumping with a single-frequency laser. *Even if they were photoexcited*, any deleterious $\Delta M_S = 0$ ISCs to the lowest singlet CTs are expected to be slower than internal conversions (ICs) to the lowest LEs due to Kasha’s rule [87]. Further verification of this energy gap was achieved by applying multi-configurational self-consistent field (MC-SCF) and configuration interaction (CI) methods on the monoradical. Here, the dimer linkage was capped with a hydrogen substituent. This approach places the energy separation between the two lowest LEs at 0.21 eV, consistent with the TDDFT/TDA predictions [Fig. 3b].

As speculated, the lowest LE transitions are largely localised on the central (tetra-chlorinated) benzyl-*p*-benzyl fragment [Fig. 3c]. Hence, for computational efficiency, the SOC matrix elements were computed for this central fragment instead, capping any open ends with hydrogen. Indeed, the MCSCF/CI results suggest appreciable SOC matrix elements along the proposed ODMR pathway [Fig. 3b]. While, strictly speaking, these calculations present only an upper bound to the true SOC matrix elements of $\text{PT}_2\text{TM-}p\text{-PT}_2\text{TM}$, their values should not decrease by much upon weak π -conjugation to the additional trichlorophenyl substituents. Most importantly, these calculations lend credence to the theoretical proposal presented by this work.

Symmetry avoids Zeeman-induced singlet-triplet mixings during EPR spectroscopy

Interestingly, in connecting two identical monoradicals of (at least) C_2 point group symmetry to form a diradical of (at least) D_2 point group symmetry, the resulting structure can avoid undesirable singlet-triplet mixings found in many weakly-coupled diradicals under an applied magnetic field.




FIG. 3: (a) Features of our diradical design, demonstrated on the PT₂TM-*p*-PT₂TM diradical. (b) Energy level diagram of PT₂TM-*p*-PT₂TM, computed using TDDFT. Also included are the root-mean-squared SOC matrix elements, averaged over all channels. These calculations were performed using MCSCF/CI methods on the central tetra-chlorinated benzyl-*p*-benzyl fragment. (c) Ground state spin density (isovalue = 0.004) and natural transition orbitals (isovalue = 0.040) for the first few excited states of PT₂TM-*p*-PT₂TM, obtained using BS-DFT/TDDFT.

This would alleviate most magnetic-field-induced decoherence events in the ground state [88, 89] (notice that the singlet and triplet GSs differ by either the coherence or a single spin flip [51]). It also facilitates Rabi nutation experiments in EPR spectroscopy [53], amongst other benefits.

To introduce the problem, we consider the spin Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{spin} of two electron spins \hat{S}_j ($j = 1, 2$) under an applied magnetic field \mathbf{B} :

$$\hat{H}_{\text{spin}} = \mu_B \mathbf{B} \cdot \mathbf{g}_1 \cdot \hat{S}_1 + \mu_B \mathbf{B} \cdot \mathbf{g}_2 \cdot \hat{S}_2 + 2J \hat{S}_1 \cdot \hat{S}_2 + \frac{\mu_0 g_e^2 \mu_B^2}{4\pi} \left[\frac{\hat{S}_1 \cdot \hat{S}_2}{|\mathbf{r}|^3} - \frac{3(\hat{S}_1 \cdot \mathbf{r})(\hat{S}_2 \cdot \mathbf{r})}{|\mathbf{r}|^5} \right]. \quad (1)$$

The first two terms represent each spin's interaction with the magnetic field (i.e. the spin Zeeman terms), characterised by different g -tensors \mathbf{g}_j ($j = 1, 2$). The third term symbolises the exchange interaction between the two spins with coupling $2J$ and is responsible for singlet-triplet splittings. The last term denotes the spin-spin dipolar interaction that gives rise to zero-field splittings in organic diradicals; here, the spatial degrees of freedom (characterised by \mathbf{r}) have been integrated over some orbital subspace (for instance, the ground state). Finally, the symbols μ_B , μ_0 , and g_e represent, respectively, the Bohr magneton, the vacuum magnetic permeability, and the electron g -factor. Implicit to the above expression is the definition of a four-dimensional Hilbert space spanned by tensor products of the two electron spin states. By applying the angular momentum sum rules, one may also express the Hilbert space in the basis of one singlet and three triplet spin states [88, 90]. This amounts to re-expressing Eq. (1) in terms of the total spin operator

$\hat{S} \equiv \hat{S}_1 + \hat{S}_2$, which yields

$$\hat{H}_{\text{spin}} = \mu_B \mathbf{B} \cdot \mathbf{g}_1 \cdot \hat{S} + \mu_B \mathbf{B} \cdot (\mathbf{g}_2 - \mathbf{g}_1) \cdot \hat{S}_2 + J (\hat{S}^2 - \hat{S}_1^2 - \hat{S}_2^2) + \hat{S} \cdot \mathbf{D} \cdot \hat{S}. \quad (2)$$

The procedure for transforming the last term of Eq. (1) into the last term of Eq. (2) is presented in most EPR texts [88, 89] with \mathbf{D} being referred to as the zero-field splitting tensor. We now see the problem: If $\mathbf{g}_1 \neq \mathbf{g}_2$, true in most organic systems, then the singlet-triplet basis block-diagonalises every term in Eq. (2) (with the triplets forming their own block) except for the second one. In other words, the second term induces mixings between the singlet state and the triplet manifold. This, as mentioned, leads to deleterious effects such as spin decoherence [88, 89] and additional Rabi frequencies [53]. One solution would be to engineer an exchange coupling J that is large enough for the Zeeman-induced singlet-triplet couplings of $\sim \mu_B B |g_2 - g_1|$ to be a perturbation relative to the singlet-triplet gap. However, as explained in our earlier work [51], further enhancement of the exchange coupling in π -diradicals is likely to result in a singlet GS, i.e. J is typically antiferromagnetic [65, 83–85].

The alternative approach would be to somehow make elements that differ between \mathbf{g}_1 and \mathbf{g}_2 disappear under experimental conditions. This can be achieved in our diradicals by aligning the magnetic field \mathbf{B} parallelly to the dimer linkage. To see that, we first note that elements of the g -tensor have the following approximate expression, obtained from second-order perturbation theory in the SOC: [88, 89]

$$g_{ab} = g_e \delta_{ab} + 2\lambda \sum_{\Psi'} \frac{\langle \Psi | \hat{L}_a | \Psi' \rangle \langle \Psi' | \hat{L}_b | \Psi \rangle}{E_\Psi - E_{\Psi'}}. \quad (3)$$

Here, λ is an effective SOC constant and $\{|\Psi'\rangle\}$, $\{E_{\Psi'}\}$ respectively denote the orbital eigenfunctions and eigenener-

gies of the molecule’s non-relativistic electronic Hamiltonian, with Ψ being the orbital eigenfunction under consideration (say, the ground state wavefunction). The indices a and b run over all three-dimensional coordinates (such as x , y , and z) and \hat{L}_a is the a -th component of the orbital angular momentum operator $\hat{\mathbf{L}}$. Because each monoradical of our proposed system is symmetric about $C_2(z)$ rotation (using the coordinate frame defined by Fig. 2e, i.e. z -axis along dimer linkage), the g -tensor must remain invariant under $C_2(z)$ rotation. Such a rotation takes $\{\hat{L}_x, \hat{L}_y, \hat{L}_z\} \rightarrow \{-\hat{L}_x, -\hat{L}_y, \hat{L}_z\}$, hence, using Eq. (3), we obtain

$$\mathbf{g} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} g_{xx} & g_{xy} & g_{xz} \\ g_{yx} & g_{yy} & g_{yz} \\ g_{zx} & g_{zy} & g_{zz} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} g_{xx} & g_{xy} & -g_{xz} \\ g_{yx} & g_{yy} & -g_{yz} \\ -g_{zx} & -g_{zy} & g_{zz} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

By contradiction, it must be that

$$\mathbf{g} = \begin{pmatrix} g_{xx} & g_{xy} & 0 \\ g_{yx} & g_{yy} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & g_{zz} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5)$$

Next, the two monoradicals in the dimer are related by a $C_2(y)$ rotation. Taking Eq. (5) to be the g -tensor of radical 1, we find the g -tensors of both radicals to be

$$\mathbf{g}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} g_{xx} & g_{xy} & 0 \\ g_{yx} & g_{yy} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & g_{zz} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

$$\mathbf{g}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} g_{xx} & -g_{xy} & 0 \\ -g_{yx} & g_{yy} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & g_{zz} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

Therefore, because both \mathbf{g}_1 and \mathbf{g}_2 have the same g_{zz} components, the second term of Eq. (2) vanishes when the magnetic field \mathbf{B} falls along the z -axis (the dimer linkage), i.e.

$$\hat{H}_{\text{spin}} = \mu_B g_{zz} |\mathbf{B}| \hat{S}_z + J (\hat{\mathbf{S}}^2 - \hat{\mathbf{S}}_1^2 - \hat{\mathbf{S}}_2^2) + \hat{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \mathbf{D} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{S}}. \quad (8)$$

The singlet-triplet states may now block-diagonalise \hat{H}_{spin} with no singlet-triplet mixings present. Furthermore, due to the approximate D_{2d} point group symmetry of our system, the zero-field splitting caused by \mathbf{D} also occurs along the z -axis. This may be further rationalised by the cylindrical spin density distribution of the diradical [89]. Therefore, the singlet-triplet basis fully-diagonalises \hat{H}_{spin} in Eq. (8).

Predicted ODMR contrasts

As a final theoretical piece to this puzzle, we construct a microkinetic model of the excited state kinetics and predict the ODMR contrast at steady state. For simplicity, we shall take the incoherent limit and consider only changes to the eigenstate populations. Also, populations of degenerate eigenstates are pooled into a single variable. Therefore, the relevant eigenstates are

- the singlet GS (labelled GS, degeneracy = 1),
- the triplet $M_S = 0$ GS (labelled GT0 for ground triplet, degeneracy = 1),
- the triplet $M_S = \pm 1$ GS (labelled GT1, degeneracy = 2),
- the singlet CTs (labelled CT, degeneracy = 2),

- the singlet LEs (labelled ES for excited singlet, degeneracy = 2),
- the triplet $M_S = 0$ LEs (labelled ET0 for excited triplet, degeneracy = 2), and
- the triplet $M_S = \pm 1$ LEs (labelled ET1, degeneracy = 4).

The kinetic processes connecting these eigenstates and their associated rate constants are presented in Fig. 4a; there, the symbols adopt their usual meanings. As far as possible, model parameters were selected within experimental reason. Of particular importance are the following:

- Also modelled are the vibrationally-excited LE states, labelled with an asterisk (*). These states represent the wavefunction following an initial Franck-Condon photoexcitation and will, within picoseconds, undergo vibrational relaxation to the ground vibrational level of the respective LE states, labelled without an asterisk ().
- The experimentally-observed IC rates from LE to GS triplets are between 10^8 and 10^{10} s^{-1} [52, 53, 67, 74]. In our model, we shall pick the upper bound as a conservative estimate. Then, because experiments predict the IC rate from CT to GS singlets to be an order of magnitude slower [52, 53], we place its value at 10^9 s^{-1} . Finally, IC from LE to CT singlets must be faster in view of the smaller energy gap [87] and we estimate this rate to be 10^{11} s^{-1} .
- The ISC rates are chosen to represent typical organic systems, i.e. around 10^7 s^{-1} between excited states (i.e. triplet LEs to singlet CTs) [91] and 10^5 s^{-1} for relaxation to the ground (i.e. singlet CTs to triplet GSs) [47, 48, 91]. Because the energy gaps between LEs and GSs are larger than between CTs and GSs, we expect their ISC rates to be scaled down by an order of magnitude to around 10^4 s^{-1} (this is also expected by the El-Sayed rules; see Refs. [51, 53]). Lastly, because the singlet CTs and triplet LEs are relatively close in energy ($\gtrsim 0.05 \text{ eV}$) [51–53], reverse ISCs are probable with a delayed timescale. By detailed balance, this rate will be around $7 \times 10^5 \text{ s}^{-1}$ if we make a safe assumption of a 0.02 eV energy gap at 85 K – these parameters also produce similar ODMR contrasts as experiments [52, 53] when the CT-to-GS ISC channel is shut (more to follow).
- The weakly-coupled pair of doublet spins in the GS can mix and decohere which, in the singlet-triplet basis, translates into population transfers among the singlet and triplet GSs. Therefore, we shall assume a uniform rate constant k_{decoh} for mixing between the four near-degenerate magnetic levels (one from the singlet and three from the triplet). This is consistent with Kopp et al. [53], where the singlet to triplet GS ISCs occur at around the same timescale as the triplet spin-lattice and spin-spin relaxations. The same decoherence pathway is also expected among the singlet and triplet LEs. Special attention is given to mixing among the triplet spin sublevels, denoted by a rate constant κ_{decoh} . In our simulations, we will always set $\kappa_{\text{decoh}} = k_{\text{decoh}}$ unless a microwave drive is applied (necessary for finding the ODMR contrast). This introduces additional triplet spin mixing that, assuming a saturating microwave field, is mathematically equivalent to the limit of $\kappa_{\text{decoh}} \rightarrow \infty$, i.e. full mixing between the triplet sublevels [26].

Solving the kinetic model for the steady-state populations yields the ODMR contrast and optically-induced spin polarisation via the following expressions [11–13]:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ODMR contrast} \\ = \frac{\sum_{j=0,1} n_{\text{ET}j}^{\text{ss},\infty} - \sum_{j=0,1} n_{\text{ET}j}^{\text{ss}}}{\sum_{j=0,1} n_{\text{ET}j}^{\text{ss}}} \times 100\% \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

and

$$\text{Spin polarisation} = \frac{n_{\text{GT}0}^{\text{ss}} - n_{\text{GT}1}^{\text{ss}}/2}{n_{\text{GT}0}^{\text{ss}} + n_{\text{GT}1}^{\text{ss}}/2} \times 100\%, \quad (10)$$

where the factor of 1/2 arises from the double degeneracy of the triplet $M_S = \pm 1$ GSs. Here, n_{Ψ}^{ss} denotes the steady-state population of state Ψ at $\kappa_{\text{decoh}} = k_{\text{decoh}}$, while $n_{\Psi}^{\text{ss},\infty}$ denotes the same quantity at $\kappa_{\text{decoh}} \rightarrow \infty$, i.e. under a microwave resonance. (The rate equations are available in Supplementary Information 1.)

The results are plotted in Fig. 4b across experimental ranges of k_{abs} and k_{decoh} . The former represents the optical pump rate and has an experimental upper bound of 10^{12} s^{-1} for our system (see Supplementary Information 2 for estimates of k_{abs} , which is based on a laser used in teaching labs [92]). Meanwhile, the latter denotes the spin relaxation rate, the slowest of which is around 10^4 s^{-1} at temperatures of around 100 K [45, 52, 53, 68]. Strikingly, at $k_{\text{abs}} = 10^9 \text{ s}^{-1}$ and $k_{\text{decoh}} = 10^4 \text{ s}^{-1}$, a high ODMR contrast of -27.29% is observed with an optically-induced spin polarisation of 62.76% . The triplet $M_S = 0$ LE population, which is proportional to the photoluminescence intensity, is also appreciable at 7.34% . Importantly, the proportion of molecules in the triplet GSs is above 25% , suggesting that the observed polarisation pathway goes beyond the shelving mechanism described by previous studies [51–53]. Finally, the above ODMR contrast was obtained at a microwave drive rate of $\kappa_{\text{decoh}} \sim 10^6 \text{ s}^{-1}$, which is experimentally reasonable [11–13]. For comparison, the predicted ODMR contrast in the absence of CT-to-GS ISC is only -0.24% , in agreement with experimental setups that employ the shelving mechanism [52, 53] (this final result was obtained with $k_{\text{CT-GT}} = 0$).

CONCLUSION

By covalently tethering two benzylic radicals at their *para* positions, the resulting diradical of D_2 point group symmetry has a triplet GS of irrep B_1 , lowest singlet CTs of irreps A and B_1 , and lowest triplet LEs of irreps B_2 and B_3 . Thus, by group-theoretical considerations, spin polarisation can be achieved via a $\Delta M_S = \pm 1$ ISC from LEs to CTs, followed by a $\Delta M_S = 0$ ISC from CTs to GSs, just like in an NV centre. Moreover, the associated SOC matrix elements are appreciable due to next-nearest-neighbour effects for the former and nearest-neighbour effects for the latter. We expect this success to be generalisable to any diradical based upon two *para*-connected benzylic radicals. This is illustrated in the $\text{PT}_2\text{TM-}p\text{-PT}_2\text{TM}$ diradical: Firstly, the benzylic radicals are *meta*-chlorinated to lock the inter-radical torsion by steric repulsion, ensuring that the GS comprises both triplets and singlets at near-degeneracy. Next, the stabilising phenyl rings are specially chosen to not break the C_2 rotational symmetry down the benzylic *ipso-para* direction. Finally, every benzylic radical has one more chloro substituent than each of its phenyl branches, thereby localising the lowest-lying excitations on the tetra-chlorinated benzylic fragment. Indeed, these expectations are reflected in the ab initio results by producing the desired electronic structure for ODMR.

To our best knowledge, our new design has checked most boxes for a robust optical-spin interface [17]. Perhaps a

minor problem not addressed by this work is the poor emissive properties of our $\text{PT}_2\text{TM-}p\text{-PT}_2\text{TM}$ prototype due to its alternacy symmetry [51, 93, 94]. For that, we expect techniques of alternacy symmetry breaking [45, 93, 94] and excited-state symmetry breaking [59, 60] employed by the organic light-emitting diode (OLED) community to be useful. In fact, the latter was recently demonstrated by Chowdhury et al. [52], who synthesised trityl-based diradicals of near-unity luminescence quantum yields by mesitylating at the *para* positions. When applied to $\text{PT}_2\text{TM-}p\text{-PT}_2\text{TM}$, a possible diradical would look like Fig. 1c, which is a suitable synthetic starting point. Notably, the ODMR contrast for this novel spin polarisation pathway is expected to be around 30% , an unequivocal improvement from earlier works [51–53]. Regarding qubit operations, our design also overcomes problems of Zeeman-induced spin decoherence and observations of multiple Rabi frequencies during EPR measurements of weakly-coupled diradicals. These are all crucial steps towards the realisation of optically-addressable molecular spin qubits.

METHODS

The geometry of benzyl-*p*-benzyl was relaxed as a triplet on UB3LYP-D3BJ/def2-SVP [95, 96] while enforcing D_{2d} point group symmetry. Due to the lack of steric hindrances, the optimisation converged to a saddle point on the potential energy surface with a single imaginary frequency of amplitude 57.8 cm^{-1} . These calculations were done using the ORCA 5.0 code [97]. We then computed the SOC matrix elements between carbon $2p$ AOs of opposite π -systems using the single-electron form of the SOC operator [98], taking each AO to be singly-occupied and using a carbon effective nuclear charge of 3.9 [99]. These integrals were computed using PySCF 2.5.0 [100] and the carbon $2p$ AOs were represented by the STO-6G basis set.

Hereafter, all ab initio calculations were performed with the ORCA 5.0 code [97]. Geometries of $\text{PT}_2\text{TM-}p\text{-PT}_2\text{TM}$ and its central tetra-chlorinated fragment (labelled $\text{Cl}_4\text{M-}p\text{-Cl}_4\text{M}$) were optimised as triplets on UB3LYP-D3BJ/def2-SVP [95, 96] with harmonic vibrational frequency analyses done to ensure no imaginary frequencies. The resulting geometries had at least D_2 point group symmetries. For the full $\text{PT}_2\text{TM-}p\text{-PT}_2\text{TM}$ diradical, its electronic structure was estimated by spin-unrestricted TDDFT/TDA at the UB3LYP/def2-SVPD level using both triplet and BS singlet ground states as reference. In cases where the latter approach yielded BS solutions of $\langle \mathbf{S}^2 \rangle \approx 1$, we assumed negligible discrepancies to the singlet energies from spin contamination because the results were similar to the triplet excitations (within 0.1 eV), which are the most-probable spin contaminants [101]. Excited state irreps were then inferred from the polarisations of the respective transition dipoles. In performing a BS-DFT calculation, we had also obtained the open-shell singlet GS energy via the following expression from Yamaguchi et al. [101]:

$$E_S - E_T = \frac{\langle \mathbf{S}^2 \rangle_T}{\langle \mathbf{S}^2 \rangle_T - \langle \mathbf{S}^2 \rangle_{\text{BS}}} (E_{\text{BS}} - E_T), \quad (11)$$

where E_T , E_{BS} , and E_S are the energies of the triplet, BS singlet, and open-shell singlet states while $\langle \mathbf{S}^2 \rangle_T$ and $\langle \mathbf{S}^2 \rangle_{\text{BS}}$ are the respective expectations of the total spin-squared. The smaller $\text{Cl}_4\text{M-}p\text{-Cl}_4\text{M}$ fragment was then used to compute the SOC matrix elements at the MCSCF/CI level, also using the def2-SVPD basis set. For that, we first performed a complete active space self-consistent field (CASSCF) calculation with 10 active electrons and 10 active orbitals, state-averaging the energy over the ground triplet and singlet states (i.e. SA2). Thereafter, the excited states




FIG. 4: (a) Schematic diagram depicting the excited-state transitions being considered by our microkinetic model. (b) Steady-state solutions to the optically-induced spin polarisation, ODMR contrast, triplet $M_S = 0$ GS population, and triplet $M_S = 0$ LE population (which simulates the emission intensity). Plots are made across varying optical pump rates k_{abs} and spin decoherence rates k_{decoh} within experimental ranges. Other parameters are defined in (a), chosen to be as realistic as possible.

were estimated using the complete active space configuration interaction (CASCI) method, among which the SOC matrix elements were computed. In this work, the electron spin states are expressed in the symmetry-aligned coordinate frame shown in Fig. 2e. Finally, with the monoradical of $\text{PT}_2\text{TM-}p\text{-PT}_2\text{TM}$ (labelled $\text{PT}_2\text{TM-H}$), its geometry was first optimised as a doublet on UB3LYP-D3BJ/def2-SVP [95, 96] and the presence of a local minimum of C_2 point group symmetry was confirmed by harmonic vibrational frequency analysis. Then, using the def2-SVPD basis set, orbitals were optimised by CASSCF(11,11) state-specific to the ground doublet, following which the excited doublet energies were obtained by CASCI. In this last calculation,

the RIJCOSX approximation (RIJCOSX = resolution of identity approximation for the Coulomb term and chain-of-spheres approximation for the exchange term) was applied using the def2/JK auxiliary basis set. All CASCI energies were corrected by the strongly contracted second-order N-electron valence state perturbation theory (SC-NEVPT2).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Y.R.P. and J.Y.-Z. were supported through the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) under 2019030-SP DOE CalTech Sub S532207 (DE-SC0022089).

- [1] D. D. Awschalom, R. Hanson, J. Wrachtrup, and B. B. Zhou, *Nature Photonics* **12**, 516 (2018).
- [2] M. H. Abobeih, J. Randall, C. E. Bradley, H. P. Bartling, M. A. Bakker, M. J. Degen, M. Markham, D. J. Twitchen, and T. H. Taminiau, *Nature* **576**, 411 (2019).
- [3] W. Pfaff, B. J. Hensen, H. Bernien, S. B. van Dam, M. S. Blok, T. H. Taminiau, M. J. Tiggelman, R. N. Schouten, M. Markham, D. J. Twitchen, and R. Hanson, *Science* **345**, 532 (2014).
- [4] J. M. Taylor, P. Cappellaro, L. Childress, L. Jiang, D. Budker, P. R. Hemmer, A. Yacoby, R. Walsworth, and M. D. Lukin, *Nature Physics* **4**, 810 (2008).
- [5] C. Degen, F. Reinhard, and P. Cappellaro, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **89**, 035002 (2017).
- [6] B. C. Rose, D. Huang, Z.-H. Zhang, P. Stevenson, A. M. Tyryshkin, S. Sangtawesin, S. Srinivasan, L. Loudin, M. L. Markham, A. M. Edmonds, D. J. Twitchen, S. A. Lyon, and N. P. de Leon, *Science* **361**, 60 (2018).
- [7] A. Gottscholl, M. Kianinia, V. Soltamov, S. Orlinskii, G. Mamin, C. Bradac, C. Kasper, K. Krambrock, A. Sperlich, M. Toth, I. Aharonovich, and V. Dyakonov, *Nature Materials* **19**, 540 (2020).
- [8] N. Chejanovsky, A. Mukherjee, J. Geng, Y.-C. Chen, Y. Kim, A. Denisenko, A. Finkler, T. Taniguchi, K. Watanabe, D. B. R. Dasari, P. Auburger, A. Gali, J. H. Smet, and J. Wrachtrup, *Nature Materials* **20**, 1079 (2021).
- [9] S. Mukherjee, Z.-H. Zhang, D. G. Oblinsky, M. O. de Vries, B. C. Johnson, B. C. Gibson, E. L. H. Mayes, A. M. Edmonds, N. Palmer, M. L. Markham, Á. Gali, G. Thiering, A. Dalis, T. Dumm, G. D. Scholes, A. Stacey, P. Reineck, and N. P. de Leon, *Nano Letters* **23**, 2557 (2023).
- [10] J. Li, Y. Jin, J. Yu, W. Yang, and T. Zhu, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* **15**, 2757 (2024).
- [11] A. Dréau, M. Lesik, L. Rondin, P. Spinicelli, O. Arcizet, J.-F. Roch, and V. Jacques, *Physical Review B* **84**, 195204 (2011).
- [12] J. P. Tetienne, L. Rondin, P. Spinicelli, M. Chipaux, T. Debuisschert, J.-F. Roch, and V. Jacques, *New Journal of Physics* **14**, 103033 (2012).
- [13] K. Li, V. D. Dergachev, I. D. Dergachev, S. Zhang, S. A. Varganov, and Y. Ping, *Excited-state dynamics and optically detected magnetic resonance of solid-state spin defects from first principles* (2024), arXiv:2404.05917 [cond-mat.mtrl-sci].

- [14] M. W. Doherty, N. B. Manson, P. Delaney, F. Jelezko, J. Wrachtrup, and L. C. L. Hollenberg, *Physics Reports The nitrogen-vacancy colour centre in diamond*, **528**, 1 (2013).
- [15] A. Gaita-Ariño, F. Luis, S. Hill, and E. Coronado, *Nature Chemistry* **11**, 301 (2019).
- [16] M. Atzori and R. Sessoli, *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **141**, 11339 (2019).
- [17] M. R. Wasielewski, M. D. E. Forbes, N. L. Frank, K. Kowalski, G. D. Scholes, J. Yuen-Zhou, M. A. Baldo, D. E. Freedman, R. H. Goldsmith, T. Goodson, M. L. Kirk, J. K. McCusker, J. P. Ogilvie, D. A. Shultz, S. Stoll, and K. B. Whaley, *Nature Reviews Chemistry* **4**, 490 (2020).
- [18] C.-J. Yu, S. von Kugelgen, D. W. Laorenza, and D. E. Freedman, *ACS Central Science* **7**, 712 (2021).
- [19] D. W. Laorenza and D. E. Freedman, *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **144**, 21810 (2022).
- [20] G. D. Scholes, *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **479**, 20230599 (2023).
- [21] W. Wu and G. D. Scholes, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* **15**, 4056 (2024).
- [22] Y. Yang, E. R. Davidson, and W. Yang, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **113**, E5098 (2016).
- [23] T. Huang, J. Chang, L. Ma, A. J. Fisher, N. M. Harrison, T. Zou, H. Wang, and W. Wu, *NPG Asia Materials* **15**, 62 (2023).
- [24] A. Zhou, Z. Sun, and L. Sun, *The Innovation* **5**, 100662 (2024).
- [25] M. K. Wojnar, D. W. Laorenza, R. D. Schaller, and D. E. Freedman, *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **142**, 14826 (2020).
- [26] S. L. Bayliss, D. W. Laorenza, P. J. Mintun, B. D. Kovos, D. E. Freedman, and D. D. Awschalom, *Science* **370**, 1309 (2020).
- [27] M. S. Fataftah, S. L. Bayliss, D. W. Laorenza, X. Wang, B. T. Phelan, C. B. Wilson, P. J. Mintun, B. D. Kovos, M. R. Wasielewski, S. Han, M. S. Sherwin, D. D. Awschalom, and D. E. Freedman, *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **142**, 20400 (2020).
- [28] R. Mirzoyan, N. P. Kazmierczak, and R. G. Hadt, *Chemistry – A European Journal* **27**, 9482 (2021).
- [29] N. P. Kazmierczak, R. Mirzoyan, and R. G. Hadt, *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **143**, 17305 (2021).
- [30] D. W. Laorenza, A. Kairalapova, S. L. Bayliss, T. Goldzak, S. M. Greene, L. R. Weiss, P. Deb, P. J. Mintun, K. A. Collins, D. D. Awschalom, T. C. Berkelbach, and D. E. Freedman, *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **143**, 21350 (2021).
- [31] M. J. Amdur, K. R. Mullin, M. J. Waters, D. Puggioni, M. K. Wojnar, M. Gu, L. Sun, P. H. Oyala, J. M. Rondinelli, and D. E. Freedman, *Chemical Science* **13**, 7034 (2022).
- [32] S. Bayliss, P. Deb, D. Laorenza, M. Onizhuk, G. Galli, D. Freedman, and D. Awschalom, *Physical Review X* **12**, 031028 (2022).
- [33] T. Goh, R. Pandharkar, and L. Gagliardi, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A* **126**, 6329 (2022).
- [34] N. P. Kazmierczak and R. G. Hadt, *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **144**, 20804 (2022).
- [35] N. P. Kazmierczak, K. M. Luedecke, E. T. Gallmeier, and R. G. Hadt, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* **14**, 7658 (2023).
- [36] K. R. Mullin, D. W. Laorenza, D. E. Freedman, and J. M. Rondinelli, *Physical Review Research* **5**, L042023 (2023).
- [37] E. Sutcliffe, N. P. Kazmierczak, and R. G. Hadt, arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.19032 [10.48550/arXiv.2407.19032](https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.19032) (2024).
- [38] T. Ihara, Organometallic complexes for biosensing, in *Advances in Bioorganometallic Chemistry*, edited by T. Hirao and T. Moriuchi (Elsevier, 2019) Chap. 14, pp. 277–303.
- [39] D. P. Mishra, B. Acharya, S. Tripathy, B. Barik, and P. K. Sahu, *Chemical Physics Impact* **7**, 100326 (2023).
- [40] D. Aguilà, L. A. Barrios, V. Velasco, O. Roubeau, A. Repollés, P. J. Alonso, J. Sesé, S. J. Teat, F. Luis, and G. Aromí, *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **136**, 14215 (2014).
- [41] E. Moreno-Pineda, C. Godfrin, F. Balestro, W. Wernsdorfer, and M. Ruben, *Chemical Society Reviews* **47**, 501 (2018).
- [42] E. Moreno-Pineda and W. Wernsdorfer, *Nature Reviews Physics* **3**, 645 (2021).
- [43] K. E. Smyser and J. D. Eaves, *Scientific Reports* **10**, 18480 (2020).
- [44] R. D. Dill, K. E. Smyser, B. K. Rugg, N. H. Damrauer, and J. D. Eaves, *Nature Communications* **14**, 1180 (2023).
- [45] S. Gorgon, K. Lv, J. Grüne, B. H. Drummond, W. K. Myers, G. Londi, G. Ricci, D. Valverde, C. Tonnelé, P. Murto, A. S. Romanov, D. Casanova, V. Dyakonov, A. Sperlich, D. Beljonne, Y. Olivier, F. Li, R. H. Friend, and E. W. Evans, *Nature* **620**, 538 (2023).
- [46] J. R. Palmer, M. L. Williams, R. M. Young, K. R. Peinkofer, B. T. Phelan, M. D. Krzyaniak, and M. R. Wasielewski, *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **146**, 1089 (2024).
- [47] A. Mena, S. K. Mann, A. Cowley-Semple, E. Bryan, S. Heutz, D. R. McCamey, M. Attwood, and S. L. Bayliss, *Room-temperature optically detected coherent control of molecular spins* (2024), [arXiv:2402.07572 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.07572).
- [48] H. Singh, N. D'Souza, K. Zhong, E. Druga, J. Oshiro, B. Blankenship, J. A. Reimer, J. D. Breeze, and A. Ajoy, *Room-temperature quantum sensing with photoexcited triplet electrons in organic crystals* (2024), [arXiv:2402.13898 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.13898).
- [49] A. Privitera, A. Chiesa, F. Santanni, A. Carella, D. Ranieri, A. Caneschi, M. D. Krzyaniak, R. M. Young, M. R. Wasielewski, S. Carretta, and R. Sessoli, arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.02104 [10.48550/arXiv.2408.02104](https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.02104) (2024).
- [50] A. Yamauchi, S. Fujiwara, N. Kimizuka, M. Asada, M. Fujiwara, T. Nakamura, J. Pirillo, Y. Hijikata, and N. Yanai, *Nature Communications* **15**, 7622 (2024).
- [51] Y. R. Poh, D. Morozov, N. P. Kazmierczak, R. G. Hadt, G. Groenhof, and J. Yuen-Zhou, *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **146**, 15549 (2024).
- [52] R. Chowdhury, P. Murto, N. A. Panjwani, Y. Sun, P. Ghosh, Y. Boeijs, V. Derkach, S.-J. Woo, O. Millington, D. G. Congrave, Y. Fu, T. B. E. Mustafa, M. Monteverde, J. Cerdá, J. Behrends, A. Rao, D. Beljonne, A. Chepelianskii, H. Bronstein, and R. H. Friend, arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.03365 [10.48550/arXiv.2406.03365](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.03365) (2024).
- [53] S. M. Kopp, S. Nakamura, B. T. Phelan, Y. R. Poh, S. B. Tyndall, P. J. Brown, Y. Huang, J. Yuen-Zhou, M. D. Krzyaniak, and M. R. Wasielewski, *Journal of the American Chemical Society* [10.1021/jacs.4c11116](https://doi.org/10.1021/jacs.4c11116) (2024).
- [54] D. Shimizu, H. Sotome, H. Miyasaka, and K. Matsuda, *ACS Central Science* **10**, 890 (2024).

- [55] T. Khvorost, P. Wójcik, C. Chang, M. Calvillo, C. Dickerson, G. Lao, E. R. Hudson, A. I. Krylov, and A. N. Alexandrova, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* **15**, 5665 (2024).
- [56] P. Wójcik, T. Khvorost, G. Lao, G. Zhu, A. Macias Jr, J. Caram, W. Campbell, M. García-Garibay, E. Hudson, A. Alexandrova, and A. Krylov, *Photoswitching molecules functionalized with optical cycling centers provide a novel platform for studying chemical transformations in ultracold molecules* (2024).
- [57] T. J. Gately, R. A. Boto, M. J. Tauber, D. Casanova, and C. J. Bardeen, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry C* **127**, 4816 (2023).
- [58] C. Shu, Z. Yang, and A. Rajca, *Chemical Reviews* **123**, 11954 (2023).
- [59] P. Murto, R. Chowdhury, S. Gorgon, E. Guo, W. Zeng, B. Li, Y. Sun, H. Francis, R. H. Friend, and H. Bronstein, *Nature Communications* **14**, 4147 (2023).
- [60] P. Ghosh, A. M. Alvertis, R. Chowdhury, P. Murto, A. J. Gillett, S. Dong, A. J. Sneyd, H.-H. Cho, E. W. Evans, B. Monserrat, F. Li, C. Schnedermann, H. Bronstein, R. H. Friend, and A. Rao, *Nature* **629**, 355 (2024).
- [61] Y. Hattori, E. Michail, A. Schmiedel, M. Moos, M. Holzapfel, I. Krummenacher, H. Braunschweig, U. Müller, J. Pflaum, and C. Lambert, *Chemistry – A European Journal* **25**, 15463 (2019).
- [62] S. Kimura, M. Uejima, W. Ota, T. Sato, S. Kusaka, R. Matsuda, H. Nishihara, and T. Kusamoto, *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **143**, 4329 (2021).
- [63] M. B. S. Wonink, B. P. Corbet, A. A. Kulago, G. B. Boursalian, B. de Bruin, E. Otten, W. R. Browne, and B. L. Feringa, *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **143**, 18020 (2021).
- [64] Z. Feng, Y. Chong, S. Tang, Y. Fang, Y. Zhao, J. Jiang, and X. Wang, *Chemical Science* **12**, 15151 (2021).
- [65] P. Murto and H. Bronstein, *Journal of Materials Chemistry C* **10**, 7368 (2022).
- [66] B. Huang, H. Kang, C.-W. Zhang, X.-L. Zhao, X. Shi, and H.-B. Yang, *Communications Chemistry* **5**, 10.1038/s42004-022-00747-8 (2022).
- [67] A. Abdurahman, J. Wang, Y. Zhao, P. Li, L. Shen, and Q. Peng, *Angewandte Chemie International Edition* **62**, e202300772 (2023).
- [68] D. Schäfter, J. Wischnat, L. Tesi, J. A. De Sousa, E. Little, J. McGuire, M. Mas-Torrent, C. Rovira, J. Veciana, F. Tuna, *et al.*, *Advanced Materials* **35**, 2302114 (2023).
- [69] R. Matsuoka, S. Kimura, T. Miura, T. Ikoma, and T. Kusamoto, *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **145**, 13615 (2023).
- [70] C.-H. Liu, Z. He, C. Ruchlin, Y. Che, K. Somers, and D. F. Perepichka, *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **145**, 15702 (2023).
- [71] B. Prajapati, M. D. Ambhore, D.-K. Dang, P. J. Chmielewski, T. Lis, C. J. Gómez-García, P. M. Zimmerman, and M. Stepień, *Nature Chemistry* **15**, 1541 (2023).
- [72] A. Abdurahman, L. Shen, J. Wang, M. Niu, P. Li, Q. Peng, J. Wang, and G. Lu, *Light: Science & Applications* **12**, 272 (2023).
- [73] Z. Zhou, K. Yang, L. He, W. Wang, W. Lai, Y. Yang, Y. Dong, S. Xie, L. Yuan, and Z. Zeng, *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **146**, 6763 (2024).
- [74] X. Chang, M. E. Arnold, R. Blinder, J. Zolg, J. Wischnat, J. van Slageren, F. Jelezko, A. J. Kuehne, and M. von Delius, *Angewandte Chemie International Edition* **63**, e202404853 (2024).
- [75] A. Mizuno, R. Matsuoka, S. Kimura, K. Ochiai, and T. Kusamoto, *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **146**, 18470 (2024).
- [76] S. Wang, X. Wang, J. Ding, Z. Zhu, J. Wang, L. Shen, A. Abdurahman, G. Lu, J. Wang, and Q. Peng, *Macromolecules* **57**, 6133 (2024).
- [77] C. P. Yu, R. Chowdhury, Y. Fu, P. Ghosh, W. Zeng, T. B. Mustafa, J. Grüne, L. E. Walker, D. G. Congrave, X. W. Chua, *et al.*, *Science Advances* **10**, eado3476 (2024).
- [78] T.-M. Hong and H.-F. Meng, *Physical Review B* **63**, 075206 (2001).
- [79] W. Barford, R. J. Bursill, and D. V. Makhov, *Physical Review B* **81**, 035206 (2010).
- [80] Z. G. Yu, *Physical Review B* **85**, 115201 (2012).
- [81] M. De Groot, I. Hesselmann, and J. Van der Waals, *Molecular Physics* **12**, 259 (1967).
- [82] A. A. Szumska, H. Siringhaus, and J. Nelson, *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics* **21**, 19521 (2019).
- [83] M. Abe, *Chemical Reviews* **113**, 7011 (2013).
- [84] J. Casado, in *Physical Organic Chemistry of Quinodimethanes*, Topics in Current Chemistry Collections, edited by Y. Tobe and T. Kubo (Springer, Cham, 2017) pp. 209–248.
- [85] T. Stuyver, B. Chen, T. Zeng, P. Geerlings, F. De Proft, and R. Hoffmann, *Chemical Reviews* **119**, 11291 (2019).
- [86] Y. Yang, D. Peng, E. R. Davidson, and W. Yang, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A* **119**, 4923 (2015).
- [87] R. Englman and J. Jortner, *Molecular Physics* **18**, 145 (1970).
- [88] N. M. Atherton, *Principles of Electron Spin Resonance*, edited by T. J. Kemp, Physical Chemistry Series (Ellis Horwood, 1993).
- [89] V. I. Chizhik, Y. S. Chernyshev, A. V. Donets, V. V. Frolov, A. V. Komolkin, and M. G. Shelyapina, *Magnetic Resonance and Its Applications* (Springer Cham, 2014).
- [90] A. Szabo and N. S. Ostlund, *Modern Quantum Chemistry: Introduction to Advanced Electronic Structure Theory* (Dover Publications, 1989).
- [91] A. Köhler and H. Bässler, *Materials Science and Engineering: R: Reports* **66**, 71 (2009).
- [92] H. Zhang, C. Belvin, W. Li, J. Wang, J. Wainwright, R. Berg, and J. Bridger, *American Journal of Physics* **86**, 225 (2018).
- [93] A. Abdurahman, T. J. H. Hele, Q. Gu, J. Zhang, Q. Peng, M. Zhang, R. H. Friend, F. Li, and E. W. Evans, *Nature Materials* **19**, 1224 (2020).
- [94] T. J. H. Hele, in *Physical Chemistry of Semiconductor Materials and Interfaces XX*, Vol. 11799, edited by A. J. Musser and D. Baran, International Society for Optics and Photonics (SPIE, 2021) p. 117991A.
- [95] S. Grimme, J. Antony, S. Ehrlich, and H. Krieg, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **132**, 154104 (2010).
- [96] S. Grimme, S. Ehrlich, and L. Goerigk, *Journal of Computational Chemistry* **32**, 1456 (2011).
- [97] F. Neese, *WIREs Computational Molecular Science* **12**, e1606 (2022).
- [98] C. M. Marian, in *Reviews in Computational Chemistry*, Vol. 17, edited by K. B. Lipkowitz and D. B. Boyd (Wiley Online Library, 2001) Chap. 3, pp. 99–204.
- [99] D. G. Fedorov, S. Koseki, M. W. Schmidt, and M. S. Gordon, *International Reviews in Physical Chemistry* **22**, 551 (2003).

- [100] Q. Sun, X. Zhang, S. Banerjee, P. Bao, M. Barbry, N. S. Blunt, N. A. Bogdanov, G. H. Booth, J. Chen, Z.-H. Cui, J. J. Eriksen, Y. Gao, S. Guo, J. Hermann, M. R. Hermes, K. Koh, P. Koval, S. Lehtola, Z. Li, J. Liu, N. Mardirossian, J. D. McClain, M. Motta, B. Mussard, H. Q. Pham, A. Pulkin, W. Purwanto, P. J. Robinson, E. Ronca, E. R. Sayfutyarova, M. Scheurer, H. F. Schurkus, J. E. T. Smith, C. Sun, S.-N. Sun, S. Upadhyay, L. K. Wagner, X. Wang, A. White, J. D. Whitfield, M. J. Williamson, S. Wouters, J. Yang, J. M. Yu, T. Zhu, T. C. Berkelbach, S. Sharma, A. Y. Sokolov, and G. K.-L. Chan, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **153**, 024109 (2020).
- [101] K. Yamaguchi, F. Jensen, A. Dorigo, and K. N. Houk, *Chemical Physics Letters* **149**, 537 (1988).