Magnomechanics in suspended magnetic beams
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Cavity optomechanical systems have become a popular playground for controllable studies of nonlinear interactions between light and motion. Owing to the large speed of light, realizing cavity optomechanics in the microwave frequency range requires cavities up to several mm in size, hence making it hard to embed several of them on the same chip. An alternative scheme with much smaller footprint is provided by magnomechanics, where the electromagnetic cavity is replaced by a magnet undergoing ferromagnetic resonance, and the optomechanical coupling originates from magnetic shape anisotropy. Here, we consider the magnomechanical interaction occurring in a suspended magnetic beam – a scheme in which both magnetic and mechanical modes physically overlap and can also be driven individually. We show that a sizable interaction can be produced if the beam has some initial static deformation, as is often the case due to unequal strains in the constituent materials. We also show how the magnetism affects the magnetomotive detection of the vibrations, and how the magnomechanics interaction can be used in microwave signal amplification. Finally, we discuss experimental progress towards realizing the scheme.

I. INTRODUCTION

In cavity optomechanical devices, the radiation pressure force mediates an interaction between mechanical modes and photons [1]. This has led to several developments, both fundamental and applied: ground state cooling [2, 3] and entanglement [4, 5] of mechanical modes, quantum information storage in the mechanical excitation and interface, e.g. between superconducting qubits and flying optical photons [6], sensitive measurements with precision limits given by quantum mechanics; classical signal processing with tunable nonlinearities [7–11].

Several implementations of cavity optomechanics have been considered: mirrors on cantilevers and beams [12, 13]; membranes in cavities [14, 15]; atomic clouds [16]; beams and plate capacitors in microwave resonators [17, 18]; photonic crystals patterned into beams [3].

Recently, the coupling between magnons and phonons has been considered to obtain an interaction similar to that in cavity optomechanics, but with the role of photons now played by magnons [19, 22]. The interaction between magnons and phonons is mediated by the combination of the magnetic shape anisotropy and the magnetoelastic effect which make the frequency of the magnet, i.e., the ferromagnetic resonance (FMR), dependent on the strain. One interesting feature is that the speed of spin waves is substantially lower than that of electromagnetic waves, which can offer a much denser integration of similar functionalities. Moreover, enhanced tunability and richer interaction suggest additional possibilities for devices for fundamental studies and applications.

A basic microwave optomechanical system is given by a suspended conducting beam capacitively coupled to a microwave resonator [17, 18]. In our work, we also consider a suspended beam as in Fig. 1 which is now assumed ferromagnetic and magnetized as a single domain. However, as shown below, a simple doubly clamped beam having a mirror symmetry in the $yz$ plane does not give rise to the desired magnomechanical coupling that is linear in the amplitude of vibrations and thus affecting the FMR frequency. This is because in such a case, there is a symmetry between the upward and downward vibrations in Fig. 1 of the beam. On the other hand, this symmetry is often broken in experiments via the presence of a static deformation such as the one shown in Fig. 1 and schematised in Fig. 2. We hence take such static defor-
motions as a starting point in the theoretical description. Typically, even in nanomechanical systems, the beam dynamics is described by the Euler-Bernoulli equation [23]. To take into account the beam stretching, the non-linear Euler-Bernoulli equation is needed [21, 23].

In contrast to the setup in [20, 21] we do not consider any external magnetic field gradient. Indeed, for small devices, a large magnetic field gradient can be hard to realize experimentally. Moreover, comparing to [19–21], in the setup considered here both mechanical and ferromagnetic resonance modes can be driven separately, opening a perspective to signal transduction.

Furthermore in our scheme, by tuning the external magnetic field, it is possible to modulate the optomechanical coupling and thereby the response. In particular, we show how, by changing its strength and direction, we can control the response of the system.

The layout of the paper is as follows. In Sec. II we derive the magnomechanical Hamiltonian for our device. In Sec. III we include mechanical and magnetic driving terms. In Sec. IV we describe possible experiments for the system. Section V discusses the first steps towards implementing a doubly clamped magnetic beam as a platform for magnomechanics.

II. MAGNOMECHANICAL HAMILTONIAN

To motivate the upcoming discussion, let us discuss the optomechanical Hamiltonian in detail. The simplest derivation of optomechanics follows from the assumption of a cavity, described by a bosonic mode $\hat{c}$, whose eigenfrequency $\omega_c$ depends on the position quadrature $\hat{x}_b$ of some mechanical mode $\hat{b}$ (e.g. a mirror connected to a spring). The typical optomechanical Hamiltonian is then obtained by an expansion of the cavity frequency to first order

$$\hat{H}_{\text{optm}} = \hbar \omega_m \hat{b}^\dagger \hat{b} + \hbar \omega_c \hat{x}_b \hat{c}^\dagger \hat{c} \approx \hbar \omega_m \hat{b}^\dagger \hat{b} + \hbar \omega_c \hat{c}^\dagger \hat{c} + \hbar g_0 \hat{c}^\dagger \hat{b}^\dagger + \hat{b},$$

where $\omega_m$ is the eigenfrequency of the mechanical mode. The constant $g_0$ is called the optomechanical coupling and the corresponding term describes the radiation pressure force.

A similar mechanism can be found in ferromagnetic systems. Then, the cavity is replaced by a ferromagnetic resonance (FMR) and so $\dot{c}$ would correspond to a magnon mode. There are at least two distinct physical mechanisms that allow the FMR frequency to depend on a mechanical mode: On one hand, it is well known that the shape of the ferromagnet affects its FMR frequency [25]. On the other hand, the magnetoelasticity directly changes the ferromagnetic dynamics, providing an extraneous anisotropy field [27]. Therefore, the relevant mechanical mode $\hat{b}$ is the vibration of the ferromagnet itself.

In this Section, we start by describing the mechanical and ferromagnetic dynamics of a beam from which we derive the magnomechanical coupling that corresponds to $g_0$ in Eq. (1).

A. Mechanical dynamics

We describe the deformations of the beam in Fig. 1 within the non-linear Euler-Bernoulli beam theory [24, 25]. We assume that the beam dynamics is governed by the deformation in the $x$ direction, that is, the deformation and its dynamics in $y$ direction may be neglected. Without any external force, the mechanical deformation $u(z,t)$ obeys the equation [25, 28]

$$\rho A \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} + EI_y \frac{\partial^4 u}{\partial z^4} = \left[ T_0 + \frac{EA}{2L} \int_0^L dz \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial z} \right)^2 \right] \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial z^2},$$

where $T_0$ is the initial tension, $\rho$ is the mass density, $E$ the Young modulus, $A = wh$ the area of the beam with a rectangular cross section, and $I_y = wh^3/12$ the corresponding bending modulus. We can make Eq. (2) dimensionless by introducing the relations

$$\bar{z} = \frac{z}{L}, \quad \bar{t} = \sqrt{\frac{EI_y}{\rho AL^4}} t,$$

$$\bar{u} = \sqrt{\frac{A}{I_y}} \bar{u}, \quad \bar{T}_0 = \sqrt{\frac{L^2}{EI_y}} T_0.$$

In order to describe the initially buckled beam and the flexural vibrations around it, we choose an approach similar to Ref. [28] which we briefly discuss here.

We divide the mechanical deformation $\bar{u}$ into a static and dynamical part ($\bar{u}_0$ and $\bar{u}_1$, respectively) as in Fig. 2 and assume that the dynamical deformation is small, that is,

$$\bar{u}(\bar{z}, \bar{t}) = \bar{u}_0(\bar{z}) + \bar{u}_1(\bar{z}, \bar{t}), \quad \bar{u}_1 \ll \bar{u}_0.$$

This allows for an expansion of the non-linear Euler-Bernoulli equation (2). We assume that a compressive stress is introduced in the fabrication process of the beam and this stress causes the static deformation as seen in Fig. 1. Here, we describe this compression by a negative tension $T_0 < 0$. Together with the boundary conditions of a doubly clamped beam for both the static and dynamical deformations ($\partial \bar{z}$ denotes $\bar{z}$-derivative)

$$\bar{u}_{0/1}(0) = \bar{u}_{0/1}(1) = \partial \bar{z} \bar{u}_{0/1}(0) = \partial \bar{z} \bar{u}_{0/1}(1) = 0,$$

FIG. 2. The beam deformation $u$ is the sum of the static $u_0$ and flexural $u_1$ component. $\hat{t}$ and $\hat{n}$ are tangent and normal vectors of the beam, respectively.
the mechanical problem may be solved. The details of
the solution can be found in Appendix A.

We find for the static deformation a particularly simple expression
\[ u_0(z) = u_m \frac{1 - \cos(2\pi z/L)}{2}, \]  
(6)
where the parameter \( u_m \) gives the deformation at the mid-point of the beam \( u_0(L/2) = u_m \). This is also the
point of the largest deformation.

From the equation for the dynamic deformation \( u_1 \) –
neglecting the terms that are of second order in \( u_1 \) –
we can then find the flexural eigenmodes \( \chi_n \) and the corresponding eigenfrequencies \( \omega_n \). These do not admit
to simple expressions but a numerical solution is readily
available [29]. Especially, we find that the dimensionless
eigenfrequencies \( \bar{\omega}_n \) are fully determined by the ratio of
the largest static deformation to the height of the beam
\( u_m/h \) but depend very weakly or not at all on the chosen
value in certain regimes for a given mode number \( n \).

With the assumption of small dynamical deformation,
the general solution can be expressed as a superposition
\[ \bar{u}_1(t, \bar{z}) = \sum_n \bar{x}_n(t) \chi_n(\bar{z}) \]  
(7)
with the dynamical amplitudes \( \bar{x}_n \). This in turn gives the mechanical energy
\[ H_{me} = \sum_n \left[ \frac{\bar{p}_n^2}{2m} + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\omega}_n^2 \bar{x}_n^2 \right], \]  
(8)
where the mass is given by \( m = \rho LA \) and the momentum by \( \bar{p}_n = m \bar{x}_n \). Then, we can quantize the harmonic oscillators as usual:
\[ \bar{x}_n = x_n^{ZPM} \hat{b}_n, \]  
\( \hat{b}_n^\dagger = (x_n^{ZPM})^{-1} \left( \bar{x}_n - \frac{i}{m \bar{\omega}_n} \bar{p}_n \right), \]  
(9a)
\[ \hat{b}_n^{\dagger} = (x_n^{ZPM})^{-1} \left( \bar{x}_n - \frac{i}{m \bar{\omega}_n} \bar{p}_n \right), \]  
(9b)
where \( x_n^{ZPM} = \sqrt{\frac{h}{2m\bar{\omega}_n}} \) is the zero-point motion amplitude and \( \hat{b}_n^{\dagger}, \hat{b}_n \) are boson operators for each mode \( n \).

B. Ferromagnetic resonance

The magnetization is driven by an effective field \( H_{\text{eff}} \)
that takes into account [30] the external magnetic field
\( H \), the demagnetizing field \( H_{\text{dm}} \) and the magnetoelastic field \( H_{me} \). We assume the associated anisotropies to
dominate over intrinsic anisotropies. We consider the
magnetization almost uniform, adiabatically following
the beam geometry. For the external magnetic field
we consider a strong static component \( H_0 \) and a perturbation \( h \) oscillating at a frequency close to the ferromagnetic resonance (FMR) frequency \( \bar{\omega}_K \). Furthermore the magnetoelastic energy is larger than the crystal
anisotropy can also be neglected in the polycrystalline
case. Consistent with the assumptions for the elastic de-
formations, we disregard shear components where the elastic deformation would mix different magnetization components.

With the above assumptions, the total magnetic energy density reads
\[ F = -\mu_0 H \cdot M + \mu_0 \frac{M^2}{2} + \frac{B_1}{M_0^2} M^2 \epsilon_{zz} \]  
\[ + \mu_0 \left( M_z^2 - M_x^2 \right) \epsilon_{xz}, \]  
(10a)
\[ \mu_0 H_{\text{eff}} = -\frac{\delta}{\delta M} \int dx^3 F[M]. \]  
(10b)
Here, \( M \) is the magnetization, \( B_1 \) is the magnetoelastic coupling coefficient [27, 31], and \( \epsilon_{zz} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^L dz u'(z)^2 \)
is the strain for the non-linear Euler-Bernoulli theory. We assume the magnet is in the Landau-Lifshitz-Gilbert
regime: \( |M| = M_S \), where \( M_S \) is the saturation magnetization.

We calculate the demagnetizing field in the thin plate
limit, \( h \ll w \approx L \), which allows us to neglect the size-
dependent terms in the demagnetizing field. By requiring the continuity of the \( B \)-field component normal to the beam and the \( H \)-field component parallel to the beam, we can find up to the second order in \( u'(z) \) (see Appendix B)
\[ F_{\text{dm}}/\mu_0 = \frac{M^2}{2} - M_x M_z u'(z) + \frac{1}{2} \left( M_z^2 - M_x^2 \right) u'(z)^2. \]  
(11)
This provides a hard axis parallel to \( \hat{n} \), the (position-
dependent) surface normal to the beam. Since we are
considering a single magnetic domain, we have to average
the demagnetizing field over the beam and the com-
ponent proportional to \( u'(z) \) disappears in the case of a
double clamped beam because of the boundary conditions \( u(0) = u(L) = 0 \) [32]. Moreover, for a small de-
formation the averaged surface normal aligns with the \( x \)
direction, which is why \( x \) axis is a hard axis for a uniform
magnetization. This means that for an in-plane magnetic field considered below, the magnetization also lies in the
\( yz \) plane. On the other hand, deformations provide a
position dependent correction to this hard axis. These
corrections are sensitive to vibrations and thus provide
one contribution to the magnomechanical coupling.

By utilizing the expansion \( \hat{b} \) of the deformation, the strain \( \epsilon_{zz} \) in Eq. (10) may be also expanded to \( \epsilon_{zz} = \epsilon_{zz}^{(0)} + \epsilon_{zz}^{(1)} \) where
\[ \epsilon_{zz}^{(0)} = \frac{1}{2L} \int_0^L dz (\partial_z u_0)^2, \]  
(12a)
\[ \epsilon_{zz}^{(1)} = \frac{1}{L} \int_0^L dz (\partial_z u_0)(\partial_z u_1). \]  
(12b)
In particular, we can observe that without the non-
linear correction to the strain in Eq. (12b) we would
not have any magnetoelastic coupling. With the solution of the static deformation in Eq. [6] we obtain
\[
\varepsilon_{zz}^{(0)} = \frac{\pi^2}{2} \left( u_m / L \right)^2.
\]

We treat both the metallic and insulator ferromagnetic cases (e.g. a two-layer beam with a ferromagnetic insulating layer and a metal layer). To do so, we can observe that the current induced by a static field \( H_0 \) parallel to the \( yz \)-plane and the flexural dynamics gives rise to a negligible screening effect for a thin film. Furthermore, the wavelength of the driving field \( h \), corresponding to a frequency close to the ferromagnetic resonance \( c/\omega \sim 10^{-1} \), is much larger than the characteristic dimension of the typical micrometre-scale beam and, since we do no make particular assumptions on \( h \), we can write the quasi-static approximation:
\[
\nabla \times H_0 \sim 0 \Rightarrow \nabla \times h,
\]
provided that we consider the screened \( h \) in the conducting case.

We assume the magnetization \( M = M_0 + m \), by \( \rho \) in the effective field and then, on \( c_{zz} \), giving rise to an optomechanics-like coupling. The magnetic anisotropy related with the strain also provides a coercive field which in the case of a magnetic field perpendicular to the beam is \( H_c = 2\left| B_1 / (\mu_0 M^2) \right| + 1|\varepsilon_{zz}^{(0)}| M_S \). For further details, see Appendix B.2.

The quantum magnetization Hamiltonian can be obtained by substituting the Holstein-Primakoff relations in the total magnetic energy \( H_{mg} = LAF \) (see Appendix B.3). Choosing the reference direction \( d \) along the static magnetization \( M_0 (\varepsilon' = \cos \theta \hat{z} + \sin \theta \hat{y}) \), we can expand and get
\[
M_{z'} = M_S - \frac{\hbar \gamma}{LA} \hat{m} \hat{m},
\]
\[
M_{z'} = m_{ZPQ} \hat{m}, \quad M_{z'} = m_{ZPQ} \hat{m},
\]
where \( m_{ZPQ} = \sqrt{\frac{2\hbar \gamma M_S}{LA}} \) and \( \gamma \) is the gyromagnetic ratio. The quantized magnetization components \( M_{z'} \), \( M_{z'} = \frac{1}{2i}(M_{z'} - M_{z'}) \) are related to those in the magnetic free energy density \( F \) in Eq. [10] by a rotation of the angle \( \theta \) about the \( x \)-axis which leaves the \( x \)-component invariant, \( M_z = M_{z'} = \frac{1}{2}(M_{z'} + M_{z'}) \).

Without considering the driving terms \( h \) and the coupling with the flexural dynamics \( \varepsilon_{zz}^{(1)} \), the magnetic Hamiltonian reads to the leading order in \( 1/M_S \)
\[
\frac{\hat{H}_m}{\hbar} = \omega_1 \hat{m}^\dagger \hat{m} + \frac{\omega_2}{2} \left( \hat{m}^\dagger \hat{m} + (\hat{m} \hat{m}^\dagger)^2 \right) + \omega_3 \frac{\hat{m}^\dagger \hat{m} - \hat{m}}{\sqrt{2}},
\]
where
\[
\omega_1 = \gamma \mu_0 \left[ H_0 \cos(\phi - \theta) + \frac{M_S}{2} \right] - 3\varepsilon_{zz}^{(0)} \gamma \mu_0 M_S \cos^2 \theta,
\]
\[
\omega_2 = \gamma \mu_0 \frac{M_S}{2} - \varepsilon_{zz}^{(0)} \gamma B_1 \frac{M_S}{M_S} \sin^2 \theta
\]
\[
- \varepsilon_{zz}^{(0)} \gamma \mu_0 M_S \left( \sin^2 \theta + 1 \right),
\]
\[
\omega_3 = -\sqrt{2} \gamma M_S \left[ \varepsilon_{zz}^{(0)} \left( \frac{B_1}{M_S} + \mu_0 M_S \right) \sin 2\theta + \mu_0 H_0 \sin(\phi - \theta) \right].
\]

The term proportional to \( \hat{m}^\dagger \hat{m} \) is the sum of four components: one coming from the external magnetic field \( H_0 \), the second and third from the hard axis and the last from the magnetoelastic coupling. On the other hand, \( \omega_2 \) does not depend on the external magnetic field. This is a consequence of the assumption that \( H_0 \) is equal parallel to the \( yz \)-plane. Finally the linear term \( \omega_3 \) does not depend on the \( x \)-hard axis strength which is quadratic in \( M_e \) in Eq. [10].

\( H_m \) is a highly tunable quadratic Hamiltonian which could be relevant in the continuous-variable quantum information processing [33]: the hard and easy axes produce a controlled squeezing. It is useful now to introduce dimensionless quadrature operators \( \hat{x}_m = (\hat{m}^\dagger + \hat{m})/\sqrt{2} \) and \( \hat{p}_m = i(\hat{m}^\dagger - \hat{m})/\sqrt{2} \). The diagonalization of the Hamiltonian is readily obtained by first displacing the \( \hat{p}_m \) quadrature by \( \omega_3/(\omega_1 - \omega_2) \) and then scaling it by a factor of \( c = \sqrt{(\omega_1 - \omega_2) / (\omega_1 + \omega_2)} \). That is, we define a new bosonic operator \( \hat{l} \) so that \( \hat{l} = \sqrt{c} \hat{p}_m + d \) with the displacement \( d = \sqrt{c} \omega_3 / (\omega_1 - \omega_2) \). Thus, the variance of the \( \hat{l} \) quadrature is changed by a factor of \( c \). In the validity range of the Euler-Bernoulli theory \( \varepsilon_{zz}^{(0)} \ll 1 \), we generally find that \( c < 1 \): the \( \hat{l} \) quadrature is obtained by squeezing \( \hat{p}_m \). At the same time, \( \hat{x}_l = \hat{x}_m / \sqrt{c} \) and the variance increases by a factor of \( 1/c \). The Hamiltonian is then given by \( \hat{H}_m = \hbar \omega_K \hat{l}^\dagger \hat{l} \) where the FMR frequency \( \omega_K = \sqrt{\omega_1^2 - \omega_2^2} \) may be expressed as...
The magnomechanical interaction Hamiltonian reads

\[ H_{mm} = \hbar \sum_n \left( g_n^{me} - g_n^{dm} \right) (\hat{b}_n + \hat{\beta}_n) \left[ \tilde{m} \tilde{m} (3 \cos^2 \theta - 1) + \frac{(\tilde{m})^2 + \tilde{m}^2 \sin^2 \theta}{2} - \frac{M_S L A}{\hbar \gamma} \cos^2 \theta - \frac{\sin^2 \theta}{2} \right] \]

where \( g_n^{me} \) and \( g_n^{dm} \) refer to magnetoelastic and demagnetizing coupling respectively. From the dimensionless \( \tilde{\beta}_n \) factors we get a selection rule: only the modes with odd \( n = 1, 3, \ldots \) corresponding to even modes functions give rise to a coupling. In Fig. 3, we plot \( \tilde{\beta}_n \) for the three lowest even modes as a function of the static bending parameter \( u_m \). We note that the change in the eigenmode shape \( \chi_n \) is as a function of \( u_m \) so drastic that, at certain points, \( \chi_n \) becomes orthogonal to the static deformation \( u_0 \) (for further details, see Appendix A). At these points, the magnomechanical coupling vanishes. Also, rather surprisingly, there is no clear hierarchy of the parameters \( \tilde{\beta}_n \), but rather, they depend strongly on the static deformation. It may hence be that a higher-frequency mode couples stronger to the magnetization dynamics.

There is also a linear coupling,

\[ H_l = \hbar \sum_n g_n^{(l)} \frac{\tilde{m} \tilde{m} - \tilde{m} \tilde{m}}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\tilde{m} \tilde{m}}{\sqrt{2}} \sin 2 \theta \]

which also depends on the mode parameter \( \tilde{\beta}_n \). The coupling strength is also directly proportional to the coercive field \( H_c \) measured perpendicular to the beam. In this work, however, we concentrate on a situation in which the FMR and mechanical frequencies are strongly detuned and the linear coupling will therefore play no further role.

Note that the interaction terms in Eqs. (20) and (21) are written in the original non-diagonalized basis, and therefore are not yet the relevant ones for magnomechanical measurements. Using the transformation (19) allows us to write this in the diagonal basis. Neglecting doubly rotating terms, the result for the magnomechanical coupling Hamiltonian is

\[ H_{mm} = \hbar \sum_n g_{m,n} (\hat{b}_n + \hat{\beta}_n) \hat{\tilde{m}} \hat{\tilde{m}} \]

C. Magnomechanical coupling

By introducing the flexural component of the strain \( \epsilon_{zz}^{(1)} \) via Eqs. (7) and (12b) and replacing \( \epsilon_{zz}^{(0)} \) in Eq. (17) by the full \( \epsilon_{zz} \), we have both a magnomechanical and linear coupling.
The squeezing factor

\[ g_{m,n} = 2(g_m^{me} - g_n^{dm}) \left( c \cos^2 \theta + \frac{1}{c} \cos 2 \theta \right) - 2cg_n^{dm}, \quad (22) \]

depends on the direction of the magnetic field in a non-trivial way which is why the magnomechanical coupling depends not only on the direction of the field but also its precise magnitude setting the direction of the magnetization. Moreover, the magnitude is different for the stable and metastable magnetizations for fields below the coercive field.

We illustrate the dependence of the magnomechanical coupling on the magnetic field direction in Fig. 4 assuming that z-axis is a hard axis \(|B_1| < \mu_0 M_S^2\). We observe that, in general, as the magnitude of the external field strengths, approaches the value \(H_0 = H_c/2\), the magnomechanical coupling decreases. Focusing on the angle \(\phi = 90^\circ\), the magnomechanical coupling changes sign and, for large external field strengths, approaches the value \(g_{m,n} \rightarrow -2g_m^{me}\) as \(M_S/H_0 \rightarrow 0\). Lastly, we find that \(H_0 = H_c/2\) represents the point where the metastable magnetization ceases to exist for some values of \(\phi\). For external fields \(H_0\) that are between \(H_c/2\) and \(H_c\) this shows up in the magnomechanical coupling as divergences; it should be noted, however, that the free energy barrier is very small at these points.

An interesting consequence of our choices for the magnetization free energy is that there are always two values of \(B_1\) that correspond to a given coercive field \(H_c\). This changes the magnomechanical coupling constant as can be observed in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5 which describe the hysteresis curves obtained for an external magnetic field pointing perpendicular to the beam at \(\phi = 90^\circ\).

Without the pre-bending \((u_0 = 0)\), the magnomechanical coupling vanishes due to the mirror symmetry with respect to the yz plane. However, as shown in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5 there are also more non-trivial cases where the magnomechanical coupling disappears, corresponding to specific directions and magnitudes of the field. In those cases, there is a second order cross-Kerr-type term, i.e., quadratic in the deformation \(u\). The situation is then analogous to the "membrane in the middle" optomechanics setup [14] with a vibrating semitransparent mirror in the center of the cavity.

![Figure 4](image1.png)

**Figure 4.** Magnomechanical coupling constant \(g_{m,n}\) as a function of the external field direction \(\phi\). The different curves represent different magnetic field strengths \(H_0\), characterized by the coercive field \(H_c\) at \(\phi = 90^\circ\). The inset shows the corresponding hysteresis curve for \(\phi = 90^\circ\).

![Figure 5](image2.png)

**Figure 5.** Magnomechanical coupling constant \(g_{m,n}\) as a function of the external field direction \(\phi\) that is otherwise identical to Fig. 4 except we set \(B_1 = -0.6\mu_0 M_S^2\). With this value, the coercive field at \(90^\circ\) remains the same but z-axis becomes an easy axis, changing both the hysteresis curve as well as the magnomechanical coupling.

### III. DRIVING INDIVIDUAL RESONANCES

In order to experimentally see the magnomechanical coupling and its effects, it is necessary to consider the ways the magnomechanical system may be driven. At the same time, dissipation to the environment is still to be taken into account. Here, we discuss some general features of the driving while showing an example of a possible scheme together with a model for its description using the input-output formalism [34]. For brevity, we
focus only on reflection measurements.

The driving of the magnon mode \( \hat{m} \) is achieved by applying an alternating magnetic field \( \mathbf{h} \) that is perpendicular to the static field \( \mathbf{H}_0 \). Here, it is convenient to choose \( \mathbf{h} \) in the direction of the displacement \( u \), i.e., in the \( x \)-direction. Then, \( \mathbf{h} \) is independent of the static field \( \mathbf{H}_0 \) or, more precisely, its direction \( \phi \). At the level of the Hamiltonian, this produces an extra term that is proportional to \( \mu_0|\mathbf{h}|M_x \) or \( |\mathbf{h}|(\hat{m} + \hat{m}^\dagger) \). When we move into the diagonalized frame, the squeezing factor \( c \) is introduced. This factor also modifies the coupling of the magnon mode to all free magnetic modes in \( x \)-direction which results in a modification of the magnon dissipation rate.

Since the alternating magnetic field can be produced by an alternating current, we can readily associate the input and output fields of the magnon mode to input and outgoing voltage signals on a transmission line. If we now denote the driving field by \( \hat{l}_{\text{in}} \), we have the input-output relation \( \hat{l}_{\text{out}} - \hat{l}_{\text{in}} = \sqrt{\kappa_\gamma} \hat{l} \) in the diagonalized frame. The dynamics is then determined by

\[
\dot{\hat{l}} = \frac{i}{\hbar} [\hat{H}_S, \hat{l}] - \frac{\kappa}{2} \hat{l} - \sqrt{\kappa_\gamma} \hat{l}_{\text{in}},
\]

where \( \hat{H}_S = \hat{H}_m + \hat{H}_{mn} + \hat{H}_{nc} \) is the system Hamiltonian, \( \kappa \) the total effective magnon linewidth (which depends on the squeezing factor) and \( \kappa_\gamma \) the dissipation rate related to external driving.

Similar to traditional optomechanics, the mechanical mode does not necessarily need to be actuated. However, it may still be driven and characterized, for instance, within the magnetomotive scheme \cite{33,37} by utilizing the static field \( \mathbf{H}_0 \). If an alternating current \( I_d \) goes through the beam, a Lorentz force proportional to \( I_d \mu_0 (\mathbf{H}_0 \sin \phi + M_S \sin \theta) \) acts on the beam to the direction \( \hat{n}(z) \) that is locally perpendicular to the beam. We may neglect the dynamical magnetization in this force as we assume its characteristic frequency to be much larger than those of the vibrational eigenmodes. Likewise, the flexural (dynamic vibrational) modes should have a negligible effect on the direction \( \hat{n}(z) \). It is possible to find the \( x \)-component of the force, \( f_x \), which in turn must be projected to the eigenmodes \( \chi_n \) to determine its effect on the amplitude \( x_n \). Due to the mirror symmetry of the static beam, only the symmetric vibrational eigenmodes couple to this force. By changing the frequency of the drive \( I_d \), we may then drive individual flexural modes on resonance if the vibrations are of high quality.

What is then observed is the induced voltage, as the beam vibrates and thus changes a magnetic flux through a circuit in the \( xz \)-plane. This induced voltage is

\[
V_{emf} = \mu_0 H_0 \sin(\phi) \int_0^L \frac{\partial u(z)}{\partial t} \, dz = \mu_0 H_0 \sin(\phi) L \sum_n \dot{x}_n.
\]

That is, all flexural modes contribute to the voltage. The static magnetization \( M_0 \) may be neglected as it does not provide a change in the magnetic flux in the first order while the dynamical magnetization changes at much higher frequency than the vibrations.

The modelling of the magnetomotive scheme can be done within the input-output formalism. First, we define formally the input and output fields for each vibration mode \( \hat{b}_n \) by the usual relation \( \hat{b}_{n,\text{out}} - \hat{b}_{n,\text{in}} = \sqrt{\gamma_n e} \hat{b}_n \) where \( \gamma_n \) again refers to the total dissipation rate of the vibration mode \( n \) whereas \( \gamma_{n,e} \) refers to external losses. One may then transform this formal input-output relation to match the induced voltage in Eq. (24) by multiplying by \( H_0 L \sin \phi \), using \( x_n \propto (\hat{b}_n + \hat{b}_n^\dagger) \), and taking the time derivative. These transformations define also new input and output fields. However, in the Fourier space, these are linear transformations so we may equally well consider the original input-output relation, as long as we remember that all the fields are in fact proportional to \( \sin \phi \) and that \( \gamma_{n,e} \) depends on the force projection on the eigenmodes. The dynamics of the flexural modes are obtained by

\[
\dot{\hat{b}}_n = \frac{i}{\hbar} [\hat{H}_S, \hat{b}_n] - \frac{\gamma_{n,e}}{2} \hat{b}_n - \sqrt{\gamma_{n,e}} \hat{b}_{n,\text{in}}
\]

from which it is straightforward to obtain the output \( \hat{b}_{n,\text{out}} \).

Lastly, it should be noted that there is "cross-driving", i.e., the different drives exemplified here interact if they are applied simultaneously. The alternating current \( I_d \) through the beam causes a force proportional to \( \mu_0 |\mathbf{h}| I_d \) to the beam. Likewise, it causes an extraneous magnetic flux which generates induced voltage proportional to the magnitude of current \( I_d \). These effects should be negligible in most cases with a frequency mismatch of the magnon and flexural modes.

IV. MAGNOMECHANICS

With the magnomechanical Hamiltonian and the scheme to drive and observe such a system, we may describe an example magnomechanics experiment. The wealth of literature on optomechanical systems can be used straightforwardly due to the similar form of the Hamiltonian. However, there are a few issues that are important for magnomechanics specifically.

The dissipation rate of a magnon mode, in general, is much larger than the accessible mechanical eigenfrequencies. In optomechanics literature, this is referred as being in the non-resolved sideband regime \( \omega_m < \kappa \). It restricts the possible magnomechanical effects. Here, we describe in detail an amplification scheme for microwave signals which is both theoretically known \cite{35} and experimentally observed \cite{39} in optomechanical systems. Especially, we focus on the aspect that is not present in optomechanics: the tunability of the magnomechanical coupling as well as the magnon eigenfrequency with respect to the external static field \( \mathbf{H}_0 \).
The derivation of the reflection coefficient, often called \( S_{12} \), follows the lines of Ref. [38]. First, we assume a strong drive on the magnon system at a frequency \( \omega_d \) and focus on the deviations around the driven system. That is, we replace \( \hat{l} \to (\sqrt{n} + \hat{l})e^{-i\omega_t t} \), where we identify \( n \) as the number of magnons, in the Hamiltonians of Eqs. [16], [20], and [21] using the transformation in Eq. (19). Note that the Holstein-Primakoff transformation gives an upper limit to the strength of the drive, given by \( M_s \gg \hbar \gamma_m/(LA) \). Then, we may neglect the second order terms of the deviations as well as the terms that rotate at frequency \( \omega_d \) or faster. The dynamical part of the Hamiltonian then reads in the diagonalized frame

\[
H_S = \hbar \Omega \hat{l} + \sum_j \omega_j \hat{b}_j \hat{\bar{b}}_j + \sum_j G_j \hat{x}_{l,j} \hat{x}_{b,j},
\]

where \( \hat{x}_{l,j} = (\hat{b}_j + \hat{\bar{b}}_j)/\sqrt{2} \) and the effective coupling constant follows from Eq. (22) by \( G_j = 2\sqrt{n}g_{m,j} \), that is,

\[
G_j = 4\sqrt{n}\left[(g_{m}^{me} - g_{m}^{dm})(\cos^2 \theta + \frac{1}{c} \cos 2\theta) - cg_{m}^{dm}\right].
\]

The effective magnomechanical coupling is thus enhanced by the number \( n \) of magnons and is tunable by the external field \( H_0 \), as it determines the direction of the magnetization \( \theta \) and the squeezing factor \( c \).

The response matrix of the magnomechanical system is obtained by utilizing the input-output equations in the Fourier space and the transformation between the bosonic operators \( \hat{l} \) and \( \hat{b}_j \) and their respective quadratures. For simplicity, let us focus on a single flexural mode \( j \) and denote \( \omega_j = \omega_m \) while dropping the other subscripts. We find the new linear response

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\hat{\bar{b}}(\omega) \\
\hat{l}(\omega)
\end{pmatrix}
= T
\begin{pmatrix}
\hat{\bar{b}}_{in}(\omega) \\
\hat{l}_{in}(\omega)
\end{pmatrix},
\]

where all elements of the matrix \( T \) may be non-zero (further details given in Appendix [C]). Here, it should be noted that \( \hat{l} \) is now defined in a frame that corotates with the drive so the frequencies are defined with respect to the drive frequency \( \omega_d \). For example, \( \hat{l}_{in}(\omega_p) \) corresponds to an input at frequency \( \omega_d + \omega_p \), whereas \( \hat{\bar{b}}_{in}(\omega_p) \) corresponds to \( \omega_d - \omega_p \).

The output fields are readily obtained from the relations \( \hat{l}_{out} = \hat{l}_{in} + \sqrt{\kappa} \hat{l} \) and \( \hat{\bar{b}}_{out} = \hat{\bar{b}}_{in} + \sqrt{\gamma} \hat{\bar{b}} \). Especially, we can define now the reflection coefficients for the magnon and mechanical systems as \( S_{12} = 1 + \sqrt{\kappa} T_{11} \) and \( S_{02} = 1 + \sqrt{\gamma} T_{33} \). Likewise, the transduction coefficients may be defined as \( S_{01} = \sqrt{\kappa} T_{13} \) (from mechanics to magnons) and \( S_{10} = \sqrt{\gamma} T_{31} \) (vice versa).

The amplification of the probe signals may be observed by calculating the reflection coefficient. Assuming that the magnon dissipation rate \( \kappa \) is large compared to \( \omega_m \) and \( \gamma \), we obtain for \( \omega_d = \omega_K \) and \( \omega = \pm \omega_m \)

\[
S_{12} = 1 - 2\frac{\kappa e}{\kappa} \left( 1 \pm \frac{G^2}{\kappa \gamma} \right)
\]

for high quality vibrations \( \omega_m \gg \gamma \). Thus, if the coupling \( G \) is large enough, we find \( |S_{12}| > 1 \). At the same time, the mechanical response is sharply peaked at approximately \( \omega_m \approx \omega_m - \text{Re} f \). This change in the resonant frequency corresponds to the optical spring effect of optomechanics. At this frequency, the reflection coefficient for the force driving the mechanics is given by

\[
f = \frac{i\omega_m \Delta G^2}{\sqrt{\gamma} (\omega_m + \omega_m - \frac{2}{2}) \Delta^2 + (i\omega_m - \frac{2}{2})^2}
\]

and \( \Delta = \omega_K - \omega_d \). Thus, the current through the beam may be modified by the magnomechanical coupling.

The reflection coefficients for different angles \( \phi \) of the external field \( H_0 \) are graphed in Fig. [5]. With the chosen parameters, the effective coupling constant \( \Delta \) vanishes at \( \phi \approx 43^\circ \) (see also the orange line in Fig. [3] and, thus, the responses match those of the uncoupled systems (blue line). It would be possible to obtain larger values of the coupling constant with values \( \phi \approx 0 \) but, as discussed in the Section [II], this would not be commensurate with the magnetomotive scheme for which the input and output amplitudes depend on \( \sin \phi \).

V. EXPERIMENT ON A MAGNETIC BEAM

Already in some experiments, magnetic beams and cantilevers have been considered [40–42]. Here we demonstrate successful fabrication and characterization of a magnetic beam made out of CoFeB, which exhibits a large magnetostriction, and is promising for the upcoming magnomechanics experiments. The beam is a bi-layer system, consisting of non-magnetic aluminium and the CoFeB layer. Using a combination of electron-beam lithography, evaporation, DC sputtering and a lift-off-based process, we first fabricated the beam structures over a silicon substrate. Subsequently, using reactive ion etching, we created the suspended bridge structures. The final fabricated bridges had a length of 50 \( \mu \)m and a width of 10 \( \mu \)m. The aluminium layer had a thickness of 100 nm while the CoFeB layer was 50 nm thick (with a Ta capping layer of 3 nm). Consequent to the fabrication steps, an asymmetric deformation is observed in the bridge at room temperature as seen in Fig. [1]. This deformation may be attributed to a compressive stress owing to a mismatch of the elastic constants in the different layers. Since the thermal expansion coefficients of these layers are also different, it is expected that the compressive stresses observed at room temperature may be changed at cryogenic temperatures. Nevertheless, as pointed out in the above sections, the presence of the
asymmetric deformation is necessary for providing a sizable magnomechanical coupling.

We also characterized the magnetic hysteresis of the suspended wire and found the low-temperature switching field \( H_{sw} = 30 \text{ mT} \) in the presence of a field in the \( y \) direction, i.e., perpendicular to the wire. This hence corresponds to the case considered in Fig. 4. Using the saturation magnetization of CoFeB, \( M_S \approx 1200 \text{ emu/cm}^3 \) corresponding to \( \mu_0 M_S \approx 1.5 \text{ T} \) or \( \gamma \mu_0 M_S \approx 42 \text{ GHz} \), this \( H_{sw} \) would be obtained with \( \epsilon_j \approx 1 + B_1/(\mu_0 M_S^2) \approx 0.01 \). This corresponds to the maximum deformation \( u_m \approx 0.06L \), quite well in line with what is seen in Fig. 4. It should, however, be noted that the magnetoelastic constant \( B_1 \) does not only depend on the material but also on the details of fabrication [31, 43]. To our knowledge, there are no accurate estimates available in the literature that would correspond to our system.

Let us then estimate the expected size of the magnomechanical coupling for this setup. With a typical zero-point motion amplitude \( x_1^{ZPM} / L \sim 10^{-10} \), length-to-height ratio \( L/h \sim 100 \), and the maximum deformation \( u_m/h = 6 \), we get \( g_{0}^{ZPM} \approx 0.2 \text{ Hz} \). This is the scale used in Figs. 4 and 5 and depending on the precise magnetic field the actual magnomechanical coupling may be somewhat larger. It is comparable to what was found for the magnomechanical coupling in [19, 22] for YIG spheres and somewhat smaller than the optomechanical coupling in our setups (e.g., \( g \sim 100 \text{ Hz} \) in [8]).

Experimental preparations on realizing the magnomechanical physics are currently ongoing in our laboratory.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We present a detailed analysis of magnetoelastic interactions in suspended micromechanical beams made out of ferromagnetic materials. We find the mechanical vibrations of the beam, and its ferromagnetic resonance, exhibit nonlinear interactions reminiscent of radiation-pressure coupling in cavity optomechanics or in microwave optomechanics. The interaction, however, is more versatile and easily configurable. Part of the interaction arises via magnetoelasticity, where the vibrations modulate the frequency of the magnetic resonance. The dominant coupling under typical conditions, however, is due to demagnetizing field of the beam, which is affected by the instantaneous shape of the vibrating beam. The predicted radiation-pressure coupling rates are smaller than in microwave optomechanics, but still sizable enough that optomechanical physics such as cooling, amplification and lasing are within experimental reach. In comparison to optomechanics, our system has the assets of a small footprint, a reconfigurable interaction, and a high power tolerance of the magnon resonance.
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Appendix A: Beam dynamics

From the non-linear Euler-Bernoulli equation (2) one can find a beam configuration that has a static deformation as well as the eigenmodes in which the beam vibrates [25]. These eigenmodes depend directly on the static deformation which is caused in our description by a negative tension \( T_0 \). That is, there is a constant compressive stress or “load” which we denote by \( P = -T_0 > 0 \) in the dimensionless units \( (T_0 = L^2 \bar{T}_0 / T_0) \). Assuming that
\( \bar{u}(\bar{z}) = \bar{u}_0(\bar{z}) + \bar{u}_1(\bar{z}, t) \) where \( \bar{u}_0 \gg \bar{u}_1 \), we find that the static deformation \( \bar{u}_0 \) is determined in the lowest order by
\[
\partial_{\bar{z}\bar{z}\bar{z}} \bar{u}_0 + \bar{\alpha}^2 \partial_{\bar{z}\bar{z}} \bar{u}_0 = 0, \quad \bar{\alpha}^2 = P - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \bar{d}\bar{z} (\partial_{\bar{z}} \bar{u}_0)^2. \tag{A1}
\]
A static deformation is possible only if \( \bar{\alpha}^2 > 0 \); otherwise \( \bar{u}_0 = 0 \). This is known as the buckling transition. If this is the case, the symmetric self-consistent solution that contains a single anti-node and obeys the boundary conditions reads
\[
\bar{u}_0(\bar{z}) = \bar{u}_m \frac{1 - \cos(\bar{\alpha} \bar{z})}{\bar{\alpha}}, \quad \bar{\alpha} = 2\pi. \tag{A2}
\]
The parameter \( \bar{u}_m = \pm 4\sqrt{\frac{P}{\pi}} - 1 \) describes the value \( \bar{u}_0 \) of deformation at the middle of the beam \( \bar{z} = 1/2 \). Thus, the static compressive force \( P \) is effectively removed from the description of the beam.

In the first order of \( \bar{u}_1 \), its dynamics is described by
\[
\partial_{\bar{z}\bar{t}} \bar{u}_1 + \partial_{\bar{z}\bar{z}} \bar{u}_1 + \bar{\alpha}^2 \partial_{\bar{z}} \bar{u}_1 - \bar{\beta} \partial_{\bar{z}\bar{z}} \bar{u}_0 = \bar{f}, \tag{A3a}
\]
\[
\bar{\beta} = \int_0^1 d\bar{z} (\partial_{\bar{z}} \bar{u}_0) (\partial_{\bar{z}} \bar{u}_1), \tag{A3b}
\]
where the dimensionless force is given by \( \bar{f} = \frac{A^2/4L^4}{E I} f \).

We can find the flexural eigenmodes by considering \( \bar{f} = 0 \) and Fourier transforming \( \bar{u}_1(\bar{z}, t) = \bar{u}_1(\bar{z}) e^{-i\omega t} \)
\[
\partial_{\bar{z}\bar{z}\bar{z}} \bar{u}_1 + \bar{\alpha}^2 \partial_{\bar{z}\bar{z}} \bar{u}_1 - \bar{\alpha}^2 \bar{u}_1 = \bar{\beta} \partial_{\bar{z}\bar{z}} \bar{u}_0, \tag{A4}
\]
where the dimensionless frequency \( \bar{\omega} \) is related to the physical one with \( \omega = \sqrt{\frac{E I}{\rho A L^2}} \bar{\omega} \). The differential equation \( (A4) \) is written so that the left hand side is the homogeneous equation while the right hand side provides the non-homogeneous term. It is straightforward to check that setting \( \bar{u}_1 \propto \partial_{\bar{z}\bar{z}} \bar{u}_0 \) gives a particular solution. Thus, the general solution may be written as
\[
\bar{u}_1(\bar{z}) = C_1 \cos(\gamma \bar{z}) + C_2 \sin(\gamma \bar{z}) + C_3 \cosh(\delta \bar{z}) + C_4 \sinh(\delta \bar{z}) + C_5 \frac{\bar{\alpha}^2}{2} \bar{u}_m \cos \bar{\alpha} \bar{z}, \tag{A5}
\]
where
\[
\gamma = \sqrt{\sqrt{\bar{\alpha}^4 + 4\bar{\omega}^2} - \bar{\alpha}^2}, \quad \delta = \frac{\sqrt{\sqrt{\bar{\alpha}^4 + 4\bar{\omega}^2} - \bar{\alpha}^2}}{\bar{\alpha}}. \tag{A6}
\]
Here, the terms with \( C_1 \ldots C_4 \) specify the solution of the homogeneous equation.

The constants \( C = (C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4, C_5) \) may be fixed in the following manner: The boundary conditions for \( \bar{u}_1 \) give in total four equations. The last equation is obtained by inserting the full general solution into Eq. \( (A4) \), where we use the definition \( (A3b) \) for \( \bar{\beta} \). This set of equations can be rearranged into a linear equation \( \bar{M}_{\text{nl}} C = 0 \), where the matrix \( \bar{M}_{\text{nl}} \) depends on frequency \( \bar{\omega} \). One can then solve the equation numerically in many ways: we use the singular value decomposition to minimize the smallest singular value and use the corresponding vector \( \bar{C} \) belonging into the null space of \( \bar{M}_{\text{nl}} \). We then normalize the found solution for \( \bar{u}_1 \) so that it corresponds to the eigenmode \( \chi_n \), that is, \( \int_0^1 \bar{d}\bar{z} \chi_n^2 = 1 \).

We note that it would be possible to remove \( C_5 \) by setting \( C_5 = -\bar{\beta}/\bar{\omega}^2 \) which gives the correct particular solution and, then, self-consistently solve for \( \bar{\beta} \). However, the division by the unknown frequency is numerically problematic since values \( \bar{\omega} \approx 0 \) are needed. Even with finite frequencies, this method did not produce orthogonal modes. With the method described above, we find the eigenmodes \( \chi_n \) to be orthonormal to a reasonable numerical accuracy, meaning that \( \int_0^1 \bar{d}\bar{z} \chi_n \chi_m \approx \delta_{nm} \).

In Fig. 7 we have plotted the five first eigenfrequencies. The structure of eigenfrequencies as a function of the static deformation \( u_m \) is that of crossings and avoided crossings. We find, as in Ref. 28, that the antisymmetric modes with \( n = 2, 4 \ldots \) do not depend on the static deformation. This is because the static deformation is symmetric and, thus, \( \bar{\beta} = 0 \) for these modes. As \( u_m \) increases, there is a crossing in eigenfrequencies between the symmetric and antisymmetric mode, followed by an avoided crossing with the next symmetric mode.

A few examples of the eigenmodes \( \chi_n \) for different static deformations \( u_m \) can be found in Fig. 8. In general, we note that the eigenmodes \( \chi_n \) with odd \( n \) are changed by the static deformation while \( \chi_n \) with even \( n \) remain the same. More specifically, the first mode \( \chi_1 \) is plotted in Fig. 8a). After the crossing in eigenfrequencies \( \omega_1 \) and \( \omega_2 \) around \( u_m/h \approx 14 \) the eigenmode \( \chi_1 \) starts to resemble the third mode at small \( u_m \); it has three anti-nodes. The same can be observed for \( \chi_3 \) in Fig. 8c) where the eigenmodes have either three or five anti-nodes. On the other hand, the eigenmode \( \chi_2 \) remains independent of \( u_m/h \) as can be seen in Fig. 8b).
Appendix B: Magnetic dynamics

1. Demagnetizing energy

The demagnetizing field is obtained by requiring the continuity of the H-field components parallel to the beam, that is $H_x = [H_x u'(z) + H_z]/\sqrt{1 + u'(z)^2}$ and $H_y$ (see Fig. 2) and the continuity of the B-field component normal to the beam, that is $B_n = [-B_x + B_z u'(z)]/\sqrt{1 + u'(z)^2}$, where $B = \mu_0 H^\text{mut}$ outside the beam and $B = \mu_0 (H^\text{mut} + M)$ inside. Then, up to the second order in $u'(z)$, we have

$$H_x^\text{dm} = -M_x [1 - u'(z)^2] + M_z u'(z), \quad (B1a)$$

$$H_y^\text{dm} = 0, \quad (B1b)$$

$$H_z^\text{dm} = M_x u'(z) - M_z u'(z)^2, \quad (B1c)$$

which corresponds to the demagnetising energy Eq. (11). Observe that, without any deformation $u(z) = 0$, the demagnetizing field corresponds to a hard axis along $x$.

2. Magnetic hysteresis

The static component of the magnetization $M_0$ can be determined for a given external field $H_0$, knowing the saturation magnetization $M_s$, the magnetoelastic constant $B_1$ and the static initial strain $\epsilon_{zz}^{(0)}$.

For simplicity, we assume that the static component of the magnetic field is parallel to the $yz$-plane: $H_0 = H_0 (\cos \phi \hat{z} + \sin \phi \hat{y})$.

$H_0$ is a function of the angle $\theta$, as the magnitude $H_0$ of the external field pointing at $\phi = 45^\circ$ is increased (orange arrows). The blue line corresponds to $H_0 = 0$. As $H_0$ is increased, the metastable local minimum of $\mathcal{F}_0$ disappears and the global minimum approaches $\phi$.

$H_0 (\cos \phi \hat{z} + \sin \phi \hat{y})$ with $H_0 > 0$. In this case, the static magnetization $M_0$ is obtained by minimizing the energy in Eq. (10)

$$\mathcal{F}_0 = -\mu_0 H_0 \cdot M_0 + \mu_0 \left(\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon_{zz}^{(0)}\right) M_x^2 + \mu_0 \left(\frac{B_1}{\mu_0 M_S^2} + 1\right) \epsilon_{zz}^{(0)} M_z^2. \quad (B2)$$

In the validity range of the Euler-Bernoulli theory $u'(z) \ll 1$ and $\epsilon_{zz} \ll 1$, we must have $M_{ax} = 0$. Thus, we can make the ansatz $M_0 = M_S (\cos \theta \hat{z} + \sin \theta \hat{y})$ where the angle $\theta$ is obtained by minimizing

$$\frac{\mathcal{F}_0}{\mu_0 M_S H_0} = -\cos(\theta - \phi) + \left(\frac{B_1}{\mu_0 M_S^2} + 1\right) M_S H_0 \epsilon_{zz}^{(0)} \cos^2 \theta. \quad (B3)$$

Since, in general, the magnetoelastic constant $B_1$ can be positive or negative, the solution of $\theta$ depends on this choice. More precisely, the sign of $B_1/(\mu_0 M_S^2) + 1$ determines the behaviour of the magnetic free energy $\mathcal{F}_0$ when $H_0$ and $\epsilon_{zz}^{(0)}$ are fixed and non-zero. In either case, the competition between the external magnetic field, the demagnetizing field, and the magnetoelastic field gives rise to hysteresis that is similar to the Stoner–Wohlfarth hysteresis.

If $B_1 > -\mu_0 M_S^2$, the prefactor of $\cos^2 \theta$ term in Eq. (B3) is positive and, therefore, $z$-axis is a hard axis of the magnetic system. The magnetic free energy in this situation is depicted in Fig. 9 as a function of $\theta$. Without any external field (blue line), the minima are found at $\theta = \pm 90^\circ$. When the external field magnitude $H_0$ is increased, at first, one of the minima becomes a global minimum and, eventually, the second metastable local minimum disappears. At the same time, the magnetization angle $\theta$ corresponding to a global minimum approaches $\phi = 45^\circ$.

The case with $B_1 < -\mu_0 M_S^2$ corresponds to an easy $z$-axis, as the sign of $B_1/(\mu_0 M_S^2) + 1$ is negative. Mathemat-
3. Magnetic Hamiltonian

The magnetization dynamics is given by the Landau-Lifshitz equation that can be written in the Hamiltonian formalism [10]

\[ \dot{a} = i \frac{\partial H_{ma}}{\partial a^*}, \quad \dot{a}^* = -i \frac{\partial H_{ma}}{\partial a}, \]  

where

\[ M_{z'} = M_S - \frac{\gamma}{LA} a^* a, \]

\[ M_{+'} = \sqrt{\frac{2\gamma M_S}{LA}} \sqrt{1 - \frac{\gamma}{2M_S LA} a^* a}, \]

\[ M_{-'} = \sqrt{\frac{2\gamma M_S}{LA}} a^* \sqrt{1 - \frac{\gamma}{2M_S LA} a^* a}, \]

\[ H_{mg} = L A F, \quad M_{+'} = M_{-'} \pm i M_{y'}, \]

and the conjugate variables are \( a = (q + ip)/\sqrt{2} \), \( a = (q - ip)/\sqrt{2} \). The quantization can be achieved with \([\hat{a}, \hat{a}^\dagger] = i \hbar \{a, a^*\} = \hbar \), where the braces represent the Poisson brackets. This corresponds to the Holstein-Primakoff bosonization, where \( \tilde{m} = \hat{a}^\dagger \sqrt{\hbar} \) creates a boson.

If we assume \( H_0 = M_S z' \) and \( H_0 \gg \hbar \), we can obtain the linearized Landau-Lifshitz equation by retaining only the quadratic terms in \( a, a^* \) in Eq. \( \text{[B6]} \). After a linear transformation \( a \to \tilde{a} \), with the same form of Eq. \( \text{[19]} \), the Hamiltonian reads \( H_{mg} = \omega_K \tilde{a}^* \tilde{a} - h (\tilde{a}^\dagger \hat{a} + \hat{a}^\dagger \tilde{a}) \), where

\[ \tilde{h} = \mu_0 \sqrt{\frac{\gamma M_S LA}{2}} [h_{z'} (\zeta^+ - \zeta^-) + ih_{y'} (\zeta^+ + \zeta^-)] \]

and \( \omega_K, \zeta^\pm \) are defined in the main text in Eqs. \( \text{[18]} \) and \( \text{[19]} \). Then, by Fourier transforming \( \tilde{a} \to e^{-i\omega t} a \), \( h_{z',y'} \to e^{-i\omega t} h_{z',y'} \), the dynamic equations for the magnetization \( \text{[B5]} \) are

\[ \begin{pmatrix} \ddot{x}_l \\ \ddot{y}_l \\ \ddot{x}_h \\ \ddot{y}_h \end{pmatrix} = M \begin{pmatrix} \dot{x}_l \\ \dot{y}_l \\ \dot{x}_h \\ \dot{y}_h \end{pmatrix} - C \begin{pmatrix} \ddot{x}_{l,in} \\ \ddot{y}_{l,in} \\ \ddot{x}_{h,in} \\ \ddot{y}_{h,in} \end{pmatrix}, \]

from which we can see that \( \omega_K \) is the FMR resonance frequency.

Appendix C: Derivation of the linear response

As in the main text, let us focus on the case of a single flexural mode. Using the input-output equations given in Eqs. \( \text{[B3]} \) and \( \text{[B5]} \) with the Hamiltonian \( \text{[26]} \), we obtain a system of equations

\[ \begin{pmatrix} \dot{x}_l \\ \dot{y}_l \\ \dot{x}_h \\ \dot{y}_h \end{pmatrix} = M \begin{pmatrix} \dot{x}_l \\ \dot{y}_l \\ \dot{x}_h \\ \dot{y}_h \end{pmatrix} - C \begin{pmatrix} \ddot{x}_{l,in} \\ \ddot{y}_{l,in} \\ \ddot{x}_{h,in} \\ \ddot{y}_{h,in} \end{pmatrix}, \]
where \( C = \text{diag}(\sqrt{\kappa_e}, \sqrt{\kappa_e}, \sqrt{\kappa_e}, \sqrt{\kappa_e}) \) is a diagonal matrix containing the external coupling rates and

\[
M = \begin{pmatrix}
-\kappa/2 & \Delta & 0 & 0 \\
-\Delta & -\kappa/2 & G & 0 \\
0 & 0 & -\gamma/2 & \omega_m \\
G & 0 & -\omega_m & -\gamma/2
\end{pmatrix},
\]

where \( \Delta = \omega_K - \omega_d \). The quadrature operators are connected to their bosonic counterparts by a unitary transformation. Let us now denote this transformation by \( U \) and define it such that

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\hat{x}_1 \\
\hat{p}_1 \\
\hat{x}_b \\
\hat{p}_b
\end{pmatrix} = U
\begin{pmatrix}
\hat{i} \\
\hat{b} \\
\hat{b}^\dagger \\
\hat{i}
\end{pmatrix},
\]

\[
U = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}
\begin{pmatrix}
1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
-\sqrt{2} & i & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & -\sqrt{2} & -i
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

The same relation holds for the input operators. Now, we can apply the Fourier transformation \( \hat{z}^{(1)}(\omega) = \int \hat{z}^{(1)}(t) e^{i\omega t} dt \) to Eq. (C1) and use the transformation (C3) to express the linear response matrix \( T \) as

\[
T(\omega) = U^{-1}(i\omega I + M)^{-1}CU.
\]

where \( I \) is the 4-by-4 identity matrix. Due to the complex structure of the response matrix \( T \), there are only \( 6 \) independent components which read

\[
T_{11} = -\frac{i\sqrt{\kappa_e}}{D} \left[ \frac{\omega_m G^2}{2} + i\chi_\gamma(-\omega_m)\chi_\gamma(\omega_m)\chi_\gamma(-\Delta) \right],
\]

(5a)

\[
T_{12} = -\frac{i\sqrt{\kappa_e}}{D} \frac{\omega_m G^2}{2},
\]

(5b)

\[
T_{13} = -\frac{i\sqrt{\gamma_e} G}{D} \frac{\chi_\gamma(-\omega_m)\chi_\gamma(-\Delta)}{2},
\]

(5c)

\[
T_{14} = -\frac{i\sqrt{\gamma_e} G}{D} \frac{\chi_\gamma(\omega_m)\chi_\gamma(-\Delta)}{2},
\]

(5d)

\[
T_{33} = -\frac{i\sqrt{\gamma_e} \Delta G^2 + i\chi_\gamma(-\omega_m)\chi_\gamma(\Delta)\chi_\gamma(-\Delta)}{2},
\]

(5e)

\[
T_{34} = -\frac{i\sqrt{\gamma_e} \Delta G^2}{2},
\]

(5f)

where \( \chi_\gamma(\omega_0) = i(\omega - \omega_0) - \eta/2 \) and

\[
D = \chi_\gamma(\omega_m)\chi_\gamma(-\omega_m)\chi_\gamma(\Delta)\chi_\gamma(-\Delta) - \Delta \omega_m G^2
\]

is the determinant of the matrix \( i\omega I + M \). The full linear response matrix \( T \) may now be written as

\[
T = \begin{pmatrix}
T_{11}(\omega) & T_{12}(\omega) & T_{13}(\omega) & T_{14}(\omega) \\
T_{12}^*(\omega) & T_{11}^*(-\omega) & T_{14}^*(\omega) & T_{13}^*(\omega) \\
T_{33}^*(\omega) & T_{33}^*(\omega) & T_{34}^*(\omega) & T_{34}^*(\omega)
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

That is, the other elements are obtained by conjugation, multiplying by a prefactor \( \sqrt{\gamma_e} \), and setting \( \omega \to -\omega \).


[29] All numerics was constructed with Python and, more precisely, with numpy-, scipy-, and matplotlib-packages. The scripts to produce Figs. 3 – 10 are available at https://gitlab.jyu.fi/jyucmt/suspended-beam-magnomechanics


[32] In a cantilever, the free energy term $\mu_0 M_s M_z u''(z)$ due to demagnetizing field [11] does not disappear. Rather, averaging over the length gives an additional free energy term $-M_s M_z[u(L) - u(0)]/L$ to Eq. (10) which may change the form of the magnomechanical coupling.


