

Magneto-rotation coupling for ferromagnetic nanoelement embedded in elastic substrate

Grzegorz Centała¹ and Jarosław W. Kłos¹

¹*Institute of Spintronics and Quantum Information, Faculty of Physics and Astronomy, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, Poland, Uniwersytetu Poznańskiego 2, 61-614 Poznań, Poland.*

(*Electronic mail: grzcen@amu.edu.pl)

(Dated: 6 March 2025)

This study investigates magneto-rotational coupling as a distinct contribution to magnetoelastic interactions, which can be influenced by magnetic anisotropy. We determine magneto-rotational coupling coefficients that incorporate the shape anisotropy of a magnetic nanoelement (strip) and demonstrate that this type of coupling can be modified through geometric adjustments. Furthermore, we analyze the magneto-rotational contribution to the magnetoelastic field in a ferromagnetic strip embedded in a nonmagnetic substrate. Both Rayleigh and Love waves are considered sources of the magnetoelastic field, and we examine how the strength of the magneto-rotational coupling varies with the direction of the in-plane applied magnetic field. We found that in the absence of magnetocrystalline anisotropy the magneto-rotational contribution to the magnetoelastic field decreases with a reduction in the thickness-to-width ratio of the strip for a Rayleigh wave, whereas for a Love wave, it changes non-monotonically. These findings enhance the understanding of magneto-rotational coupling in magnonic nanostructures.

I. INTRODUCTION

Based on the wave computing paradigm^{1,2}, spin waves and surface acoustic waves (SAWs) enable the design of nanoscale magnonic³ and phononic^{4,5} devices that process GHz signals. This approach allows for the implementation of computational schemes that are difficult or even impossible to achieve with conventional electronic circuits, such as neuromorphic computing^{6,7} or even the efficient simulation of quantum algorithms⁸. However, wave computing on both magnonic and phononic platforms faces unique challenges. For phononics, achieving the nonlinear regime or non-reciprocal propagation is a significant hurdle, while for magnonics, relatively low group velocity and high attenuation present notable limitations. Hybrid magnonic-phononic systems offer a promising solution to overcome these challenges.

Typically, magnonic-phononic hybrids^{9–19} rely on magnetic materials with strong magnetostrictive properties due to their microscopic (atomic) structure. This requirement limits the choice of magnetic materials, as they must also exhibit relatively low damping of magnetization dynamics. An intriguing alternative involves using magnetic materials and structures characterized by magnetocrystalline or shape anisotropy, which enable the exploitation of magneto-rotational coupling^{20,21}. This unconventional magnetoelastic interaction not only facilitates coupling but also induces a non-reciprocity effect^{21,22}.

The magneto-rotational coupling has been a well-known phenomenon for nearly 50 years^{23,24}, with its theoretical foundations established in the 1960s^{25,26}. Recently, this narrow field has experienced a revival in both experimental^{20,22} and theoretical research^{21,27}, driven by increasing interest in magnetoelastic systems that explore the interplay between SAWs and spin waves in magnetic layers, as initiated by Weiler^{28,29}.

Most prior work on magneto-rotational coupling focuses on homogeneous magnetic layers with magnetocrystalline

anisotropy deposited on non-magnetic substrates²¹. In such cases, shape anisotropy is determined solely by the saturation magnetization and the orientation of magnetization relative to the surface normal. In contrast, the work presented here investigates magneto-rotational coupling between the fundamental mode of precessing magnetization and SAWs in a ferromagnetic strip embedded in an elastic, non-magnetic substrate. Specifically, we examine how varying the strip's shape (defined by the ratio of its thickness to width) affects magneto-rotational coupling with Rayleigh and Love waves. Our research shows that it is possible to modify the magneto-rotational coupling by changing the shape anisotropy of the ferromagnetic nanoelement. We found that, in the absence of magnetocrystalline anisotropy, the magneto-rotational contribution to the magnetoelastic field decreases as the thickness-to-width ratio of the strip is reduced or for a Rayleigh wave. In contrast, for a Love wave, this contribution varies non-monotonically.

In the Model section, we introduce the formalism used to determine the magneto-rotational coupling coefficients for the strip, considering the dynamic magnetoelastic contributions and the magneto-rotational effect. In the Results section, we present and analyze the dependence of magneto-rotational contributions to magnetoelastic energy and fields on the orientation angle of the equilibrium magnetization.

II. THE MODEL

The magneto-rotation coupling is related to the presence of magnetic anisotropy in magnetic material which experiences elastic deformation in the form of local twists. Such deformation is formally described by the non-zero antisymmetric part $\omega = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla\mathbf{u} - \nabla\mathbf{u}^T)$ of displacement gradient tensor $\nabla\mathbf{u}$ and, in general approach, gives the contribution to magnetoelastic energy density G_{me} . The rotation tensor ω is often neglected because the equilibrium condition for the whole body requires

the balance of the mechanical torques. However, the precessing magnetization can be a source of the torque²⁶ and ω can not be omitted for magnetoelastic systems.

The magnetoelastic energy density in continuum and elastically isotropic medium, expanded up to linear terms in strain $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla\mathbf{u} + \nabla\mathbf{u}^T)$ and rotation tensors $\boldsymbol{\omega}$, is given by the formula:

$$G_{\text{me}} = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} (b_{\alpha\beta}\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta} + K_{\alpha\beta}\omega_{\alpha\beta}) m_{\alpha}m_{\beta}, \quad (1)$$

where the coefficient $b_{\alpha\beta}$ describes the conventional magnetoelastic interaction and $K_{\alpha\beta}$ magneto-rotation coupling. Since G_{me} is a quadratic form $\mathbf{m}^T \cdot \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{m}$ in terms of magnetization vector $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{M}/M_s$ (normalized to saturation magnetization M_s), the matrix \mathbf{A} can be uniquely defined as symmetric matrix: $A_{\alpha\beta} = b_{\alpha\beta}\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta} + K_{\alpha\beta}\omega_{\alpha\beta} = A_{\beta\alpha}$. Taking into account that the matrix of strain (and rotation) is symmetric (antisymmetric) by definition: $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta} = (\partial_{\beta}u_{\alpha} + \partial_{\alpha}u_{\beta})/2 = \varepsilon_{\beta\alpha}$, $(\omega_{\alpha\beta} = (\partial_{\beta}u_{\alpha} - \partial_{\alpha}u_{\beta})/2 = -\omega_{\beta\alpha})$, we can find that corresponding matrices of coefficients must be symmetric $b_{\alpha\beta} = b_{\beta\alpha}$ (and antisymmetric $K_{\alpha\beta} = -K_{\beta\alpha}$).

The magneto-rotation coupling results from the fact that the anisotropy axis in magnetic material $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ changes its direction $\hat{\mathbf{n}} \rightarrow \hat{\mathbf{n}} + \delta\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ due to elastic deformation, i.e. rotate around the axis of the elastic twist by the angle $\delta\varphi = \frac{1}{2}\nabla \times \mathbf{u}$, which modifies $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ by the amount $\delta\mathbf{n} = \delta\varphi \times \hat{\mathbf{n}}$. The angle $\delta\varphi(\boldsymbol{\omega})$ depends on the components $\omega_{\alpha\beta}$ of the rotation tensor. Therefore, such correction to anisotropy energy density can be interpreted as a contribution $K_{\alpha\beta}\omega_{\alpha\beta}m_{\alpha}m_{\beta}$ to magnetoelastic energy density.

The magnetic anisotropy has two main sources: (i) volume and surface magnetocrystalline anisotropy, related to the atomistic ordering of the magnetic material, and (ii) shape anisotropy, generated by demagnetizing effects of the magnetic body. Regardless of the source magnetic anisotropy will generate magneto-rotation coupling which can be incorporated in the general equation (1). These properties refer to any component of the energy density that is characterized by anisotropic dependence on \mathbf{m} .

In our studies, we considered the simple ferromagnetic nanoelement (strip of the width w and thickness t) deposited on a non-magnetic substrate where the surface acoustic waves (SAW) can propagate with in-plane applied magnetic field – see Fig. 1. The strip is characterized by both the shape anisotropy, tending to align the magnetization along the strip, and surface out-of-plane anisotropy K_s , on its bottom or top face. The effective magnetocrystalline anisotropy $K_1 = K_s/t$ depends on the thickness and the shape anisotropy on the thickness-to-width ratio $p = t/w$. As a result, the magneto-rotation coupling is quite complex and can be tuned by geometric means. We considered the coupling between SAW and the fundamental mode of precessing magnetization. The density of energy related to anisotropy can be written in the general form:

$$G_a = \frac{1}{2}\mu_0M_s^2\mathbf{m}^T \cdot \mathbf{N} \cdot \mathbf{m} + K_1(\mathbf{m} \times \hat{\mathbf{n}}_{\text{mc}})^2, \quad (2)$$

where μ_0 is vacuum permeability and the magnetocrystalline uniaxial anisotropy is oriented along z -axis: $\hat{\mathbf{n}}_{\text{mc}} = \hat{\mathbf{z}}$.

In xyz -Cartesian coordinate system, the demagnetizing tensor \mathbf{N} for the strip, oriented as presented on Fig. 1 has only two non-zero elements¹:

$$N_{yy} = \frac{1}{\pi} \left(\frac{p^2-1}{2p} \ln(1-p^{-2}) - \frac{1}{p} \ln(p) + 2 \arctan(p) \right), \quad (3)$$

$$N_{zz} = 1 - N_{yy}.$$

It is worth noting that the demagnetization energy density formula $\frac{1}{2}\mu_0M_s^2\mathbf{m}^T \cdot \mathbf{N} \cdot \mathbf{m}$ is strict for a generalized ellipsoid³¹, e.g. for an elliptical strip. However, this is a very good approximation for square strip ($p \approx 1$), which also holds for flatter strips (e.g. for the structure considered here where $p \approx 0.1$), if we can still neglect the dipolar pinning^{3,33} – see Supplementary material.

If the shape anisotropy dominates over the magnetocrystalline anisotropy ($\frac{1}{2}\mu_0M_s^2N_{zz} - K_1 > 0$), then uniaxial easy-plane anisotropy can be introduced for both the x - and y -directions. Next, we consider how the rotations of the vectors, $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \rightarrow \hat{\mathbf{x}} + \delta\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{y}} \rightarrow \hat{\mathbf{y}} + \delta\hat{\mathbf{y}}$, modify the energy density associated with magnetic anisotropy. Taking into account (2) and (3), we can express the anisotropy energy density in the presence of an elastic twist of the magnetic material as:

$$G_a = K_1 + \frac{1}{2}\mu_0M_s^2N_{yy}(\mathbf{m} \cdot (\hat{\mathbf{y}} + \delta\hat{\mathbf{y}}))^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2}\mu_0M_s^2N_{zz} - K_1\right)(\mathbf{m} \cdot (\hat{\mathbf{z}} + \delta\hat{\mathbf{z}}))^2. \quad (4)$$

Taking advantages from the fact that changes of the directions $\delta\hat{\mathbf{x}}$, $\delta\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ and $\delta\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ of the xyz -axis are small, we can write (4):

$$G_a = K_1 + \frac{1}{2}\mu_0M_s^2N_{yy}(\mathbf{m} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{y}})^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2}\mu_0M_s^2N_{zz} - K_1\right)(\mathbf{m} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{z}})^2 + \mu_0M_s^2N_{yy}(\omega_{xy}m_xm_y - \omega_{yz}m_y m_z) + (\mu_0M_s^2N_{zz} - 2K_1)(\omega_{xz}m_xm_z + \omega_{yz}m_y m_z). \quad (5)$$

The last two terms in (5) is the magneto-rotation contribution $G_{\text{me,K}}$ to magnetoelastic energy density G_{me} . The first term denotes the anisotropy energy density in the absence of deformation. Deriving of (5), we assume that $\delta\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \omega_{xy}\hat{\mathbf{x}} + \omega_{zy}\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ and $\delta\hat{\mathbf{z}} = \omega_{xz}\hat{\mathbf{x}} + \omega_{yz}\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ are small. By comparing $G_{\text{me,K}}$ with Eq. 2, we can determine the coefficients $K_{\alpha\beta}$ for magneto-rotation coupling:

$$K_{xy} = \frac{1}{2}\mu_0M_s^2N_{yy} = -K_{yx}$$

$$K_{yz} = \frac{1}{2}\mu_0M_s^2(N_{zz} - N_{yy}) - K_1 = -K_{zy} \quad (6)$$

$$K_{xz} = \frac{1}{2}\mu_0M_s^2N_{zz} - K_1 = -K_{zx}$$

$$K_{xx} = K_{yy} = K_{zz} = 0.$$

The conventional magnetoelastic coupling constants, resulting from isotropic magnetostriction of magnetic material are given by the formula: $b_{\alpha\beta} = \delta_{\alpha\beta}b_1 + (1 - \delta_{\alpha\beta})b_2$.

Let's discuss now the magnetoelastic energy density (2) for dynamic magnetization precessing around the arbitral direction $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_3$, determined by the anisotropy and applied field. We assume that the equilibrium direction for static magnetization $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_3$ is deflected from $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ -direction by the angle θ_M , and its projection on xy -plane creates the angle ϕ_M with $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ -direction. Then,




FIG. 1. Magnetoelastic interaction between the fundamental mode of the precessing magnetization in a ferromagnetic strip (blue) and surface acoustic waves (SAW) propagating in a non-magnetic substrate (orange) along the x -direction, i.e. perpendicular to the strip. The interaction is not only due to the intrinsic magnetostriction of the ferromagnetic material but also caused by the magnetic anisotropy and related to the magneto-rotation coupling. The magnetic anisotropy can be tuned by modifying the shape anisotropy, determined by the ratio of thickness t to width w , and the magneto-crystalline anisotropy, introduced by interfacing the ferromagnet with another material (gray layer). The magnetoelastic interaction is strongly anisotropic and depends on both the direction of the equilibrium magnetization $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_3$, controlled by the external magnetic field (the orientation of the precession axis is given by θ_M and ϕ_M angles), and the polarization of the SAW – the interaction is different for Love-SAW (L-SAW) and Rayleigh-SAW (R-SAW).

we can consider the magnetization vector \mathbf{m}' in $x_1x_2x_3$ Cartesian coordinate system rotated by the angles θ_M, ϕ_M respect to xyz system – see Fig. 1. In the linear approximation, the component of magnetization along the equilibrium direction can be considered as constant and equal to saturation magnetization $m_3 \approx 1$ and the remaining dynamic components are small: $m_1(t), m_2(t) \ll 1$. The transformation of magnetization vector between xyz and $x_1x_2x_3$ coordinates systems: $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{R} \cdot \mathbf{m}'$ is given by the orthonormal matrix $\mathbf{R}^{-1} = \mathbf{R}^T$:

$$\mathbf{R} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta_M \cos \phi_M & \sin \phi_M & \sin \theta_M \cos \phi_M \\ \cos \theta_M \sin \phi_M & \cos \phi_M & \sin \theta_M \sin \phi_M \\ -\sin \theta_M & 0 & \cos \theta_M \end{pmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

The transformation of the matrix $A_{\alpha\beta} = b_{\alpha\beta} \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta} + K_{\alpha\beta} \omega_{\alpha\beta}$ from xyz to $x_1x_2x_3$ coordinate system is expressed as: $\mathbf{A}' = \mathbf{R}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{R}$. This allows finding the leading term of the magnetoelastic energy density g_{me} depending on dynamic compo-

nents of magnetization m'_1, m'_2 :

$$\begin{aligned} G_{me} &= \mathbf{m}^T \cdot \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{m} = \mathbf{m}'^T \cdot \mathbf{A}' \cdot \mathbf{m}' \\ &= A'_{33} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{2A'_{13}m'_1 + 2A'_{23}m'_2}_{g_{me}} \\ &\quad + 2A'_{12}m'_1m'_2 + A'_{11}m_1^2 + A'_{22}m_2^2, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where we took $\mathbf{m}' = m_1\hat{\mathbf{x}}_1 + m_2\hat{\mathbf{x}}_2 + \hat{\mathbf{x}}_3$ and used the identity: $(\mathbf{R} \cdot \mathbf{m}')^T = \mathbf{m}'^T \cdot \mathbf{R}^T$. The expression for g_{me} reads:

$$g_{me} = 2(A'_{13}m'_1 + A'_{23}m'_2), \quad (9)$$

where A'_{13} and A'_{23} takes the explicit form:

$$\begin{aligned} A'_{13} &= \frac{1}{4} \sin(2\theta_M) (b_1(\varepsilon_{xx} + \varepsilon_{yy} - 2\varepsilon_{zz}) \\ &\quad + b_1(\cos(2\phi_M)\varepsilon_{xx} - \varepsilon_{yy}) \\ &\quad + 2\sin(2\phi_M)(b_2\varepsilon_{xy} + K_{xy}\omega_{xy}) \\ &\quad + \cos(2\theta_M) (\cos(\phi_M)(b_2\varepsilon_{xz} + K_{xz}\omega_{xz}) \\ &\quad + \sin(\phi_M)(b_2\varepsilon_{yz} + K_{yz}\omega_{yz})), \quad (10) \\ A'_{23} &= \sin(\theta_M) (\frac{1}{2} \sin(2\phi_M)b_1(\varepsilon_{yy} - \varepsilon_{xx}) \\ &\quad + \cos(2\phi_M)(b_2\varepsilon_{xy} + K_{xy}\omega_{xy}) \\ &\quad + \cos(\theta_M) (\cos(\phi_M)(b_2\varepsilon_{yz} + K_{yz}\omega_{yz}) \\ &\quad - \sin(\phi_M)(b_2\varepsilon_{xz} + K_{xz}\omega_{xz})). \end{aligned}$$

The magnetoelastic energy density G can be used to determine the contribution to effective field perceived by magnetization as a result of magnetoelastic coupling:

$$\mathbf{H}_{me} = -\frac{1}{\mu_0 M_s} \nabla_{\mathbf{m}} G_{me}, \quad (11)$$

where $\nabla_{\mathbf{m}}$ is the gradient taken respect to the components of \mathbf{m} . The magnetoelastic field \mathbf{H}_{me} is introduced to the linearized Landau-Lifshitz equation as an external field which does not depend on magnetization and is determined by the gradient of dynamic deformation: ε, ω . We should calculate the magnetoelastic field in $x_1x_2x_3$ coordinate system at the equilibrium orientation of magnetization $\mathbf{m}'_0 = \hat{\mathbf{x}}_3$.

$$\mathbf{H}'_{me} = -\frac{1}{\mu_0 M_s} \nabla_{\mathbf{m}'} G_{me} \Big|_{\mathbf{m}'=\mathbf{m}'_0} = -\frac{2}{\mu_0 M_s} \mathbf{A}' \cdot \mathbf{m}' \Big|_{\mathbf{m}'=\mathbf{m}'_0}, \quad (12)$$

were used the following identity for quadratic form defined by symmetric matrix: $\nabla_{\mathbf{m}'}(\mathbf{m}'^T \cdot \mathbf{A}' \cdot \mathbf{m}') = 2\mathbf{A}' \cdot \mathbf{m}'$. The components of \mathbf{H}'_{me} taken in x_1 - and x_2 -directions read:

$$h'_{1,me} = -\frac{2}{\mu_0 M_s} A'_{13}, \quad h'_{2,me} = -\frac{2}{\mu_0 M_s} A'_{23}. \quad (13)$$

III. RESULTS

We considered the ferromagnetic CoFeB strip, where the surface anisotropy was induced by the MgO layer covering the strip embedded in an elastic substrate – see Fig. 1.




FIG. 2. The coefficients $K_{\alpha\beta}$ for the magneto-rotation coupling as a function of the aspect ratio thickness/width (t/w) of the ferromagnetic strip. The values of $K_{\alpha\beta}$ obtained from the equations (6) and (3) are related to the conventional magneto-elastic constant $b_2 = 7 \times 10^6$ MJ/m³. We have fixed the thickness of the strip $t = 5$ nm and varied its width w . The solid black (dashed red) lines denote the case where the magnetocrystalline anisotropy $K_1 = K_s/t$ is present (absent). The calculation was performed for surface anisotropy $K_s = 1.05$ mJ/m² and saturation magnetization $M_s = 1150$ kA/m. The green rectangle and pink square visualize the aspect ratio. In the absence of K_1 , the absolute sizes t , w are irrelevant and the coefficients $K_{\alpha\beta}$ are determined only by the aspect ratio t/w .

For such a system, we took the following values of material parameters: surface anisotropy:³⁴ $K_s = 1.05$ mJ/m² and saturation magnetisation:³⁴ $M_s = 1150$ kA/m. We assumed the magnetoelastic coupling constants³⁵: $b_2 = 7 \times 10^6$ MJ/m³, $b_1 = -0.5b_2$.

The magnetoelastic interaction is characterized by a strong anisotropy. It depends both on the direction around which the magnetization precesses and on the polarization of the elastic waves. It seems interesting to estimate the influence of the magneto-rotation interaction on this anisotropy or to determine it qualitatively in the absence of conventional magnetoelasticity $b_1 = b_2 = 0$. For the assumed values of M_s , K_s and t the shape anisotropy prevails over the magnetocrystalline anisotropy (2), which means that when an external magnetic field is applied in the plane of the strip, the equilibrium magnetization remains oriented in the plane ($\theta_M = 90^\circ$), between the strip axis and the field direction. This makes it possible to simplify the study and to consider the anisotropy of the magnetoelastic (and especially magneto-rotation) interaction as a function of the direction ϕ_M of the plane-oriented equilibrium magnetization of the strip. For this geometry, the dynamic components of the magnetization m'_1 and m'_2 are oriented in the out-of-plane and in-plane directions, respectively, which means that they will differ in amplitude. These ratio varies with the orientation of the equilibrium magnetization and the applied field H_0 – see Supplementary material. The dynamic magnetization amplitudes were calculated numerically. In Fig. 3, we plot the angular dependence of the magnetoelastic interaction energy density estimated as $|g_{me}| \approx |A'_{13}m'_1| + |A'_{23}m'_2|$ where the following averaged values of the strain and rotational tensor elements were taken

(we assume at the wavelength of SAW is larger than the strip width): $\epsilon_{xx} = \epsilon_{yy} = 10^{-6}$, $\epsilon_{zz} = 0.1\epsilon_{xx}$, $\epsilon_{xy} = 0.25\epsilon_{xx}$, $\epsilon_{xz} = \epsilon_{yz} = 0.05\epsilon_{xx}$, $\omega_{xy} = \epsilon_{xy}$, $\omega_{xz} = \omega_{yz} = \epsilon_{xz}$ ²⁹. For the calculations of the energy density of the magnetoelastic interaction, we have considered the very small amplitude of the SW precession obtained from numerical solutions of the linearised Landau-Lifshitz equation – see Supplementary material. The values of $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{M}/M_s$ are of the order of 10^{-6} .

We considered two particular polarizations of the SAW Love-SAW (L-SAW) and Rayleigh-SAW (R-SAW). For considered geometry (Fig. 1) the following elements of strain (and rotation) tensors are non-zero for (i) R-SAW: ϵ_{xx} , ϵ_{zz} , $\epsilon_{zx} = \epsilon_{xz}$ ($\omega_{zx} = -\omega_{xz}$), and (ii) L-SAW: $\epsilon_{xy} = \epsilon_{yx}$ ($\omega_{xy} = -\omega_{yx}$), $\epsilon_{yz} = \epsilon_{zy}$ ($\omega_{yz} = -\omega_{zy}$).

In Fig. 3, we presented the angular dependence of the elastic energy density $|g_{me}|(\phi_M)$ for different in-plane ($\theta_M = \pi/2$) orientation ϕ_M of equilibrium magnetization $M_s \hat{\mathbf{x}}_3$ ($\phi_M = 0$ means that the $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_3$ is oriented along the CoFeB strip $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_3 = \hat{\mathbf{y}}$). In Fig. 3(a,b), we presented the case of the flat strip ($t/w = 0.1$) with out-of-plane magnetocrystalline anisotropy K_1 which competes with its shape anisotropy. The green contours present a small contribution from magneto-rotation coupling which is magnified 30 times (Fig. 3(a)) or 15 times (Fig. 3(b)) in reference to total magnetoelastic energy density (black contour). We can see that for R-SAW, the magneto-rotation coupling enhances the total magnetoelastic energy density $|g_{me}|(\phi_M)$ and shallows its minimum at the direction $\phi_M = 0$, where the equilibrium magnetization is perpendicular to the strip's axis. On the other hand, for L-SAW, the magneto-rotation increases $|g_{me}|(\phi_M)$ by a few percent in the direction $\phi_M = 90^\circ$ where $|g_{me}|$ was already maximized. It is worth noting that this direction ($\phi_M = 90^\circ$) is the easy axis of shape anisotropy of the strip and we do not need to apply external magnetic field H_0 to align the equilibrium magnetization along this direction.

When we cancel the easy axis out-of-plane anisotropy $K_1 = 0$ then the effective anisotropy increases for a flat strip that is also reflected in the increase of the magneto-rotation coupling constants $|K_{xz}|$, $|K_{yx}|$ for small values of t/w . Moreover, once we neglect $K_1 = K_s/t$ (e.g. by the increase of the thickness t), we can focus on the shape anisotropy which only on the t/w ratio and not on the absolute values of width w and thickness t . Green contours in Fig. 3(c,d) are plotted for the same shape of the strip $t/w = 0.1$ as in Fig. 3(a,b). Let's discuss how the modification of the shape anisotropy, by the increase of the t/w ratio affects the magneto-rotation coupling for R-SAW and L-SAW. This effect is illustrated by the orange, pink, and red contours in Fig. 3(c,d). For R-SAW the magneto-rotation coupling is reduced for increasing aspect ratio t/w . However, for L-SAW the magneto-rotation coupling strength changes differently. It grows significantly for $t/w < 1$. It is worth noting that the lines in Fig. 3 are not continuous for angles $\phi_M \approx 0$. This corresponds to the case when the external magnetic field H_0 (we used the value $H_0 = 0.5M_s$) cannot reorient the static magnetization near the direction of the hard axis $\phi_M = 0$ – see Supplementary material.

The analysis of the magnetoelastic energy density $|g_{me}|$ observes the role of the individual components of the magne-




FIG. 3. The angular dependence of the magnetoelastic energy density $|g_{me}|$ (see Eqs. 9 and 10) for the case when the equilibrium magnetization is oriented in the plane ($\theta_M = 90^\circ$). We consider the coupling of the magnetization dynamics with surface acoustic waves of different polarization (a,c) R-SAW and (b,d) L-SAW – see Fig. 1. In (a,b), we present the density of magnetoelastic energy for ferromagnetic strip of width $w = 50$ nm and thickness $t = 5$ nm, using the same material parameters as in Fig. 2. Black (green) lines represent the total value of $|g_{me}|$ (the contribution of the magneto-rotation coupling to $|g_{me}|$, corresponding to the case when the ferromagnet has no intrinsic magnetostriction $b_1 = b_2 = 0$). For (c,d), we neglected the magnetocrystalline anisotropy $K_1 = 0$ and the change of shape anisotropy. Color lines shows the contribution of the magneto-rotation coupling for different values of the thickness-to-width ratio (t/w) – see inset between (c) and (d). The black lines in (c,d) shows the total $|g_{me}|$ for $t/w = 0.1$. The dynamic magnetization amplitudes were calculated numerically, and took the following averaged values of the elements of the strain and rotation tensors: $\epsilon_{xx} = \epsilon_{yy} = 10^{-6}$, $\epsilon_{zz} = 0.1\epsilon_{xx}$, $\epsilon_{xy} = 0.25\epsilon_{xx}$, $\epsilon_{xz} = \epsilon_{yz} = 0.05\epsilon_{xx}$, $\omega_{xy} = \epsilon_{xy}$, $\omega_{xz} = \omega_{yz} = \epsilon_{xz}$. The contribution of the magneto-rotation coupling is small, and therefore all color contours are magnified 30 (a,c) and 15 (b,d) times.

toelastic field. Fig. 4 presents the angular dependence of the out-of-plane (Fig. 4(a,b)) and in-plane (Fig. 4(c,d)) components of total magnetoelastic field (black contours) and their




FIG. 4. The angular dependence of the dynamic components of the magnetoelastic field $|h'_{i,me}|$ (10) for the case when the equilibrium magnetization is oriented in the plane: ($\theta_M = 90^\circ$). We consider the coupling of the magnetization dynamics with surface acoustic waves of different polarization (a,c) R-SAW and (b,d) L-SAW – see Fig. 1. The upper (a,b) and lower (c,d) panels show the results for the out-of-plane component $|h'_{1,me}|$ and the in-plane component $|h'_{2,me}|$, respectively. The black (green) lines represent the total values of $|h'_{i,me}|$ (the contribution of the magneto-rotation coupling $|h'_{i,me-MR}|$ to $|h'_{i,me}|$, corresponding to the case when the ferromagnet has no intrinsic magnetostriction $b_1 = b_2 = 0$). The results are shown for the same model parameters as in Fig. 3(a,b). The contribution of the magneto-rotation coupling is small, and therefore green contours are magnified 10 times (a,b) or 100 times (d). There is a magneto-rotation contribution to the in-plane component of the magnetoelastic field for R-SAW (c).

magneto-rotation contribution (green contours). The results refer to the flat strip $t/w = 0.1$ with out-of-plane magnetocrystalline anisotropy, that corresponds to the $|g_{me}|$ in Fig. 3(a,b). It is easy to see that for R-SAW (Fig. 4(a,c)) the in-plane component of the magneto-rotation contribution to the magnetoelastic field $h'_{2,me-MR}$ is zero, while for L-SAW (Fig. 4(b,d)) it is significantly reduced compared to the out-of-plane component $h'_{1,me-MR}$. In the considered system (i.e., for a planar




FIG. 5. The relative contribution of the out-of-plane ($i = 1$) and in-plane component ($i = 2$) of dynamic magneto-rotation field $h'_{i,me-MR}$, referred to the corresponding dynamic components of total magnetoelastic field $h'_{i,me}$ for (a) R-SAW (b) L-SAW. The values $|h'_{i,me-MR}|/|h'_{i,me}|$ are plotted depending on the thickness to width ratio (t/w) for two selected directions $\phi_M = 45^\circ$ and $\phi_M = 90^\circ$ where total magnetoelastic coupling is large for R-SAW and L-SAW, respectively. The solid-black and dashed-red lines denote the cases where the magnetocrystalline anisotropy is included and neglected ($K_1 = 0$), respectively. The results are shown for the same model parameters as in Fig. 3.

strip embedded in an elastic substrate), the magneto-rotation effects affect the magnetization dynamics mainly due to the out-of-plane component of the effective field.

Let's discuss more strictly the modification of the components of the magnetoelastic field due to magneto-rotation coupling. Fig. 5 present the dependence of the ratio of magneto-rotation contribution to the total magnetoelastic field of out-of-plane and in-plane components for R-SAW (Fig. 5(a)) and L-SAW (Fig. 5(b)). We selected the directions $\phi_M = 45^\circ$ and $\phi_M = 90^\circ$ around which one can expect the largest magnetoelastic coupling for R-SAW and L-SAW, respectively. We can see that, for R-SAW, the contribution of the magneto-rotation field is the largest for planar strip $t/w \approx 0$. However, for L-SAW these contribution changes non-monotonously. We observe the zero of the out-of-plane component of magneto-rotation contribution at $t/w = 1$ and then ($t/w > 1$) the rapid increase of the ratio $|h'_{1,me-MR}|/|h'_{1,me}|$. The in-plane contribution of the magneto-rotation field is zero for R-SAW. However, for L-SAW the contribution $|h'_{2,me-MR}|/|h'_{2,me}|$ is non-zero but small and increases gradually with the growth of the t/w ratio.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We studied the magneto-rotational coupling in a ferromagnetic strip. Our analysis demonstrated that all non-diagonal coefficients of the magneto-rotational coupling matrix are non-zero for this system and can be tailored by adjusting the shape anisotropy, which depends on the ratio of the strip's thickness to its width.

We investigated how the coupling between the fundamental

mode of magnetization in a strip embedded near the surface of a non-magnetic material and surface acoustic waves of the Rayleigh or Love type depends on the direction of the in-plane applied magnetic field. The magneto-rotational field components, oriented perpendicular to the surface, play a dominant role (Fig. 4(a,b)). The angular characteristics of these fields are orthogonal for Rayleigh and Love waves. For a Rayleigh wave, the magneto-rotational coupling is strongest when the magnetic field is aligned with the wave propagation direction (where conventional coupling is weakest): $\phi_M = 0$. In contrast, for a Love wave, the magneto-rotational interaction is most pronounced when the magnetic field is oriented perpendicular to the wave propagation direction: $\phi_M = 90^\circ$.

The magneto-rotational interaction is weaker compared to conventional magnetostriction. When the magnetic field is aligned in the direction that maximizes conventional magnetoelastic interaction, the magneto-rotational contribution $|h'_{me-MR}|/|h'_{me}|$ constitutes only a few percent of the magnetoelastic field. For the system under study – a CoFeB strip with a SAW propagating perpendicular to its axis – this contribution is approximately 8% when the thickness-to-width ratio t/w approaches zero (where the strip resembles a layer). For Rayleigh wave, the contribution decreases with a reduction in t/w (Fig. 5). For a Love wave, in the absence of magnetocrystalline anisotropy, the magneto-rotational contribution to the magnetoelastic field reaches a minimum at $t/w = 1$. Beyond this point (for $t/w > 1$), the contribution increases significantly (Fig. 5(b)). Under these conditions (Love wave, $\phi_M = 0$, $t/w \gg 1$), the magneto-rotational coupling is significantly enhanced.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work has received funding from National Science Centre Poland grants UMO-2020/39/O/ST5/02110, UMO-2021/43/I/ST3/00550, and support from the Polish National Agency for Academic Exchange grant BPN/PRE/2022/1/00014/U/00001. The authors would like to thank Dr. Piotr Graczyk for his comments and remarks.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The data for the essential figures (Fig. 2, Fig. 3) can be accessed via the following URL <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14911460>. The remaining data is available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

¹F. Zangeneh-Nejad, D. L. Sounas, A. Alù, and R. Fleury, "Analogue computing with metamaterials," *Nat. Rev. Mater.* **6**, 207–225 (2021).

²A. Mahmoud, F. Ciubotaru, F. Vanderveken, A. V. Chumak, S. Hamdioui, C. Adelman, and S. Cofana, "Introduction to spin wave computing," *J. Appl. Phys.* **128**, 161101 (2020).

³A. V. Chumak, P. Kabos, M. Wu, C. Abert, and et al., "Advances in magnetism roadmap on spin-wave computing," *IEEE Trans. Magn.* **58**, 1–72 (2022).

⁴C. Campbell, *Surface Acoustic Wave Devices for Mobil and Wireless Communications*, 1st ed. (Academic Press, Inc., USA, 1998).

- ⁵P. Delsing, A. N. Cleland, M. J. A. Schuetz, J. Knörzer, and et al., “The 2019 surface acoustic waves roadmap,” *J. Phys. D: Appl. Phys.* **52**, 353001 (2019).
- ⁶Á. Papp, W. Porod, and G. Csaba, “Nanoscale neural network using nonlinear spin-wave interference,” *Nat. Comm.* **12**, 6422 (2021).
- ⁷M. Kraimia, P. Kuzewski, J.-Y. Duquesne, A. Lemaître, F. Margailan, C. Gourdon, and L. Thevenard, “Time- and space-resolved nonlinear magnetoacoustic dynamics,” *Phys. Rev. B* **101**, 144425 (2020).
- ⁸C. Yang, T. Liu, J. Zhu, J. Ren, and H. Chen, “Surface-acoustic-wave computing of the grover quantum search algorithm with metasurfaces,” *Phys. Rev. Appl.* **15**, 044040 (2021).
- ⁹L. Thevenard, I. S. Camara, S. Majrab, M. Bernard, P. Rovillain, A. Lemaître, C. Gourdon, and J.-Y. Duquesne, “Precessional magnetization switching by a surface acoustic wave,” *Phys. Rev. B* **93**, 134430 (2016).
- ¹⁰R. Verba, I. Lisenkov, I. Krivorotov, V. Tiberkevich, and A. Slavin, “Nonreciprocal surface acoustic waves in multilayers with magnetoelastic and interfacial dzyaloshinskii-moriya interactions,” *Phys. Rev. Appl.* **9**, 064014 (2018).
- ¹¹M. Xu, J. Puebla, F. Auvray, B. Rana, K. Kondou, and Y. Otani, “Inverse edelstein effect induced by magnon-phonon coupling,” *Phys. Rev. B* **97**, 180301 (2018).
- ¹²O. S. Latcham, Y. I. Gusieva, A. V. Shytov, O. Y. Gorobets, and V. V. Kruglyak, “Controlling acoustic waves using magneto-elastic fano resonances,” *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **115**, 082403 (2019).
- ¹³M. Küß, M. Heigl, L. Flacke, A. Hörner, M. Weiler, M. Albrecht, and A. Wixforth, “Nonreciprocal Dzyaloshinskii–Moriya magnetoacoustic waves,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 217203 (2020).
- ¹⁴S. Tateno and Y. Nozaki, “Highly nonreciprocal spin waves excited by magnetoelastic coupling in a Ni/Si bilayer,” *Phys. Rev. Appl.* **13**, 034074 (2020).
- ¹⁵T. Yokouchi, S. Sugimoto, B. Rana, S. Seki, N. Ogawa, S. Kasai, and Y. Otani, “Creation of magnetic skyrmions by surface acoustic waves,” *Nat. Nanotechnol.* **15**, 361–366 (2020).
- ¹⁶N. K. P. Babu, A. Trzaskowska, P. Graczyk, G. Centała, S. Mieszczyk, H. Głowiński, M. Zdunek, S. Mielcarek, and J. W. Klos, “The interaction between surface acoustic waves and spin waves: The role of anisotropy and spatial profiles of the modes,” *Nano Lett.* **21**, 946–951 (2021).
- ¹⁷R. Lopes Seeger, L. La Spina, V. Laude, F. Millo, A. Bartaszyte, S. Margueron, A. Solignac, G. de Loubens, L. Thevenard, C. Gourdon, C. Chappert, and T. Devolder, “Symmetry of the coupling between surface acoustic waves and spin waves in synthetic antiferromagnets,” *Phys. Rev. B* **109**, 104416 (2024).
- ¹⁸K. M. Seemann, O. Gomonay, Y. Mokrousov, A. Hörner, S. Valencia, P. Klamsner, F. Kronast, A. Erb, A. T. Hindmarch, A. Wixforth, C. H. Marrows, and P. Fischer, “Magnetoelastic resonance as a probe for exchange springs at antiferromagnet-ferromagnet interfaces,” *Phys. Rev. B* **105**, 144432 (2022).
- ¹⁹S. Mondal, M. A. Abeed, K. Dutta, A. De, S. Sahoo, A. Barman, and S. Bandyopadhyay, “Hybrid magnetodynamical modes in a single magnetostrictive nanomagnet on a piezoelectric substrate arising from magnetoelastic modulation of precessional dynamics,” *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces* **10**, 43970–43977 (2018).
- ²⁰M. Xu, K. Yamamoto, J. Puebla, K. Baumgaertl, B. Rana, K. Miura, H. Takahashi, D. Grundler, S. Maekawa, and Y. Otani, “Nonreciprocal surface acoustic wave propagation via magneto-rotation coupling,” *Sci. Adv.* **6**, eabb1724 (2020).
- ²¹T. Sato, W. Yu, S. Streib, and G. E. W. Bauer, “Dynamic magnetoelastic boundary conditions and the pumping of phonons,” *Phys. Rev. B* **104**, 014403 (2021).
- ²²L. Liao, F. Chen, J. Puebla, J. ichiro Kishine, K. Kondou, W. Luo, D. Zhao, Y. Zhang, Y. Ba, and Y. Otani, “Nonreciprocal magnetoacoustic waves with out-of-plane phononic angular momenta,” *Sci. Adv.* **10**, eado2504 (2024).
- ²³S. Maekawa and M. Tachiki, “Surface acoustic attenuation due to surface spin wave in ferro- and antiferromagnets,” *AIP Conf. Proc.* **29**, 542–543 (1976).
- ²⁴V. G. Bar’yakhtar, V. M. Loktev, and S. M. Ryabchenko, “Rotational invariance and magnetoflexural oscillations of ferromagnetic plates and rods,” *J. Exp. Theor. Phys.* **61**, 1040 (1985).
- ²⁵R. D. Mindlin and H. F. Tiersten, “Effects of couple-stresses in linear elasticity,” *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **11**, 415–448 (1962).
- ²⁶H. F. Tiersten, “Variational principle for saturated magnetoelastic insulators,” *J. Math. Phys.* **6**, 779–787 (1965).
- ²⁷K. Yamamoto, M. Xu, J. Puebla, Y. Otani, and S. Maekawa, “Interaction between surface acoustic waves and spin waves in a ferromagnetic thin film,” *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.* **545**, 168672 (2022).
- ²⁸M. Weiler, L. Dreher, C. Heeg, H. Huebl, R. Gross, M. S. Brandt, and S. T. B. Goennenwein, “Elastically driven ferromagnetic resonance in nickel thin films,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 117601 (2011).
- ²⁹L. Dreher, M. Weiler, M. Pernpeintner, H. Huebl, R. Gross, M. S. Brandt, and S. T. B. Goennenwein, “Surface acoustic wave driven ferromagnetic resonance in nickel thin films: Theory and experiment,” *Phys. Rev. B* **86**, 134415 (2012).
- ¹A. Aharoni, “Demagnetizing factors for rectangular ferromagnetic prisms,” *J. Appl. Phys.* **83**, 3432–3434 (1998).
- ³¹J. A. Osborn, “Demagnetizing factors of the general ellipsoid,” *Phys. Rev.* **67**, 351–357 (1945).
- ³G. Centała, M. L. Sokolovskyy, C. S. Davies, M. Mruczkiewicz, S. Mamica, J. Rychlý, J. W. Klos, V. V. Kruglyak, and M. Krawczyk, “Influence of non-magnetic dielectric spacers on the spin-wave response of one-dimensional planar magnonic crystals,” *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 224428 (2019).
- ³³J. Rychlý-Gruszecka, J. Walowski, C. Denker, T. Tübandt, M. Mönzenberg, and J. W. Klos, “Shaping the spin wave spectra of planar 1D magnonic crystals by the geometrical constraints,” *Sci. Rep.* **12**, 20678 (2022).
- ³⁴D.-S. Lee, H.-T. Chang, C.-W. Cheng, and G. Chern, “Perpendicular magnetic anisotropy in MgO/CoFeB/Nb and a comparison of the cap layer effect,” *IEEE Trans. Magn.* **50**, 1–4 (2014).
- ³⁵F. Vanderveken, B. Sorée, F. Ciubotaru, and C. Adelman, “Power transfer in magnetoelectric resonators,” (2022), arXiv:2204.03072 [physics.app-ph].
- ²A. G. Gurevich and G. A. Melkov, *Magnetization Oscillations and Waves* (CRC Press, London, 2020).
- ³⁷D. Wang, C. Nordman, Z. Qian, J. M. Daughton, and J. Myers, “Magnetostriction effect of amorphous CoFeB thin films and application in spin-dependent tunnel junctions,” *J. Appl. Phys.* **97**, 10C906 (2005).
- ³⁸R.-C. Peng, J.-M. Hu, K. Momeni, J.-J. Wang, L.-Q. Chen, and C.-W. Nan, “Fast 180 magnetization switching in a strain-mediated multiferroic heterostructure driven by a voltage,” *Sci. Rep.* **6**, 27561 (2016).

Supplementary material: Magneto-rotation coupling for ferromagnetic nanoelement embedded in elastic substrate

I. DIRECTION OF EQUILIBRIUM MAGNETIZATION IN FERROMAGNETIC STRIP

Demagnetizing effects in the ferromagnetic finite strip are always present. In the absence other sources of anisotropy and an external magnetic field, the shape anisotropy forces the magnetization to align along the axis of the strip. The application of an external magnetic field, deflected from the strip axis, can change the direction of equilibrium magnetization. However, this change depends on the value of the external magnetic field and only for very strong field the orientation of magnetization ϕ_M follows the applied field direction ϕ_H – see Supp. Fig. 6 (a, b).




FIG. 6. The angular dependence of the orientation of equilibrium magnetization (ϕ_M) with respect to the direction applied external magnetic field (ϕ_H) for (a) flat: $t/w = 0.1$ and (b) square $t/w = 1$ strip, respectively. The dependences $\psi_M(\psi_H)$ are plotted for few values external magnetic field H_0 equal to 0.125, 0.25, 0.5 of saturation magnetization (M_s). c) The amplitude of the dynamic component of magnetization in the out-of-plane direction (fundamental mode), for angles of application of the external magnetic field $\phi = 20^\circ, 45^\circ, 70^\circ$. For each angle, the ratio of the average value of the in-plane dynamic magnetization amplitude $\langle |m_{\parallel}| \rangle$ and the average value of the out-of-plane dynamic magnetization amplitude $\langle |m_{\perp}| \rangle$ expressing the average ellipticity was determined. d) The change in the fundamental mode frequency with the angle of magnetization (ϕ_M), in the strip with t/w ratio 0.1 (pink dashed line) and 1 (brown dashed line). Black line is FMR frequency for layer of pristine CoFeB. Studies were obtained for $H_0 = 0.25 M_s$.

The shape anisotropy changes with the aspect ratio (t/w thickness-to-width) of the strip¹. Because of the dependence of magnetorotation coupling on shape anisotropy, this kind of magnetoelastic interaction is influenced both by the the strip and direction of applied field.

Since our model is strictly applicable to the fundamental mode in the strip of ellipsoidal cross-section, we decided to show the profiles the fundamental mode in rectangular strip. In Supp. Fig. 6 (c) presents the out-of-plane component of dynamic magne-

tization $|m_{\parallel}| = |m_{\perp}|$. This mode is the most uniform for the smallest deviations of applied field (and equilibrium magnetization) from the axis of the strip, which is consistent with intuition.

However, the inhomogeneities of the profile of fundamental mode are not large, and we can assume that the precession of magnetization is approximately homogeneous across the strip. To calculate the magnetoelastic energy density, it is necessary to know the dynamic amplitudes of the scaled magnetizations. For a strip with an elliptical cross-section, the analytical formula can be used²:

$$\frac{m_{\parallel}}{m_{\perp}} = \frac{m_2}{m_1} = i \sqrt{\frac{-N_{yy} \cos 2\phi_M + H_0/M_s \cos \phi_H}{N_{zz} - 2K_1/(\mu_0 M_s^2) - N_{yy} \sin^2 \phi_M + H_0/M_s \cos \phi_H}}, \quad (14)$$

where N_{yy} and $N_{zz} = 1 - N_{yy}$ are elements of the demagnetization tensor. In our case, however, we determined the averaged ellipticity numerically.

It is worth noting the frequency studies when changing the equilibrium magnetization angle – see Supp. Fig. 6 (d). As expected, the frequency of the fundamental mode in the strip is higher than in the uniform layer due to dipolar pinning³. However, by rotating the equilibrium magnetization, it is easy to see that the frequency falls below the FMR frequency of the layer. This can be explained by the presence of the generation of potential wells that cause the reduction of dipolar pinning and the concentration of the magnetization amplitude closer to the edges of the strip.

¹A. Aharoni, “Demagnetizing factors for rectangular ferromagnetic prisms,” J. Appl. Phys. **83**, 3432–3434 (1998).

²A. G. Gurevich and G. A. Melkov, *Magnetization Oscillations and Waves* (CRC Press, London, 2020).

³G. Centała, M. L. Sokolovskyy, C. S. Davies, M. Mruczkiewicz, S. Mamica, J. Rychły, J. W. Kłos, V. V. Kruglyak, and M. Krawczyk, “Influence of nonmagnetic dielectric spacers on the spin-wave response of one-dimensional planar magnonic crystals,” Phys. Rev. B **100**, 224428 (2019).