**Supplemental Material**

**Quasi-static strain governing ultrafast spin dynamics**

Y. Shin, M. Vomir, D.-H. Kim, P. C. Van, J.-R. Jeong, and J.-W. Kim

**SM1) Ultrafast Sagnac interferometry (USI)**

Temperature profiles of sub-systems, decisive quantities for *η*qss(*t*), have been speculated so far by solving the three temperatures model based on experimental data of *θ*(*t*) and *R*(*t*). However, the critical drawback in this process is that *R*(*t*) is, by implication, assumed to have only the contribution of the thermo-optic property () excluding the piezo-optic one () although two effects have a similar order (: complex refractive index). With this reason, the quasi-static strain (piezo) has not been paid attention and this hinders the quantitative estimations of the temperature profiles and the dynamic thermal coupling coefficients *g*ij. For the photo-induced pump-probe experiments, as thermal and strain effects take place nearly at the same time (within 1 ps), we need special ways to investigate those separately. The piezo-optic coefficient of metals is rarely known due to the short penetration depth and moreover it is a very hard task to obtain the reliable coefficient value (usually can be done with the pump-probe method) due to its high sensitivity to many material parameters at the same time. Therefore, we directly measured *u*(*z* = 0, *t*) using USI to obtain the unambiguous values of *η*qss(*t*) and *η*p(*z*, *t*).


****

FIG. S1 Schematic diagram of USI setup. DBS: dichroic beam splitter, NPBS: non-polarizing beam splitter, W-PBS: Wollaston PBS, QWP: quarter wave plate, OL: objective lens, PD: photodetector. This common-path type increases the stability of the measurements.

Figure S1 describes USI measurement setup based on a Ti:sapphire oscillator system issued with a center wavelength of 800 nm and a temporal width of 40 fs. After passing through an electro-optic modulator operating at 1 MHz, the dispersed pulse is compressed to 45 fs by pairs of negative-chirped mirrors. The pump pulses are frequency-doubled by a 500-μm-thick BiB3O6 (BiBO) crystal and have a temporal width of 65 fs at a sample position. The 45 ° () linearly polarized probe of 800 nm passing through PBS is divided into p-pol. and s-pol. probe beams after W-PBS. The incoming p-pol. (s-pol.) beam passes the QWP1 twice after reflection from the sample, then converted to s-pol. (p-pol.) beam making a propagation path of closed loop marked with the blue (yellow) arrow. The p-pol. beam arrives at a negative delay (1 ns before pump-excitation) while s-pol. beam senses the perturbed optical response of the film. Here, we used W-PBS instead of Glan- or cube-type PBS, which has a poor extinction ratio in reflection.



FIG. S2 Probe output intensities of the two photodetectors as a function of the rotation angle *ψ* of QWP2. The four-fold symmetry of probe outputs is the essential requirement for the reliable pump-probe Sagnac interferometric measurements.

The high extinction ratio is important to get high quality symmetric curves of two PDs in static measurements by rotating angle *ψ* of QWP2 as plotted in Fig. S2. This four-fold symmetry is the prerequisite for reliable dynamic measurement. The nonzero offset of PD2 stands for the imperfect destructive interference between two probe beams. This usually comes from the scatterings, the polarization breaking from the imperfection of optical elements, the non-collimated intrinsic laser beam property, etc.



FIG. S3 USI signals of the two photodetectors for the Co single layer measured at *ψ* = 0. By summing and subtracting of two interferometric signals, the real (*ρ*) and imaginary (*δϕ*) parts of the pump-induced optical response in the complex amplitude-reflection coefficient are obtained.

For the dynamic measurement, the 400-nm pump with a larger diameter size (N.A. = 0.4 of OL2) than that of the probe (N.A. = 0.55 of OL1) is focused on the back side of the sample. At *ψ* = 0, pump-probe interferometric signals of PDs are obtained as shown in Fig. S3. With the simple relation of , , and the pump-induced change  is obtained. From respective measurement signals  and  of PDs (red and blue circles in Fig. S3), experimental curves of Fig. 1(c) in the main text are obtained.

**SM2) Quasi-static strain calculation and parameter values**

*Three temperatures model and one-dimensional wave equation*

To obtain *η*(*z*, *t*), it is necessary to solve the three temperatures model and one-dimensional wave equation in the Co(25)/Al2O3 structure. The three temperatures model is described as follows:

, (1)

where *i, j = e, l, s* stand for electrons, lattice, and spins. The *C*i and *κ*i are the heat capacity per unit volume and the thermal conductivity of bath *i*. The *g*ij is the coupling coefficient between two baths *i* and *j*, and *P*(*z, t*) the laser source term. Using boundary conditions – continuities of both the heat transfer at air/Co (), Co/Al2O3 () and the temperatures at Co/Al2O3 () – temperature profiles of the three baths are obtained. Here, since there is an arbitrariness for the selection of pump intensity and unknown value of *C*s, we carefully chose the value by matching with experimental data of both *u*(*z* = 0, *t*) of Sagnac measurement and the demagnetization *θ*L(*t*)/*θ*L (longitudinal geometry) under *H*ext = 0.5 T and *ϕ* = 90 °. That is, *T*l(*z, t*) obtained from three temperature model calculation is linked to *u*(*z*, *t*) through the one-dimensional wave equation as follows:

, (2)

where *ρ* is the mass density, *υ* the sound velocity, *β* the linear thermal expansion coefficient, and *B* the bulk modulus. Using boundary conditions – continuities of both the stress at air/Co (), Co/Al2O3 () and the displacements at Co/Al2O3 () – *u*(*z*, *t*) is solved. By matching *u*(0, *t*) with the Sagnac measurement curve as shown in Fig. 1(c) of the main text, *η*qss(*t*) is fairly determined. The discrepancy in the pump intensity occurring between two different instruments – Sagnac from the oscillator system and MOKE from the amplifier system – are calibrated with Δ*R*(*t*)/*R* of the same Co single layer. The parameter values used in the simulation are as follows: *C*e = 6.6×102 *T*e, *C*l = 3.5×106 [S1], *C*s = -*W*m*dM*2/*dT*s J/m3⋅K [S2], where a molecular field prefactor *W*m was assumed to be 4.5×108 for Co and *C*l = 3.1×106 for Al2O3 [S3]. *κ*Co = 64 [S1], *κ*Al2O3 = 20 W/m⋅K [S4] at 500 K, *B* = 190, *ν* = 0.31 for Co [31] and *B*Al2O3 = 240 GPa, *ν* = 0.28 for Al2O3 [S5]. For dynamic heat coupling coefficients between two sub-systems, we used following values: *g*el = 1.3×1018, *g*ls = 5.0×1017, and *g*es = 3.5×1017 W/m3⋅K to qualitatively match with *θ*L(*t*)/*θ*L and *u*(*z* = 0, *t*) curves as mentioned earlier. For Curie-Weiss curve, we extracted *M*(*T*)=*M*s(1-1.058(*T*/*T*c)α)ξ by fitting data in Ref. [S6], here *M*s = 1360 emu/cm3, *T*c = 1380 K, *α* = 3.15, and *ξ* = 0.50.

*Landau-Lifshitz-Gilbert simulation*

To extract Δ*f*/*f*m from the spin precession dynamics, we need to solve the LLG equation incorporating the magnetoelastic energy term,

, (3)

where *M*s is the saturation magnetization,  the effective magnetic field vector defined as (*F*tot: total magnetic free energy), the gyromagnetic ratio *γ*s = 1.63×1011 rad/s⋅T [S7], and the assumed phenomenological damping constant *α*d = 0.015. *F*tot consists of the magnetocrystalline, dipole, Zeeman, and magnetoelastic energy terms. For the polycrystalline Co film, the magnetocrystalline energy was set to be zero and the magnetoelastic energy term was defined as , where *λ*s = -62 μ for a polycrystalline film [S8], , and  the angle between  and *σ*s direction.

**SM3) Differential Kerr rotation curves for Co single layer for various *ϕ* and *I*p**




FIG. S4 Differential Kerr rotation data of spin precessions of the Co single layer with varying *ϕ* and *I*p. (a) *θ*(*t*) for *ϕ* = 15 ° (b) for *ϕ* = 30 ° (c) for *ϕ* = 45 ° with varying *I*p respectively, and (d) for *I*p = 2.45 mJ/cm2 with varying *ϕ*.

In Fig. S4, we present supplementary data measured for other angles of *ϕ* (15, 30, 45 °) with various *I*p. All data (Fig. S4(a)-(c)) show that the frequency increase of spin precession with *I*p is manifested for broad ranges of angle *ϕ*, not for specific conditions. Figure S4(d) shows the spin precessions for the highest intensity *I*p = 2.45 mJ/cm2 with varying *ϕ*.

**References**

[S1] S. A. Montague, C. W. Draper, and G. M. Rosenblatt, J. Phys. Chem. Solid. **40,** 987 (1979).

[S2] A. H. Morrish, *The Physical Principles of Magnetism* (Wiley-IEEE, New York, 2001), p. 259-275.

[S3] Y. Xu, H. Wang, Y. Tanaka, M. Shimono, and M. Yamazaki, Mater. Trans. **48,** 148 (2007).

[S4] D. G. Cahill, S.-M. Lee, and T. I. Selinder, J. Appl. Phys. **83,** 5783-5786 (1998).

[S5] R. L. Aggarwal and A. K. Ramdas, A. K. *Physical Properties of Diamond and Sapphire* (CRC, Boca Raton, 2019).

[S6] W. W. Stifler, Phys. Rev. (Series I) **33,** 268 (1911).

[S7] G. G. Scott, Phys. Rev. **104,** 1497 (1956).

[S8] E. Klokholm and J. Aboaf, J. Appl. Phys. **53,** 2661 (1982).